

1" = 198'

### NOTIFICATIONS

CASE#: C15-2016-0019  
LOCATION: 2502 Nueces St.

This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.

This product has been produced by CTM for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.



46  
2

**CITY OF AUSTIN  
Board of Adjustment  
Decision Sheet**

**DATE: Monday, March 14, 2016**

**CASE NUMBER: C15-2016-0019**

\_\_\_\_ Brooke Bailey  
\_\_\_\_ Michael Benaglio  
\_\_\_\_ William Burkhardt  
\_\_\_\_ Eric Goff  
\_\_\_\_ Melissa Hawthorne  
\_\_\_\_ Don Leighton-Burwell  
\_\_\_\_ Rahm McDaniel  
\_\_\_\_ Melissa Neslund  
\_\_\_\_ James Valadez  
\_\_\_\_ Michael Von Ohlen  
\_\_\_\_ Kelly Blume (Alternate)

**APPLICANT: Mike McHone**

**OWNER: First Choice Property**

**ADDRESS: 2502 NUECES ST**

**VARIANCE REQUESTED:** The applicant has requested variance(s) to Section 25-6-601 (A) (Parking Requirements for University Neighborhood Overlay District) to reduce the number of required parking spaces from 79 spaces (required, 60% of the 131 spaces required by Appendix A) to 40 spaces (requested) in order to erect a 253 bed high-rise multi-family use in a "MF- 4 – NP" Multifamily Residence Medium Density - Neighborhood Plan zoning district. (West University, Outer West Campus)

**Note:** Multi-family uses can apply administratively to provide 40% of spaces required by Appendix A (52 spaces for this site) if the use participates in a car sharing program or sets aside 10% of the dwelling units on the site to house persons whose household income is less than 50 % of the median income.


**BOARD'S DECISION: POSTPONED TO MARCH 14, 2016 BY APPLICANT; March 14, 2016 POSTPONED TO MAY 9, 2016 BY APPLICANT**


**FINDING:**

1. The Zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because:
2. (a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that:  
(b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because:

3. The variance will not alter the character of the area adjacent to the property, will not impair the use of adjacent conforming property, and will not impair the purpose of the regulations of the zoning district in which the property is located because:

4  
3

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Leane Heldenfels  
Executive Liaison

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William Burkhardt  
Chairman

44  
4

**CITY OF AUSTIN  
Board of Adjustment  
Decision Sheet**

**DATE: Monday, February 8, 2016**

**CASE NUMBER: C15-2016-0019**

\_\_\_\_ Brooke Bailey  
\_\_\_\_ Michael Benaglio  
\_\_\_\_ William Burkhardt  
\_\_\_\_ Eric Goff  
\_\_\_\_ Melissa Hawthorne  
\_\_\_\_ Don Leighton-Burwell  
\_\_\_\_ Melissa Neslund  
\_\_\_\_ James Valadez  
\_\_\_\_ Michael Von Ohlen  
\_\_\_\_ Kelly Blume (Alternate)  
\_\_\_\_ Rahm McDaniel

**APPLICANT: Mike McHone**

**OWNER: First Choice Property**

**ADDRESS: 2502 NUECES ST**

**VARIANCE REQUESTED:** The applicant has requested variance(s) to Section 25-6-601 (A) (Parking Requirements for University Neighborhood Overlay District) to reduce the number of required parking spaces from 79 spaces (required, 60% of the 131 spaces required by Appendix A) to 40 spaces (requested) in order to erect a 253 bed high-rise multi-family use in a "MF- 4 – NP" Multifamily Residence Medium Density - Neighborhood Plan zoning district. (West University, Outer West Campus)

**Note:** Multi-family uses can apply administratively to provide 40% of spaces required by Appendix A (52 spaces for this site) if the use participates in a car sharing program or sets aside 10% of the dwelling units on the site to house persons whose household income is less than 50 % of the median income.


**BOARD'S DECISION: POSTPONED TO MARCH 14, 2016 BY APPLICANT**


**FINDING:**

1. The Zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because:
2. (a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that:  
(b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because:

3. The variance will not alter the character of the area adjacent to the property, will not impair the use of adjacent conforming property, and will not impair the purpose of the regulations of the zoning district in which the property is located because:

46  
5

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Leane Heldenfels  
Executive Liaison

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William Burkhardt  
Chairman

**Heldenfels, Leane**

**From:** Mike Mchone [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 08, 2016 5:51 PM  
**To:** Heldenfels, Leane  
**Cc:** 'Mike McHone'; 'David Kanne'; 'Adam Stephens'  
**Subject:** FW: 2502 Nueces - Parking Variance; C15-2016-0019

46  
6

~~Urgent~~

Hi Leane,

The developer and the NP Contact Team (CANPAC) have scheduled a meeting for April 5<sup>th</sup> (see below). Since this meeting is after the BOA meeting on March 14<sup>th</sup> and CANPAC had made the request for the initial postponement, all parties have agreed that it would be in the best interest of all concerned to ask for an additional postponement of this BOA case to the April meeting. Please advise everyone if this is possible and the date of the April BOA meeting.

Thanks,

Mike

Cell; 512-554-8440

**From:** David Kanne [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 08, 2016 1:19 PM  
**To:** Adam Stephens  
**Cc:** bart; Walter Wukasch  
**Subject:** Re: 2502 Nueces - Parking Variance

Thanks for confirming this Adam. I look forward to speaking with everyone at CANPAC on April 5th. If anyone has any questions prior to this meeting I am happy to have a phone call or meet in person.

David Kanne | President



Lincoln Ventures LLC | Acquisitions + Development

1717 W. 6th Street Suite 234  
Austin, TX 78703

o 512.410.0342  
c 512.804.9100  
f 512.410.0342

[www.Lincoln-Ventures.com](http://www.Lincoln-Ventures.com)

On Tue, Mar 8, 2016 at 1:02 PM, Adam Stephens [REDACTED] wrote:

We have your parking variance request on our agenda for our 4/5 meeting with the expectation of the case appearing before the BOA at their April meeting.



## CITY OF AUSTIN

### Development Services Department

One Texas Center | Phone: 512.978.4000  
505 Barton Springs Road, Austin, Texas 78704

46  
7

## Board of Adjustment General/Parking Variance Application

**WARNING:** Filing of this appeal stops all affected construction activity.

This application is a fillable PDF that can be completed electronically. To ensure your information is saved, [click here to Save](#) the form to your computer, then open your copy and continue.

The Tab key may be used to navigate to each field; Shift + Tab moves to the previous field. The Enter key activates links, emails, and buttons. Use the Up & Down Arrow keys to scroll through drop-down lists and check boxes, and hit Enter to make a selection.

The application must be complete and accurate prior to submittal. *If more space is required, please complete Section 6 as needed.* All information is required (if applicable).

### For Office Use Only

Case # C115-2016-0019 ROW # 11469306 Tax # 0214010407

TCAD ✓

### Section 1: Applicant Statement

Street Address: 2502 Nueces

Subdivision Legal Description:

North 1/2 of Lot 2 " & Lot 3 Outlot 51 Division D Hitchcock Subdivision

Lot(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Block(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Outlot: \_\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_\_\_\_

Zoning District: University Neighborhood Overlay 175 ft. Sub-district (LR-NP) (West University)

I/We Michael R. McHone on behalf of myself/ourselves as

authorized agent for First Choice Property affirm that on

Month January, Day 6, Year 2016, hereby apply for a hearing before the

Board of Adjustment for consideration to (select appropriate option below):

☒ Erect ☐ Attach ☐ Complete ☐ Remodel ☐ Maintain ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Structure: High-rise Student Housing

Revised

C15-2015-0019

LY  
8

Portion of the City of Austin Land Development Code applicant is seeking a variance from:

University Neighborhood Overlay District (UNO) Parking requirements LDC 25-6-601  
2502 Nueces will have 42 units and be an UNO SMART HOUSING PROJECT (UNO)  
50 parking spaces are required 41 will be provided  
a variance for 9 spaces is requested

## Section 2: Variance Findings

The Board must determine the existence of, sufficiency of, and weight of evidence supporting the findings described below. Therefore, you must complete each of the applicable Findings Statements as part of your application. Failure to do so may result in your application being rejected as incomplete. Please attach any additional supporting documents.

I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings:

### Reasonable Use

The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because:

UNO requires pedestrian uses on the majority of the frontage of the building. 2502 Nueces is a narrow lot with frontage on both Nueces Street and Seton Avenue. Strict compliance with the parking requirement is not reasonable.

### Hardship

a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that:

The narrowness of the lot does not allow for a turning radius sufficient to have adequate below grade parking. Additionally, the required support structure for building foundation limits the below grade area for parking.

b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because:

Most other sites in the UNO district are not "through lots" and are lots that are more square and not so narrow; therefore they have adequate space for below grade parking.

### Area Character

The variance will not alter the character of the area adjacent to the property, will not impair the use of adjacent conforming property, and will not impair the purpose of the regulations of the zoning district in which the property is located because:

UNO requires the leasing of the parking separate from the leasing of the apartment. One of the goals of the UNO district is to discourage students from bringing private cars to Austin. Other UNO projects have excess parking and are not as constrained by the geometry of their site.



**Parking (additional criteria for parking variances only)**

Request for a parking variance requires the Board to make additional findings. The Board may grant a variance to a regulation prescribed in the City of Austin Land Development Code Chapter 25-6, Appendix A with respect to the number of off-street parking spaces or loading facilities required if it makes findings of fact that the following additional circumstances also apply:

LY  
9

1. Neither present nor anticipated future traffic volumes generated by the use of the site or the uses of sites in the vicinity reasonably require strict or literal interpretation and enforcement of the specific regulation because:

The parking requirement no longer corresponds to the current or anticipated future parking needs for UNO residents. Alternatives to on site parking is provide in the UT and othe public parking garages. Smart Car and Zip cars are readily available;also Uber and Lyft are a growing option.

2. The granting of this variance will not result in the parking or loading of vehicles on public streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because:

The onsite parking with be sufficient for ADA requirements, and loading and unloading of residents. There will be parking for normal maintenance and management. All on street parking is in the UNO parking benefit district and is metered and this was done to regulate the on street parking to prevent the inteference with the free flow of traffic.

3. The granting of this variance will not create a safety hazard or any other condition inconsistent with the objectives of this Ordinance because:

UNO's goal is to create a predominately pedestrian area use public transportation. Students with cars park them and do not use them on a daily basis. Reducing the number of cars is a goal of UNO. Reducing the on site parking for this project is consistant with the goals of UNO.

4. The variance will run with the use or uses to which it pertains and shall not run with the site because:

The change of the use from a 2 story 50 plus year old dormitory to a high rise student apartment in the UNO 175 ft, height district with the parking varaince will be along term use and the use of the site will be in place for decades and the use will not change.

**NOTE: The Board cannot grant a variance that would provide the applicant with a special privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated.**

### Section 3: Applicant Certificate

I affirm that my statements contained in the complete application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Applicant Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

*Michael R. McHone*

Date: 01/07/2016

Applicant Name (typed or printed): Michael R. McHone

26  
10

Applicant Mailing Address: P. O. Box 8142  
City: Austin State: TX Zip: 78713  
Phone (will be public information): (512) 554-8440  
Email (optional – will be public information): mchone1234@sbcglobal.net

#### Section 4: Owner Certificate

I affirm that my statements contained in the complete application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Owner Signature: by Michael R. McHone Date: 1/7/2016  
Owner Name (typed or printed): See attached authorization

Owner Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone (will be public information): \_\_\_\_\_  
Email (optional – will be public information): \_\_\_\_\_

#### Section 5: Agent Information

Agent Name: Michael R. McHone  
Agent Mailing Address: P. O. Box 8142  
City: Austin State: TX Zip: 78713  
Phone (will be public information): (512) 554-8440  
Email (optional – will be public information): mchone1234@sbcglobal.net

#### Section 6: Additional Space (if applicable)

Please use the space below to provide additional information as needed. To ensure the information is referenced to the proper item, include the Section and Field names as well (continued on next page).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

46  
11

### Letter of Authorization

This Letter of Authorization is effective as of this 7 day of December, 2015.

#### RECITALS:

- A. First Choice Property, a sole proprietorship, is the owner of the property located at 2502 Nueces, Austin, Texas 78705 (the "Property"), and
- B. The owner of First Choice Property is Steven Green.

#### NOW THEREFORE:

As the owner of First Choice Property, Steven Green hereby authorizes Scott Wuest, Wuest Engineering & Design, any representative of Wuest Engineering & Design (collectively "Wuest"), and Mike Mchone ("Mchone") to act on First Choice Property's behalf as the owner of the Property during all phases reasonably related to the submission, processing and completion of the application, permitting and development of the Property (collectively, the "Development Process"). Specifically, Steven Green expressly authorizes Wuest to engage in the following activities: site-plan permitting, demolition approval, land status determination application processing, S.M.A.R.T. Housing review and building permitting, licensing agreement approval, unified development agreement approval, and all easement drafting and recording as well as any activity reasonably related to the foregoing expressed Development Process activities. Wuest and Mchone shall be the principal contacts during the Development Process.

Signature of Owner: First Choice Property, a general partnership

Steven Green  
By: Steven Green, General Partner


State of Texas       }  
County of Travis   }

This instrument was acknowledged before me on the 4<sup>TH</sup> day of December, 2015 by Steven Green.

Notary Public



# Travis CAD - Map of Property ID 206463 for Year 2015



## Property Details

### Account

Property ID: 206463

Geo ID: 0214010407

Type: Real

Legal Description: N 1/2 OF LOT 2 \* & LOT 3 OLT 51 DIV D HITCHCOCK SUBD

### Location

Situs Address: 2502 NUECES ST TX 78705

Neighborhood: DORMITORY

Mapsco: 585E

Jurisdictions: 03, 02, 68, 01, 0A, 2J

### Owner

Owner Name: FIRST CHOICE PROPERTY

Mailing Address: , PO BOX 19337, , AUSTIN, TX 78760-9337

### Property

Appraised Value: N/A

<http://propaccess.traviscad.org/Map/View/Map/1/206463/2015>

powered by  
**PropertyACCESS**  
www.trueautomation.com

Map Disclaimer: This tax map was compiled solely for the use of TCAD. Areas depicted by these digital products are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to mapping, surveying or engineering standards. Conclusions drawn from this information are the responsibility of the user. The TCAD makes no claims, promises or guarantees about the accuracy, completeness or adequacy of this information and expressly disclaims liability for any errors and omissions. The mapped data does not constitute a legal document.

Waterloo Surveyors Inc.  
**SURVEY PLAT**

J14373

ADDRESS:  
2502 NUECES STREET  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78705

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:  
LOT 3, AND THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF LOT 2, HITCHCOCK'S SUBDIVISION OF OUTLOT NO. 51, DIVISION "D", ACCORDING TO THE MAP OR PLAT THEREOF, RECORDED IN BOOK Z, PAGE 622, DEED RECORDS OF TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS.

THE UNDERSIGNED DOSE HEREBY CERTIFY TO OLD REPUBLIC NATIONAL TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY AS PER TITLE COMMITMENT NUMBER 1505304-HAY, HAVING AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF FEBRUARY 17, 2015, 8:00 AM.

AS PER GF# 1505304-HAY, LOT 3 & NORTH HALF OF LOT 2:

[1] TERMS, CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS RECORDED IN VOLUME 5252, PAGE 696, VOLUME 11085, PAGE 397, VOLUME 11326, PAGE 314, DEED RECORDED OF TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS, AND DOCUMENT 2002095950, OFFICIAL PUBLIC RECORDS OF TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS.

[2] INCLUDES ALL ITEMS, CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS AS SET OUT IN SAID TITLE COMMITMENT AND EASEMENTS WHICH ARE NOT RECORDED IN THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS.


*Seton Avenue*

Tree #: Size" Type  
T1: 10" Hackberry  
T2: 15" Pecan  
T3: 27" Elm  
T4: 18" Pecan  
T5: 29" & 21" Pecan  
T6: 10" & 6" Hackberry  
T7: 10" Hackberry  
T8: 27" Pecan  
T9: 12" Pecan  
T10: 14" Pecan  
T11: 10" Pecan  
T12: 28" Pecan  
T13: 25" Pecan  
T14: 9" Elm  
T15: 9" & 5" Hackberry



SCALE  
1" = 30'

LEGEND  
1/2" FOUND IRON ROD FIR  
1/2" FOUND IRON PIPE FIP  
UTILITY LINE  
WOOD FENCE  
CHAIN LINK FENCE  
RECORD



NOTE:  
SAID PROPERTY IS 0.3087 ACRES  
(13,448 SQ. FT.)

*Nueces Street*

State of Texas:  
County of Travis:

The undersigned does hereby certify that this survey was this day made on the property legally described hereon and is correct, and this survey substantially complies with the current Texas Society of Professional Surveyors Standards and Specifications for a Category 1A Condition II Survey.

I certify that the property shown hereon is not within a special flood hazard area as identified by the Federal Insurance Adm. Department of HUD Flood hazard boundary map revised as per Map Number: 48453C0465H

Zone: X Dated: 8/26/2008

Dated this the 13th day of March, 2015.

TREES UPDATED 3/24/2015

Thomas P. Dixon R.P.L.S. 4324

16  
13/16



City of Austin  
Planning and Development Review  
Land Status Determination  
1995 Rule Platting Exception

March 24, 2015

File Number: C8I-2015-0099

Address: 2502 NUECES ST

Tax Parcel I.D. #0214010407

Tax Map Date: 02/28/2013

The Planning & Development Review Department has determined that this parcel, as described in the attached description and map, **IS EXCEPTED FROM THE REQUIREMENT TO PLAT** in accordance with the Land Development Code, Section 25-4-2(C), and is eligible to receive utility service.

The parcel of land consists of five acres or less, and is described as being lot three (3), and the North one-half of lot two (2), Hitchcocks Subdivision of Outlot 51, Division "D" in the current deed, recorded on Aug 24, 1990, in Volume 11258, Page 0006, Travis County Deed Records. This parcel existed in its current configuration on January 1, 1995, as evidenced by a deed recorded on Jul 08, 1983, in Volume 8157, Page 134, Travis County Deed Records. The parcel was lawfully receiving utility service, as defined in Section 212.012 of the Texas Local Government Code, on January 1, 1995, as evidenced by water service on Feb 24, 1958. The parcel meets the requirements of the Land Development Code for roadway frontage and is located on an existing street.

Additional Notes/Conditions:  
NONE


This determination of the status of the property is based on the application of Chapter 212, Municipal Regulation of Subdivisions and Property Development, Texas Local Government Code; and the City of Austin Land Development Code, Chapter 25-4, Subdivision. Recognition hereby does not imply approval of any other portion of the City Code or any other regulation.

By: Michelle Casillas  
Michelle Casillas, Representative of the Director  
Planning and Development Review Department


2/14

14  
15

## University Neighborhood Overlay Height Districts




2502  
Nueces





# The Ruckus

## Parking Exemption Request



5/56



The Ruckus (2502 Nueces St.) is a student housing complex located in West Campus that is currently being developed for fall 2017. The Ruckus will be located within 2 blocks of the University of Texas.

The Ruckus West Campus will feature 70 units and a total of 253 beds. The Ruckus will have a large 1<sup>st</sup> floor amenity area and a 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Terrace. The Ruckus will have two (2) floors of parking and five (10) floors of apartment units.

18/56

## OUTDATED PARKING REQUIREMENTS

The UNO (University Neighborhood Overlay) was adopted in 2004. The current parking reduction of 60% is roughly 10 Years Old. More and More Students are deciding to drive fewer cars due to the increase in public transportation and alternative options such as Uber and Lyft.

Currently The Corner (New Student Housing Development) which is 42% Pre Leased only has 17 Parking Spots leased for Fall 2017. That equates to the parking only being 20" Pre Leased. This development is 8 Blocks further

## VOICES FROM CAMPUS

## New study suggests fewer students want to drive

By Becky Hayes July 24, 2012 10:09 am

- Between 2007 to 2011,
  - The number of cars purchased by people aged 18 to 34 fell almost 30%;
  - Only 44% of teens obtained driver's licenses within the first year of becoming eligible;
  - Only 54% of teens obtain their drivers license before turning 18; and
  - 96% of college millennial consumers are focused on making money to curtail their tuition and other college expenses (which includes a car expense).
- Between 1983 and 2010,
  - The percentage of 19-year-olds in the US who have driver's licenses dropped from 87.3% to 69.5%.
  - The percentage of persons in their 20s in the US who have driver's licenses dropped from 33% to 22%.
- For 2015, a car was ranked as the 6th worst expenditure for a college student.



## Millennials Don't Care About Owning Cars, And Car Makers Can't Figure Out Why


Driving numbers are down for younger people and the auto industry hasn't found a way to respond. It's because they don't understand why millennials could possibly not want to drive.

Illustration by Florian Beyer


2/16

# The 12 Alternatives To Owning A Car That Convinced Me To Sell Mine

- Uber
- Lyft
- Car to Go
- UT Shuttle System
- Cap. Metro Bus System
- Car Sharing
- Walking
- Expenses
- Rental Cars
- Kindness



# UT Parking Garages



The San Antonio Garage (SAG) is located adjacent to the Ruckus and provides:

- 24 Hour / 7 Day a Week Access
- 335 Parking Spots
- Permitted Parking for Students
  - Annual Fee: \$628
  - Semester Fee: \$299
  - Summer Fee: \$131
- Daily Visitor Parking Accessibility
- UT students who live off campus (ie: those who do not have an official university residence hall contract) are eligible to receive a San Antonio Garage parking permit.

22/24

# Private Parking Garages

## Non Resident Parking Availability

- 1) The Castilian
- 2) 26 West
- 3) Quarters on Campus
- 4) Villas on Guadalupe
- 5) Lone Star Lofts
- 6) West Campus Elloras
- 7) 24 Longview



# Private Parking Garages

## Non Resident Parking Availability

### Non-resident Parking

Villas on Guadalupe <vilasonguadalupe@greystar.com>  
To: "scott@accrealty.com" <scott@accrealty.com>

Mon, Jan 11, 2016 at 10:25 AM

Hi Scott,

I've attached the forms that are required for non-resident parking. The parking addendum is only a sample as I will need to fill in your client's specific vehicle information and lease dates. In addition to these, we require a copy of your driver's license and valid car insurance.

As I stated on the phone, we are currently at 85% and generally do not fill up the entire garage. Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Best Regards,

Heather Kroll

Community Advisor | The Villas on Guadalupe

2810 Hemphill Park Austin, Texas 78705

Phone: (512) 220-0200 | Fax: (512) 220-0204 | [vilasonguadalupe@greystar.com](mailto:vilasonguadalupe@greystar.com)

### re: Quarters on Campus: Non-resident Parking

Sean Oberg <soberg@quartersoncampus.com>  
To: "Scott Burns, Esq." <Scott@accrealty.com>

Thu, Jan 14, 2016 at 12:33 PM

Good Afternoon Scott,

Yes we do provide non-resident parking, pricing depends on length of time of parking contract. We do have a ton of spaces available, we have never filled the garage completely. Jerian is our parking director and you can reach him at [park@quartersoncampus.com](mailto:park@quartersoncampus.com)

Thank you.

Sean Oberg

Leasing Consultant

(T) 512.531.0123 (F) 512.531.0114

2222 Rio Grande St. Suite 200B Austin, TX 78705

[www.quartersoncampus.com](http://www.quartersoncampus.com)

24/76



# Private Parking Garages

## Non Resident Parking Availability

re: 24 Longview - Availability

Bryan Henson <bhenson@smrtx.com>  
To: 'Scott Burns, Esq.' <scott@accreality.com>

Mon, Jan 11, 2016 at 2:40 PM

Hey Scott -

Thank you for the email. We do have parking at 2401 Longview Street for non-residents. There are plenty of spots to rent in the building, so send this to as many people as you wish. They cost is \$75 per month and they would need to sign up until May 2016 (can be longer, if needed). Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Have a great day,

Bryan Henson

Parking Spaces for Non-Tenants

Ryan Machemehl <ryanmachemehl@512reality.com>  
To: scott@accreality.com

Thu, Jan 14, 2016 at 2:48 PM

Good afternoon,

At this time, we do not have any parking spaces available at 2408 Leon Street. However, last year we did have quite a few come available in August, so I do expect there to have some available again this year. If you have any clients interested in potentially leasing a space with us, I would be more than happy to add their names onto our waiting list. At this time we only have 1 interested party, but that's sure to change soon with preleasing already starting up.

To add their names to the waiting list, just have them email me here at this address and include their name and date that they would like to begin leasing the space and we can go from there!

Thank you,

Ryan Machemehl  
Assistant Property Manager

512 Realty

2404 Rio Grande St  
Austin, TX 78705  
p: (512) 322 - 0512  
f: (512) 322 - 0504

2/5/16

# Private Parking Garages

## Non Resident Parking Availability

re: 26 West: Non-resident housing

26 West <26West@americancampus.com>  
To: "Scott Burns, Esq." <Scott@acrealty.com>

Thu, Jan 14, 2016 at 1:24 PM

26 West

T: 512.477.3400 | F: 512.477.3400

<http://26-west.com>

600 W. 26<sup>th</sup> Street

Austin, TX 78705

Hi Scott, and usually it is not difficult finding parking in the parking garage. We have a total of 7 floors that have parking and we only have 5 actual residential floors so once they receive their parking passes they should not have any difficulties. Thanks

Non-Resident Parking at the Castilian

Lauren Holdman <LHoldman@americancampus.com>  
To: "scott@acrealty.com" <scott@acrealty.com>

Fri, Jan 15, 2016 at 5:02 PM

Hi Scott,

So sorry the day got away from me but I wanted to get this to you before I left the office for the long weekend. So we do have non-resident parking available at the Castilian for the Fall 2016 semester. All inquiries for parking just need to contact our office here at 512.478.9811 or email us at [custleaseing@americancampus.com](mailto:custleaseing@americancampus.com) and we will send them the required paperwork. They will be required to pay a \$50 app fee and the monthly fee will range from \$95-\$149 depending on how long their term is.

Let me know if you have any other questions!

Lauren Holdman  
Leasing Coordinator

The Block | Texan & Vintage | The Castilian

American Campus Leasing Center

T: 512.478.9811

<http://www.americancampus.com/>

26/1/16

The evidence supports that fewer and fewer college students are bringing cars to school but for those who do, ample parking exists in West Campus through both UT and private parking garages.

2/16

019-2016-0019



## City of Austin

P.O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78768  
[www.cityofaustin.org/housing](http://www.cityofaustin.org/housing)

4/23

### Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Department

February 3, 2016

**S.M.A.R.T. Housing- Preliminary Certification**  
**Lincoln Ventures LLC – 2502 Nueces – University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO)**  
**(ID #66057)**

#### TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Lincoln Ventures LLC – 2502 Nueces (development contact: Mike Mchone, 512.481.9111 (o); [mchone1234@sbcglobal.net](mailto:mchone1234@sbcglobal.net)) has submitted a S.M.A.R.T. Housing application for the construction of a 35 unit (147 bedroom) multi-family development at 2502 Nueces, Austin TX 78705 in the University Overlay District of the West Campus Neighborhood Planning Area. The project will be subject to a forty (40) year affordability period after issuance of certificate of occupancy. Per the UNO Ordinance, 20140213-056, the applicant has elected to rent by the bedroom. This project is electing to pay the fee-in-lieu versus providing an additional 10% of affordable units or bedrooms. Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the fee-in-lieu calculation must be finalized and paid in full to the Neighborhood Housing and Community Development office and the applicant must enter into a Restrictive Covenant stating the affordability requirements and terms which will be filed for record at the Travis County Clerk Office.

NHCD certifies that the proposed construction will meet the S.M.A.R.T. Housing standards at the pre-submittal stage. Since 10% of the bedrooms (15 bedrooms) will serve households at or below 60% Median Family Income (MFI), the development will be eligible for 25% waiver of the fees listed in Exhibit A of the S.M.A.R.T. Housing Resolution adopted by the City Council. The expected fee waivers include, but are not limited to, the following fees.

Capital Recovery Fees  
Building Permit  
Concrete Permit  
Electrical Permit  
Mechanical Permit  
Plumbing Permit

Site Plan Review  
Misc. Site Plan Fee  
Construction Inspection  
Subdivision Plan Review  
Misc. Subdivision Fee  
Zoning Verification

Land Status Determination  
Building Plan Review  
Parkland Dedication (by  
separate ordinance)

In addition, the development must:

- ♦ Pass a final inspection and obtain a signed Final Approval from the Green Building Program. (Separate from any other inspections required by the City of Austin or Austin Energy. Contact Austin Energy Green Building: 512-482-5300 or [greenbuilding@austinenergy.com](mailto:greenbuilding@austinenergy.com)).
- ♦ Pass a final inspection to certify that accessibility standards have been met.

The applicant must demonstrate compliance with the reasonably-priced standard after the completion of the units, or repay the City of Austin in full the fees waived for this S.M.A.R.T. Housing certification.

Please contact me by phone 512.974.3128 or by email at [Sandra.harkins@austintexas.gov](mailto:Sandra.harkins@austintexas.gov) if you need additional information.

Sandra Harkins  
Neighborhood Housing and Community Development

Cc: Laurie Shaw, Capital Metro  
Maureen Meredith, PZD  
M. Simmons-Smith, DSD  
Katherine Murray, Austin Energy  
Randi Jenkins, AWU  
Ellis Morgan, NHCD

Bryan Bomer, AEGB  
Gina Copic, NHCD  
Marilyn Lamensdorf, PARO  
Heldi Kasper, AEGB  
Carl Wren, DSD

Alma Molieri, DSD  
Susan Kinel, NHCD  
Stephen Castleberry, DSD  
Lynda Courtney, DSD  
Cande Coward, DSD

Must Reads: [GOP Has Mad Max Problem](#) | [Black Lives Matter Reshapes 2016 Election](#) | [Trump Wins Nevada](#)

Search

# NO PARKING HERE

You've heard about how robocars are going to upend the economy. But have you thought about what they'll do to urban space?

BY CLIVE THOMPSON

January/February 2016 Issue

6 IK

Email [\(FORWARD\)PATH+MOJES/122221](#)

212 (6404 0414)



1/20/17

2/2/2017


1

**IF YOU DRIVE OUT** to visit Disney's Epcot center in Orlando, Florida, you will arrive at one of the biggest parking lots in America. With room for 12,000 cars, it sprawls out over 7 million square feet—about the size of 122 football fields. If you look at the lot on Google Maps, you realize that it's nearly the size of Epcot center itself. Disney built one Epcot to hold the visitors. Then it built another to hold the cars.

Disney isn't alone in its expansive approach to parking. Parking is, after all, what cars do most of the time: The average automobile spends 95 percent of its time sitting in place. People buy cars because they need to move around, but the amount of time they actually *do* move around is tiny. So the cars are parked, and in multiple spaces: A car owner needs a spot near home, but also spots near other places he or she might go—the office, a shopping mall, Epcot.

A 2011 [study](http://chester.faculty.asu.edu/library/access39_parking.pdf) ([http://chester.faculty.asu.edu/library/access39\\_parking.pdf](http://chester.faculty.asu.edu/library/access39_parking.pdf)) at the University of California-Berkeley found that the United States has somewhere close to a billion parking spots. Since there are only 253 million passenger cars and light trucks in the country, that means we have roughly four times more parking spaces than vehicles. If you totaled up all the area devoted to parking, it'd be roughly 6,500 square miles, bigger than Connecticut.

Social critics often complain that the interstate highway system deformed the United States by encouraging sprawl. But the metastasizing of parking has had equally profound effects. On an aesthetic level, it makes cities grimly ugly. Economically, it is expensive to build. A [study](http://www.sightline.org/research_item/who-pays-for-parking/) ([http://www.sightline.org/research\\_item/who-pays-for-parking/](http://www.sightline.org/research_item/who-pays-for-parking/)) by the Sightline Institute




(<http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/12/uber-lawsuit-drivers-class-action-shannon-liss-riordan>)

Meet "Sledgehammer Shannon," Uber's Worst Nightmare  
(<http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/12/uber-lawsuit-drivers-class-action-shannon-liss-riordan>)

LY  
2/9

found that at least 15 percent of the price of rent in Seattle stemmed from developers' cost of building parking.



*Evolver*

Those costs are passed on to tenants whether they own a car or not (on top of any per space fee the landlord charges)—padding rent by an average of \$246 a month in Seattle and \$225 nationwide.

And worst of all may be the emissions that parking causes. Studies have found that anywhere from about 30 to 60 percent of the cars you see driving around a downtown core are just circling, looking for an open space to claim. (An IBM [SURVEY](https://www-01.ibm.com/press/us/en/pressrelease/35515.wss) (<https://www-01.ibm.com/press/us/en/pressrelease/35515.wss>) found that worldwide, urban drivers spend an average of 20 minutes per trip looking for parking.) When Donald Shoup, an urban-planning professor at the University of California-Los Angeles, examined just one small business area near his university—Westwood Village—he found that "cruising" for parking, as he dubs it, burns 47,000 gallons of gas and generates 730 tons of carbon dioxide a year. What's more, all that asphalt traps heat and raises the temperature of

44  
30

cities during the summer. Environmentally, aesthetically, and economically, parking is a mess.

4  
31

*If you totaled up all the land devoted to parking, it'd be roughly 6,500 square miles, bigger than Connecticut.*

But for the first time in history, urban experts are excited about parking—because they can see the end in sight.

We are, they say, on the cusp of a new era, when cities can begin dramatically reducing the amount of parking spaces they offer. This shift is being driven by a one-two punch of social and technological change. On the social side, people are increasingly opting to live in urban centers, where they don't need—or want—to own a car. They're ride-sharing or using public transit instead.

And technologically, we're seeing the rapid emergence of self-driving cars. Google's models have traveled more than a million miles with almost no accidents, and experts expect that fully autonomous vehicles will hit the consumer market as early as a decade from now. Indeed, car technology is advancing so rapidly that it's causing legitimate economic concerns. Already, companies like Uber and Lyft are under fire for treating drivers as independent contractors, with far fewer rights and benefits than employees (see "[Road Warrior](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/12/uber-lawsuit-drivers-class-action-shannon-liss-riordan) <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/12/uber-lawsuit-drivers-class-action-shannon-liss-riordan>"). And that disruption is nothing compared with what will happen once cars can drive themselves; millions of taxi, delivery, and long-haul trucking jobs that traditionally have gone to new immigrants and low-education workers could vanish in a few years. Labor activists and economists are understandably alarmed at the prospect.

But at the level of urban design and the environment, self-driving cars could produce huge benefits. After all, if cars can drive themselves, fleets of them could scurry around picking people up and dropping them off, working with sleek, robotic efficiency. With perfect computerized knowledge of where potential riders were, they could pick up several people heading the same way, optimizing ride-sharing on the fly. One [study](http://www.cace.utexas.edu/prof/kockelman/public_html/TRB15SAVsinAustin.pdf) ([http://www.cace.utexas.edu/prof/kockelman/public\\_html/TRB15SAVsinAustin.pdf](http://www.cace.utexas.edu/prof/kockelman/public_html/TRB15SAVsinAustin.pdf)) suggests a single self-driving car could replace up to 12 regular vehicles. Indeed, many urbanists predict that fleets of robocars could become so reliable that many, many people would choose not to own automobiles, causing the amount of parking needed to drop through the floor.

"Parking has been this sacred cow that we couldn't touch—and now we *can* touch it," says Gabe Klein, who has headed the transportation departments in Chicago and Washington, DC. He sees enormous potential—all that paved-over space suddenly freed up for houses and schools, plazas and playgrounds, or just about anything. "All that parking could go away, and then what happens?" he asks. "You unlock a tremendous amount of value."

**AMERICA BEGAN ITS** love affair with parking in the 1940s and '50s, when car use exploded. Panicked cities realized they would soon run out of curb space, but they didn't want to discourage car ownership or build enough public transit. So instead they passed minimum parking requirements: If a developer wanted to erect a new office or apartment building, it had to build parking. For residences, typically two spots per household are required. And in general, cities calculated the highest peak amount of parking a location might need and demanded that developers build it.

Way back in the 1960s, UCLA's Shoup became alarmed by the massive growth of parking. As he saw it, the problem was that in most people's minds, the spaces seemed to be "free." When developers are forced to build parking, the cost is folded into the purchase price, be it a home, an office, or a restaurant. And when people don't pay to park at the curb (only a tiny fraction of curbside spots in the United States are metered), it's the city that pays to build and maintain that spot. These costs are passed down to consumers and taxpayers, but since they're never itemized, they're easy to ignore. In my neighborhood in Brooklyn, for example, housing prices are sky-high, but the city doesn't charge me to park on the street. When I tell this to Shoup, he points out that if they *did* charge me, the odds are high that I'd never have bought my car. When a city provides free parking, it's also economically unfair, since it's a subsidy available only to those who are wealthy enough to own cars.

*"Parking is wildly mismanaged—it's probably our most inefficient use of resources in many ways."*

"Parking is wildly mismanaged—it's probably our most inefficient use of resources in many ways," Shoup tells me. Indeed, minimum parking requirements usually force developers to build more parking than the market actually calls for. Sightline found ([http://www.sightline.org/research\\_item/who-pays-for-parking/](http://www.sightline.org/research_item/who-pays-for-parking/)) that in greater Seattle, 37 percent of residential lots are empty at night—precisely when you'd expect residential parking spaces to be *most* used.

There are

4

times as  
many parking  
spaces as  
cars in  
America.

4  
32



The deep irony is that cities rarely require developers to construct enough affordable housing, but they pass strict laws making sure vehicles can be adequately housed. "We don't force [developers] to build the right number of bedrooms for people! We just force them to build the right number of bedrooms for cars," says Jeffrey Tumlin, the principal and director of strategy for Nelson Nygaard, a parking consultancy.

Up  
33

To be fair to politicians, there's a long history of people freaking out if parking isn't plentiful. "Thinking about parking seems to take place in the reptilian cortex, the most primitive part of the brain responsible for making snap decisions about urgent fight-or-flight choices, such as how to avoid being eaten," as Shoup dryly wrote in his 2005 book, *The High Cost of Free Parking*.



Evolver

Ultimately, he notes, parking is a self-reinforcing problem. Cities trained people to expect that parking would be plentiful and free, which encouraged them to drive everywhere—which made them demand more parking. Decades of perverse incentives cemented the automobile as the main way people get around. As the Census Bureau reported (<https://www.census.gov/hhes/commuting/files/2014/acs-32.pdf>) in 2005, fully 76.4 percent of US workers who lived in the same city where they worked commuted to their jobs in a car, by themselves. Only 7.8 percent of them

commuted by public transit. Parking, urban reformers fretted, seemed like an intractable problem.

**AT LEAST, THAT'S** how the picture looked 10 years ago. But then something strange happened to our relationship with cars.

Jeff Kenworthy is a professor of sustainability at Curtin University in Australia, and for decades he has been collecting data on how people travel in major industrialized cities around the world. He's found (<http://www.ecologica.co.uk/pdf/wtnd17.2.pdf>) that the pace at which people increase their use of cars has been slowing. In the '60s, car use grew by 42 percent. In the '80s, it grew by less—only 23 percent. Then from 1995 to 2005, it went up by only 5 percent. In some cities car use actually declined, including London (down 1.2 percent), Atlanta (10.1 percent), and Houston (15.2 percent). Kenworthy says many cities are reaching "peak car use," and it's all downhill from here.

"The dominance of the car," he says, "is on the wane in many places."

Why? It's partly the price of gas, which rose dramatically in the early 2000s and has in many parts of the world stayed high since then. (Car insurance is historically high too.) But Kenworthy suspects it is also related to a concept known as the "Marchetti Wall ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marchetti%27s\\_constant](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marchetti%27s_constant))." Back in 1994, the Italian physicist Cesare Marchetti observed that throughout history—going back to ancient Rome—the majority of people disliked commuting more than one hour to work. If you're faced with a longer commute, you hit the Wall and rearrange your life, finding a new, more local job or moving closer to the office. In the 1990s and early 2000s, not only did use of public transit grow, but Kenworthy found that cities worldwide were becoming denser, in part because millennials weren't decamping for the suburbs (like their boomer parents did), and because seniors were moving back to urban cores, to enjoy the walkable life. As a society, we slammed into the Marchetti Wall and backed away.

True, this trend isn't necessarily set in stone. While the number of vehicle miles traveled per capita in the United States began declining in 2005, it began rising again in 2014. The dip might have been a result of the Great Recession and \$4-per-gallon gas, says Constantine Samaras, a civil and environmental engineer at Carnegie Mellon University. The price of gas in the United States has since gone down, and "when the price is cheap, people are going to drive more."

But many experts argue that the urbanizing trend is likely to accelerate because millennials are a Marchetti generation—they're increasingly turning

26  
34

U  
35

*Millennials are much more likely than their elders to say they try to actively minimize driving to avoid causing environmental damage.*

against the car. Research (<http://www.frontiergroup.org/reports/fg/transportation-and-new-generation>) by the Frontier Group, a think tank that often publishes work on energy and transportation, found that the average annual number of miles driven by American 16- to 34-year-olds dropped 23 percent between 2001 and 2009, a pretty stunning fall. Meanwhile, millennials took 24 percent more bike rides and used more public transit. Indeed, they're much less likely than previous generations to even be able to drive: In 1983, some 87.3 percent of 19-year-olds nationwide had a driver's license. By 2010, only 69.5 percent of them did. And while you might suspect that the recession was at play, rates of driving are down even among young adults with high-paying jobs.

When millennials are polled, they're much more likely than their elders to say they try to actively minimize driving to avoid causing environmental damage. They're buying far fewer cars than their forebears did, which worries carmakers. Toyota USA President Jim Lentz said in a speech last year, "We have to face the growing reality that today young people don't seem to be as interested in cars as previous generations."

**THERE IS ONE** trend of mobility that young people have embraced, though: On-demand car services like Uber and Lyft.

A year ago, Uber reported that its drivers were making 1 million trips per day; this past summer, the company told prospective investors that it was growing 300 percent year over year. Fully 70 percent of Uber's customers are under the age of 34, and 56 percent of them live in cities, as a survey by the market research firm Global Web Index found. Ride-hailing has big implications for weaning cities off their addiction to parking. The millennial generation is learning that it can have a car without needing to own or ever park one.

What's more, Uber is seeing especially rapid growth in its ride-sharing offering, Uber Pool, which matches travelers heading to roughly the same destination. In exchange for sharing a ride, the fare is at least 25 percent cheaper than a regular Uber fare. The company introduced the service in San Francisco a year ago, and already nearly 50 percent of all Uber rides in the city are pooled.

This fact stuns even Uber itself. "The adoption of ride-sharing is larger than

anybody anticipated. The market is massive," says David Plouffe, the former Obama campaign manager who is now Uber's chief adviser and a board member, during an interview at the company's shiny headquarters in downtown San Francisco. "I don't think anyone who was around in the beginning suggested that the market would be this big. I mean, we have a good service, but clearly this is married up with how people want to live."

Uber, he says, is now launching a service aimed at ride-sharing for daily commutes. "So, I'm getting ready to go to work. I put my coffee mug in the sink. I turn on the app. I pick up my keys. Somebody three blocks away says, 'I'm going the same way,'" he says.

Carpooling, of course, has been touted for decades as a way to use cars more efficiently. But it never took off because it suffered from an information problem: There was no way to coordinate rides on the fly, no way to know whether someone four blocks away was heading in the same direction as you, *right this instant*. Safer just to drive yourself, right? And this gave birth to a welter of personal choices that seemed perfectly reasonable individually, but that together created a massive environmental and urban land use problem—with many of us heading off to work in the same direction and with cars that contained, statistically, only 1.13 people each.

That information problem is now gone. The smartphone has solved it. Equipped with GPS and mobile data, the mobile phone may ruin our concentration and erode our privacy at every turn, but it's remarkably good at one task: on-the-fly coordination. If the trend toward ride-sharing keeps accelerating, how might that change traffic and parking? When a group of MIT scientists crunched data on Boston-area commuting patterns, they found ([http://www2.cs.uic.edu/~urbcomp2013/urbcomp2015/papers/Real-time-Ridesharing\\_Alexander.pdf](http://www2.cs.uic.edu/~urbcomp2013/urbcomp2015/papers/Real-time-Ridesharing_Alexander.pdf)) that if 50 percent of drivers shifted over to ride-sharing, it would reduce traffic congestion by 37 percent and decrease the number of vehicles on the road by 19 percent.

Tumlin, the parking consultant, is struck by the shift in the zeitgeist. He's 46 and says that "my generation was the last generation to believe that owning our own car would bring us freedom, autonomy, social status, sex." For today's young people, the mobile phone is a much more potent technology of autonomy and social status—and, in a neat twist, you can't use your phone while you're driving. They are rival activities, and the phone is winning. People want access to a car, but don't feel a need to own one, just as they've increasingly adopted streaming services instead of vinyl, CDs, or even MP3s.

"This conflation of auto ownership and personal identity," Tumlin concludes,

# 31%

Lb  
36

of our  
downtown  
commercial  
cores are  
devoted to  
parking.

"is permanently broken."

WHEN THE GOOGLE self-driving car first pulled out into a busy intersection, with convertibles racing past us, I stole a look over at the driving wheel. It was turning by itself, as if a ghost were piloting the vehicle. It was an unnerving sight, though the Google engineers riding along with me were by now quite blasé: These cars have already driven a total of 1.2 million miles and have only been in a tiny number of accidents. The computer guidance system, said the engineer sitting in the driver's seat—his hands folded in his lap—is a very cautious driver.

*Google's latest prototype was tooling around: a cute, egg-shaped little pod that was about as big as a Smart Car, except it didn't even have a steering wheel.*

"Almost like a new person who's driving for the first month or so," he added.

These cars can also sense far more than humans can. Another engineer riding shotgun held a laptop showing how our car "saw" the road with its laser, radar, and camera vision: The screen looked like the wireframe of a video game, with yellow boxes for pedestrians, red boxes for cyclists, and purple and green ones for other vehicles. The car could see not just what was ahead of us, but far off to the sides and behind us too.

"That's what makes computers more fun, that they can detect a million things at one time, whereas your average driver is probably only focused on that one thing," the engineer said with a grin. As if to prove the point, the car abruptly slowed down: It had detected a woman to our right drifting slightly into our lane.

Ten years ago, self-driving car prototypes could barely drive 10 miles across a relatively uncluttered desert. Now they're expertly weaving through traffic in Silicon Valley, Austin, and Pittsburgh. "The rate of progress," marveled the engineer, "is mind-blowing." They dropped me off at Google's headquarters, where I wandered up to a rooftop parking lot. There, Google's latest prototype—so new that journalists aren't allowed to ride in it—was tooling around: a cute, egg-shaped little pod that was about as big as a Smart Car, except it didn't even have a steering wheel.

46  
37

46  
38

town. The upshot, Kockelman figures, is that if you shifted the entire city to autonomous cars, it would need a staggering 90 percent less parking than it needs today. It'd be speedy travel: In Kockelman's model, when people called for a car, one typically came along in about 20 seconds. It'd be profitable: When she spec'd out the cost of running an Uber-like fleet of robot cars, she calculated it would cost \$70,000 to buy and deploy each vehicle, but that each would earn a 19 percent profit on investment every year. And rides would only be about \$1 per mile, even if just a single passenger rode at a time—half as cheap as today's typical Austin cab fare.

*A city run on shared autonomous cars would likely have a dramatically lower environmental footprint.*

"You could make the fleet smaller," she says, "and you can reduce parking in downtown." The streets would still be busy—crowded, even—with vehicles whizzing to and fro. It's just that they wouldn't need to park. It would be the taxi-ization of nearly all human mobility.

A city run on shared autonomous cars would likely have a dramatically lower environmental footprint. That's partly because you'd get rid of the "circling" that plagues urban traffic. But it's also because high-tech cars would be new—and, given that they'll probably emerge en masse about 10 years from now, they'd be electric. A model

(<http://www.nature.com/nclimate/journal/v5/n9/full/nclimate2685.html>) of city traffic published in *Nature* last July by Berkeley Lab scientist Jeffrey Greenblatt deduced that emissions would be 90 percent lower if cars were all autonomous and electric. And the truth is, it's easier for a fleet of robot cars to go electric than it is for individual car owners to do so. If I owned an electric car, I'd constantly be at risk for "range anxiety": the fear that my battery might die when I'm far from a charging station. But a robot fleet could optimize repowering, sending a car to pick up a traveler only when the car had enough juice to get to the traveler's destination, and taking low-battery cars out of service to recharge as needed.

"You could conceivably imagine a world in which you don't need to pave as much of the roadway," says James Anderson, a behavioral scientist at RAND who co-authored a report on autonomous cars in 2014. "If they're driving themselves, cars could precisely put themselves on four-meter-wide bits of pavement," leaving the rest of the road to some other purpose or surface,

maybe grass. "You can imagine fairly utopian, far-off visions."

We won't know what's truly possible until there are lots of autonomous vehicles on the road. For all the success that Google, Stanford, and Carnegie Mellon University have had with their robot cars, they've mostly been driven in mild climates. Nobody has figured out how to tackle snow, which tends to confuse today's computer vision systems. It's probably solvable, but precisely when—or when governments will be satisfied enough of self-driving cars' safety to approve them for sale—is anybody's guess.

44  
39

*"Who will be the last human driver?" asks Samaras. "It'll probably be our grandkids."*

But you don't need fully autonomous cars to get big reductions in parking. Already some cars can parallel park themselves. Carmakers could soon produce vehicles that you drive yourself but that, once you're at a parking lot, you send off to find a space by themselves. Since nobody would need to get in or out of them after they parked, they could position themselves as snugly together as Tetris bricks, fitting far more cars into our existing parking lots and garages. Achieve even this small feat of self-driving, and it could be possible to never build another piece of parking, says Samaras, the Carnegie Mellon engineer.

Some urban thinkers told me that 15 years from now, autonomous vehicles will have erased the need for up to 90 percent of our current lots. "There is more parking today in American cities than they will ever, ever need," Tumlin says. It'll vanish as human driving vanishes.


"Who will be the last human driver?" asks Samaras. "It'll probably be our grandkids."

**WHAT WOULD A CITY** look like if it suddenly needed 90 percent less parking?

A few cities have experimented with reclaiming road space. One of the biggest such projects was in Seoul, South Korea, in the early 2000s, when the municipal government tore up a 3.5-mile elevated highway that had covered the Cheonggyecheon River and transformed <http://landscapeperformance.org/casc-study-briefs/cheonggyecheon-stream-restoration/#/overview> it into a public park. The effects on the city were immediate: In addition to encouraging a surge in tourism, the park cooled the surrounding area by 9 degrees Fahrenheit during the summer.

46  
40

"Now they have this incredible green corridor with tons of space and hundreds of thousands of people using it," says Kenworthy. There had been 120,000 cars a day flowing through the area, and opponents of the project had claimed that all these cars would cram onto side streets instead. But car use went down. We often believe traffic is like a liquid; prevent it from going down one road, and it'll just flow down a nearby one. But in reality, Kenworthy says, traffic is more like a gas: "A gas compresses or expands based on how much space you give it."



**WASTED SPACE:** A study by the Seattle-based Sightline Institute found that developers are required to build an average of 1.5 parking spaces for every two bedroom unit—more than half the size of the average apartment itself. Or consider that the average church in America seats 400. A church that size is typically required to have a parking lot almost five times larger than the church itself. *Based on designs by Seth Goodman/Graphing Parking. (<http://graphingparking.com>) Graphic by Chris Philpot*

New York City has seen similar experiments. Ex-Mayor Mike Bloomberg

[closed \(<http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/432-13/mayor-bloomberg-transportation-commissioner-sadik-khan-design-construction-commissioner/#/o>\) down](http://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/432-13/mayor-bloomberg-transportation-commissioner-sadik-khan-design-construction-commissioner/#/o)

several blocks of Times Square, turning them into well-trafficked pedestrian hangouts. The most famous reclaimed space is Manhattan's High Line (<http://www.nycgovparks.org/parks/the-high-line>), once a dilapidated elevated railway and now a verdant park that drew 6.2 million visitors in 2014 (2 million of whom were locals) and hosts live events. "It's a park, it's a cultural institution, it's a plaza, all put together," says Robert Hammond, who spearheaded the restoration project and now runs the nonprofit that tends it. He suspects the future of public parks is these sorts of "hybrid" spaces, built on reclaimed urban space.

When land in a city suddenly becomes freed up for new uses, it's called "infill."



44  
41

The downside of our love affair with cars is that on average we've asphalted over 31 percent of our commercial downtown cores with parking. But the upside, Shoup tells me, is massive potential infill. If we wean ourselves off the need to store cars, spots and lots could be converted into parks, schools, hospitals, housing. Better yet, it's property that is precisely where you'd want new development: downtown, inherently walkable. "The upside of the mess we've made," Shoup says, "is that we have a lot of land."

Take New York City, where there are roughly 102,000 public parking spaces below 60th Street—taking up roughly 18.4 million square feet, a space equal to about half of Central Park.

"San Francisco is going bananas for new housing, and Manhattan is always looking for space, and here we have this sitting in front of us," Samaras says. "That's what autonomous vehicles can do."

**THERE ARE SOME** big speed bumps on the road to a low-parking future, though. That's because most of these rosy projections assume self-driving cars are likely to be deployed en masse by ride-sharing firms that would use them with deep efficiency, offering such convenience and cheapness that we'd all ditch our personal vehicles.

But there's another route the future might take. Shannon McDonald, an architect and historian of American parking, recently got a glimpse of it. She flew to Baltimore to visit her brother, who picked her up in his new car. It included several self-piloting features; he showed her how it wouldn't let him steer accidentally into a neighboring lane on the highway, and when he got home, the car parallel parked itself. Such features might make self-driving cars so alluring that everyone wants one.

"What if they're all privately owned? You've got a driverless vehicle, and maybe you don't share it," McDonald tells me. If her brother and sister-in-law had a fully self-driving car, maybe they'd decide to go to New York to see theater. It's a crazy-long five-hour drive, but who cares? They could kick back. They would "ride all the way in and sleep in it all the way back," she says. If you can read, watch TV, work and do email, or catch up on sleep while your car steers, the sting goes out of commuting.

In this version of the future, self-driving cars could smash through the Marchetti Wall. They would unlock what's known as "induced demand"—prompting commutes of such lengths that they'd have been previously unfathomable. Or we might find people deciding they never need to park their cars because, hey, cars can circle on their own.

LL  
42

McDonald imagines a commuter going to work in his self-driving car: "Let's say he gets to the office, he gets dropped off at the front door. And he tells the car to go find its cheapest parking." Maybe it drives out to the far suburbs, to park for free on a side street. "He says, 'Okay, just go have fun today! Go drive around! Come back and get me at five. Why not? It's cheaper!'" The problem of cruising could morph into a Monty Pythonesque parody of modern life: a street clogged with traffic, but all the cars are empty. In economic terms, this is called a "rebound effect": If you make something suddenly more efficient to do, people will do more of it.

Urban and traffic thinkers are divided about how serious these negative impacts could be. Many suspect the Marchetti Wall will remain in place. "We're unmoved by these arguments," says Berkeley Lab's Greenblatt. "Because seriously, most people are not going to sit in a car for hours a day." Others agree, pointing out that the generational shift away from owning a personal car isn't likely to dim. Most experts I spoke to said governments should set policies that make fleet-based ride-sharing more appealing than individual car ownership. The main lever here is "congestion pricing": A city could—as London already does—require drivers to pay extra fees to travel in the congested downtown areas unless they're in ride-shared vehicles. Nearly every expert I spoke to advocated some version of congestion pricing to prevent a rebound effect.

*If cities leave self-driving cars entirely to the private sector, they court risk.*

Others pointed out that personal ownership might well blur with fleet ownership. If someone owned a self-driving car, she might opt to make money off it by having it drive off to work for a fleet when she's at the office. Cities could also offer incentives to ride-sharing services that augment public transit, feeding people to major subway and rail lines. (This is already a trend: Uber reports that in some cities, one-third of its trips begin or end at a public-transit station.)

The bottom line is, if urban officials want to make sure these technologies benefit civic life, they need to start talking about them now. "If we want it to be sustainable, the city has to get involved in these services," says Tom Radulovich, executive director of Livable City, a nonprofit transit group. Cities could deploy their own fleets of subsidized self-driving cars—the next

generation of public transit—aiming them particularly at the mobility disabled and underserved and low-income areas, where residents often lack the credit cards required by ride-sharing apps. They could commission vans that could pool more people than a car, providing a nice midpoint between personal vehicle ownership and a bus.

If cities leave self-driving cars entirely to the private sector, they court risk. When the usage of public transit grows or shrinks, the city knows immediately, and can adapt to what the public is demanding. But companies like Lyft and Uber are opaque, releasing very little information about their usage. This is already making it hard for San Francisco to plan for the future: Figuring out where to develop public transit hinges on understanding how people are moving themselves around using private-sector means. "We don't have the data to understand the market size and what's happening to it," says Timothy Papandreou, the city's director of strategic planning and policy for SFMTA.



A parklet in San Francisco. *San Francisco Planning Department*

As Radulovich points out, there's historical precedent for the government getting more deeply involved in regulating private ride-sharing. After all, today's public transit started out as a hodgepodge of private systems—a bus line here, a streetcar there—that slowly merged into one large system. "Public transit went through this—it was venture funded, but then it became public." That reverse privatization is unlikely to happen again, but cities could ensure the system serves civic needs by using carrots and sticks: incentivize people to use ride-sharing but require that ride-sharing firms share their data.

$$\frac{14}{43}$$

44  
44

Gabe Klein argues that good deals can serve both the city and the private sector. When he ran the transportation system in Washington, DC, Klein—who'd previously worked for Zipcar—created a new policy: Zipcar would be allowed to park its cars for free in some curbside city spots. It was controversial: giving away a public resource to a private firm? But Klein argued that because a single Zipcar is used by many people and driven far more often than a regular single-owner car, each would take cars off the road. Klein also got DC to charge more for on-street parking, again nudging people away from owning private cars. In the ensuing years (which also saw the rise of the ride-sharing apps), DC saw 6 percent fewer registrations for cars, even as the population increased by 3 percent.

**OBVIOUSLY, CITIES SHOULD** get cracking on their plans for the self-driving future. But are there things they can do right now to reduce the amount of parking and driving?

Shoup recommends that cities apply something like Uber's infamous surge pricing to parking: If a block tends to be full of parked cars at a particular time of day, the city should charge more, and if the demand is lower, it should charge less. The goal, Shoup says, is to price parking so that there are always one or two spots open on a block. Achieve that, and presto: A city could get rid of circling, since drivers could always quickly find a spot. Emissions and traffic would go down, while higher meter fees would encourage use of public transit.

*Shoup recommends that cities apply something like Uber's infamous surge pricing to parking.*

Would dynamic pricing actually work?

In 2011, San Francisco decided to find out. In several areas of downtown, it set up new high-tech meters ([<http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2016/01/future-parking-self-driving-cars>](http://people.ucsc.edu/~adammb/publications/Millard-Ball>Weinberger Hampshire 2014 Assessing the Impacts SFPark.pdf</a>) and sensors in the ground that told the city how busy these blocks and city parking lots were from morning to noon, from noon to 3 p.m., and from 3 p.m. to the evening. Every few months, the city examined the data and adjusted the price for each time segment of each block or lot up or down. Over the next two years, the city shifted parking costs upward on 37 percent of the time segments per blocks or lots, while at another 37 percent, the prices dropped. (The price of the others fluctuated.) It turned out that the hottest demand for parking was between noon and 3 p.m.</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

44  
45

The new pricing scheme had precisely the effect the city hoped it would. Blocks that were previously jammed all day now typically had one spot open. Overall, driving in the pilot areas went down by about 2,400 miles per day—and circling plummeted by 50 percent. That helped reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 30 percent. (In comparison, areas in the city that weren't in this pilot study saw their emissions go down by only 6 percent.) Meanwhile, drivers reported that it took them 43 percent less time to find parking. And the program was even profitable: The city took in \$3.3 million more at the meters, even as it lost \$500,000 as parking citations decreased.

"Seeing the circling go down was one of the nicest findings," said Tom Maguire, director of Sustainable Streets for the city's Municipal Transportation Agency, when I visited him in his downtown office. "The circling hurts everybody: air quality, greenhouse gas, collisions, making the streets much less pleasant." He was also happy to put some meat on Shoup's arguments against free parking. "If there's one takeaway, it's that the theory is true: If you raise the price, you have a little less parking demand. Until we did something on the scale of almost the entire downtown of San Francisco plus seven other neighborhoods, I don't think it had been proven that the theory was true."

So far, alas, few cities are following San Francisco's lead. People—especially merchants—tend to holler when a city starts charging for parking. Three years ago, Ellicott City, a historic town in Maryland, installed smart meters on its main drag, only to have so many merchants complain that the city soon tore them out.

Shoup thinks cities need to be politically savvy to get citizens on board. One way, he says, is to engineer the meters to provide a hyperlocal benefit—plow some of the profits a meter generates back into sprucing up the very street on which the meter sits. Ventura County in California installed smart meters that were connected by wifi to the city, and then used those meters to broadcast free wifi to locals. It was an immediate hit.

But the central policy that can discourage the growth of parking is to eliminate minimum parking requirements. Take Los Angeles, which used to force developers to build two parking spots for every new unit of housing, hampering redevelopment in the downtown core. In 1999, the city eased the rules, and in a short time, developers started renovating the old buildings, providing an average of only 1.3 parking spots per unit. Buyers didn't care: They still bought the housing. The market, as Shoup observes, is willing to cope. Build less parking, and people will find other ways to get around.

The average  
automobile  
spends  
**95%**  
of its time  
sitting in place.

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, 2010

LL  
46

A LOWER-PARKING FUTURE could be downright lovely, judging by a glimpse I recently got of it. I was walking through the Mission District of San Francisco when I came across a curious sight: two curbside parking spots that had been transformed into a tiny public "parklet" (<http://sf.curbed.com/archives/2013/04/08/highlighting-a-few-of-the-many-parklets-along-busy-valencia-street.php>). Built out of huge, curved pieces of wood, it looked like a ship beached on the side of the road. Two young men sat on the benches having a business meeting. Across the street was another parklet, where thick desert vegetation—some clipped to resemble a triceratops—spilled out in front of a private residence.

Founded five years ago—and since emulated by cities ranging from London to Ames, Iowa—San Francisco's parklet program allows a property owner or business to apply to transform their storefront parking spots into a wee little plaza. There are now scores of parklets throughout San Francisco, including a particularly fascinating cluster of nine between 20th and 24th streets on Valencia Street. As I toured the strip, it gave me a vision of how remarkably a city could evolve: Imagine if 90 percent of all curbside parking spots were turned into strips of public parks, filled with greenery, urban gardening, and people relaxing.

They are oddly peaceful places. A few blocks down the strip at another parklet with a rainwater catchment exhibit, I found Nicole Hubman, a 30-year-old who was sitting and reading, waiting for her yoga class across the street. It turns out that Hubman's life is a study in the massive changes already underway in our relationship to driving. She used to live in Boston, where her commute was an hour and a half each day. She hit her own Marchetti Wall, and it made her miserable. So when she moved to San Francisco, she decided to get around on public transit.

"I hate driving," she says. "I'm allergic to it."



CLIVE THOMPSON (<http://authors/clivethompson>)

Clive Thompson is a contributing writer for the *New York Times Magazine* and a columnist for *Wired*.

<http://authors/clivethompson>

via:

[thompson](http://thompson)

Heldenfels, Leane

---

44  
47

**From:** Toni Guckert <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 12, 2016 2:24 PM  
**To:** Heldenfels, Leane  
**Subject:** C15-2016-0019 2502 Nueces street request for Parking Variance  
[REDACTED]

Hi Leane,

I am writing to ask for clarification on this request. I have read through the PDF here: <http://www.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=247487>

On the page hand labeled "M13" - it says there will be "five (10) floors of apartment units". Is it "five" or "10"? Or do I just not understand the terminology.

We own Unit 3A in Orange Tree (between Seton and Rio Grande and 25th and 26th street). One of our daughters has always been in residence there for the last 8 years. To say that there is enough parking on west campus because facilities such as the Castillion etc. still have non-resident parking spots available for rent is inaccurate. Anyone who has ever tried to drive around west campus to find parking knows there is a strangling shortage. To allow this developer to exacerbate the situation by not at least building his share like the rest of us is irresponsible.

It looks like this meeting may have been delayed and I may have not missed my opportunity to object. If that is correct please add me to the "I Object" group.

It looks like the Central Area Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee might be good to contact since they requested the delay? Would that be your recommendation?

Thanks very much for taking the time to read this Leane. I am sure you are very busy

Regards  
Toni J. Guckert

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, **you are not required to attend**. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak **FOR** or **AGAINST** the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:
- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

DAVID ANGLIN

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor  
☒ I object

806 W 24<sup>TH</sup> #12A (CRAIX CONDO)

Your address as filed by this application

2/3/16

Date

Signature

281 744-0088

Daytime Telephone

Comments: PARKING IN THE WEST CAMPUS

IS ALREADY A CRISIS. FURTHER HOUSING  
WITHOUT THE ALREADY MODERST REQUIREMENT  
MAKES A PROBLEM WORSE. TOW TRUCKS  
WILL TAKE TIME TO KEEP CRAIX PARKING  
CLEAR ALREADY. BUILDING SHOULD  
HAVE ACCEPTABLE PARKING VS. ASSUMPTION  
TEXANS WILL GO WITHOUT CARS.

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

5/16



Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. **All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.**

**Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces**

**Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, leane.heldenfels@austintexas.gov**

**Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016**

*Bill Tower - Indian Creek Ltd.*

Your Name (please print)

*Bill Tower*

Your address(es) affected by this application

*501 WZLH #328 Austin 78705 2/5/16*

Signature

*713 626 7600*

Daytime Telephone:

Comments:

*Parking is terrible in area already. All new improvements need to construct all required parking!*

**If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:**

**Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor**

**Leane Heldenfels**

**P. O. Box 1088**

**Austin, TX 78767-1088**

**(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)**

**Or Fax: (512) 974-6305**

**Or Email: leane.heldenfels@austintexas.gov**

*4/4*

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, **you are not required to attend.** However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak **FOR** or **AGAINST** the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:

- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nuances

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, leane.heldenfels@austintexas.gov

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

*Bill Tower - Indian Creek Ltd.*

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor  
☒ I object

Your address(es) affected by this application

*501 W26th #328 Austin 78705 2/5/16*

Signature

Date

Daytime Telephone: *713 626 7600*

Comments:

*Parking is terrible in area already. All new improvements need to construct all required parking!*

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: leane.heldenfels@austintexas.gov

*5126*

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak **FOR** or **AGAINST** the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:
- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

## Heldenfels, Leane

**From:** Mike Mchone [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 05, 2016 4:44 PM  
**To:** Heldenfels, Leane  
**Cc:** 'Mike McHone'  
**Subject:** RE: C15-2016-019/C15-2016-0018

26  
51

Leane,

I have discussed this with both clients and they agree to the postponement on the condition that this is noted as the "neighbors" postponement and will not be allowed to again delay the hearing.

Mike

**From:** Heldenfels, Leane [mailto:Leane.Heldenfels@austintexas.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 04, 2016 5:23 PM  
**To:** Mike McHone  
**Subject:** FW: C15-2016-019/C15-2016-0018

Hi Mike – do you object to request for postponement below? FYI – community registry notices were postmarked timely. If you don't object, then I'll just read the request into the record at the beginning of the hearing and the Board will most likely vote for it since this is interested party's first request to postpone – so no need to attend the hearing.

If you do object, then arrive at the beginning of the meeting to speak to your objection.

Take care – advise if questions –

Leane

**From:** Adam Stephens [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 04, 2016 4:56 PM  
**To:** Heldenfels, Leane  
**Cc:** adam@stephens-land.com  
**Subject:** C15-2016-019/C15-2016-0018

This message is from Adam Stephens. [REDACTED]

Re: C15-2016-0018 (915 W. 22nd) and C15-2016-0019 (2502 Nueces)

Board of Adjustment:

The Central Area Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee (CANPAC) requests a postponement for these two cases. The notices mailed 1/29 and 1/28 were the first we have received as the applicant has not contacted any affected neighborhood associations or the contact team for this planning area. Mary Ingle will be attending the hearing on behalf of CANPAC to request the postponement.

Thank you, Adam Stephens and Bart Whatley, CANPAC co-chairs

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:
- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

Your Name (please print) SOUTHWEST PUBLIC HEARINGS  
☐ I am in favor  
☒ I object

501 W 36th St 78705

Your address(es) affected by this application

Robert Frank Signature 2/4/16 Date

Daytime Telephone: 335/234-7691

Comments: Parking in the area is

a problem as things are more

allowing a variance will be detrimental

to the neighborhood

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov)

5216

**Heldenfels, Leane**

---

**From:** Adam Stephens <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 04, 2016 4:56 PM  
**To:** Heldenfels, Leane  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** C15-2016-019/C15-2016-0018  
[REDACTED]

LY  
53

This message is from Adam Stephens. [REDACTED]

Re: C15-2016-0018 (915 W. 22nd) and C15-2016-0019 (2502 Nueces)

Board of Adjustment:

The Central Area Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee (CANPAC) requests a postponement for these two cases. The notices mailed 1/29 and 1/28 were the first we have received as the applicant has not contacted any affected neighborhood associations or the contact team for this planning area. Mary Ingle will be attending the hearing on behalf of CANPAC to request the postponement.

Thank you, Adam Stephens and Bart Whatley, CANPAC co-chairs

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:
- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

Steven Hymn

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor

☒ I object

501 W 26th St #302 Austin TX 78705

Your address(es) affected by this application

Steven Hymn 2-3-16

Date

Daytime Telephone: 562 841 8527

Comments: A 253 bed highrise CAN NOT be supported by only 40 parking spaces. This is a highly trafficked area already congested. Having 213 cars without parking would be disastrous!

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

5/16

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, **you are not required to attend**. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak **FOR** or **AGAINST** the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (*it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice*); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:

- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leanne Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leanne.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leanne.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

*SALON STAVANSKY*

Your Name (please print)

*1000 SIDEHILL PATH*

☐ I am in favor  
☒ I object

*806 West 24th Street*

Your address(es) affected by this application

*AUSTIN, TX 78731*

*Austin, TX*

*Feb 02, 2016*

Signature *[Signature]* Date

*512 345 6044*

Daytime Telephone:

Comments: *The City needs to pay attention*

*to infrastructure. Fix the roads*

*before you allow more development.*

*High density is counterproductive*

*to Austin.*

*Where are you going to park the*

*Cars?*

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leanne Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leanne.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leanne.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

*5/15*

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:
- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

CONG HENRY PHAM

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor  
☒ I object

806 W. 24th Street #212

Your address(es) affected by this application

Signature: [Signature] Date: 2/1/16

Daytime Telephone: 979-777-4112

Comments:

Parking Spaces are at premium in the area. Reduction from 79 to 40 spaces will lead additional parking by tenants in the proposed high-rise to surrounding streets. All buildings should abide to the same requirement w/o exception.

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

5/15



## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, **you are not required to attend**. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak **FOR** or **AGAINST** the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:
- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

CONG HENRY PHAM  
Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor  
☒ I object

806 W. 24th Street #212

Your address(es) affected by this application

*LA/Pham* 2/1/16  
Signature Date

Daytime Telephone: 979-777-4112

Comments:

Parking Spaces are at premium in the area. Reduction from 79 to 40 spaces will lead additional parking by tenants in the proposed high-rise to surrounding streets. All buildings should abide to the same requirement w/o exception.

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

5/1/16

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, **you are not required to attend**. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak **FOR** or **AGAINST** the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:
- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

Victor C. Yin

Your Name (please print)

2529 Rio Grande Unit 36 (on Section)

Your address(es) affected by this application

Victor C. Yin

Jun 30, 2016

Signature

Date

Daytime Telephone: 512-796-8860

Comments:

Due to high congestion area, new development must provide self sufficient parking according to the rules. Increased and up increasing parking congestion already unacceptable on the street.

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

5816

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak **FOR** or **AGAINST** the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (*it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice*); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:
- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

PATRICK WALSH

Your Name (please print)

806 W 24th ST #115

Your address(es) affected by this application

[Signature] 1-29-16

Signature

Date

Daytime Telephone: 210 865-2009

Comments: Already to congested.

CAR sharing and low income

housing will not offset

over crowding problems.

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov)

5815

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, **you are not required to attend**. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak **FOR** or **AGAINST** the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (*it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice*); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:

- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

*Shaharun Fatemi*

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor  
☒ I object

*2529 Rio Grande St #26 + 95*

Your address(es) affected by this application

Signature

Date

Daytime Telephone: *855-404-6131*

Comments:

*① worsening of traffic*

*② lack of proper infrastructure*

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov)

*6/16*

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Persons and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing **not required to attend**. However, if you do attend, you are **not required to speak FOR or AGAINST** the proposed action. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental group that has expressed an interest in an application affecting the action.

At the hearing, the board or commission may postpone or adjourn the hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a decision for a postponement or continuation that is not later than the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A person's decision may be appealed by a person with an interest in the property that is identified as a person who is affected by the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal must determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

A person is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the property, or who communicates an interest in the property.

A written statement to the board or commission before or after the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of the application *may be delivered to the contact person listed on a*

requesting for the record at the public hearing;

A property is defined as a residential lot that is within 500 feet of the subject property proposed development; or a commercial or industrial lot that is within 500 feet of the subject property proposed development; or an environmental or neighborhood organization that is within 500 feet of the subject property proposed development.

A person must be filed with the director of the responsible department within 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be obtained from the responsible department.

For more information on the City of Austin's land development services, visit the web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

**Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces**

**Contact:** Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

**Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016**

FLORIAN D NUESCH

*Your Name (please print)*

824 E 24th St

*Your address(es) affected by this application*

[Signature]

*Signature*

Daytime Telephone: 210 275-6177

*Date*

1-29-16

*Comments:*

**If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:**

**Mail:** City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

*(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)*

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leana.heldenfels@austintexas.gov)

5176

**Heldenfels, Leane**

---

**From:** Patrick Walsh [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 29, 2016 11:20 AM  
**To:** Heldenfels, Leane  
**Subject:** C15-2016-0019, 2502 NUECES

I object. This area is already too congested, with too little parking. Car sharing and low income housing will never offset the reduction of parking spots. No, no, no.

Patrick Walsh  
806 w 24th St.

4  
b2

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

LY  
63

**Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces**

**Contact:** Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, leane.heldenfels@austintexas.gov

**Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016**

Luis G. DELAROSA

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor

☒ I object

2406 Rio Grande St. The Croix Unit 333

Your address(es) affected by this application

Luis G. De La Rosa

Signature

1-29-16

Date

Daytime Telephone: 361-876-7727

Comments: I would object to A high rise multi-family project having A VARIANCE for fewer parking spaces. I think that the overflow of cars from the project would end up in the street area, The overflow of vehicles would create traffic congestion near my condominium,

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor  
Leane Heldenfels  
P. O. Box 1088  
Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: leane.heldenfels@austintexas.gov

## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak **FOR** or **AGAINST** the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice); or

• appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing;

and:

- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

Robert C. Edwards

Your Name (please print)

506 W. 20th Street # 303 Austin, TX 78705

Your address(es) affected by this application

*[Signature]*

Signature

Date

Daytime Telephone: 281 276-1105

Comments: This area is overbuilt & already has parking issues. Allowing this project to reduce the required number of parking spaces will make the street parking even worse. The streets are already over crowded.

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor

Leane Heldenfels

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov)

5/5



## PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak **FOR** or **AGAINST** the proposed application. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During a public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or recommend approval or denial of the application. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice will be sent.

A board or commission's decision may be appealed by a person with standing to appeal, or an interested party that is identified as a person who can appeal the decision. The body holding a public hearing on an appeal will determine whether a person has standing to appeal the decision.

An interested party is defined as a person who is the applicant or record owner of the subject property, or who communicates an interest to a board or commission by:

- delivering a written statement to the board or commission before or during the public hearing that generally identifies the issues of concern (it may be delivered to the contact person listed on a notice); or
- appearing and speaking for the record at the public hearing; and:
- occupies a primary residence that is within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development;
- is the record owner of property within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development; or
- is an officer of an environmental or neighborhood organization that has an interest in or whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet of the subject property or proposed development.

A notice of appeal must be filed with the director of the responsible department no later than 10 days after the decision. An appeal form may be available from the responsible department.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our web site: [www.austintexas.gov/devservices](http://www.austintexas.gov/devservices)

Written comments must be submitted to the contact person listed on the notice before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the name of the board or commission, or Council; the scheduled date of the public hearing; the Case Number; and the contact person listed on the notice. All comments received will become part of the public record of this case.

Case Number: C15-2016-0019, 2502 Nueces

Contact: Leane Heldenfels, 512-974-2202, [leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov)

Public Hearing: Board of Adjustment, February 8th, 2016

☐ I am in favor  
☒ I object

Your Name (please print)

Robert C. Evans  
806 W. 24th Street #203 Austin TX 78705

Your address(es) affected by this application

Signature

Date

Daytime Telephone: 281.276-1105

Comments: This area is overbuilt & already has parking issues. Allowing this project to reduce the required number of parking spaces will make the street parking even worse. The streets are already over crowded.

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned by noon the day of the hearing via:

Mail: City of Austin-Development Services Department/ 1st Floor  
Leane Heldenfels  
P. O. Box 1088  
Austin, TX 78767-1088

(comments postmarked on the Wednesday before the hearing or later may not be received by noon the day of the hearing.)

Or Fax: (512) 974-6305

Or Email: [leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov](mailto:leaneheldenfels@austintexas.gov)

5/1/16

