

## **Comments from Thursday Night Pin-Ups (sticky notes on the Designer-Recommended Design)**

### **Parks**

- No park
- No park
- Park needs to be 4 acres for 250 apts
- No amphitheater
- Who maintains the park?
- 2-acre park as one of the first projects
- Like the restroom at the park
- Build park first
- Like open space provided to surrounding community's benefit
- Love this park
- Love park with retail
- Love the park design
- Love the green space near restaurants
- Check out Diana Memorial Playground, Kensington Gardens (UK) – nature play pad for all ages
- Add an area for sit-down type of games with tables and chairs
- Splashpad and Thinkery-type of playground; eliminate the age separation areas
- 

### **Trees and Environment**

- Hiking trail is a great idea
- Landscape with Central Texas
- Do not use St. Augustine
- Do not plant water-thirsty plants
- Add solar and water conservation wherever possible
- Plant trees on this side too <pointing to adjacent property next to Austin Oaks site>
- Drought-resistant, Central Texas native planting (Scott Ogden)

### **Office**

- Too much office

### **Hotels**

- No hotel
- No hotel
- No hotel
- No hotel
- Eliminate hotel
- Yes to hotel
- Yes, hotel great idea
- Hotel very much needed

- Love hotel, put on Mopac
- Move hotel to Mopac
- Hotel on long Mopac side
- Hotel on Mopac
- Could the hotel be here (Parcel 2) views of downtown like in earlier option
- Music on ground floor of hotel (lobby)

### **Transportation/ Parking**

- Too much traffic
- Too much traffic
- Too much traffic
- Too much traffic on Hart Lane and Spicewood
- Make Executive Center Drive one way from Wood Hollow to Mopac frontage
- Roundabout at Woodhollow/ Executive Center Project
- Bike lane please <marked on Spicewood Springs>
- Widening Executive Center Drive for bike lanes – makes no sense. It is not a “rider-friendly” street, as it drops off onto Mopac access road which is not cyclist-friendly
- Like the street parking
- Let park users park in garages too (at least 2 hours free)
- Can you push parking structures partly below ground without adding more rental sq. ft.?
- Implement a system that drastically reduces speed
- Put big high highway here <Spicewood>
- Traffic needs roads

### **Restaurant/ Retail**

- Not enough retail
- Need more restaurants
- More retail/restaurant at expense of office
- Like the green with restaurants
- Encourage local restaurant or retail to move in
- No inappropriate restaurant like Hooters
- More restaurant, less medical
- I liked the restaurants here (Parcel 7)
- I like the restaurants here also (Parcel 7)
- I also miss restaurants at this location (Parcel 7)
- Daycare? Grocery? Yes
- Miss the retail/ restaurant cluster

### **Residential**

- No apartments
- No multi-family apartments
- No more residential – think Tschools!
- Please no residential

- No residential
- No more apts
- No housing
- No to residential
- No residential
- Too many residential
- No residential
- No apts <graphic>
- No apts <graphic>
- No more residential, unless you have a plan to alleviate school crowding
- No housing
- We do not want residential
- No residential
- No residential
- No more apts
- Do not want any residential
- We voted for No residential
- No housing – we didn't want that
- No multi-family; not agreed upon 1/27
- No housing; build a bigger park
- What happened to senior housing and amenities
- More residential, less office, hotel, to reduce traffic!!
- Yes, residential
- Keep the housing
- More diverse housing
- Who voted? I didn't. Yes to residential to reduce traffic
- Okay with residences
- Studio or 1-bedroom, maybe some 2-bedroom max (naturally limits kids)
- Gear residential to younger demographic (no kids)
- Limit to age-restricted to protect school overcrowding
- Restrict multi-family to no children
- Affordable housing, aging in place, small residents/condos
- Still would like to see condos
- Condos
- condos
- Condos, please
- Yes, residential
- with all this residential, need some space for schools

### **Height**

- 5 stories max
- 1.2 mil. Sq.ft. what?!?!
- No buildings over 5 stories

- 5 stories max all around
- 5 stories max
- No to 7 stories – move 2 stories to parcel 3
- No to 7 stories
- Lower square footage
- Level too high; cut back amenities
- Recommended plan – total s.f. too high
- 7 stories seems appropriate for site/value
- Mopac buildings shouldn't be this tall; precedent <can't read>
- Too high
- Too high
- Too high!
- Too high
- Too tall
- Too much
- Too much
- Too much
- Too much sq. footage
- We voted for 6!
- Number of levels?
- Height along Mopac is fine
- Taller building on Mopac are good; lighten density on neighborhood side
- Stop at 5 levels. Development should pay more for all traffic improvements than the minimum
- Make this building (in parcel 5) taller instead of the Mopac buildings. This one appears to be in a hollow.

### General

- My vote is for code-compliant
- My vote is for code-compliant
- Should have compliant option
- Why wasn't the code-compliant plan part of the vote?
- Code-compliant office (or senior living only)
- Great place-making
- No 14 mil amenities
- No thank you
- This plan is biased to favor it over the code-compliant
- 5% retail/restaurant, 50% office, 25% residential
- Total area seems appropriate
- Music venue would go where?

### Other

- Trump for president
- Hyperbole beats facts

- This is not binding
- Charrette equals charade
- No Hooters in our neighborhood