

Written comments must be submitted to the board or commission (or the contact person listed on the notice) before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the board or commission's name, the scheduled date of the public hearing, and the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice.

Case Number: C14-2020-0001
Contact: Kate Clark, 512-974-1237
Public Hearing: February 18, 2020, Zoning and Platting Commission
March 12, 2020, City Council

ERIKA Aguirre
Name (please print)

901 NUTRIA Run
Address(es) affected by this application

Erika Aguirre
Signature

| |
|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I am in favor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I object |

2/10/2020
Date

Home Telephone: _____

Comments: _____

If I use this form to comment, it may be returned to:

City of Austin
Planning & Zoning Department
Kate Clark
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767-8810

From: Don Zdancewicz
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 10:48 AM
To: Clark, Kate <Kate.Clark@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Heather Zdancewicz <
Subject: 6917 Colton Bluff Springs Road - Case Number C14-2020-0001

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

Ms. Clark:

I live and own 7013 Nutria Run and the rear property line of my property is the north right-of-way line of Colton Bluff Springs Road. So I live directly across the street from 6917 Colton Bluff Springs Road. Due to a meeting that I need to attend for work, I will be traveling back to Austin late the afternoon/early evening, so I may not be able to attend the Zoning and Platting Commission meeting tonight that will hear this proposed zoning change.

I would like to request that this item be moved to the end of the docket, so that I can attend and voice my opposition to this proposed zoning change. If that cannot happen, I request that my comments listed below (and attached) be submitted into the record of this case. Here is my notes/comments/opinions on this case:

1. The largest portion of the property is requesting zoning change to MF-3. The City of Austin Zoning Ordinance section 25-2-64 – Multifamily Residence Medium Density (MF-3) District Designation defines this zone as: “Multifamily residence medium density (MF-3) district is the designation for multifamily use with a maximum density of up to 36 units per acre, depending on unit size. An MF-3 district designation may be applied to a use in a multifamily residential area located near supporting transportation and commercial facilities in a centrally located area or in an area for which medium density multifamily use is desired.”
2. The Zoning Change Review Sheet (page 5) stated that the nearest CapMetro transit stop is located approximately 1,500 linear feet from the property. While technically true, this is VERY misleading as this distance is measured from the southwest corner of the property, which is part of the creek buffer, which would be undevelopable. To get to that CapMetro stop from the closest point of the developable portion of the property, someone would have to walk down Colton Bluff Springs Road, which does not have any sidewalks, and Alum Rock Road, a portion of which does not have sidewalks. The closest commercial facility is located on Thaxton Road at Pandadero Drive, which is 0.75 miles from the southwest corner of the site and even further if measured from what would be considered the developable portion of the site. Thus, it appears to be highly inconsistent to change the zoning to MF-3 given the above stated definition of the MF-3 zone.
3. Again on page 5 of the Zoning Change Review Sheet, it is stated that the proposed use is a 144 unit multi-family apartment complex. How do we know that if approved, this would be the maximum number of units built since there is no site plan being presented? If the applicant can propose the number of units, they must have a concept plan, at the very least. This should be presented as part of this application for public input. The

property is stated to be 23.24 acres. Since the maximum density is 36 units per acre in MF-3 zone, then the maximum unit allowed would be over 800 units. What assurance do we have that only 144 units will be built?

4. On page 7 of the Zoning Change Review Sheet, it is stated that the site is subject to compatibility standards along the South property line. The property to the south is currently undeveloped. However, there is no such compatibility standards stated for the North property line, which is directly across from the single family houses that exist in the Vista Pointe community, including my house. If no compatibility standards exist for the north side, then it would follow that buildings could be built to the maximum height and nearest setback allowed by the zoning ordinance. This seems to be highly incompatible with the nature of this neighborhood.
5. On page 8 of the Zoning Change Review Sheet, under “Transportation”, the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan is referenced as calling for 120 feet right-of-way for McKinney Falls Parkway and 64 feet right-of-way of Alum Rock Drive. Yet, nothing is noted for Colton Bluff Springs Road. It seems highly unlikely that the site could utilize Alum Rock Drive for access due to the creek at the western portion of the site. So unless all traffic will be required to enter and exit the site off of McKinney Falls Parkway, why is Colton Bluff Springs Road not listed in this section?
6. Also on page 8, it is stated that a traffic impact analysis was not required. Yet the increased traffic should absolutely be a consideration of this zoning change. If any traffic from the site is exiting and entering the site from Colton Bluff Springs Road, it will have a terribly negative impact on the Vista Pointe subdivision. As many residents will attest, the community is already seeing heavy cut through traffic. This will only get worse with a huge multi-family development across the street, and with little better options for traversing the City’s streets. Per <https://data.mobility.austin.gov/signal-requests/>, a traffic signal has been recommended as part of the 2016 Bond Corridor program at the intersection of William Cannon Drive and Janes Ranch Road, which is the entrance to the Vista Pointe subdivision. The same site does not list any such traffic signals being planned at Colton Bluff Springs Road and McKinney Falls Parkway. Thus the natural thing will be for this whole new community to use our neighborhood as a cut through to get to this new proposed light as it will be difficult for them to access McKinney Falls Parkway without one.
7. The City of Austin Guide to Zoning, dated September 2016 can be found at https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Planning/zoning_guide.pdf. Section II, Zoning Principles states: “Zoning should promote compatibility with adjacent and nearby uses and should not result in detrimental impacts to the neighborhood character.” Unless you can ensure that this zoning change and future development will not “result in detrimental impacts to the neighborhood character”, then this zoning change cannot be approved. The resulting increases in traffic through our neighborhood alone should exclude this zoning change from consideration.

8. Section IV of the same City of Austin Guide to Zoning states that "...nearby neighbors are considered to have a stake in the zoning as well...". This is well said, but why has the applicant not reached out to discuss this zoning change with the residents that are closest to this property? I know that neither my wife nor I have been contacted, except to get the notice of the hearing.

9. The homeowners in the Vista Pointe (AKA Springfield Section 5 & Springfield Section 4) whose lots abut Colton Bluff Springs Road were told by KB Homes (developer/builder of Vista Pointe) (and previous owner of 6917 Colton Bluff Springs Road property) that the 6917 Colton Bluff Springs Road property could not be developed based upon the flood plain and other environmental concerns. I feel that I have been dealt with in bad faith.

Therefore, I respectfully urge the Zoning and Platting Commission to reject this zoning change application.

Thanks,
Don Zdancewicz
7013 Nutria Run
Austin, TX 78744
571-239-2013 (cell)
(Adjacent property owner)