

Comments transcribed from the Rating Forms on Tuesday, January 26. Grouped into categories. (A, B, C after items indicates the comment was included with that option.)

### General Comments

- 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> grade center to relieve Doss/Hill/Murchison
- Add space to relieve school problem as a whole <can't read> – schools Doss, Gullet and Pillow can change boundary
- Same fair calculations for code compliant; not applies to apples
- Heritage (A) – lowest building heights, 4-acre open space, need to say exceed and improve environmental conditions
- Esperanza (B) – 1<sup>st</sup> school in the Austin Area – cottage relocated at Zilker; retail internal
- Balcones - C - largest open space; retail, ground floor of hotel
- Want more of a town center feel
- Can we dictate schools that kids will go to?
- Like zone 1 and 2 of concept C and 3 and 4 of concept A; mix together
- Not anything new (A)
- Building setback from Wood Hollow (A)
- Acceptable, given the additional amenities – C
- I'm fine with any of these ideas. Not all neighbors are anti-everything
- Ok – middle zone of A
- No building in zone nearest Spicewood (Creek Zone – A)
- Maximize green building
- All need more trees
- Esperanza/Heritage – indoor multi-sport complex; similar to soccer zone in Cedar Park which has nice café and craft beer
- This plan is my favorite because no impact on schools – A
- It's hard to imagine neighbors going to this development (any plan) to enjoy open space, even the <can't read?> in plan C because the roads to it are not walking/biking friendly
- Hart Lane frontage combined with Middle Zone look too much like apartment canyons. Retail too far away from apartments – A
- Thank you for all your hard work!!! Hopefully this process will become the benchmark for Austin.
- Your example of “current zoning” is unrealistic – 5 story underground parking is not feasible – therefore your square footage in this scenario of current zoning is also unrealistic. False comparisons are a bit like a bait and switch.
- None of these plans are acceptable if zoning is other than conventional
- Height okay, only if conventional zoning applies – A, B, C
- Please include Code Compliance as my first and only option
- Too much congestion – A
- I like the concept of bringing the buildings closer to the street – A
- Throughout plans – more mixed use; need to address traffic flow
- Status quo – A
- Too impervious – Hart Lane Frontage - B
- Code-compliant plan saves more heritage trees

- A and C best plans, but need a variation if the <can't read> together - small retail with office above
- Need more of a town center – gathering place feel. None of the plans have it – Heritage (A) is closest
- Need to include stories on each building in the charts
- Don't like garages fronting on Spicewood – A
- Best street frontage along interior street – A
- Love the density along the street – B
- REDO – you need to go back to the drawing board
- Prefer Code Compliant – would like to talk about that; liked Heritage (A)
- The only think I like about any of these is the creek preservation
- Code baseline option is preferred \*\*
- We want more of a town center somewhere
- Most preferred plan – C
- Take care of elderly! And disabled access
- Family friendly atmosphere
- All zones <parallel??> to wetlands ordinance.
- Better urban form, but otherwise comparatively uninspired, than status quo- A
- Like uses on this area – Mopac frontage – A
- Fewest connections – B
- Walk out 38<sup>th</sup> St (sic) onto street – B
- Right lane turn into development – Executive Drive – allow retail along – B
- <one team turned in a new site plan, taping left half of C with right half of A, folded along left edge of creek zone

#### **Environmental (creek, open space, trees)**

- Want the creek treatment with restaurants overlooking
- Creek is pretty, not great park (B)
- Love the park
- Wins (Creek Zone, C)
- Consider heritage and protected trees
- More playscapes
- CEF is important; heritage tree preservation (A)
- Would like to see park (B)
- Yes, great to have local park (A)
- Noise from Mopac not good for amphitheater -C
- Dog Park! Fenced area for off-leash – A
- Park – A, C
- Love the setback from the creek – B
- Preserves too few trees to justify taller buildings – Hart Lane frontage of B
- Loses too many trees – Middle zone of B
- Good park – C
- Would like it to be open access – Creek zone – B, C

- I like the Creek Zone providing some buffer between office and neighborhood in South
- Love embellishing the natural creek area – B
- Park shows welcoming view from Mopac and embellishes Creek Zone – B
- I like the park on Hart Lane as buffer to apartment concentration. Is welcoming – C
- I like as much space as possible - C
- Park is fine – B, C
- Playground, hike and bike trails preferred in the 2-acre park – C
- Preferred, like the large park – C
- Love the parks – B
- Alignment of buildings along Wood Hollow is good at park – A
- Park development on corner of Spicewood/Hart creates place – C
- Connections between open space good – C
- Park/Open Space good – C
- Park on corner is good otherwise no sense of place/destination for this corner – C
- Park is good, but no parking – too
- Open space – A
- Large parkland – B
- Nice neighborhood park, large park area – C
- Great park – B, C
- Great city park at Hart Lane entry – C
- I like the park at Hart Lane – would be great for the neighborhood – C
- Killed too many trees – A
- Good parking for park – C
- Great amenity (Creek Zone) – B, C
- Neighborhood park is a great addition – C
- Less desirable than park – A
- Awesome creek zone – B, C
- P-A-R-Ks – C
- No parks (wanted) – C
- <can't read> Access - C
- Acceptable, if lower – B, C
- Make sure the retail has decks that take advantage of the creek. Hike and bike trail recirculate the water pumped for flow – A
- Need trail to the creek – B
- Hike and bike trail, public restrooms – B
- Great idea on park – C
- No family park, a big gap in our neighborhood – A
- Lacks a park, just open space that isn't that usable. Our neighborhood has lots of natural open space, but not a single park for kids – B
- Should be some café/active uses fronting family park with playscapes – should have active uses, open directly on park – C
- Good think about this proposal – mixed use, parkland – C
- No parks (wanted) – A, B, C

## Transportation

- Need to fix Hart and Spicewood road – signal
- No access to Spicewood Springs Rd -C
- Cut thru street from Exec Center Drive to Spicewood Springs – C
- Too much traffic on Hart Lane – A
- Has worst traffic – A
- Access road good – C
- Easy access to townhomes – B
- The level of traffic 100-150 <can't read> seems difficult for the current setup of Mopac/Spicewood; proposals that significantly add to traffic/gridlock do not feel neighborhood-friendly
- No additional outlet on Hart – B
- Straight connections to Hart are weird and add confusion to already weird intersection at Spicewood Springs Rd – B
- Mopac Frontage – C – does not give any recognition of Austin Oaks to Mopac/Spicewood Springs
- Road is too close to existing neighborhood – B
- Must limit traffic on Hart Lane; this is a failed intersection already
- At Hart Lan – no lights; is a very dangerous intersection – B, C
- Too much strain on Hart – B
- Park and ride facility. - A
- I like the street alignment – B
- Like road to MF – A
- Lots of parking garage (B)
- Parking near the park
- Screen parking
- Parking garages need to be available to housing when cars are less used
- Parking garages on Mopac preferred
- Building 4 must go; tall buildings and parking structures and hotel near Mopac – A, B
- Too much surface parking; I like the buildings at streets – A
- Underground parking is awesome!
- Too much parking – B
- Any plan should be based on a buildable, economically feasible baseline plan. No underground parking structures, which are not physically or economically feasible.
- Code Compliant is good. You will never get 980K because the underground parking is prohibitive.
- Parking zone for people who are visiting park (Creek Zone), A, B

## Health Center

- Fitness center good because staggers peak time office – C
- No hotel, no gym! – A
- Like hilltop health center – A

## Retail (restaurants, etc.)

- Want the creek treatment with restaurants overlooking
- Love the hilltop restaurants – sexy, but unnecessary -A
- More neighborhood retail (Torchy's – new and bigger)
- Catering kitchen with office
- Missing Gloria's at <can't read>
- Catering kitchen for office use
- Restaurant overlooking park
- No drivethroughs (ex. Starbucks)
- Retail with office is better (B)
- Would like to see retail at bottom of multi-family – C
- Like the retail on the bottom of office – B
- Retail on first floor of office -C
- Love the hilltop restaurants - A
- I like having retail centrally located to serve the neighborhood – B
- Add catering kitchens to any plan
- Restaurants are isolated – and where are patrons going to park? – A
- Parks and restaurants – A
- Would love more retail – B, C
- Love the restaurants on park/Creekside – A
- Retail on ground floor – C
- Hilltop restaurant; creative amphitheater – C
- Retail along Mopac; multi-level – C
- Have cafes/restaurants in middle near parks – C
- Need grocery store +/- 7K sq.ft. to accommodate residential – B
- Rooftop restaurants or bars on roofs of offices
- VMU needed retail at bottom of office – C
- Like restaurant at location – A
- Carry over restaurant on Rim Rock - C

## Office

- We need to increase building height of office and parking needs to go under office, not underground, just below. 8-10 stories is good.
- Tall is fine with me – C
- Too many buildings on Mopac – A
- Sort of accept height for extra amenities – C

- Buildings too high; perhaps less residential, more office so lower building height and less trees cut down – C
- Too many offices along Mopac – A
- I like less concentration of office on Moapc; note: Mopac itself is ugly. Trees in scheme are great – C
- Shouldn't exceed 5 stories – C
- I like having office space along Mopac frontage
- Advantage of high rises = more park space – C
- Need to rethink the small office and parking structure in the lower right corner – very awkward – B
- All office (Mopac Frontage)- B
- Move office frontage along access road – B, C
- Like the configuration but higher office buildings – A
- Go big and high. Don't care as much about what happens on Mopac – C
- Remove office – A – creek zone
- 5 story max – C
- Not scared of height (Mopac frontage) – B, C

### **Residential**

- Love the town homes
- As minimal MF as possible
- Not sure that age restricting won't (sic) solve the school problem
- Can we add condo purchase, not rental
- Worried about 1000 sq.ft. some secret agenda for residential?
- Mixed feelings on residential (okay on 250)
- Like more diverse housing types, not just apartments (townhomes, condos)
- Like the midrange residential option - 250 units
- Larger square footage in apts
- Like mix of housing (B)
- Too much residential on Hart Lane – resulting in too much traffic – A
- Parking below residences good idea - A
- Unless residential is 55+ (vote of U on option B, and A on option C)
- Worried about impact of residential (middle zone of option B)
- Is close to and reflects surrounding residential = good – C
- No residential – B, C
- 750 apartments feels like a lot of gridlock; Spicewood/Anderson at noon already is
- Prefer residential outlet vs. office – C
- Only if senior housing; too much multifamily and parking garages – B
- Too much multifamily – C
- Need differentiation in types of housing
- Too much residential, not enough office – C
- Would like no residential, more buffer between houses – A
- Residential makes sense along Hart (prefer no residential – B)

- Ground floor retail – housing above – B
- More housing above retail for neighborhood retail – B
- Make more housing (Middle Zone) – B, C
- No residential, but a park is good – B, C
- Housing density on Hart without park space is problematic - B
- More variation in housing; townhouses on south side instead of MF or more variation in housing product, possibly to purchase – C
- More family with children units; condos owned – C
- Too much residential – C
- Only if it is for elderly age-restricted – B, C
- 5-story apt. building is too tall for that corner – B
- Housing is disconnected from park – B
- I like the townhomes - B

### **Hotel**

- Trip generator for hotel
- Hotel and retail along Mopac, not Wood Hollow (Option A); actually better near park and residential
- Like the hotel set back from the street (Wood Hollow) with more trees - C
- Hotel set back from Wood Hollow – C
- Hotel good idea!
- Hotel location not good – A
- Like the hotel near the creek - C
- No hotel, no gym! – A, B, C
- Hotel on frontage; hotel on Mopac – A
- Only a 4\* hotel – B, C
- Hotel positioning is good – A
- Keep hotel on Mopac; taller ok on Mopac – A
- If we have to have hotel, build along Mopac; taller buildings along Mopac – C
- Keep hotel on Mopac due to continuous traffic and noise
- Like hotel paralleling creek – A
- Do not like hotels – A
- Hotel closer to Mopac – C
- Prefer hotel and retail plans in middle zone – A
- I like the addition of the hotel and retail – B
- Hotel/creek zone combination would justify “luxury” hotel
- Hotel closer to Mopac - C