

October 26, 2016

TO: ZAP Commissioners

CC: Andrew Moore, Case Manager, Austin Oaks PUD
Planning and Zoning Department

While we all have been working with the Austin Oaks PUD submission for almost three years, some of the background and history may not be fresh in your minds, so I offer the following information to help you with your deliberations next week. Much of this is from my personal perspective, which is sometimes difficult to separate from the duties I've performed as NWACA President during 2014-15, and now as a member of the NWACA Board and its Zoning and Transportation Committee. Please consider this my personal message, though – it is not a message from the NWACA Board.

Factors that we need to keep in mind – and that have played a part in how I've worked on this PUD:

- Austin will continue to grow and change; Northwest Hills will be part of that change. Austin Oaks will be part of that change, whether we like that or not.
- Our population evolves; neighbors who've been here for decades move on, and new families move in. They have needs some current residents may not have – local playgrounds and parks are among those.
- As change happens, many of us would like to preserve the environment and character of our neighborhood. However, tradeoffs will need to be made. Our traffic issues are like those in the rest of the City, all of it exacerbated by increasing levels of housing stock in the outlying areas. Density is a tradeoff that helps mitigate traffic issues, given that public transit is made available to serve the density.
- Preserving trees as we add to our population requires more density; the more we sprawl, the more trees we lose.

From the start of this case, I've been part of the NWACA team working to inform the neighbors and reflect their voice to the decision-makers on this case.

- We gathered the community in August 2014 (311 people) to learn about the first PUD plan. That meeting gave a clear message to the owner's representative that the plan was unacceptable.
- We polled the community 3 times
 - once at the August meeting
 - once a month later to get to a larger audience (where 85% of the 683 respondents opposed the plan)
 - again in February, 2015 to get the reaction of the neighborhood to a set changes proposed by the owner's representative (where 82% of the 501 respondents opposed the plan and 14% said more adjustments were needed)
- We met with the developer's representative and other neighborhood groups for a year, trying to find a way forward, but failed. In June 2015, the NWACA Board asked the City and the owner to provide the neighborhood with a charrette, where neighborhood input could be gathered.
- That request was answered at a ZAP meeting in September, 2015 and the owner did a "reset," bringing in a new team. Jon Ruff, the owner, and his new representative, Michael Whellan, met with neighborhood representatives on October 7 to kick off a new approach.

- The group at that meeting designated a subgroup as the charrette Working Group, which worked on the communications to the neighborhoods about the charrette events, including 2 information meetings and 2 input gathering meetings prior to the week-long charrette workshop held the last week of January, 2016. For the most part, the group worked well together and in good faith, as the charrette was prepared.
- The Working Group selected a nationally-respected charrette facilitator, Doug Farr, and they chose a local renowned design team, TBG, to provide the designers for the charrette. Throughout, the group was coordinated by Ben Luckens and me – he well-experienced in charrettes, and me reading about the details of how to run a charrette and doing a lot of legwork to ensure it all ran well.
- The charrette proceeded with a schedule agreed to by the working group, but there was disagreement (after the charrette) about several elements of the charrette:
 - A “Code Compliant Plan” was inserted into the mix but understood in different ways. The charrette design team, the charrette organizers, and some participants saw it as a baseline, against which their charrette designs would be gauged. It is very common for charrettes to have such a baseline; it’s never intended to be a candidate outcome. Some participants saw it as a true alternative to be evaluated and pushed for it to be considered as such.
 - In our planning, the process of getting to a final outcome was described as a consensus process that’s used in all charrettes, to whittle down the choices each evening as the charrette progressed. In the middle of the charrette design week, some participants convinced Doug Farr to conduct a vote. That vote was originally planned for Wednesday evening, but audience questions and discussion went so late that we had to leave the premises before that vote could happen. It was then conducted on Thursday night with those who were present Thursday night.
- Because the charrette was done by nationally-respected professionals and it followed the charrette process, the NWACA board supported the outcome of the charrette. It was the best means that the Board could find for getting community input in an organized way. A resolution to that effect was passed on February 10, 2016.
- The Working Group came apart a few weeks after the charrette, when those unhappy with the outcome separated from NWACA representatives; I can’t speak to the work they’ve done since.
- NWACA formed a Zoning Committee sub-committee to review the post-charrette round of PUD documents that were submitted to the City, to ensure that the proposal was in agreement with the outcome of the charrette. That committee spent many hours reviewing each update, identifying issues, talking them over with Mr. Whellan, and meeting with City Staff in several departments to get questions answered.
- Based on the sub-committee’s work, the NWACA Board found that the submission now before you supports the outcome of the charrette, and they expressed that in their resolution of September 14, 2016. What is in the submission conforms to the charrette outcome, balancing tradeoffs among the 4 T’s – trees, tall, traffic, and “t’schools,” to quote Doug Farr.

In getting to a good outcome, we’re all making tradeoffs. I see those tradeoffs as worthwhile:

- With the PUD, we get an agreement in which the neighborhood has a say. We set conditions that need to be met, and we have a City ordinance with which to enforce them.

- We have language now in the submitted Land Use Plan that ensures that the neighborhood will be informed of any change – even administrative changes – before they are approved, so that we can speak to them.
- With this PUD, we get a mixed used development, with retail and restaurants and housing; without the PUD, we live with whatever the owner chooses to build on that site, most likely all office space.
- With this PUD, we get parks – a 2.37-acre Neighborhood Park, a .52-acre Heritage Park, and a 5.24-acre Creek Park – all public usable green space that will be deeded to the City of Austin. In addition, we get \$1.5M of funding to develop the Neighborhood Park. Without this PUD, we get none of that.
- With this PUD, we minimize the impact on school overcrowding by keeping the housing units relatively small. We also get affordable housing – 10% of the 250 units are designated as affordable housing units. And half of those are offered at an income level that fits AISD teachers, with teachers having preference for those units – enabling those who teach in the nearby area schools to live in the neighborhood.
- With this PUD, we get traffic mitigation from the owner to help contend with the traffic generated. Without the PUD, we'll get at least the same number of 19,000 total trips/day – it could be as much as 25,000 or more. With the PUD, we get a cap on additional traffic and we get at least the 4 traffic improvements required of the owner. We trust that the City and TXDOT will provide other funds to help with the inevitable traffic congestion and that which we see now.
- With this PUD, we get creek restoration – enhancing the Creek Park mentioned above. That's a significant investment we would not get without the PUD.
- With this PUD, we sacrifice some trees, but we get additional trees planted. And... heritage trees will naturally grow from what is there now and from the small ones that are planted. Our tradeoffs don't naturally appear - Parks don't grow from saplings or seeds; teacher housing doesn't; retail doesn't; restaurants don't.

I've done my best to keep the neighborhood's many interests in mind throughout his process, and I've tried to keep an even keel in how I talk about it. I'd ask that other neighbors do the same. We all have the same goal – a vibrant, happy neighborhood.

A lot of time has gone into the 2.5 years of the PUD proposals. I can personally account for at least 600 hours, 70 of them in the charrette week alone. Others have also spent a lot of time. How many ZAP meetings? How many hour of ZAP Commissioner meetings, emails, reading time? It's now time that we move on and get decisions made. I urge you to support this proposal and get it moved on to City Council.

Thanks very much!

Joyce Statz

From: [Blackthorne](#)
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Support Austin Oaks
Date: Friday, October 28, 2016 10:49:57 AM

I am writing to support the current proposal for the Austin Oaks PUD. Here is why:

A charrette process was undertaken consisting of neighborhood stakeholders and the developer in a public effort, presided over by a facilitator. The "Preferred Plan" that came out of the charrette was supported by a majority vote of the participants. The latest PUD submittal was vetted heavily for general compliance with the "Preferred Plan".

The NWACA zoning committee and the NWACA board both passed resolutions supporting the charrette process and stating that the latest submittal supports the results of the charrette process.

Council Member Gallo supports the latest submittal because it represents years of intensive work by the neighborhood association and developer working together to mold this project into the best possible product by mitigating height, traffic, drainage, impervious cover and increasing community benefit via parks, trails, retail, restaurants, and affordable housing for teachers. The proposed impervious cover is actually decreasing.

The developer has offered a lot of new design improvements, very much different and more desirable than the original submittal.

The alternative would be for the developer to develop the site in smaller tracts under existing conventional zoning that would not require any kind of superiority or public contributions like the extensive parks that are proposed. It would bypass the neighborhood input that has made this development an actual benefit to the neighborhood.

Please vote for approval.

John B.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Supporting Austin Oaks zoning proposal
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 11:46:49 AM

As an Austin resident and voter, I want to register my support for projects that make more housing available.

I think it is crazy, during a housing shortage, to block proposals to build more housing.

Thanks

Geoff Bradford
6208 Sun Vista Dr
Austin, TX 78749

[REDACTED]

From: [Jay Blazek Crossley](#)
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Support Austin Oaks
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 12:33:27 PM

Hello Commissioners,

I am writing to request that you support the Austin Oaks PUD and do not block it, but instead pass it and send it on to Council. My understanding is that it is coming up for discussion next Tuesday November 1st, 6pm at the Zoning and Platting Commission Meeting.

There is no questions that such a project will reduce regional traffic and provide residents of the neighborhood with a higher quality of life, while being aligned with Imagine Austin. Continued opposition to such projects is dramatically damaging to Austin, causing more climate emissions, greater traffic, and dislocation of low income people.

Thanks,
Jay

Jay Blazek Crossley
Texas Policy Analyst

713-244-4746

From: [Pete Gilcrease](#)
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Support Austin Oaks
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 12:40:20 PM

Zoning and Platting Commissioners,

Please support the Austin Oaks PUD. Our neighborhoods deserve more community benefits like restaurants, parks, and retail and the latest proposal will provide us with that. We also need to increase our tax base in Austin by allowing more density in order to sustain services we offer Austinites.

Thank you,
Pete Gilcrease

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Support Austin Oaks PUD
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 11:45:06 AM

Hello All,

I am writing in support of the Austin Oaks PUD.

The developer and surrounding neighborhoods have worked together collaboratively, and NWACA and the developer have arrived at an understanding. The opposition may be vocal, but ultimately, they constitute a minority.

As Austin grows, we can either add more office space (relatively) close to downtown, or increase the pressures for Austin to sprawl. I'd rather see office space added on a site that has already been developed, then extend infrastructure, roads, and services to a new site on the periphery, adding to Austin's infrastructure maintenance obligations and compromising the effectiveness of mass transit, which depends on compact and connected development patterns

This new office space will add much-needed revenue to Austin's tax rolls, helping to offset the ever-increasing tax burden on homeowners and landlords.

I would support adding more housing to the Austin Oaks PUD. In order to keep the housing market stable and prevent rapid increases in home prices and rents, we must add housing as fast as, or faster than, we are adding jobs. If anything, Austin Oaks needs a couple hundred more housing units.

Thanks for your consideration,

Evan Gill

From: [Patrick Goetz](#)
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Support Austin Oaks
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 11:11:11 AM

Hi -

Stakeholders went to the trouble of conducting a 3-day long charrette which dramatically scaled back the developer's original plans and resulted in a plan which most participants felt good about, including many who were formerly opposed.

Of course now the NIMBY's are moving the goal posts again, asking you to oppose this project, likely because "it lacks neighborhood input" and "no one told them this was happening!"

Don't fall for this nonsense. Support the revised Austin Oaks PUD and let's let Austin get on with having a property tax base that supports our ambitions without unduly burdening single family home owners in the process.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Support Austin Oaks
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 10:33:10 AM

The Austin Oaks PUD has gone through a strong process, with a neighborhood charrette and support from NWACA. Its a good project - revamping old office buildings into a more mixed and vibrant place, including badly needed residential multi-family as well as a variety of other uses. If we want to preserve the environment, we need more places like this in Central Austin, not fewer. People need to be able to work, live, and play centrally if we want to reduce our carbon footprint. Stopping or dramatically scaling back a project like this does not stop demand for office or housing, it just means that people will like have to be further spread out, and sprawl will continue to take its environmental toll, with longer commutes, increasing impact on climate change, and a more economically stratified and weaker metro area.

Sincerely,
Brennan Griffin

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Please Support Austin Oaks
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 10:43:41 AM

Dear Zoning and Planning Members,

Please support the Austin Oaks projects submittal. It is my understanding, based on the input of well informed neighbors of the project, that it is has been well thought out and carefully planned WITH neighborhood input that provides good amenities that will enhance the neighborhood. This is a GOOD product of collaborative and thoughtful design. Don't let the input of those who would say, "NO!" to any development of any sort ruin what could be a really good project in a part of town that could use more of this sort of community centric work.

**Thank you,
Janet L. Hobbs**

Janet L. Hobbs, AIBD
Hobbs' Ink Custom Home Design
www.hobbs.ink www.hobbsink.com



From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: In Support of Austin Oaks
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 10:13:53 AM

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Dean Lupul and I am writing in support of the latest Austin Oaks PUD proposal. I have a family of five and I live and work in Northwest Hills so I have been monitoring the progress of the site plan closely, In short, I believe the type of development and amenities proposed is exactly what the area needs.

Please vote in favor of the current Austin Oaks PUD proposal.

Sincerely,
Dean Lupul

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Support Austin Oaks
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 8:12:33 AM

Dear Zoning and Planning Commissioners,

My name is Deborah Pardo-Kaplan and I live on Far West Blvd in Northwest Hills. I am in favor of the Austin Oaks Development. I attended the entire Charrette Process and felt it was fair. The preferred plan was supported by a majority of people and would have been supported even further had parents of young kids been able to attend the meetings. Council Member Gallo is in support as well.

I feel Austin Oaks will be a benefit for our neighborhood, including its parks, housing (that could be used by teachers), its retail and restaurants and hotel. There are currently no playgrounds except at the schools. And I think the developer is generous in offering this to our area.

While I am aware of traffic concerns, I believe working with Cap Metro will help with this issue and also I believe the development will create more walkability in the neighborhood as some residents will work there and bike there.

Please vote in favor of the Austin Oaks planned urban development. The voices who oppose are loud, but it doesn't mean they are the majority.

Thanks you.

Deborah Pardo-Kaplan

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: support Austin Oaks
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 10:33:50 AM

Hello

I am writing to voice my support for the proposal to redevelop Austin Oaks. Currently the property is not very attractive, nor does it provide many neighborhood amenities. With the extensive input process, I'm encouraged that the developer has listened to neighborhood demands and is offering substantial community benefits including greenspace and retail that would cut down on car trips for nearby residents. Imagine Austin calls for a more compact and connected city, with preservation of greenspace being a high priority. With the redevelopment of Austin Oaks we would get better flood mitigation, less impervious cover, and increased neighborhood amenities, all at no cost to the taxpayer, and actually increase the tax base by the increased value of the property. To me this is win-win for all sides and I urge your support.

Thank you for your time, and for your service to the city.

Mary Pustejovsky

From: [REDACTED]
To: Moore, Andrew
Subject: Fwd: Please Support Austin Oaks
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 12:16:37 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: David Whitworth <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Oct 27, 2016 at 12:15 AM
Subject: Please Support Austin Oaks
To: bc-Thomas.Weber@austintexas.gov, bc-Ann.Denkler@austintexas.gov, bc-Jolene.Kiolbassa@austintexas.gov, bc-Gabriel.Rojas@austintexas.gov, bc-Dustin.Breithaupt@austintexas.gov, bc-Bruce.Evans@austintexas.gov, bc-Yvette.Flores@austintexas.gov, bc-Betsy.Greenberg@austintexas.gov, bc-Susan.Harris@austintexas.gov, bc-Sunil.Lavani@austintexas.gov, bc-Ana.Aguirre@austintexas.gov
Cc: andy.moore@austintexas.gov

Zoning and Platting Commissioners:

My name is David Whitworth and I live about a block from Austin Oaks with my wife and two children. I urge you to support the latest PUD submittal by Spire.

I am writing you as a neighbor with my personal thoughts although I am involved with NWACA as a board member and zoning chair. I simply point that out so you know I have followed this closely and actively for years now, although not as closely as some of our hardest working neighbors: Ben Luckens & Joyce Statz.

It is well known now that this is the latest in a string of submittals by Spire since 2014 with their second consultant and after an intensive charrette process. The charrette process consisted of neighborhood stakeholders and the developer in the same room working out details in a public effort with design professionals that was presided over by a facilitator. The "Preferred Plan" that came out of the charrettes was supported by a majority vote of the participants. The latest submittal was vetted heavily for general compliance with the "Preferred Plan".

The NWACA zoning committee and the NWACA board both passed resolutions supporting the charrette process and stating that the latest submittal supports the results of the charrette process. Council Member Gallo has now come out in support of the latest submittal because it represents years of intensive work by the neighborhood association and developer working together to mold this project into the best possible product by mitigating height, traffic, drainage, impervious cover and increasing community benefit via parks, trails, retail, restaurants, and affordable housing for teachers. Note the impervious cover is actually decreasing.

The current development at Austin Oaks is largely a parking lot, with little positive impact on my quality of life as a neighbor. It offers zero interaction with neighbors via social gathering spots and meeting places. If the developer has agreed to reduce height and contribute to traffic mitigation while including parks, trails, retail and restaurant amenities, and housing for

more neighbors, then this is the kind of product I would like to see near my home. It will enhance the options and amenities our neighborhood can enjoy and keep me from driving through 3 other neighborhoods to get to all the great amenities on Burnet Road, which many NWACA residents currently must do adding more vehicle miles traveled needlessly.

Northwest Hills is a wonderful suburban community that is still close in. People like that. The people I know and hear from also like all the great amenities and social places that Austin has to offer but feel that gets lighter on the West side of Mopac in our area. The developer has offered up quite a lot, while reducing objectionable impacts from previous submittals. This is a win-win scenario placed at the edge of our neighborhood along a highway and major road (Mopac at Spicewood Springs/Anderson).

Please vote in favor and do not go to subcommittee or deny this case requiring super-majority at council. As properties continue to appreciate I fear that this site would be broken up into smaller tracts under conventional zoning that would not require any kind of superiority or public contributions we will enjoy like parks. It would certainly bypass any of the neighborhood input that has made this development an actual benefit to the neighborhood.

Best Regards,
David Whitworth

From: [Shannon Meroney](#)
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#); [Michael Whellan](#)
Cc: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Please support Austin Oaks PUD
Date: Friday, October 28, 2016 4:02:21 PM


Hello,

I am writing as a resident of Northwest Hills and asking that you SUPPORT the Austin Oaks proposed PUD. Our neighborhood association did an amazing job of creating an inclusive, transparent process to allow all residents to provide input into what this development should look like. The developer has worked very hard to listen and incorporate that feedback. The Charette process was a best in class procedure that should serve as a teaching model for all other neighborhoods. We are thrilled that the density is reasonable and building heights limited. We are gaining a park and green space that we have never had and the City could not give us. It is a win-win for all of us.

I participated fully in the process which was fair and balanced. The nay Sayers thought so too until they realized that they lost when all the votes were in. Then they immediately started to try to tear down and poke holes in the process they asked for and helped create. Please don't be persuaded by their half truths and misstatements. The same handful of people who opposed the project at the beginning and still do. They always will. There is no redevelopment they would be happy with or agree to. But the majority of our neighborhood who stepped up and participated support the outcome. And the current proposal honors it. Do not let the Vocal minority convince you that our neighborhood doesn't want this. It is simply not true.

Please support the AO PUD. Thank you.

Shannon Meroney
(512) 731-6615


Please excuse my friend Siri's typing

From: [Jared Haas](#)
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#)
Subject: Support Austin Oaks
Date: Sunday, October 30, 2016 1:43:55 PM
Attachments: [facebook.png](#)
[instagram.png](#)
[linked-in.png](#)
[news.png](#)

Zoning and Platting Commissioners:

My name is Jared Haas, a local building designer, and Austinite of 10 years. I am writing on behalf of being a proud Austinite of 10 years, rather than as a building designer. I originally moved to Austin for its culture, progressive nature, beauty, diversity, and affordability. However, due to Austin's current lack of affordability, it is drastically affecting its culture, progressive nature, beauty, and diversity. A simple solution would be to just move. However, I am not ready to give up on Austin that easily. I have purposefully made this my home and wish to plant roots here, ultimately to own a home and start a family. As it currently stands, and I speak for the majority of Austinites in 2016, this is not looking like a possibility. In order to achieve this, the majority of Austinites need to speak up to its governing officials who install the laws and language to put us in the right direction. Allowing (smart) density within the urban core will help increase the housing supply and decrease the extensive demand that has been driving up housing and land costs. I strongly support this PUD development as outlined by David Whitworth's email below:

My name is David Whitworth and I live about a block from Austin Oaks with my wife and two children. I urge you to support the latest PUD submittal by Spire.

I am writing you as a neighbor with my personal thoughts although I am involved with NWACA as a board member and zoning chair. I simply point that out so you know I have followed this closely and actively for years now, although not as closely as some of our hardest working neighbors: Ben Luckens & Joyce Statz.

It is well known now that this is the latest in a string of submittals by Spire since 2014 with their second consultant and after an intensive charrette process. The charrette process consisted of neighborhood stakeholders and the developer in the same room working out details in a public effort with design professionals that was presided over by a facilitator. The "Preferred Plan" that came out of the charrettes was supported by a majority vote of the participants. The latest submittal was vetted heavily for general compliance with the "Preferred Plan".

The NWACA zoning committee and the NWACA board both passed resolutions supporting the charrette process and stating that the latest submittal supports the results of the charrette process. Council Member Gallo has now come out in support of the latest submittal because it represents years of intensive work by the neighborhood association and developer working together to mold this project into the best possible product by mitigating height, traffic, drainage, impervious cover and increasing community benefit via parks, trails, retail, restaurants, and affordable housing for teachers. Note the impervious cover is actually decreasing.

The current development at Austin Oaks is largely a parking lot, with little positive impact on my quality of life as a neighbor. It offers zero interaction with neighbors via social gathering spots and meeting places. If the developer has agreed to reduce height and contribute to traffic mitigation while including parks, trails, retail and restaurant amenities, and housing for more neighbors, then this is the kind of product I would like to see near my home. It will enhance the options and amenities our neighborhood can enjoy and keep me from driving through 3 other neighborhoods to get to all the great amenities on Burnet Road, which many NWACA residents currently must do adding more vehicle miles traveled needlessly.

Northwest Hills is a wonderful suburban community that is still close in. People like that. The people I know and hear from also like all the great amenities and social places that Austin has to offer but feel that gets lighter on the West side of Mopac in our area. The developer has offered up quite a lot, while reducing objectionable impacts from previous submittals. This is a win-win scenario placed at the edge of our neighborhood along a highway and major road (Mopac at Spicewood Springs/Anderson).

Please vote in favor and do not go to subcommittee or deny this case requiring supermajority at council. As properties continue to appreciate I fear that this site would be broken up into smaller tracts under conventional zoning that would not require any kind of superiority or public contributions we will enjoy like parks. It would certainly bypass any of the neighborhood input that has made this development an actual benefit to the neighborhood.

*Best Regards,
David Whitworth*

I strongly hope you take our emails into consideration and vote to help shape a positive and inclusive future for everyone.

Regards,

-

jared haas | [un.box studio](http://un.boxstudio.com)

LEED Green Associate

www.un-boxstudio.com

2400 E Cesar Chavez St, #302

Austin, TX 78702

o | 512.474.2544

c | 512.277.0945



From: [Wanda Brown](#)
Subject: Austin Oaks PUD hearing - Nov 1, 2016 - citizen input
Date: Sunday, October 30, 2016 11:01:01 PM

Hello,

Thank you for taking the time to read my input on the subject planning hearing.

I am a residential neighbor of the Austin Oaks complex.

I am not in agreement with the charrette conclusion as stated by the NorthWest Austin Civic Association (NWACA), and not in agreement with the latest communication offered by NWACA on this subject.

However, I understand that development will occur at the Austin Oaks location, and would like to offer input on the resolution of plans for the site.

1. It appears that the applicant is offering only \$628,000 for the greatly increased traffic mitigation. I use the Greystone and Mopac service road intersection frequently to reach Mopac South, and the traffic at that location is already heavy. I believe your staff's TIA memo dated Oct 6, 2016, state that a number of impacted intersections fail at a much greater rate even after the \$628,000 is applied to traffic mitigation.

I would ask that ZAP and City Council require full and complete payment for traffic mitigation for all intersections surrounding the property, especially Greystone and Mopac and Executive Center and Mopac. Applicant offered \$10million for mitigation last year, and reduced it to \$628,000 in the latest proposal. The citizens of Austin should not be taxed to pay for development cost of traffic mitigation.

2. From the 2015 PUD plan, there were 8 buildings, 6 of which would have 7-10 floors. The current PUD plan has 12 buildings (plus 5 garages), 11 of which would have 6-8 floors. *I ask for the 8 buildings, with maximum building heights of 60 ft - 5 stories tall. And I ask that the applicant, Zap, and City Council get rid of the MSL (mean sea level) figures on the building heights in the Land Use Plan, those are site specific (this is not a site plan) and in conflict with stated building heights.*

3. From the 2015 PUD plan, 8 Heritage trees were to be cut down, 1 Heritage tree to be transplanted, tree survey by code every 5 years. Current PUD plan has 13 Heritage trees & 31 Protected trees to be cut down, and proposes the same 2013 tree survey used for 25 years. *I ask that the applicant scale back the variances and impact on the Heritage and Protected trees, and go back to the 2015 proposal on the Heritage trees and 5 year tree survey. Further, the proposed 25-year tree survey is unrealistic and unheard of as trees can grow up to 10" in diameter during that time. Existing Heritage and Protected tree ordinances should be followed, allowing the applicant to develop the property in a profitable manner.*

Thank you for your time and effort on this project.

If allowed, please include my input in the back-up material for this case.

Kind regards,
Wanda Brown
Edgerock Drive
Austin, TX 78731

From: [Dianna Watkins](#)
To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#)
Cc: [Moore, Andrew](#); [Rusthoven, Jerry](#); [Lesniak, Chuck](#)
Subject: Request Regarding Austin Oaks PUD
Date: Friday, October 28, 2016 1:53:49 PM

Dear Zoning and Platting Commissioner:

I respectfully request that you not approve the Austin Oaks PUD application at your November 1, 2016 meeting.

I was born in Austin, grew up in the Rosedale area, raised a family in Crestview and retired to the Northwest Austin area where I travel Spicewood Springs Road, Steck Avenue and Anderson Lane on a daily basis. I don't need an accurate traffic study to inform me of the congested traffic conditions on these main roadways. I experience them first hand every day. I have sat through three street light changes to get past the MOPAC/ Spicewood Springs intersection at 2:00 in the afternoon. I have heard angry people honk and display road rage due to the congestion that is limiting their ability to accomplish daily objectives. 500 percent increase in traffic will decrease our quality of life in the area as well as cause heighten frustration leading to road rage and make us all just plain very unhappy citizens. It appears that the only happy people would be Spire Realty as they collect their financial windfall.

I am not totally against redevelopment of the Austin Oaks property however, I feel that it should be designed with a limit of 5 stories. Also, please have the developer get rid of the mean sea level figures on building heights in the Land Use Plan. I also believe that they need to scale back the variances and impact on the Heritage and Protected trees. Please protect the trees! And we all need to be realistic about the impact that a 500 percent increase in traffic will have on the quality of our lives within District 10.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and for the protection you give our wonderful city. Please include this communication in the back-up materials on this case to ZAP and the Council.

Sincerely,
Dianna Watkins
3621 Claburn Dr
Austin, TX 78759

From: [Wayne and Theresa Vincent](#)
 To: [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#)
 Cc: [Moore, Andrew](#); [Rusthoven, Jerry](#); [Lesniak, Chuck](#)
 Subject: Austin Oaks PUD
 Date: Sunday, October 30, 2016 12:15:32 PM

All, I am a resident of Northwest Hills and as such, I am extremely concerned about the impacts of the proposed development to our safety, environment, and quality of life. The current proposal is simply unacceptable, and unfair to those of us who have invested so much time and money to build a life here. For example, my husband and I have paid TENS OF THOUSANDS of extra dollars to address (often very minor) code compliance issues during a recent remodel (McMansion rules, heritage tree rules, infrastructure rules, etc etc), so I am incensed that the developer in question here is not even being held to the same standard (for example, using a 25-year tree survey is laughable). Noncompliance should not be for sale!!!

I would very much like to STOP this development altogether! At a MINIMUM, I would like to add my voice to the requests and concerns attached at the bottom of this note regarding the following points:

- a. SAFETY - PROJECTIONS OF NEARLY FIVE TIMES THE CURRENT TRAFFIC COUNTS ARE NOT ADDRESSED - Have the applicant fully mitigate the increased traffic as some of these intersections become "dangerously unsafe" even after the proposed mitigation (for example Greystone @ MoPac; stats for Executive Ctr @ MoPac are left out of Staff Memo), last year applicant offered \$10M in traffic mitigation, but is now only offering \$628K in traffic mitigation.
- b. BUILDING CODE - Eliminate the MSL (mean sea level) figures on the building heights in the Land Use Plan, those are site specific (this is not a site plan) and in conflict with stated building heights.
- c. HERITAGE TREES - This is simply not acceptable - private residences would never be allowed to skirt the rules in this way. Scale back the variances and impact on the Heritage and Protected trees. DO NOT USE a 25 year tree survey (trees grow 10" diameter in that time) and follow the Heritage and Protected tree Ordinances.

I hereby request that this message be included in the back-up materials on this case to ZAP & to Council.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. These are real lives impacted, not just meaningless numbers. Please help keep Austin special and beautiful and not let it degrade into another Houston.

Theresa Vincent
 3711 Hidden Hollow
 Austin, TX 78731

Attachment 1: PROPOSAL FACTS

TRAFFIC FACTS:
 - Now 4,086 trips per day

- Previous PUD (2015) 19,819 trips per day
- NWACA's Charrette PUD (Jan. 2016) "17,000 trips per day"
- Current PUD (Oct. 2016) 19,648 trips per day (per TIA), 380% increase over current (net new trips 15,562 per day)
- By Staff's TIA Memo dated Oct. 6, 2016, a number of impacted intersections fail at a much greater rate even after the applicant's total of only \$628,000 in mitigation offered. Greystone @ MoPac becomes particularly dangerous and is unmitigated by the applicant equal to Executive Center @ MoPac.

BUILDING HEIGHT FACTS:

- WG asked for 5 stories (60 ft) max; limited to current zoning baseline entitlement, which we are now told is about 1M sq. ft., current 445,322 sq. ft.
 - Previous PUD (2015) 8 buildings; 6 at 7-10 floors; 1.28M total sq. ft.
 - Current PUD (2016) 12 buildings + 5 garages; 11 at 6-8+ floors (by MSL figures); 1.191 Million sq. ft.
- (Land Use Plan needs to get rid of conflicting and site specific MSL -mean sea level- building height figures)

TREE FACTS:

- WG asked to reduce # of impacted Heritage & Protected trees
- Previous PUD (2015) 8 Heritage trees to be cut down, 1 Heritage tree to be transplanted, tree survey by code every 5 years.
- Current PUD (2016) 13 Heritage trees & 31 Protected trees to be cut down (proposed), Same 2013 tree survey used for 25 years.