

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Weber, Thomas - BC](#)  
**Cc:** [Moore, Andrew](#); [Rusthoven, Jerry](#); [Lesniak, Chuck](#)  
**Subject:** Austin Oaks PUD  
**Date:** Sunday, October 16, 2016 10:13:24 AM

---

Dear Commissioner Weber - Please vote no on the Austin Oaks PUD as is. There are several issues that concern me.

1. 13 Heritage trees and 31 protected trees are to be cut down in the current proposal. Previously it was 8 Heritage trees to be cut down and one transplanted. Cutting down 43 trees is outrageous to me.
2. A tree survey that is good for 25 years is unacceptable. Some of these trees can grow up to 10" in that amount of time. Please stay with the current code of surveying the trees every 5 years.
3. Traffic mitigation - The previous PUD of 2015 had car trips at 19,819 trips per day. What came out of the charrette was 17,000 car trips per day. Current PUD, as of October 16, now has 19,648 car trips per day per the TIA. What specific traffic mitigation can be done with the \$628,000 offered by the developer? Per staff's TIA memo dated October 6, 2016, a number of impacted intersections fail at a much greater rate even after the applicant's total of only \$628,000 in mitigation funding. What happen to the \$10,000,000 figure?
4. What affordable housing is offered?

Thank you for your service to our city. I really appreciate it.

Stephanie Ashworth  
District 10 constituent  
7608 Parkview Circle  
Austin, TX 78731

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#)  
**Cc:** [Moore, Andrew](#); [Rusthoven, Jerry](#); [Lesniak, Chuck](#)  
**Subject:** THE AUSTIN OAKS PUD  
**Date:** Sunday, October 16, 2016 5:30:07 PM

---

Dear Zoning and Platting Commission,

On Tuesday, October 18, you are scheduled to hear the Austin Oaks PUD case. I am writing to urge you to reject the PUD as not superior.

You probably have heard that the Environmental Commission did not approve the PUD as superior, and they were correct in doing so.

The applicant should have to comply with the Heritage and Protected tree ordinances. They should not be able to wait 25 years before doing another tree survey -- trees grow a lot in that amount of time.

People in the neighborhood are concerned that the building heights will change because the applicant is using Mean Sea Level on the land use plan. We're worried that buildings will actually be taller than specified in the PUD application. Do we really want to set a precedent for buildings that tall in neighborhoods between 183 and 360? Once you ok this for the Austin Oaks site, you've opened the door for other neighborhoods...and that's definitely not superior.

The applicant should have to fully mitigate the traffic hell they're proposing for the neighborhood . Under the plan, we'll go from 4,086 trips per day to almost 20,000 (Twenty. Thousand. Trips.) Many of our neighborhood intersections are already failing, even without this huge influx of traffic. Last year, the applicant offered \$10 million in traffic mitigation, which has now dropped to \$628,000...which really won't do anything.

Lastly, you're going to hear a lot about a community park. How much of that "parkland" is land that is unbuildable? How much of that space will actually welcome children and be suitable for play? How many people in the neighborhood really want an amphitheater that will bring even more people and traffic into the neighborhood?

Also, please do not be misled about neighborhood support for this project. I am a NWACA member and I did not support the Charrette outcome. That process was a kangaroo court whose outcome was predetermined. They are posting information about the progress of the plans without stating the source of the information. When asked the source of the information, they do not respond.

Thank you for your service to the community. Please include my letter in the back-up materials on this case to the City Council.

Sincerely,

Tela Goodwin Mange  
7104 Spurlock Dr  
Austin TX 78731

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#); [Moore, Andrew](#); [Rusthoven, Jerry](#); [Lesniak, Chuck](#)  
**Subject:** Austin Oaks PUD  
**Date:** Sunday, October 16, 2016 8:48:37 PM

---

Dear Zoning and Platting Commission,

On Tuesday, October 18, you are scheduled to hear the Austin Oaks PUD case. I am writing to urge you to reject the PUD as not superior.

You probably have heard that the Environmental Commission did not approve the PUD as superior, and they were correct in doing so.

The applicant should have to comply with the Heritage and Protected tree ordinances. They should not be able to wait 25 years before doing another tree survey -- trees grow a lot in that time and a lot of trees can be cut down and removed during that time as well.

My husband and I live at Green Trails, directly across the street from this development. We are concerned that the building heights will change because the applicant is using Mean Sea Level on the land use plan. We're worried that buildings will actually be taller than specified in the PUD application. Do we really want to set a precedent for buildings that tall in neighborhoods between 183 and 360? Once you ok this for the Austin Oaks site, you've opened the door for other neighborhoods...and that's definitely not superior.

The applicant should have to fully mitigate the astronomical increase in traffic they're proposing for the neighborhood. Under the plan, we'll go from 4,086 trips per day to almost 20,000. We have lived on Green Trails for 26 years and the traffic from the current development has never increased nor been problematic to the neighborhood. So for 26 years, the traffic has increased in the neighborhood but not from this development. Now you are being asked to approved a development that will increase the traffic to a magnitude that is unconscionable. We moved into this neighborhood because of the green spaces and the exceptional schools for our children. It was a safe place for our kids to ride bikes to school. This proposed development will ruin our neighborhood and the quality of life that we enjoy today. Many of our neighborhood intersections are already failing, even without this huge influx of traffic. Last year, the applicant offered \$10 million in traffic mitigation, which has now dropped to \$628,000...which really won't do anything. This development doesn't belong in an established neighborhood!

I know you're going to hear a lot about a community park. How much of that "parkland" is land that is unbuildable? How much of that space will actually welcome children and be suitable for play? Living directly across the street from the location of the proposed amphitheater, I can promise you that we do NOT want it in this so called "parkland".

I keep hearing that the neighborhood supports this proposed PUD and I can promise you that isn't correct. I am a NWACA member and I did not support the Charrette outcome. My husband and I were only able to attend one night of the Charrette and that just happened to be the night that they were taking the vote. No one told us ahead of time that the vote would be taken that night and the

whole process was nothing more than just a matter of going through the motions. That process was a waste of time for everyone because the outcome was predetermined.

I have lived in Austin for 52 years, grew up in S. Austin and moved to my home on Green Trails in 1990. We have raised our children in our current home and it is home base for them still today, even though they are now adults and live in another city. It breaks my heart to think that we will have to move if this PUD is approved because the traffic it will generate will ruin the quality of life for the residents of this great neighborhood. Every school that is fed by this neighborhood is overcrowded and this PUD will only exacerbate that problem. Please do not ruin our homes, our quality of life, our neighborhood, by approving this PUD. It is NOT SUPERIOR!

Sincerely,

Diane Newberry  
3801 Green Trail N  
Austin, TX 78731

**From:** [Guernsey, Greg](#)  
**To:** [Rusthoven, Jerry](#); [Moore, Andrew](#); [Rivera, Andrew](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Austin Oaks PUD - Staff TIA Memo  
**Date:** Monday, October 17, 2016 8:21:12 AM  
**Attachments:** [AOTIAStaffMemoSummarySpreadsheet.pdf](#)

---

FYI

---

**From:** Brad Parsons [mailto:████████████████████]  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 15, 2016 4:17 PM  
**To:** Guernsey, Greg  
**Subject:** Re: Austin Oaks PUD - Staff TIA Memo

Oct. 15, 2016

Mr. Guernsey:

Attaching a summary spreadsheet that is in support of the points made in the 2 neighborhood requests (NSCNA & NWAN) yesterday for a 2 week postponement on the case, the first neighborhood requests for postponement since the case began. There are a number of errors in the TIA delay time LOS table data. The attached spreadsheet lists only the intersections with the worst delay of time LOS, there are numerous other errors in the TIA table data from the applicant's TIA.

Beyond the 2 week postponement request, with regard to traffic impacts, we are particularly concerned that there is no effective mitigation proposed or agreed to at the Greystone & MoPac EB intersection **equal to what is offered at Executive Center and MoPac, a deceleration AND acceleration lane. WE SEE THIS AS A GRAVE SAFETY ISSUE that could be reasonably mitigated.**

Sincerely,

Brad Parsons  
3706 Greystone Dr.  
ANC Sector 1 Rep.

<b>Worst intersection delays in TIA Staff Memo</b>	<b>Existing AM seconds delay</b>	<b>No Build AM by 2024 sec. delay **</b>	<b>Build W/O Mitigation AM by 2024 **</b>	<b>Build W/ Mitigation AM by 2024 *</b>	<b>Existing PM seconds delay</b>	<b>No Build PM by 2024 sec. delay **</b>	<b>Build W/O Mitigation PM by 2024 **</b>	<b>Build W/ Mitigation PM by 2024 *</b>	<b>Mitigation Desc.</b>						
<b>Steck @ MoPac SBFR (signal)</b>	SB 143.8 sec. INT 114.7 sec.	SB 233.9 INT 184.3 EB 88	SB 250.7 INT 197.4 EB 88	SB 250.7 INT 197.4 EB 88	SB 202.5 INT 132.2	SB 303.2 INT 196.9 EB 84.9	SB 321.6 INT 209.4 EB 84.9	SB 321.6 INT 209.4 EB 84.9	No mitigation by applicant						
<b>Steck @ MoPac NBFR (signal)</b>	NB 610 sec. INT 203 sec.	NB 766.6 INT 253.9 WB 62.8	NB 765 INT 253.4 WB 62.8	NB 765 INT 253.4 WB 62.8	NB 458.2 INT 169.8	NB 594.3 INT 234 WB 86.7	NB 594.3 INT 234 WB 86.7	NB 594.3 INT 234 WB 86.7	No mitigation by applicant						
<b>Spicewood @ MoPac SBFR (signal)</b>	EB 198.6 sec. INT 91.7 sec.	<b>EB 284.1</b> <b>INT 150.2</b> <b>SB 147.4</b>	<b>EB 91.2</b> <b>INT 94.1</b> <b>SB 125.1</b>	EB 91.2 INT 94.1 SB 125.1	EB 108 INT 66.4 SB 86.1	EB 162.4 INT 97.2 SB 125.3	EB 219.5 INT 111.2 SB 105.2	<b>EB 220.5</b> <b>INT 111.5</b> <b>SB 105.2</b>	New lane SB right turn channelized from Loop 1 to Spicewood Sprgs. New lane EB right turn channelized from Spicewood Sprgs to Loop 1.						
<b>Spicewood @ MoPac NBFR (signal)</b>	NB 99.9 sec.	NB 157.6	NB 236.4 INT 96.3 WB 68.7	NB 236.4 INT 96.3 WB 68.7	NB 161.1	NB 233 INT 68.5	NB 309.2 INT 91.4	NB 309.2 INT 91.4	No mitigation by applicant						
<b>Greystone @ MoPac (NO SIGNAL)</b>	EB 56.4 sec.	<b>EB 172.1</b>	<b>EB 254.9</b> <b>4.25 min</b>	<b>EB 254.9</b> <b>4.25 min</b>	EB 34.7	<b>EB 81.6</b>	<b>EB 143.4</b> <b>2.39 min</b>	<b>EB 143.4</b> <b>2.39 min</b>	Adding SB right turn deceleration lane on Loop 1 to exit at Greystone. <b>No acceleration lane proposed from Greystone onto Loop 1, as is for Executive Center Dr. (#1 SAFETY ISSUE in whole plan)</b>						
<b>Far West @ MoPac SBFR (signal)</b>	SB 26.8	SB 69	SB 13.6 INT 15.3	SB 13.6 INT 15.3	<b>SB 151.5</b> <b>INT 78.7</b>	<b>SB 277.7</b> <b>INT 139.4</b>	<b>SB 78.6</b> <b>INT 49.5</b>	SB 78.6 INT 49.5	New lane SB right turn channelized from Loop 1 to Far West Blvd.						
<b>Far West @ MoPac NBFR (signal)</b>					EB 32.2 INT 30.8	EB 70.8 INT 61.7	<b>EB 117</b> <b>INT 97.9</b>	<b>EB 117</b> <b>INT 97.9</b>	No mitigation by applicant						
<b>Far West @ Wood Hollow (signal)</b>	NB 68.8 sec.	<b>NB 115</b>	<b>NB 88.2</b> WB 56.7	NB 64.8 WB 42.9 SB 54.7	NB 65.2 SB 65.9	NB 80.9 SB 69.2	NB 51.2 SB 69.2	NB 51.2 SB 69.2	New NB right turn overlap operation, restripe, adjust signal timing.						
<b>Spicewood @ Hart (NO signal, SIGNAL TO BE ADDED)</b>	NB 28.7 sec.	NB 53.7	NB 25.5	NB 25.5	NB 77.4	<b>NB 381.1</b>	<b>NB 35.9</b>	NB 35.9	Redesign the intersection. New traffic signal. Advanced warning flasher west of intersection. Widen NB Hart Ln approach for added left turn lanes.						
					* These two columns have errors in the Staff Memo. W/ mitigation appear to be reposting of the W/O mitigation column										
					** Problem in the data between No Build and Build W/O mitigation. Numbers should not be going down from No Build to Build W/O mit. for same year.										
					<b>Highlighted red numbers are in error. Selected from many in TIA.</b> <b>Understand this data all originated from the applicant's TIA.</b>										

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Weber, Thomas - BC](#); [Rojas, Gabriel - BC](#); [Kiolbassa, Jolene - BC](#); [Denkler, Ann - BC](#); [Aguirre, Ana - BC](#); [Breithaupt, Dustin - BC](#); [Evans, Bruce - BC](#); [Flores, Yvette - BC](#); [Greenberg, Betsy - BC](#); [Harris, Susan - BC](#); [Lavani, Sunil - BC](#)  
**Cc:** [Moore, Andrew](#); [Rusthoven, Jerry](#); [Lesniak, Chuck](#)  
**Subject:** Austin Oaks PUD  
**Date:** Sunday, October 16, 2016 5:45:24 PM

---

Hello. I am writing as a member of the Austin Oaks charrette working group because I am concerned about the proposed Austin Oaks PUD. I have three main problems: (1) the result of the charrette process, because the final plan that resulted, completely ignored previous votes taken during the charrette; (2) the current proposal contradicts that final plan that came out of the charrette, clearly in terms of traffic and the number of trees being removed and seemingly in terms of building heights; and (3) the proposal sets a precedent for exceeding current zoning and producing 6-8 story buildings up and down MOPAC, indeed, throughout the city.

I hope you appreciate my concerns, which are shared by many in the NW Hills and around the city, and that you will oppose the proposed PUD and recommend that the developer reduce the scale of the project. What we voted on Wednesday night of the charrette – 4-story buildings along Spicewood Springs and 6-story buildings along MOPAC – and what was subsequently ignored when drafting the final plan represents a useful starting point. In case you are interested, I provide more detail below on how the charrette process worked.

Thank you,

Chris Wlezien  
5921 Mount Bonnell Road  
Austin, Texas 78731

Observations on the January 25-29, 2016, charrette:

1. I and various others who attended every night thought that the charrette process was going well from its beginning on Monday morning through Wednesday night, as it reflected the input from the various workshops we conducted in advance as well as the preferences of charrette participants. The process went off the rails on Thursday night. That night we voted on a plan that ignored the votes from the night before. On Wednesday night we voted for no residential and then an option with 4 stories along Spicewood Spring and 6 stories along MOPAC. These were difficult decisions for the neighborhood to take, as we were exceeding current zoning and so were supporting a PUD. We arrived on Thursday expecting to see a plan that reflected the votes of the night before, but that was not the case. Instead, we were presented with an option that included residential, had 5 stories along Spicewood and 7 stories along MOPAC, and approached 1.2 million square feet, bundled with various amenities on which we were not given the opportunity to vote. I expected a plan of approximately 1,050,000 square feet with no more than 6 stories. This was one that would have passed very easily, approaching unanimity, I think, particularly if it included some amenities. But, note I and most others I know who attended did not even expect a vote, as it was not indicated in the charrette plan and we in the working group were not notified.

2. How they arrived at the recommended plan was and is not clear. I have asked the working group but, like the votes from Wednesday night of the charrette, my questions were ignored by the developer and his representative. One person in the group told me that the facilitators/designers had to make trade-offs, e.g., to include residential, height had to go above 6 stories. I replied that this would have been understandable had we voted for residential and 6 stories, where a trade-off was required/implied. The response was that they relied on Post-Its charrette attendees had placed on the displays on Wednesday night, which showed support for residential. I then asked about what Post-Its showed on Thursday night and was told they were about even. It seems that when leaders didn't like votes, as on Wednesday night, they ignored them, and when they did like the votes, as on Thursday night, they accepted them. Why vote at all? Why not just rely on Post-Its? Why even include the public? Two people who I didn't know before the charrette told me that they felt like the community just didn't matter in the end – one said that “we wasted our time.”
  
3. The resulting plan, while preferred to the code-compliant plan, is not the community's “consensus plan.” This partly reflects what I say in point 1 above. It also reflects the fact that support for the plan in a vote against code-compliant is not a basis for inferring consensus. Consider that the rationale for the charrette is **\*not\*** that it produces an alternative that is better than code-compliant, but that it produces the community's preferred alternative. Hundreds of plans could have beaten the code-compliant option, including the one we voted on Wednesday night of the charrette. That approximately 60% voted for the plan supports what I am saying, as it is hardly consensus. And keep in mind that the voters that night were not a random or representative sample of the neighborhood, as few of us knew there would be a vote and many who attended on Wednesday night stayed home on Thursday, thinking the important decisions had already been made.

-----  
Christopher Wlezien  
University of Texas at Austin  
Department of Government  
158 W 21st ST STOP A1800  
Austin, TX 78712-1704

E-mail: [REDACTED]  
Homepage: <http://www.utexas.edu/cola/depts/government/faculty/cw26629>  
Journal: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org>  
e-  
Book: <http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/Other/bo19211950.html>  
Book: <http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/T/bo13948250>  
Book: <http://www.cambridge.org/9780521687898>  
Book: <http://www.russellsage.org/publications/who-gets-represented>

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Gabriel.Rojas@austintexas.gov](mailto:Gabriel.Rojas@austintexas.gov); [Jolene.Kiolbassa@austintexas.gov](mailto:Jolene.Kiolbassa@austintexas.gov); [Thomas.Weber@austintexas.gov](mailto:Thomas.Weber@austintexas.gov); [Ana.Aguirre@austintexas.gov](mailto:Ana.Aguirre@austintexas.gov); [Ann.Denkler@austintexas.gov](mailto:Ann.Denkler@austintexas.gov); [Bruce.Evans@austintexas.gov](mailto:Bruce.Evans@austintexas.gov); [Yvette.Flores@austintexas.gov](mailto:Yvette.Flores@austintexas.gov); [Sunil.Lavani@austintexas.gov](mailto:Sunil.Lavani@austintexas.gov); [Susan.Harris@austintexas.gov](mailto:Susan.Harris@austintexas.gov); [Betsy.Greenberg@austintexas.gov](mailto:Betsy.Greenberg@austintexas.gov); [Dustin.Breithaupt@austintexas.gov](mailto:Dustin.Breithaupt@austintexas.gov)  
**Cc:** [Moore, Andrew](mailto:Moore.Andrew); [Rusthoven, Jerry](mailto:Rusthoven.Jerry); [Lesniak, Chuck](mailto:Lesniak.Chuck)  
**Subject:** Austin Oaks PUD -- Just Say No  
**Date:** Monday, October 17, 2016 6:47:21 PM

---

Dear ZAP Members,

I have lived in NWHills for many years. It is sad that the voice of the community is falling on deaf ears in regards to this development. The NWHills HOA and others have said "NO" more than once. However, this PUD will not go away!

Based on the data available, the additional residences, businesses, and office area are going to harm the neighborhood that is loved by those that live in it. The "developer" purchased the land with the buildings and zoning in place. That should have been the end of the story. The city continues to do things to increase the bank account without regard to what they are doing to the people that live in these communities.

Reviewing data available it is hard to believe anyone is really doing their job to capture accurate information.

#### TRAFFIC STATS:

- Now 4,086 trips per day
- Previous PUD (2015) 19,819 trips per day
- NWACA's Charrette PUD (Jan. 2016) "17,000 trips per day"
- Current PUD (Oct. 2016) 19,648 trips per day (per TIA), 380% increase over current (net new trips 15,562 per day)
- By Staff's TIA Memo dated Oct. 6, 2016, a number of impacted intersections fail at a much greater rate even after the applicant's total of only \$628,000 in mitigation offered.

#### BUILDING HEIGHT STATS:

- WG asked for 5 stories (60 ft) max; limited to current zoning baseline entitlement, which we are now told is about 1M sq. ft., current 445,322 sq. ft.
- Previous PUD (2015) 8 buildings; 6 at 7-10 floors; 1.28M total sq. ft.
- Current PUD (2016) 12 buildings + 5 garages; 11 at 6-8+ floors (by MSL figures); 1.191 Million sq. ft.

(Land Use Plan needs to get rid of conflicting and site specific MSL -mean sea level-building height figures)

#### TREE STATS:

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

(Good review of that at <http://austintx.swagit.com/play/10052016-808>)

As a leader, I would expect clear and accurate data to support the community concerns. If the

desire is for the developer to proceed, the developer should should:

- a. The applicant fully mitigate the increased traffic as some of these intersections become "dangerously unsafe" even after the proposed mitigation (for example Greystone @ MoPac; stats for Executive Ctr @ MoPac are left out of Staff Memo), last year applicant offered \$10M in traffic mitigation, now only offering \$628K in traffic mitigation;
- b. Get rid of the MSL (mean sea level) figures on the building heights in the Land Use Plan, those are site specific (this is not a site plan) and in conflict with stated building heights; and
- c. Scale back the variances and impact on the Heritage and Protected trees. NO 25 year tree survey (trees grow 10" diameter in that time) and follow the Heritage and Protected tree Ordinances. Applicant CAN do it.
- d. What about schools, road wear-and-tear/improvement, community services, utilities, police support, and other necessities.

I would prefer that this project be moved to a more suitable site in Austin. That is available for such a development and can support additional infrastructure (schools, parks, streets, etc.). Placing this PUD in an already crowded community: with schools over-capacity, traffic out of control, low/no public transportation --- just does not make sense.

I expect this to be included in the back-up materials on this case to ZAP and to Council.

Thank you!  
Jill Klucher

Jill Klucher  
(512)587-4878