

From:
To: [Rhoades, Wendy](#)
Subject: Peaceful Hill Rezoning
Date: Sunday, December 4, 2022 4:40:19 PM

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

Wendy,

I'm writing on behalf of our adjacent neighbors just across South Boggy Creek.

When the new apartments were approved at 7400 South Congress just beside my home at 301 Blackberry, we were able to keep the entry and exit to those new buildings channeled out onto South Congress, and avoided having our Blackberry connected as a through street to Congress to provide a rear access.

I notice in the case of this new and otherwise similar apartment development just across the creek from us that Foremost is being planned as a through street in the name of "connectivity." It will completely change the existing character of the residential neighborhood if Foremost becomes a connector from Peaceful Hill all the way through to I-35.

Providing denser housing on public transit routes is a worthy goal, but changing the character of an existing neighborhood is a sacrilege, and should be avoided at all costs. The same is true of forcing an existing residential neighborhood to accept the presence of four story apartments towers over the current single story owner occupied private homes.

Connectivity and denser housing are worthwhile goals, but not in the context of ruining the quality of life of people who have invested years of their earnings in a quiet and calm existence that will be destroyed by this proposed new group of dense apartments.

Peaceful hill should be granted the same right to a deeply wooded set-back and no heavily traveled connector street that was afforded to our neighborhood just to the north of them by a few blocks.

Please, be considerate.

Thank you.

~Ed Miller

CAUTION: This email was received at the City of Austin, from an EXTERNAL source. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious and/or phishing email, please forward this email to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From:
To: [Rhoades, Wendy](#)
Subject: Peaceful Hill Rezoning
Date: Sunday, December 4, 2022 4:45:21 PM

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

Hello Wendy,

I'm writing on behalf of our adjacent neighbors just across South Boggy Creek.

When the new apartments were approved at 7400 South Congress just beside my home at 301 Blackberry, we were able to keep the entry and exit to those new buildings channeled out onto South Congress, and avoided having our Blackberry connected as a through street to Congress to provide rear access.

I notice in the case of this new and otherwise similar apartment development just across the creek from us that Foremost is being planned as a through street in the name of "connectivity." It will completely change the existing character of the residential neighborhood if Foremost becomes a connector from Peaceful Hill all the way through to I-35.

Providing denser housing on public transit routes is a worthy goal, but changing the character of an existing neighborhood is a sacrilege, and should be avoided at all costs. The same is true of forcing an existing residential neighborhood to accept the presence of four story apartment towers over the current single story owner occupied private homes.

Connectivity and denser housing are worthwhile goals, but not in the context of ruining the quality of life of people who have invested years of their earnings in a quiet and calm existence that will be destroyed by this proposed new group of dense apartments.

Peaceful hill should be granted the same right to a deeply wooded set-back and no heavily traveled connector street that was afforded to our neighborhood just to the north of them by a few blocks.

Thank you.

Dot Aikman
Your Friendly Neighborhood Real Estate Broker
Sky Realty
512-633-5281

PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

This zoning/rezoning request will be reviewed and acted upon at two public hearings: before the Land Use Commission and the City Council. Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to participate in a public hearing, you are not required to participate. This meeting will be conducted both online and in-person at which you will have the opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the proposed development or change. Contact the case manager for further information on how to participate in the public hearings. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

Staff is conducting a pilot program to receive case-related comments online which can be accessed through this link or QR code:
<https://bit.ly/ATXZoningComment>



During its public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date or may evaluate the City staff's recommendation and public input forwarding its own recommendation to the City Council. 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 is required.

During its public hearing, the City Council may grant or deny a zoning request or rezone the land to a less intensive zoning than requested but in no case will it grant a more intensive zoning.

However, in order to allow for mixed use development, the Council may add the MIXED USE (MU) COMBINING DISTRICT to certain commercial districts. The MU Combining District simply allows residential uses in addition to those uses already allowed in the seven commercial zoning districts. As a result, the MU Combining District allows the combination of office, retail, commercial, and residential uses within a single development.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our website: www.austintexas.gov/planning.

Written comments must be submitted to the board or commission (or the contact person listed on the notice) before the 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. Correspondence and information submitted to the City of Austin are subject to the Texas Public Information Act (Chapter 552) and will be published online.

Case Number: C14-2021-0123

Contact: Wendy Rhoades, 512-974-7719

Public Hearing: December 6, 2022, Zoning and Platting Commission

Zane Schnantz

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

7602 Loganberry Dr Austin, TX

Your address(es) affected by this application (optional)

[Signature]

Signature

11/25/22

Date

Daytime Telephone (Optional):

Comments: Ditmar road is already dangerous
as it is. It can not support any more traffic.

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned to:
City of Austin, Housing & Planning Department

Wendy Rhoades

P. O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767

Or email to:

wendy.rhoades@austintexas.gov

PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

This zoning/rezoning request will be reviewed and acted upon at two public hearings: before the Land Use Commission and the City Council. Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to participate in a public hearing, you are not required to participate. This meeting will be conducted both online and in-person at which you will have the opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the proposed development or change. Contact the case manager for further information on how to participate in the public hearings. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

Staff is conducting a pilot program to receive case-related comments online which can be accessed through this link or QR code:
<https://bit.ly/ATXZoningComment>



During its public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date or may evaluate the City staff's recommendation and public input forwarding its own recommendation to the City Council. 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 is required.

During its public hearing, the City Council may grant or deny a zoning request or rezone the land to a less intensive zoning than requested but in no case will it grant a more intensive zoning.

However, in order to allow for mixed use development, the Council may add the MIXED USE (MU) COMBINING DISTRICT to certain commercial districts. The MU Combining District simply allows residential uses in addition to those uses already allowed in the seven commercial zoning districts. As a result, the MU Combining District allows the combination of office, retail, commercial, and residential uses within a single development.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our website: www.austintexas.gov/planning.

Written comments must be submitted to the board or commission (or the contact person listed on the notice) before the 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. Correspondence and information submitted to the City of Austin are subject to the Texas Public Information Act (Chapter 552) and will be published online.

Case Number: C14-2021-0123

Contact: Wendy Rhoades, 512-974-7719

Public Hearing: December 6, 2022, Zoning and Platting Commission

Your Name (please print)

JOAN Judy 78745
7607 Loganberry

Your address(es) affected by this application (optional)

Joan Judy
Signature

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

12/5/22
Date

Daytime Telephone (Optional):

512 789-1455

Comments:

TRACT 1 - limit all building
height to 40 feet
- Prohibit access to Peaceful Hill,
including NO ACCESS from
Foremost Drive to Peaceful Hill
- Prohibit commercial use along
Peaceful Hill

Tract 2 - support requested.
3011119

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

City of Austin, Housing & Planning Department

Wendy Rhoades

P. O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767

Or email to:

wendy.rhoades@austintexas.gov

ZAP 12-6-2022 - C14-2021-0123 - 7900 South Congress

Good evening Chair and Commissioners, my name is Margaret Valenti and I live on Peaceful Hill Lane. I'm here this evening to speak on case # C14-2021-0123, on what my neighbors and I call the 43-acre Peaceful Hill/Byrdhill Lane/South Congress project. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'd also like to thank my Peaceful Hill neighbors, John Stokes, Rene Pettyjohn, Sam Barrows, Mia Ibarra, John Orr, Chad Sitar, and Doug Votra. We and others have been involved in discussions regarding this project for well over a year.

We all live directly across from the 43-acre property we are discussing tonight. While I've lived in my home for over 15 years, others have been here for twice as long. When I purchased my home, I knew that eventually the vacant land across from me would be developed. It's been a good run. That being said, I want to make it clear to this commission that none of the PH neighbors have indicated they are against the development of this land.

We are not opposing development but are requesting development that is compatible with the existing and nearby zoning.

Since August 2021 when the applicant first proposed a 13-acre residential project on what is now referred to as Tract 1 we have consistently supported housing at the SF-6 zoning level. SF-6 is compatible with the neighboring land use of SF-2, SF-3. It is also consistent with the existing SF-6 Verrado development also on PH and the recently approved SF-6 zoning of the 7901 PH project that came before you just 2 months ago in October.

Now that the proposed project has tripled in size to 43 acres and includes commercial use as well as a new road connecting S. Congress to Peaceful Hill, we are still saying yes to development but are more concerned about compatible zoning along our street.

The neighbors have clearly stated they object to heights of 45ft, 55ft and 60ft. We also object to the proposed extension of Foremost Dr. connecting to Peaceful Hill Lane.

We are asking for the following development standards in the form of amended staff CO's or new CO's:

1. We support the staff CO of a 30ft vegetative buffer, however we would amend it to include no sidewalk within the buffer and the sidewalk be built on project property and out of the ROW.
 2. We support the staff CO's prohibiting vehicular access to Peaceful Hill Lane from Tract 1, except for the portion of public right-of-way for extension of Foremost Drive however we would amend the CO to include: emergency access only in and out of Foremost Drive.
 3. We support the staff recommended **prohibited uses** on Tract 1 but would like to add a new CO that prohibits: medical or diagnostic offices and facilities.
 4. We support the staff recommended **conditional uses** on Tract 1 but would like to add a **new CO** that requires: all commercial space will be located 70 ft from western property line (Peaceful Hill) and located in building portions on easternmost and southernmost buildings
 5. We would amended staff CO that establishes that no more than 50 % of all building facades located between 30 ft and 75 ft of the western property line to **no more than 25%** of all building facades be located between 30 ft and 70 ft of the western property line
 6. We would amended staff CO that requires that at least 20% of all building facades shall be located more than 240 ft from the western property line to **at least 50%** of all building facades shall be located more than 240 ft from the western property line
- And finally, we would ask for a **new CO** that no buildings shall be taller than 35 ft within the first 70 ft of the western property line. From this line eastward, no building height shall exceed 50 ft. This speaks to the proposed heights of 45 ft, 56 ft and 60 ft on portions of Tract 1 which are not compatible with surrounding residences or other developments on the western side of Peaceful Hill

I want to thank you all for hearing the case this evening. I am aware that some of my neighbors have additional comments about the project.

Again, we support the requested zoning and CO's for Tract 2 but object to the requested zoning and CO's for Tract 1.

Thank you again for all of your time and effort. I'm available for questions of you have.