Zoning Request

ZC-20-04

Mystic Canyon



Summary

Request:	Zoning change from FD, CC,	Zoning change from FD, CC, & P to SF-6				
Applicant:	Bill E. Couch	Property Owner:	Kali Kate Services, Inc.			
	Carson Brigance and	Carson Brigance and 4550				
	Doering, Inc.	Doering, Inc. Buda, TX 78610				
	5501 W William Cannon Dr	5501 W William Cannon Dr				
	Austin, TX 78749					

Notification

<u>rtotijication</u>					
Application:	January 7, 2020	Neighborhood Meeting:	April 7, 20202		
Published:	March 8, 2020	# of Participants	1		
Posted:	March 6, 2020	Personal:	March 6, 2020		
Response:	General inquiries: 1				
	Opposition: 2	Opposition: 2			
Support: 1					

Property Description

Legal Description:	5.217 out of the Benjamin J. White Survey			
Location:	East of Old Ranch Road 12 and Craddock			
Acreage:	5.217 PDD/DA/Other: N/A			
Existing Zoning:	FD, CC, P	SF-6		
Existing Use:	Vacant	Single-family		
Existing Occupancy:	Do not apply Occupancy: Apply		Apply	
Preferred Scenario:	Existing Neighborhood	Proposed Designation:	Same	
CONA Neighborhood:	Castle Forest	Sector:	2	
Utility Capacity:	Adequate Floodplain:		No	
Historic Designation:	N/A	My Historic SMTX	No	
		Resources Survey		

Surrounding Area	Zoning	Existing Land Use	Preferred Scenario
North of Property:	MF-24	Multifamily	Existing Neighborhood
South of Property:	SF-6	Vacant	Existing Neighborhood
East of Property:	SF-6	Single Family	Existing Neighborhood
West of Property:	ETJ / SF6	Vacant	Existing Neighborhood

Zoning Request

ZC-20-04

Mystic Canyon



Staff Recommendation

<u>X</u>	Approval as Submitted	Alternate Approval	Denial	
Sta	ff: Tory Carpenter, AICP, CNU-A	Title: Planner	Date: May 13, 2020	

Commission Recommendation

Approval as Submitted

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting: April 28, 2020

Speakers in favor or opposed:

None.

Recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held April 28, 2020:

A motion was made by Commissioner Dillon, seconded by Commissioner Rand, to approve ZC-20-04. The motion carried 6-0.

- **For:** (6) Chairperson Gleason, Commissioner Rand, Commissioner McCarty, Commissioner Dillon, Commissioner Moore, Commissioner Agnew, Commissioner Spell.
- Against: 0

Recused: (1) Commissioner Haverland **Absent:** (1) Vice Chairperson Kelsey

<u>History</u>

The request is associated with the Mystic Canyon development which includes 127 single-family lots. In 2018, the applicant was granted a zoning change from FD to SF-6 for 56.6 acres of the surrounding property. While the developer also had the subject property under contact, it was not included with the application materials for the original zoning change.

Additional Analysis

Comments from Other Departments

comments from c	Total Bepartments		
Police	No Comment		
Fire	No Comment		
Public Services	No Comment		
Engineering	No Comment		

Zoning Request ZC-20-04

Mystic Canyon



Evaluation			Compatibility of Uses & Density Criteria (Sec.4.1.2.5)	
Consistent	Inconsistent	Neutral	Compatibility of Uses & Density Criteria (Sec.4.1.2.5)	
<u>x</u>			Helps prevent the impacts of high density uses on low density areas	
		<u>N/A</u>	Limits changes in neighborhood density categories unless directed by a small area plan or neighborhood character study Studies were not complete at the time of this request.	
<u>x</u>			Encourages more opportunities for home ownership More single-family detached homes allows for more opportunities for home ownership.	
		<u>x</u>	Ensures a diversity of housing to serve citizens with varying needs and interests	

Evaluation			Criteria for Approval (Sec.2.5.1.4)
Consistent	Inconsistent	Neutral	
<u>x</u>			Whether the proposed zoning map amendment implements the policies of the adopted Comprehensive Plan and preferred scenario map SF-6 is a "Considered" zoning district per table 4.1
		<u>N/A</u>	Whether the proposed zoning map amendment is consistent with any adopted small area plan or neighborhood character study for the area Studies were not complete at the time of this request.
		<u>N/A</u>	Whether the proposed zoning map amendment is consistent with any applicable development agreement in effect
<u>x</u>			Whether the uses permitted by the proposed change in zoning district classification and the standards applicable to such uses shall be appropriate in the immediate area of the land to be reclassified <i>This use is consistent with surrounding development.</i>
<u>x</u>			Whether the proposed zoning will reinforce the existing or planned character of the area The predominant surrounding zoning is also SF-6. This zoning change should reinforce the existing character of the area as it is consistent.

Zoning Request ZC-20-04

Mystic Canyon



Evaluation			Criteria for Approval (Sec.2.5.1.4)
Consistent	Inconsistent	Neutral	
<u>x</u>			Whether the site is appropriate for the development allowed in the proposed district While this site is over the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone, it can be developed with no more than 20% impervious cover.
<u>x</u>			Whether there are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used according to the existing zoning Since the property is currently zoned FD, it allows for two-acre single-family lots. These would be much larger than those of the surrounding area and would limit the ability to provide for a more compact development.
<u>X</u>			Whether there is a need for the proposed use at the proposed location The rezoning would increase housing availability.
<u>x</u>			Whether the City and other service providers will be able to provide sufficient public facilities and services including schools, roads, recreation facilities, wastewater treatment, water supply and stormwater facilities, public safety, and emergency services, while maintaining sufficient levels of service to existing development Roads and utility infrastructure will be required to extend into and through the development at the developer's cost.
<u>x</u>			Whether the proposed rezoning will have a significant adverse impact on property in the vicinity of the subject property The proposed use is consistent with adjacent uses.

Evaluation			Criteria for Approval (Sec.2.5.1.4)
Consistent	Inconsistent	Neutral	
		<u>N/A</u>	For requests to a Neighborhood Density District, whether the proposed amendment complies with the compatibility of uses and density in Section 4.1.2.5 This is not a request for a Neighborhood Density District.
<u>x</u>			The impact the proposed amendment has with regard to the natural environment, including the quality and quantity of water and other natural resources, flooding, and wildlife management While this site is over the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone, it can be developed with no more than 20% impervious cover.
<u>x</u>			Any other factors which shall substantially affect the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare None noted.