Zoning Request	
ZC-20-12	

# Steen Road



### <u>Summary</u>

Request:	Zoning change from Futur	Zoning change from Future Development "FD," to Single Family 6 "SF-6"		
Applicant:	Mike Siefert Lookout Partners, L.P. 1789 S Bagdad Rd #104 Leander, TX 78641	Property Owner:	Lookout Partners, L.P. 1789 S Bagdad Rd #104 Leander, TX 78641	
Notification			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Notification			
Application:	August 26, 2020	Neighborhood Meeting:	August 31, 2020
Published:	September 6, 2020	# of Participants	0
Posted:	September 4, 2020	Personal:	September 4, 2020
Response:	Opposition: 23		
	In support: 1		

## Property Description

Legal Description:	14.71 acres out of the J.W. Berry Survey			
Location:	Near N LBJ Drive and Stee	Near N LBJ Drive and Steen Road		
Acreage:	14.71 acres	PDD/DA/Other:	N/A	
Existing Zoning:	FD	Proposed Zoning:	SF-6	
Existing Use:	Vacant	Proposed Use:	Single Family Residential	
Existing Occupancy:	<b>Restrictions Apply</b>	Occupancy:	<b>Restrictions Apply</b>	
Preferred Scenario:	Existing Neighborhood	Proposed Designation:	Same	
CONA Neighborhood:	N/A	Sector:	3	
Utility Capacity:	By Developer	Floodplain:	No	
Historic Designation:	N/A	My Historic SMTX	No	
		<b>Resources Survey</b>		

Surrounding Area	Zoning	Existing Land Use	Preferred Scenario
North of Property:	ETJ	Vacant	Low Intensity
South of Property:	SF-6	Single Family	Existing Neighborhood
East of Property:	AR	Single Family	Existing Neighborhood /
			Open Space
West of Property:	SF-6	Single Family	Existing Neighborhood

	Zoning Request	ad
20-20-12	ZC-20-12	

#### Staff Recommendation

X Approval as Submitted		Alternate Approval	Denial		
Staf	ff: Tory Carpenter, AICP, CNUA-A	Title : Planner	Date: September 23, 2020		

#### **Commission Recommendation**

Approval as Submitted	Approval with Conditions / Alternate	<u>X</u>	Denial	
Speakers in favor or opposed				
In Favor:				
1. Mike Siefert				
Opposed.				
2. Randall and Diane Osbor	ne			
3. Steven Aycock				
4. George Gilbert				
5. Jane Saunders				
6. Mary Ann and Robert Mo	berke			
7. Dan Caldwell				
8. Harold Stern				
9. Diane Eure				
10. Naomi Medina				
11. Richard Medina				
	ning and Zoning Commission Meeting held Se	-		
A motion was proposed by Comm	nissioner Kelsey, seconded by Commissioner H	lavei	land to recommend denial of ZC-	
20-12. The motion passed 9-0.				
For: 9				
Against: 0				
Absent: 0				

#### <u>History</u>

This property was annexed in 2015 as part of a City-initiated annexation. The property maintained the default zoning district of Future Development. The applicant has stated that their intention is to entitle the property to sell.

#### Additional Analysis

The development will take access from N LBJ Drive. To meet minimum block perimeter requirements, streets must extend through the site for future connections.

Comments from Other Departments		
Police	No Comment	
Fire	No Comment	
Public Services	No Comment	
Engineering	No Comment	

300/



	Evaluation		Criteria for Approval (Sec.2.5.1.4)
Consistent	Inconsistent	Neutral	
<u>×</u>			Whether the proposed zoning map amendment implements the policies of the adopted Comprehensive Plan and preferred scenario map <i>SF-6 is a "Considered" zoning district per Table 4.1.</i>
		<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 <i>Studies were not complete at the time of this request.</i>
		<u>N/A</u>	Whether the proposed zoning map amendment is consistent with any applicable development agreement in effect <i>There are no development agreements associated with this site.</i>
<u>×</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>
x			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.
×			Whether the site is appropriate for the development allowed in the proposed district While there are significant slopes on less than 10% of the site, additional restrictions on impervious cover will apply in these areas.
<u>×</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.



Evaluation			Criteria for Approval (Sec.2.5.1.4)
Consistent	Inconsistent	Neutral	
<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 <b>Roads and utility infrastructure will be required to extend</b> <b>into and through the development at the developer's cost.</b>
<u>x</u>			Whether the proposed rezoning will have a significant adverse impact on property in the vicinity of the subject property <b>The proposed use is consistent with adjacent uses.</b>
		<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 <i>This is not a request for a Neighborhood Density District.</i>
<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 <b>Residential homes are appropriate for this site.</b>
<u>×</u>			Any other factors which shall substantially affect the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare <i>None noted.</i>