

RESTRICTIVE COVENANT AMENDMENT REVIEW SHEET

CASE: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) – Sunset Ridge

DISTRICT: 8

ADDRESS: 8401 and 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway

SITE AREA: approximately 9.606 acres

EXISTING ZONING: GO-CO-NP

PROPOSED ZONING: Amendment to Restrictive Covenant

PROPERTY OWNER: Los Indios Ventures, Inc.

AGENT: Armbrust & Brown, PLLC (Richard T. Suttle, Jr.)

CASE MANAGER: Jonathan Tomko (512) 974-1057, jonathan.tomko@austintexas.gov

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends amending the Restrictive Covenant as outlined in *Exhibit D: Restrictive Covenant Amendment Redlines*. Please see the *basis of recommendation* section for more details.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION/RECOMMENDATION:

February 27, 2024: Neighborhood Postponement granted to March 26, 2024, applicant is in agreement.

March 26, 2024: Case is scheduled to be heard by Planning Commission

CITY COUNCIL ACTION:

April 4, 2024: Case is tentatively scheduled to be heard by City Council

ORDINANCE NUMBER:

N/A

ISSUES:

N/A

CASE MANAGER COMMENTS:

The subject tract of approximately 9.606 acres of undeveloped land. To the north is additional undeveloped land (across Southwest Parkway). To the south, east and west are single-family residences.

This case seeks to add multifamily residential use as a permitted use of the property and establish a maximum impervious cover of 55% and 1:1 floor to area ratio for multifamily residential use. In exchange for the proposed modifications the project will:

1. Provide water quality controls in accordance with the Save Our Springs Initiative

2. Achieve a minimum one-star rating under the Austin Energy Green Building Program
3. Restrict access to Sunset Ridge
4. Provide a minimum of four EV charging stations
5. Remove invasive species in accordance with the City of Austin Invasive Species Management Plan

BASIS OF RECOMMENDATION:

Zoning should allow for reasonable use of the property.

Austin currently has a housing shortage and an affordable housing shortage. Restricting the use of this property to prohibit multifamily residential use is unreasonable in light of this situation. The applicant has proposed modifications that address environmental quality, sustainability, transportation access, and removal of invasive species.

The proposed zoning should be consistent with the goals and objectives of the City Council.

Austin City Council adopted the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint in 2017. In the last annual report (2022) HousingWorks Austin identified that Council District 8 had only attained 2% of the district's 10-year goal for new affordable housing units. Approving this restrictive covenant agreement would help add additional income restricted affordable housing units to Council District 8, furthering this adopted goal.

Intensive multifamily zoning should be located on major arterials and highways.

Southwest Parkway is an ASMP level 4 roadway with 182' of right of way. This is a major corridor by any standard and should be where intensive multifamily zoning is located.

EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USES:

	Zoning	Land Uses
Site	GO-CO-NP	Undeveloped land
North	Not applicable	Southwest Parkway and undeveloped land
South	SF-2-CO-NP; SF-3-NP	Single-family residences
East	SF-2-CO-NP	Single-family residences; Undeveloped
West	GO-MU-CO-NP; RR-NP	Single-family residences

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING AREA: Oak Hill Combined (West Oak Hill)

WATERSHED: Williamson Creek – Barton Springs Zone (Contributing Zone)

SCHOOLS: Oak Hill Elementary Small Middle School Austin High School

COMMUNITY REGISTRY LIST:

Austin Independent School District, Austin Lost and Found Pets, Aviara HOA, City of Rollingwood, Covered Bridge Property Owners Association, Inc., East Oak Hill Neighborhood Association, Friends of Austin Neighborhoods, Neighborhood Empowerment Foundation, Oak Hill

Association of Neighborhoods (OHAN), Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan - COA Liaison, Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan Contact Team, Oak Hill Trails Association, SELTexas, Save Our Springs Alliance, Sierra Club, Austin Regional Group, TNR BCP - Travis County Natural Resources, Travis Country West Owners Association

AREA CASE HISTORIES:

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>REQUEST</u>	<u>COMMISSION</u>	<u>CITY COUNCIL</u>
C14-06-0061 (8509 Southwest Parkway)	GO-MU-CO to GO-MU- CO (change a condition of zoning)	To Grant (05-23-2006)	Approved (07-27-2006)
C14-02-0164 (Southwest Parkway)	RR and DR to MF-1-CO	To Grant (12-17-2002)	Approved (06-05-2003)
C14-85- 288.166(RCA)	Amend a Restrictive Covenant filed on C14-85- 288.166	To Grant (05-11-2010)	Approved (06-10-2010)

RELATED CASES:

SPC-2023-0448C.SH – Site plan is currently in review.

ADDITIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:

Comprehensive Planning

Imagine Austin

The initiation, termination or amending of a Restrictive Covenant is not under the purview of the policies of the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan and therefore an Imagine Austin compliance report has not been provided for this case.

Environmental Review / Environmental Office Review

FYI: The applicant is advised that this property is located in the Hill Country Roadway (HCR) Overlay. Please consider compatibility of the proposed project goals with applicable HCR requirements and update the amendment as necessary.

Please provide any available exhibits associated with the proposed development of the tract.

With the exception of impervious cover limits, please demonstrate other departures from current environmental code that the proposed restrictive covenant allows, including:

- a) Heritage tree protection,
- b) Cut/fill,
- c) Construction on slopes, etc.

Staff will support the amendment if the project commits to compliance with current environmental code at the time of site plan.

C14-85-288.166(RCA2)

Consider incorporating light pollution reduction criteria into the project by committing to compliance with Austin Energy Green Building ST7 Light Pollution Reduction criteria as a part of achieving 2-star Austin Energy Green Building Rating.

Consider incorporating bird friendly design criteria into the project by committing to compliance with Austin Energy Green Building STEL5 Bird Collision Deterrence criteria as a part of achieving 2-star Austin Energy Green Building Rating.

PARD – Planning & Design Review

Residential units that are certified affordable under the SMART Housing Policy are exempt from the parkland dedication requirements per City Code § 25-1-601(C)(3). Parkland dedication will be required for any new market-rate residential units that may be proposed by a development resulting from this Restrictive Covenant amendment at the time of subdivision or site plan, per City Code § 25-1-601.

Transportation and Public Works – Engineering Review

Note: The applicant is proposing to restrict access to Sunset Ridge.

The Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) calls for 58 feet of right-of-way for Sunset Ridge. It is recommended that 29 feet of right-of-way from the existing centerline should be dedicated for Sunset Ridge according to the Transportation Plan with the first subdivision or site plan application. [LDC 25-6-51 and 25-6-55].

The adjacent street characteristics table is provided below:

Name	ASMP Classification	ASMP Required ROW	Existing ROW	Existing Pavement	Sidewalks	Bicycle Route	Capital Metro (within ¼ mile)
Sunset Ridge	Level 1	58'	49'	29'	No	No	No
Southwest Parkway	Level 4	154'	182'	112'	No	Yes	No

Austin Water Utility

No comments for a restrictive covenant amendment case.

Site Plan

Site Plan comments will be provided at the time of site plan submittal.

INDEX OF EXHIBITS TO FOLLOW:

Exhibit A: Zoning Map

Exhibit B: Aerial Map




Exhibit C: Applicant's Summary Letter

Exhibit D: Restrictive Covenant Amendment Redlines

Exhibit E: Affordability Unlocked Certification

Exhibit F: Comments from Interested Parties


$$1'' = 400'$$

-  SUBJECT TRACT
 PENDING CASE
 ZONING BOUNDARY


CASE#: C14-85-288.166(RCA2)

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 the Planning Department for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Aus in regarding specific accuracy or completeness.



Created: 2/14/2024



Sunset Ridge

-  SUBJECT TRACT
-  ZONING BOUNDARY
-  PENDING CASE
-  CREEK BUFFER

ZONING CASE#: C14-85-288.166(RCA2)
 LOCATION: 8401 & 8401 1/2 Southwest Pkwy
 SUBJECT AREA: 9.606 Acres
 GRID: B21
 MANAGER: Nancy Estrada



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

Created: 1/3/2024

ARMBRUST & BROWN, PLLC

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

100 CONGRESS AVENUE, SUITE 1300
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-2744
512-435-2300

FACSIMILE 512-435-2360

Richard T. Suttle, Jr.
(512) 435-2310
rsuttle@abaustin.com

November 7, 2023

Lauren Middleton-Pratt
Director, Planning Department
City of Austin
1000 E. 11th Street, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78702

Re: Restrictive Covenant Amendment C14-85-288.166 (the "Application")

Dear Mrs. Middleton-Pratt:

This Application is submitted to amend the restrictive covenant recorded in Volume 10801, Page 236 of the Real Property Records of Travis County, Texas and later amended in Document No. 2010095372 of the Official Public Records of Travis County, Texas (the "Restrictive Covenant") and associated with zoning case C14-85-288.166.

The Restrictive Covenant encumbers approximately 12.1557 acres of land, of which, 9.606 acres is owned by Los Indios Ventures, Inc. and located at 8401 and 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway (the "Property"). A site plan will be submitted in conjunction with this Application for the construction of a multi-family project with associated parking and infrastructure (the "Project").

The purpose of this Application is to add multi-family residential use as a permitted use of the Property and establish a maximum impervious cover of 55% and 1:1 FAR for multi-family residential use.

In exchange for the proposed modifications, the Project will:

1. provide water quality controls in accordance with the Save Our Springs Initiative and outlined in Section 1.6.9.3 of the Environmental Criteria Manual,
2. achieve a minimum one-star rating under the Austin Energy Green Building Program,
3. restrict access to Sunset Ridge,
4. provide a minimum of four (4) EV charging stations, and
5. remove invasive species in accordance with the City of Austin Invasive Species Management Plan.

ARMBRUST & BROWN, PLLC


Page 2

A copy of the redlined restrictive covenant as well as copies of the Restrictive Covenant are included with this Application.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this Application. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

ARMBRUST & BROWN, PLLC



Richard T. Suttle, Jr.

cc: Joi Harden
Amanda Morrow
Amanda Hendrix

**AMENDMENT OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANT
FOR
ZONING CASE NO. C14-85-288.166**

Owner: Los Indios Ventures, Inc., a Texas corporation

Address: 151 South 1st Street, Suite 200, Austin, Texas 78704

City: The City of Austin, a home-rule city, municipal corporation and political subdivision of the State of Texas, in Travis County, Texas.

City Council: The City Council of the City of Austin

Consideration: Ten and No/100 Dollars (\$10.00) and other good and valuable consideration paid by the Owner to the City of Austin, the receipt and sufficiency of which is acknowledged.

WHEREAS, Boston Lane G.L.S. Joint Venture, as owner of all that certain property described in Zoning File No. C14-85-288.166, consisting of approximately 9.6 acres of land (the "Property"), as more particularly described in the restrictive covenant recorded in the Real Property Records of Travis County, Texas, in Volume 10801, Page 236, (the "Restrictive Covenant") imposed certain restrictions and covenants on the Property by the Restrictive Covenant of record.

WHEREAS, the Restrictive Covenant provided that the covenant could be modified, amended, or terminated only by joint action of both (a) a majority of the members of the City Council of the City of Austin, or such other governing body as may succeed the city Council of the City of Austin, and (b) the Owner(s) of the Property at the time of such modification, amendment or termination.

WHEREAS, Los Indios Ventures, Inc., a Texas corporation is the current owner (the "Owner") of the Property on the date of this Amendment of Restrictive Covenant (the "Amendment") and desires to amend the Restrictive Covenant as to the Property.

WHEREAS, the City Council and the Owner agree the Restrictive Covenant should be amended.

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the premises and mutual promises, covenants, and agreement hereinafter set forth, the City of Austin and the Owner agree as follows:

1. Paragraph No. 1 of the Restrictive Covenant is deleted in its entirety and the following provisions are substituted in its place.

6-10-10
#58

1 (A). The Property may be developed up to a floor-to-area ratio of 0.5 to 1.0 for an office use, provided that the Property is developed in accordance with the following standards:

- a. Impervious cover is limited to 55 percent.
- b. Water quality facilities which meet non-degradation standards as defined by the Save Our Springs Ordinance, in accordance with Section 1.6.9.3 (Control Measure Design) of the Environmental Criteria Manual.
- c. Except for emergency access purposes, vehicular access to Sunset Ridge is prohibited.

1 (B). The Property may be developed with a religious assembly use and related administrative support, day care services and educational facilities (collectively, "Religious Assembly Use"), provided that the Property is developed in accordance with the following standards:

- a. Water quality facilities which meet non-degradation standards as defined by the Save Our Springs Ordinance, in accordance with Section 1.6.9.3 (Control Measure Design) of the Environmental Criteria Manual.
- b. It is expressly acknowledged that the standards described in subparagraph (a) and (c) in Section 1(A) above shall not apply to a Religious Assembly Use.

1(C). If the Property is developed for any use permitted under the Restrictive Covenant other than office use, as described in 1(A) above, the Property shall be limited to a maximum floor-to-area ratio of 0.25 to 1.0.

2. The following uses are prohibited uses of the Property and are removed from the list of permitted uses set forth in Paragraph 3 of the Restrictive Covenant:


Agricultural sales and services	Building maintenance services
Business support services	Construction sales and services
Service station	Custom manufacturing
Limited warehousing and distribution	General warehousing and distribution
Maintenance and service facilities	Railroad facilities

3. Except as expressly provided for in this Amendment, each and every one of the terms, conditions, and provisions of the Restrictive Covenant, as set forth in the Restrictive Covenant, shall continue in full force and effect on and after the effective date of this Amendment and shall apply to a Religious Assembly Use, including without limitation, the impervious cover provisions contained in Paragraph No. 2 of the Restrictive Covenant.
4. The City Manager, or his designee, shall execute, on behalf of the City, this Amendment for Zoning File No. C14-85-288.166, as authorized by the City Council of the City of Austin. The Amendment shall be filed in the Official Public Records of Travis County, Texas.


EXECUTED to be effective the 21st day of June, 2010

OWNER:


Los Indios Ventures, Inc., a Texas corporation

By: 
Tim Jamail, President

CITY OF AUSTIN:

By: 
Sue Edwards,
Assistant City Manager,
City of Austin


APPROVED AS TO FORM:



Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin

THE STATE OF TEXAS :

COUNTY OF TRAVIS :

This instrument was acknowledged before me on this the 14th day of JUNE, 2010 by Tim Jamail, President of Los Indios Ventures, Inc., a Texas corporation, on its behalf.




Notary Public, State of Texas

THE STATE OF TEXAS


:

:

COUNTY OF TRAVIS

:

This instrument was acknowledged before me on this the 28 day of June, 2010, by Sue Edwards, as Assistant City Manager of the City of Austin, a municipal corporation, on behalf of said municipal corporation.



Dana F. Eskew
Notary Public, State of Texas

AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:
City of Austin Law Department
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-1088
Attn: Diana Minter, Paralegal

FILED AND RECORDED

OFFICIAL PUBLIC RECORDS

Dana DeBeauvoir

Jul 01, 2010 04:44 PM

2010095372

FERGUSONLL: \$28.00

Dana DeBeauvoir, County Clerk

Travis County TEXAS



City of Austin

P.O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767
<https://www.austintexas.gov/department/housing-planning>

Housing Department

February 16, 2024

Affordability Unlocked Development Bonus Certification
 Manifold RE
Sunset Ridge – (ID 923-6021)

To Whom It May Concern:

Developer Manifold RE (development contact: Brad Holland, email: bholland@manifoldre.com; ph: 202-440-0401) is planning to develop a **438-unit multifamily rental** development known as Sunset Ridge, located at or near 8413 and 8509 Southwest Parkway, Austin, TX 78735. The applicant has elected to participate in the City of Austin's Affordability Unlocked Development Bonus Program, Type 2, so the development can receive waivers or modifications from certain development regulations as described in Ordinance No. 20190509-027.

Affordability Unlocked – Type 2 – Rental – 8413/8509 Southwest Pkwy.	
Total units: 438 units	
<u>Minimum Required:</u> 50% (219 units) available to households averaging 60% MFI 20% (88 units) at or below 50% MFI 50% of affordable units 2+ bedrooms (Type 2)	<u>Proposed unit mix:</u> 24% (107 units) at or below 50% MFI 16% (69 units) at or below 60% MFI 10% (44 units) at or below 80% MFI - 50% of affordable units 2+ bedroom
Affordability Period (AU units): 40 Years	
Street Impact Fee Waivers: 176/438 units	

Note: This certification letter only reflects the minimum requirements for the relevant program (AU). Should the owner choose to participate in other affordability programs, the development may be subject to additional affordability restrictions and/or a longer affordability period.

The Housing Department certifies that the project, at the site plan submittal stage, meets the affordability requirements to qualify as a Type 2 development and is eligible to receive waivers and modifications of development regulations as described in Ordinance No. 20190509-027.

The affordability commitments outlined in this letter qualify the development for a 100% reduction of the street impact fee only for the number of units listed in the table above.

If changes are made through the review process, the applicant must notify the Housing Department and an amendment to the Affordability Unlocked Land Use and Restrictions Agreement must be made and a revised Affordability Unlocked Certification letter must be issued. An administrative hold will be placed on the building permits, until the following items have been completed: 1) the number of affordable units have been finalized and evidenced through a sealed letter from project architect, and 2) a Restrictive Covenant stating the

affordability requirements and terms has been filed for record at the Travis County Clerk Office.

Please contact me by phone at 512.978.1594 or by email at Brendan.kennedy@austintexas.gov if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brendan Kennedy", with a stylized, cursive script.

Brendan Kennedy, Project Coordinator
Housing Department

From: [allison.trucillo](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: AGAINST Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA) Request
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:26:08 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello,

I'm writing regarding Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). I'm "against" the "Restrictive Covenant Amendment" request.

My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Best,
Allison Trucillo
Homeowner, Travis Country West

Best,
Allison

Sent from my Galaxy

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: dcafclement@gmail.com
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Fw: Proposed Sunset Ridge apartments
Date: Thursday, February 8, 2024 3:03:43 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-eysl4id1.png](#)

Hi Donna,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the 2/7 Environmental Commission agenda. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be added as backup with the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Donna Clement <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:32 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Frederick L. Clement <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Proposed Sunset Ridge apartments

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] - [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Lilly,

My husband and I are homeowners in Travis Country West. We are against the Restricted Covenant Amendment request related to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments. We have many concerns, and they were expressed at the Environmental Commission meeting this evening by Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and other parties who oppose the development.

We hope that you will take our concerns seriously, and take action against the Restricted Covenant Amendment

request so that this development cannot move forward.

Thank you for your consideration,

Donna and Fred Clement

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lee Knight](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Interested Party - Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:56:40 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Elizabeth,

As an interested party, I am firmly AGAINST the Restrictive Covenant Amendment for Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA).

My concerns and reasons for my AGAINST position will be included (but not limited to) with those expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Please confirm receipt and recording of my AGAINST position as a listed interested party.

Thanks,

--

Lee Knight

Austin, TX

C: 330.397.7281

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Kurt Nehrenz](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:23:43 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Good afternoon, Elizabeth.

I would like to formally state that I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request proposed by Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA), and my concerns are shared by those expressed by Stuard Goodman and Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the request.

Please let me know if there is any more information that I can provide that you would find useful.

Best Regards,
Kurt

--

Kurt Nehrenz
Co-Founder, CEO
LampLight Logistics
+1.512.481.8002

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Melinda Knight](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Opposition to Sunset Ridge Apartments development - Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA).
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:24:47 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Funk,

I am writing to express my opposition to the Restrictive Covenant Amendment attached to Sunset Ridge Apartments development - Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA).

My concerns include those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge project.

Thank you,
Melinda Knight
5613 Fort Benton Dr.
Austin 78735

Melinda Knight
330.565.0238

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Kristina Tarsha](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Opposition to Sunset Ridge Apts
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:07:35 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

External Email - Exercise Caution

Elizabeth Funk,

I am writing with regards to Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

I am AGAINST the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment” request.

My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thank you,
Kristy Tarsha

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Donna Clement](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Cc: [Frederick L. Clement](#)
Subject: Proposed Sunset Ridge Apartment Development
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:30:39 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Funk,

I am against the Restricted Covenant Amendment request related to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments. I have many concerns, and they were expressed at the Environmental Commission meeting this evening by Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and other parties who oppose the development.

We hope that you will take our concerns seriously, and take action against the Restricted Covenant Amendment request so that this development cannot move forward.

Thank you for your consideration,

Donna and Fred Clement
Travis Country West Homeowners

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Melinda Knight](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Re:
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:29:13 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-ivpjo5m.png](#)

Hi Melinda,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Melinda Knight <mclaireknight@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:21 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject:

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Lilly,

I am writing to express my opposition to the Restrictive Covenant Amendment attached to Sunset Ridge Apartments development - Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA).

My concerns include those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge project.

Thank you,
Melinda Knight

5613 Fort Benton Dr.
Austin 78735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: arnoldjr@juno.com
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Re: Against Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288-166(RCA) Item2 tonight
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:30:29 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-31dlgspp.png](#)

Hi Michelle,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:22 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Against Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288-166(RCA) Item2 tonight

You don't often get email from arnoldjr@juno.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

I am write "AGAINST" the "Restrictive Covenant Amendment" item, #2 on tonight's 6pm meeting agenda. Mr. Chandler Harris (one of my neighbors) will be speaking this evening and know he and Stuart Goodman from a neighboring association will be speaking to similar shared concerns as I have.

There is no information provided about what changes you are "recommending " and whether this comprises a preliminary approval to proceed under the changes???

I support the organization "Save Our Springs", the concerns of our 227 neighbors and nearby neighborhoods regarding the accelerated process involving this development and can't imagine how this development is in keeping with the goals of environmental protections for Barton Creek.

Please withdraw the stated approved "recommendation with conditions" and require the new developer to respect the process for applying without "conditions" I also am in favor of the sentiments of other speakers in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development - which I hope you will heed..

I am available to discuss this matter at your earliest convenience.

Michelle Arnold
5708 Sunset Ridge
Travis Country West
Interested Party

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Donna Clement](#)
To: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: Proposed Sunset Ridge apartments
Date: Thursday, February 8, 2024 5:49:32 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-evsl4id1.png](#)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Thank you very much.

On Thu, Feb 8, 2024 at 3:03 PM Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Hi Donna,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the 2/7 Environmental Commission agenda. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be added as backup with the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review

City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Donna Clement <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:32 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Frederick L. Clement <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Proposed Sunset Ridge apartments

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Lilly,

My husband and I are homeowners in Travis Country West. We are against the Restricted Covenant Amendment request related to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments. We have many concerns, and they were expressed at the Environmental Commission meeting this evening by Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and other parties who oppose the development.

We hope that you will take our concerns seriously, and take action against the Restricted Covenant Amendment request so that this development cannot move forward.

Thank you for your consideration,

Donna and Fred Clement

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Lee Knight](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Interested Party - Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA).
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:58:27 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-2qlnnspe.png](#)

Hi Lee,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Lee Knight <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:57 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Interested Party - Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA).

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Leslie,

As a listed interested party, I am firmly AGAINST the Restrictive Covenant Amendment for Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA).

My concerns and reasons for my AGAINST position will be included (but not limited to) with those expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Please confirm receipt and recording of my AGAINST position as a listed interested party.

Thanks,

--

Lee Knight

Austin, TX

C: 330.397.7281

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Kristina Tarsha](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Opposition to Sunset Ridge Apts
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:28:30 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-hjq24kny.png](#)

Hi Kristina,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Kristina Tarsha [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:10 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Opposition to Sunset Ridge Apts

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

External Email - Exercise Caution

Leslie Lilly,

I am writing with regards to Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

I am AGAINST the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment” request.

My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Again, I am opposed to the RCA request.

Thank you,
Kristy Tarsha
Concerned resident

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Kurt Nehrenz](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: regarding Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:54:00 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-ti3mxro0.png](#)

Hi Kurt,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Kurt Nehrenz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:23 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: regarding Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Good afternoon, Leslie.

I would like to formally state that I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request proposed by Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA), and my concerns are shared by those expressed by Stuard Goodman and Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the request.

Please let me know if there is any more information that I can provide that you would find useful.

Best Regards,
Kurt

--

Kurt Nehrenz
Co-Founder, CEO
LampLight Logistics
+1.512.481.8002

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [lance.smith](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 Apartment Development
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:28:30 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-n1asv55w.png](#)

Hi Lance,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: lance.smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:07 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 Apartment Development

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

I am a concerned Travis County West resident in opposition to the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request. My concerns include those that will be discussed by Stuart Goodman and Chandler Harris in opposition to the proposed apartment development at Sunset Ridge.

Thank You
Lance Smith

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or

opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Nino De Falcis](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:29:59 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello,

I'd like to share that I'm against the "Restrictive Covenant Amendment" request.

My concerns include, but not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Your consideration of the above matter is very important to me.

Best regards,

Nino De Falcis
84084 Big Timber Dr
Austin, TX
512.470.3980

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Kristin Wright](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:30:35 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-4c3nkz3t.png](#)

Hi Kristin,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Kristin Wright <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:22 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Graeme (husband) Wright <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA)

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello Leslie - We live in Travis Country West neighborhood off Southwest Parkway and I am writing regarding the Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA) on the agenda of the Environmental Commission meeting today.

My husband Graeme and I are against the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment” request.

My concerns include the increase in impervious cover directly adjacent to our property on Fort Benton. Our understanding is that the property was given a larger than normally allowed amount of

impervious cover in order to achieve their purpose.

My concerns will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman and Chandler Harris, speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thanks, Kristin and Graeme Wright
5508 FORT BENTON DR
AUSTIN, TX 78735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Nino De Falcis](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:02:01 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-lf5vu33v.png](#)

Hi Nino,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Nino De Falcis <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:32 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello,
I'd like to share that I'm against the "Restrictive Covenant Amendment" request.

My concerns include, but not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Your consideration of the above matter is very important to me.

Best regards,

Nino De Falcis
84084 Big Timber Dr
Austin, TX 78734
512.470.3980

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Brad Johnson](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Thursday, February 8, 2024 3:02:52 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-2llqge4q.png](#)

Hi Brad,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the 2/7 Environmental Commission agenda. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be added as backup with the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Brad Johnson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:01 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Good evening,

I am emailing regarding Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). I want to express that I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request under consideration. I believe Chandler Harris and others expressed their concerns during a meeting today. I also have strong concerns, including but not limited to environmental and safety issues related to the proposed apartments.

Sincerely,

Brad Johnson
5921 Sunset Ridge
Austin, Texas 78735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Craig Handley](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:05:00 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-ckaitzh0.png](#)

Hi Craig,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Craig Handley <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:03 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Leslie Lily,

Hello, I am an interested party writing regarding the propsed Sunset Ridge apartments.

I am against their restrictive covenant amendment request.

Historically retractive covenants are used to discriminate against the less powerful and there is

no doubt that is the intent here, to protect investors from accountability for the environmental degradation that will occur as a result of this development.

Additionally, my concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Sincerely,
-Craig Handley

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Lori McKey](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:02:18 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-wushhqe.png](#)

Hi Lori,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Lori McKey [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:55 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Leslie,

I am against the restrictive covenant amendment request on the Sunset Ridge Apartment project shown above.

My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the

proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thank you,
Lori McKey

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Pete Chung](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Cc: [Keena Chung](#); [Lilly, Leslie](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:24:34 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Thank you Elizabeth and Leslie. I agree with my wife's statements below and appreciate your time and for acknowledging our concerns.

On Wed, Feb 7, 2024 at 3:20 PM Funk, Elizabeth <Elizabeth.Funk@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Thank you! I have forwarded your concerns to the commissioners so they can read them before tonight's meeting. Thanks for your time and please let me know if I can help in any way!

Elizabeth Funk

She/her

Program Coordinator – Environmental Policy & Review Division

Office: 512-568-2244

City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Keena Chung <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:19 PM
To: Funk, Elizabeth <Elizabeth.Funk@austintexas.gov>; Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Keena Chung <[REDACTED]>; Pete Chung <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello Ms. Funk & Ms. Lilly,

I am messaging you both regarding this project:

- Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

I am messaging specifically to say that my husband and I are “against” the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment” request.

Our concerns include, but are not limited, to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other parties speaking this evening in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Sincerely,

Peter & Keena Chung

Residents of Travis Country West

5705 Sunset Ridge

Austin, TX 78735

• • •

Keena E. Chung, MSN, RN, CFNP, CPNP-AC

Nurse Practitioner

IG: @keenachung

512-981-9880 mobile



CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [michael rabakon](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:01:02 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-1qbwkvoz.png](#)

Hi Michael,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: michael rabakon <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:59 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Leslie, I am writing to let you know that I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request.

My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Kind Regards,

Michael Rabakon
512-569-2450

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Barbara Bearden](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:59:15 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-pulozogw.png](#)

Hi Barbara,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Barbara Bearden <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:54 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Subject: re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

We are “against” the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment” request.

Our concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in

opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Barbara and Jim Bearden
5605 Fort Benton Dr.
512.751.9735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Robert Anderson](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:29:24 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-3kylkrwy.png](#)

Hi Robert,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Robert Anderson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:14 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Leslie,

I am emailing regarding the Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request. My concerns include , but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Regards,
Robert Anderson

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Robbie Lowe](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:04:40 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-bxffkqz0.png](#)

Hi Robbie,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Robbie Lowe <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:54 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Ms. Lilly,

I want you to know that my husband and I are against the "Restrictive Covenant Amendment" request for Sunset Ridge 290.

My concerns include but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Please do not approve this amendment.

Roberta and Kurtis Lowe

8613 Cobblestone
Austin, TX 78735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Justin Jensen](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:54:48 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-ibxqnss5.png](#)

Hi Justin,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Justin Jensen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:21 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello Ms. Lilly,

I hope this message finds you well. I was just notified by a neighbor of the environmental commission meeting regarding the subject property tonight, but I am unfortunately unable to attend.

I own approximately 11.5 acres that border the subject property to the West at 5415 Travis Cook Road, where I operate a honey bee farm. I also treat the property as a wildlife refuge where the likes of bobcats, foxes, and coyotes visit nightly.

I am very concerned about the proposed apartment development impacting my livestock and the local wildlife, and I am “against” the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment” request. My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thank you for noting my stance and please let me know if there is any other information I can provide to help with your assessment.

Regards,
Justin Jensen, Wekshi Capital
5415 Travis Cook Rd, Austin, TX 78735
PIDs: 103831, 103832, & 103834

P.S. A couple photos from my property are attached.

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Wayne Kiser](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:53:30 PM
Attachments: [image118645.png](#)
[Outlook-meyl25h5.png](#)

Hi Wayne,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Wayne Kiser <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:40 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: FW: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] - [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello Ms. Lily,

I am emailing you with regards to the above referencing Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). My name is Wayne Kiser and I reside at 8700 Cobblestone, Austin, Texas 78735. I would like it known in writing that I am AGAINST Restrictive Covenant Amendment request. My concerns include but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thank you for your time,

Wayne Kiser

Field Adjuster

The Littleton Group, a Davies company



1250 S Capital of Texas Hwy, Bldg. 1, Suite 460

Austin, Texas 78746

P. +1 512-900-8391

CA License Number 2H38469

E. [REDACTED]

www.davies-group.com/claims/na/

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

Legal disclaimer:

The information contained in this e-mail and any attachments to it may be legally privileged and include confidential information intended only for the recipient(s) identified above. If you are not one of those intended recipients, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender of that fact by return e-mail and permanently delete the e-mail and any attachments to it immediately. Please do not retain copy or use this e-mail or its attachments for any purpose, nor disclose all or any part of its contents to any other person.

Any statements made, or intentions expressed in this communication may not necessarily reflect the view of the Company. Be advised that no content herein may be held binding upon the Company or any associated Company unless confirmed by the issuance of a formal contractual document. The Company may monitor the content of emails sent and received via its network for viruses or unauthorized use and for other lawful business purposes.

The sender of this email is a member of the Davies Group of companies, the parent of which is Davies Group Limited (registered in the UK Company Number 6479822).

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Helen Moore](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:52:45 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-eh132i1v.png](#)

Hi Helen,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Helen Moore <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:44 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Good afternoon,

I am an interested party in this development:

I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request. This request seeks to over-tap an already burdened resource by adding an impervious cover on a hilltop that will likely create several downhill issues for the surrounding development. My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

I believe this development to be a danger to the surrounding environment in the form of runoff contamination, erosion, and negligent to the local watershed.

I would also like it addressed that the neighborhood and surrounding property owners were not informed of this meeting until yesterday, which seems highly unethical. This will be documented for future reference.

Thank you for your time,

Helen Logue

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Barbara Bearden](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: re: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:53:25 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

External Email - Exercise Caution

We are “against” the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment” request.

Our concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Barbara and Jim Bearden
5605 Fort Benton Dr.
512.751.9735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Carey Burnett](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge 290-C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:28:58 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-q14wltqa.png](#)

Hi Carey,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Carey Burnett <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:08 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290-C14-85-288.166(RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Leslie, I am against the "Restrictive Covenant Amendment: request. My concerns include, but not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments Development.

--

Carey Burnett | (512) 809-7672
5416 Fort Benton Dr, Austin, TX 78735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: bryan@wealthwriters.com
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge Apartments - Environmental Commission Meeting
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:05:04 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-hqjbiwko.png](#)

Hi Bryan,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Bryan Harris [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:02 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge Apartments - Environmental Commission Meeting

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

RE: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

Ms. Lily:

I am a homeowner in Travis Country West and a registered interested party in this project. (My property is the nearest lot to the development with the greenbelt between.)

I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request. My concerns include those to be expressed by the speakers tonight (Stuart Goodman and Chandler Harris)—as well as others who may voice opposition to the Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Please take their comments to heart.

I attended the conference call a couple of weeks ago and had several concerns about the information arising from the responses. I don't think this project has been properly evaluated and seems pushed through carelessly and without regard for the impact to the habitat and quality of life and safety of our neighborhood.

Thanks for your consideration.

Bryan

Bryan Harris
5512 Fort Benton Dr.
Austin, TX 78735
(512) 695-5966

bryan@wealthwriters.com

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Lindsay Castaneda](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge Apartments 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:31:11 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-w0i4z32p.png](#)

Hi Lindsay,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Lindsay Castaneda [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:22 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge Apartments 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

My name is Lindsay Castañeda and I live in the Travis Country West neighborhood. I am emailing you in regards to Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). I am writing to let you know that I am “against” the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment” requested by the developer.

My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thank you,
Lindsay Castañeda

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Kristen Alexandrov](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge Development
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:22:06 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Elizabeth,

I am registered as an interested party and am writing in regards to Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). I am very much against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request, and my concerns include those that will be presented by Chandler Harris and Stuart Goodman at the meeting this evening.

Thank you for noting my opposition,
Kristen Alexandrov
owner at 8700 Southwest Parkway

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
To: [Kristen Alexandrov](#)
Cc: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Johnston, Liz](#)
Subject: Re: Sunset Ridge Development
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:29:52 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-ojqigev3.png](#)

Hi Kristen,

Thank you for your email regarding the Sunset Ridge restrictive covenant amendment listed on the Environmental Commission agenda this evening. We will make sure to forward your message to the commissioners to be considered alongside the item. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best
Leslie

Leslie Lilly

Environmental Conservation Program Manager – Environmental Policy and Review
City of Austin | Watershed Protection Department

C: (512) 535-8914

www.austintexas.gov/watershed



From: Kristen Alexandrov <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:21 PM
To: Lilly, Leslie <Leslie.Lilly@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Sunset Ridge Development

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Leslie,

I am registered as an interested party and am writing in regards to Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). I am very much against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request, and my concerns include those that will be presented by Chandler Harris and Stuart Goodman at the meeting this evening.

Thank you for noting my opposition,
Kristen Alexandrov

owner at 8700 Southwest Parkway

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Rami reddy Muthyala](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Regarding Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:27:14 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Elizabeth,

It was pleasure talking to you over the phone regarding Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA).

1. I am "against" to the Restrictive Covenant Amendment" Request.

Some of the major concerns

- a. Traffic Safety and pollution impact.
- b. Water and sewage and drainage impact
- c. Noise pollution etc.
- d. Home burglary and entering multifamily members in to our community premises cause lot of troubles.

Also, my concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thanks & Regards,
Rami Mutyala

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Eric Logue-Sargeant](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 - C14-85-288.166 (RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:21:11 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Good afternoon,

I am an interested party in this development:

I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request. This request seeks to over-tap an already burdened resource by adding an impervious cover on a hilltop that will likely create several downhill issues for the surrounding development. My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

I believe this development to be a danger to the surrounding environment in the form of runoff contamination, erosion, and negligent to the local watershed.

Thank you for your time,

Eric Logue-Sargeant

5612 Fort Benton Drive,

Austin TX, 78735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Helen Moore](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 - C14-85-288.166 (RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:43:36 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Good afternoon,

I am an interested party in this development:

I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request. This request seeks to over-tap an already burdened resource by adding an impervious cover on a hilltop that will likely create several downhill issues for the surrounding development. My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

I believe this development to be a danger to the surrounding environment in the form of runoff contamination, erosion, and negligent to the local watershed.

Thank you for your time,

Helen Logue

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Don Gibson](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Lilly, Leslie](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:21:16 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

External Email - Exercise Caution

Elizabeth/Leslie, I am an Austin resident at 5616 Medicine Creek Drive. As I will be unable to attend the Environmental Commission meeting scheduled for 6:00PM today 2/7/24, I wanted to state directly my vehement opposition to the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request in the subject case.

My personal concerns include the following:

- Water, sewage, and drainage impact to area aquifer, vegetation, and wildlife
- Traffic safety issues and pollution impact on Southwest Parkway & Travis Cooke Rd
- Light and noise pollution to adjoining residential areas

I am familiar with and support the positions that will be expressed by Chandler Harris and Stuart Goodman who will be speaking at this evening's meeting.

Please feel free to reach out to me directly at the number below with any questions.

Thank you,
Don Gibson
(518) 573-2207

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Brad Dunn](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:36:12 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Elizabeth,

I just wanted to let you know that I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request associated with the Sunset Ridge Development. I have shared my concerns with Stuart Goodman and Chandler Harris along with any other party that will speak tonight against this proposal. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Brad Dunn
5516 Fort Benton Dr
Austin, TX 78735
512-299-2982
Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Jason Svatek](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:27:32 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Elizabeth,

I understand there is a meeting tonight that just came to my attention from a neighbor. Is there a special process to become "interested party" on all aspects of this case, not just the site plans where I became an IP with Mase cone?

As a homeowner, and as President and representative of the 227 homeowners in the Travis Country West HOA, I'd like you to know we are AGAINST the Restrictive Covenant Amendment requested by the developing party for Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA).

We're in lock step with our homeowners and several surrounding communities. I'm unable to attend tonight (I'm running our own HOA meeting at the same time). Many of my concerns will be addressed tonight by Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and other parties speaking in opposition to the proposed amendment. My community members have also expressed concerns that echo their sentiments. As a native Austinite, Barton Springs, our greenbelt, and this fragile section of Austin hill country are too valuable to bend to big developers and deep pockets. Please protect the integrity of our communities and livelihoods by rejecting this matter. Moving from commercial to residential should completely negate any prior variances and I'm certain the footprint, traffic, and various other factors are completely dissimilar.

Please take the comments of Stuart and Chandler with great weight from the hundreds of homeowners in my community supporting these gentlemen, and understand this proposal has the capacity to impact these families significantly.

Feel free to contact me if you'd like any further context or conversation on the matter.

Jason Svatek
TCW HOA President
512.496.4677

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Joseph Harris](#)
To: [Lilly, Leslie](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:17:05 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Great day Leslie,

I will be speaking this evening at the Environmental Commission meeting. I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment Requests regarding Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). No "Interested Parties" were notified of this hearing, and consideration of any preparation in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments give a severe appearance of impropriety. That being said, the negative environmental impacts of this development far outweigh any good that could come from moving forward with this endeavor. My concerns include, but are not limited to the following:

- 1.) Impervious Cover: SOS Ordinance that allows 25% net impervious cover in the Contributing Zone, where the property in questions is situated. This property is adjacent to the Barton Creek Watershed, which allows for 20% net impervious cover. The increased request for impervious coverage, in conjunction with the density amendments is gross and abusive to the local environment. I would request to conduct a study to evaluate the environmental impact of considering any request to increase the impervious cover limit in this Contributing Zone.
- 2.) Canyon Spring Environmental Feature (identified on the US Geological Survey) is located on the east parcel requesting an increase in impervious cover. I would request to conduct an environmental assessment of Canyon Spring along with identification of any other previously unidentified critical environmental features prior to environmental recommendation.
- 3.) Tree Survey: 17 Heritage Trees identified on east land parcel in 2015 survey. I would request complete tree surveys for both parcels to identify trees for removal / mitigation measures. Further, I would request an assessment of the resulting environmental impacts.
- 4.) Car Pollution: A low estimate of 1,995 car trips per day are expected from the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments Development. I would request to conduct a projected annual pollution study on the potentially negative environmental impacts that this element would have on the Barton Creek Watershed preserve.
- 5.) Light / Noise Pollution: The proposed 438 unit Sunset Ridge Apartments complex would exponentially increase the amount of unnatural light introduced to the nocturnal environment / habitat of indigenous species. If allowed, this development would destroy the homes of any wildlife that currently reside in these two parcels. That should not be allowed when considering impervious cover regulations. I would additionally request a study on the potentially negative environmental impacts that this additional light / noise would have on the Barton Creek Watershed preserve.

Kind regards,

- Chandler Harris
5700 Sunset Ridge
Austin, TX 78735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Craig Handley](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:02:38 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Elizabeth Funk,

Hello, I am an interested party writing regarding the proposed Sunset Ridge apartments.

I am against their restrictive covenant amendment request.

Historically restrictive covenants are used to discriminate against the less powerful and there is no doubt that is the intent here, to protect investors from accountability for the environmental degradation that will occur as a result of this development.

Additionally, my concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Sincerely,
-Craig Handley

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lori McKey](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:52:09 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Elizabeth,

I am against the restrictive covenant amendment request on the Sunset Ridge Apartment project shown above.

My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thank you,
Lori McKey

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Keena Chung](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#); [Lilly, Leslie](#)
Cc: [Keena Chung](#); [Pete Chung](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:18:53 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello Ms. Funk & Ms. Lilly,

I am messaging you both regarding this project:

- Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

I am messaging specifically to say that my husband and I are “against” the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment” request.

Our concerns include, but are not limited, to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other parties speaking this evening in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Sincerely,

Peter & Keena Chung
Residents of Travis Country West
5705 Sunset Ridge
Austin, TX 78735

...

Keena E. Chung, MSN, RN, CFNP, CPNP-AC
Nurse Practitioner
IG: [@keenachung](#)
512-981-9880 mobile

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [michael rabakon](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:58:53 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Elizabeth, I am writing to let you know that I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request.

My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Kind Regards,

Michael Rabakon
512-569-2450

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Robert Anderson](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:12:05 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Elizabeth,

I am emailing regarding the Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request. My concerns include , but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Regards,
Robert Anderson

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Robbie Lowe](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:51:44 PM
Importance: High

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Ms. Funk,

I want you to know that my husband and I are against the "Restrictive Covenant Amendment" request for Sunset Ridge 290.

My concerns include but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Please do not approve this amendment.

Roberta and Kurtis Lowe
8613 Cobblestone
Austin, TX 78735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Wayne Kiser](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:39:00 PM
Attachments: [image586946.png](#)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello Elizabeth,

I am emailing you with regards to the above referencing Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). My name is Wayne Kiser and I reside at 8700 Cobblestone, Austin, Texas 78735. I would like it known in writing that I am AGAINST Restrictive Covenant Amendment request. My concerns include but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thank you for your time,

Wayne Kiser

Field Adjuster

The Littleton Group, a Davies company



1250 S Capital of Texas Hwy, Bldg. 1, Suite 460

Austin, Texas 78746

P. +1 512-900-8391

CA License Number 2H38469

E. [REDACTED]

www.davies-group.com/claims/na/

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

Legal disclaimer:

The information contained in this e-mail and any attachments to it may be legally privileged and include confidential information intended only for the recipient(s) identified above. If you are not one of those intended recipients, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender of that fact by return e-mail and permanently delete the e-mail and any attachments to it immediately. Please do not retain copy or use this e-mail or its attachments for any purpose, nor disclose all or any part of its contents to any other person.

Any statements made, or intentions expressed in this communication may not necessarily reflect the view of the Company. Be advised that no content herein may be held binding upon the Company or any associated Company unless confirmed by the issuance of a formal contractual document. The Company may monitor the content of emails sent and received via its network for viruses or unauthorized use and for other lawful business purposes.

The sender of this email is a member of the Davies Group of companies, the parent of which is Davies Group Limited (registered in the UK Company Number 6479822).

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [diana mayo](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:34:45 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

External Email - Exercise Caution

We live in the Travis Country West and we live off Big Timer/Travis Cook. We are against the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment”
Our concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Diana and Carlos Mayo
5524 Ft Benton Dr
Austin Texas 78736
513-484-2547

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Justin Jensen](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:14:08 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello Ms. Funk,

My neighbor has just informed me of an environmental commission meeting tonight, which the city did not notify me of. I wish I was available to attend, but I am unable to get childcare on such short notice.

I own approximately 11.5 acres that border the subject property to the West at 5415 Travis Cook Road, where I operate a honey bee farm. I also treat the property as a wildlife refuge where the likes of bobcats, foxes, and coyotes visit nightly.

I am very concerned about the proposed apartment development impacting my livestock and the local wildlife, and I am "against" the "Restrictive Covenant Amendment" request. My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thank you for noting my stance and please let me know if there is any other information I can provide to help with your assessment.

Regards,
Justin Jensen, Wekshi Capital
5415 Travis Cook Rd, Austin, TX 78735
PIDs: 103831, 103832, & 103834

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Matt Hartman](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:53:51 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello Elizabeth,

Echoing concerns I know my neighbors have expressed, I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments locations and the Restrictive Covenant Agreement mentioned in the subject above. Generally speaking, I stand with speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition tonight.

While I am pro affordable housing generally (as a lifelong Austinite with a public policy background, I recognize the difficulty posed by Austin's growth and have voted for many affordable housing bonds and supported many organizations who have as their purpose providing safe, affordable housing) this is simply not a well thought out or logical location- not walkable, not close to public transit, no meaningful job opportunities or large employers nearby, etc. This doesn't get into the obvious issues with congestion, traffic, environmental and other issues that will affect our small HOA community to which I know my neighbors can speak to better.

Further, everything about the development's timeline thus far has seemed conspicuously designed to try to bypass public feedback by affected neighbors, which inspires little hope on my behalf that the developer actually cares at all about remedying obvious issues surrounding safety and walkability beyond just securing funding to make the economics work for their investors.

Thanks, Matt Hartman

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Brad Johnson](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:59:32 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Good evening,

I am emailing regarding Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). I want to express that I am against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request under consideration. I believe others expressed their concerns during a meeting today. I have strong concerns, including but not limited to environmental and safety issues related to the proposed apartments.

Sincerely,

Brad Johnson
5921 Sunset Ridge
Austin, Texas 78735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Dylan Ewers](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:31:44 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Elizabeth,

I am emailing to say that I am against the restrictive covenant amendment request.

My concerns include, but are not limited to those expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments Development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dylan Ewers

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [David Arnold](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Cc: [Chandler Harris](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288-166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:00:04 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Ms. Funk,

I am writing regarding Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288-166(RCA). I am wholeheartedly "AGAINST" the "Restrictive Governance Amendment" item, #2 on tonight's 6pm meeting agenda for this development and am distrustful of the lack of transparency/communication of the "conditions" which support your recommendation. I understand Mr. Chandler Harris (one of my neighbors) will be speaking this evening and know he and Stuart Goodman will be speaking to similar shared concerns as I have.

From an environmental perspective, I have never had an explanation as to how a previously (multi-year) variance for impervious cover (25%) for the property to a negotiated (55%) to construct a commercial building is now assumed to apply to a very different footprint associated with a 450 unit apartment complex. Why don't the proposed developers have to re-qualify for a variance for their initial design and ongoing changes to come that likely differ in footprint to a commercial entity?

I implore you to withdraw approved "recommendation with conditions" and require the new developer to respect the process for applying for a precise plan which will likely exceed the cover contemplated for a commercial building. I also am in favor of the sentiments of other speakers in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

I am available to discuss this matter at your earliest convenience.

--

Very Respectfully,
David Arnold
415-599-6900 Mobile

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:03:58 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

External Email - Exercise Caution

I am against the restrictive covenant amendment request (C14-85-288.166 (RCA)).
My concerns include those that will be presented by Stuart Goodman and Chandler Harris as well as anyone speaking in opposition to the Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thank You
Lance Smith
Travis Country West Resident
Sent from my iPhone

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Eun Kim](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:03:37 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ma'am

I am Eun Kim who is the owner of 5713 Sunset Ridge.

Regarding the project of sunset ridge apartment project,

I against the Restrictive Covenant Amendment Request.

Thank you for your attention

Eun Kim

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Carey Burnett](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge 290-C14-85-288.166(RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:06:50 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Elizabeth, I am against the "Restrictive Covenant Amendment: request. My concerns include, but not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments Development.

--

Carey Burnett | (512) 809-7672
5416 Fort Benton Dr, Austin, TX 78735

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Lindsay](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge Apartments - 290 C14-85-288.166 (RCA)
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:20:08 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

My name is Lindsay Castañeda and I live in the Travis Country West neighborhood. I am emailing you in regards to Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA). I am writing to let you know that I am “against” the “Restrictive Covenant Amendment” requested by the developer.

My concerns include, but are not limited to those that will be expressed by speakers Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and any other party speaking in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Thank you,
Lindsay Castañeda

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Beck, Hunter](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge Apartments
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:10:06 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi, Elizabeth

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments. Stuart Goodman, Chandler Harris, and others are voicing most of the "interested party" concerns, but I want to call out a few items specifically:

- This is a beautiful area of Austin, and the natural destruction involved in setting up a new apartment complex will be massive, especially on a portion of land that is so full of nature. From a natural and personal point of view, I'm concerned that the complex will increase road noise and disturb ecosystems. I'm not sure Austin is doing enough to consider these impacts.
- Many of my neighbors and I have received little information concerning this process. Despite becoming an "interested party," I've received minimal communication from the city about the developments in this case, thus the concern about proper environmental impact research.
- Finally (and likely not your problem, but I would be remiss not to mention it), allowing road access onto Sunset Ridge from the apartment complex will only serve to congest small, residential roads instead of encouraging the use of Southwest Parkway and Travis Cook/Old Bee caves (despite the latter two being small roads as well). From a safety consideration as well, this is a small community where children frequently play in yards and sometimes on the streets – something that doesn't mix well with the additional car/pedestrian traffic.

Please let me know what I can do to be helpful in this regard. I want this to be a productive process for everyone and ensure it's done the right way.

Thank you,
Hunter Beck
8612 Cobblestone

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: [Bryan Harris](#)
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Sunset Ridge Apts. - Environmental Commission Meeting
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:59:31 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

RE: Sunset Ridge 290 C14-85-288.166(RCA)

Ms. Funk:

I am a homeowner in Travis Country West and a registered interested party in this project. (My property is the nearest lot to the development with the greenbelt between.)

I am against" the Restrictive Covenant Amendment request. My concerns include those to be expressed by the speakers tonight (Stuart Goodman and Chandler Harris)--as well as others who are speaking to oppose the Sunset Ridge Apartments development.

Please take their objectives to heart.

I attended the conference call a couple of weeks ago and had several concerns about the information arising from the responses. I don't think this project has been properly evaluated and seems pushed through carelessly and without regard for the impact to the habitat and the quality of life--as well as safety--of our neighborhood.

Thanks for your consideration.

Bryan

Bryan Harris
5512 Fort Benton Dr.
Austin, TX 78735
(512) 695-5966

bryan@wealthwriters.com

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

From: arnoldjr@juno.com
To: [Funk, Elizabeth](#)
Subject: Tonight's Meeting Agenda Item 2 C14-85-288.166(RCA) - AGAINST
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:29:32 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Ms. Funk

I write "AGAINST" the "Restrictive Covenant Amendment" item, #2 on tonight's 6pm meeting agenda. Mr. Chandler Harris (one of my neighbors) will be speaking this evening and know he and Stuart Goodman from a neighboring association will be speaking to similar shared concerns as I have.

There is no information provided about what 'changes' you are "recommending " and whether this comprises a preliminary approval to proceed under those changes...

I support the organization "Save Our Springs", the concerns of our 227 neighbors and nearby neighborhoods regarding the accelerated process involving this development and can't imagine how this development is in keeping with the goals of environmental protections for Barton Creek.

Please withdraw the stated approved "recommendation with conditions" and require the new developer to respect the process for applying without "conditions" I also am in favor of the sentiments of other speakers in opposition to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments development - which I hope you will heed..

I am available to discuss this matter at your earliest convenience.

Michelle Arnold
5708 Sunset Ridge
Travis Country West
415-328-8867 Mobile

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

8401 Southwest Parkway

Kristen Alexandrov <[REDACTED]>

Wed 2/21/2024 7:43 AM

To: Tomko, Jonathan <Jonathan.Tomko@austintexas.gov>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Jonathan,

I am responding to the notice regarding the 2/27 hearing on Case #C14-85-288.166(RCA2), 8401 and 8401 1/2 Southwest Parkway. I cannot attend the hearing, but would like to voice my opposition to this project and my concerns over the traffic and environmental impact. I believe it is imperative for both traffic and environmental studies to be conducted before this project is considered.

Thank you,
Kristen Alexandrov
Owner, 8700 Southwest Parkway

CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious or phishing email, please report it using the "Report Message" button in Outlook or forward to cybersecurity@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: C14-85-288.166(RCA2)

Contact: Jonathan Tomko, 512-974-1057

Public Hearing: February 27, 2024, Planning Commission

Michael Holman

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

5704 Sunset Rdg, Austin, TX 78735

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

[Signature]

Signature

2/22/24

Date

Daytime Telephone (Optional): _____

Comments: I object to the amendment of the 1987

Restrictive Covenant. Concerns:

- Negative impact on surrounding environment;
- Multi-family housing adjacent to single-family housing;
- Compromised safety resulting from increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic;
- Reduced value to adjacent single-family property.

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

City of Austin, Planning Department

Jonathan Tomko

P. O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767

Or email to:

jonathan.tomko@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: C14-85-288.166(RCA2)

Contact: Jonathan Tomko, 512-974-1057

Public Hearing: February 27, 2024, Planning Commission

Jane Holzman

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

5704 Sunset Rdg, Austin, TX 78735

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

Jane Holzman

Signature

2/22/2024

Date

Daytime Telephone (Optional): 512 422-5054

Comments: I object to the amendment of the 1987 Restrictive Covenant. Concerns:

- Negative impact on surrounding environment;
- Multi-family housing adjacent to single-family housing;
- Compromised safety resulting from increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic;
- Reduced value to adjacent single-family property;

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

City of Austin, Planning Department

Jonathan Tomko

P. O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767

Or email to:

jonathan.tomko@austintexas.gov

Additional Comments Received on C14-85-288.166(RCA2)

Email from Cara AkROUT 2/26/24 3:51pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Cara AkROUT. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the

East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress

Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Cara Akrouit

Email from Ashley Hurt 2/26/24 3:51pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Joel and Ashley Hurt. We are owners of a home in Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-

288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the

disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Joel and Ashley Hurt

Email from Rajinder Koul 2/26/24 3:52pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Rajinder Koul. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes

- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and

breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying

Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders:

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Tara P. Lambropoulos 2/26/24 3:53pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Tara Lambropoulos. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to

fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious

Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Corbula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders:

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,
Tara Lambropoulos

Email from Adib Masumain 2/26/24 3:54pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Adib Masumian. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the

Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,
Adib Masumian

Email from Mathias Brossard 2/26/24 3:55pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Mathias Brossard. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers.

Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue

that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997. The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)). The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than

the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS.

Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

--

Mathias Brossard

Email from Anne C. Geraci 2/26/24 3:56pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Anne Geraci and I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced [8413 Southwest Parkway](#). This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Thanks, and Hook 'em!
Anne

Email from James Palmer 2/26/24 3:56pm

To: Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is James Palmer. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you

that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes

- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file

#: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-

288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Jim Pamer

Email from J. Wise 2/26/24 3:57pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Jaime Wise_. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following

areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code,"

which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders:The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly

requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Kiser Wayne 2/26/24 3:59pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Wayne Kiser. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a

deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Wayne Kiser

Email from Joseph Harris 2/26/24 3:59pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Chandler Harris. I am a "Interested Party" resident of Travis Country West regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments in a well-documented timeline.

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and provide a breakdown of what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997. The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)) The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming staircase topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other

City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

- Chandler Harris
5700 Sunset Ridge
Austin, Texas 78735

Email from Frederick L. Clement 2/26/24 4:04pm

Dear Ms. Ellis,

My name is Frederick L. Clement. I am an owner in and resident of Travis Country West Neighborhood Association. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with a sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a

Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Ms. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing

projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down.

1) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country

Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I respectfully request that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS.

Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Your sincerely,

Frederick L. Clement,
Resident, Travis Country West

Email from Nicole Johnson 2/26/24 4:05pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Nicole Johnson. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues

including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents

designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Nicole Johnson, concerned Travis Country West Resident

Email from Brent Kirby 2/26/24 4:16pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Brent Kirby. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning

Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,”

which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Brent Kirby

Email from Brad Johnson 2/26/24 4:19pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Brad Johnson. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members

of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective within the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental

Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing has its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS.

Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

Brad Johnson

Email from Tim Moreland 2/26/24 4:19pm

My apology for misspelling your surname in the previous email attached below.

Email from Tim Moreland 2/26/24 4:17pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Tim Moreland. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive

Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line

with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all “Interested Parties,” Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Timothy A. Moreland

Email from Morgan Reece 2/26/24 4:22pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Morgan Reece. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a

Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted

to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City

Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Morgan Reece

Email from Jane Holeman 2/26/24 4:23pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Jane Holeman. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-

288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please**

publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m. Sincerely,

Jane Holeman

Email from Lindsay Casteneda 2/26/24 4:27pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Lindsay Castañeda . I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for**

Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in

the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable

Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Lindsay Castañeda

Email from Brad Dunn 2/26/24 4:27pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Brad Dunn, I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before

the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing

projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a

deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors,

the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Brad Dunn

5516 Fort Benton Dr

Austin, TX 78735

Email from Mike Holeman 2/26/24 4:29pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Michael Holeman. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say

that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree

Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes

and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Michael Holeman

Email from Diana Mayo 2/26/24 4:34pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Diana C Mayo. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the

case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Diana and Carlos Mayo

5524 Ft Benton Dr

Austin TX 78735

512-484-2547

Email from Michelle Lee 2/26/24 4:42pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Michelle Lee. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration

when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams

sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Michelle

Email from Robbie Lowe 2/26/24 4:42pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Roberta R Lowe

Roberta R Lowe

8613 Cobblestone

Austin, TX 78735

Email from Sam B 2/26/24 4:42pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is _____. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was

dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Sincerely, Richard Boekennoogen
5600 Ft. Benton Dr., Austin, Tx. 78735
A resident of Travis Country West.
(I apologize but, I'm unable to write on a PDF.)

Email from David Wu 2/26/24 4:43pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Donggang David Wu. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Donggang David Wu

Email from Frank Singor 2/26/24 4:45pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Frank Singor. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically

because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective within the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997. The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming staircase topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-**

288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m. Sincerely,

Email from Sheila Anderson 2/26/24 4:45pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Sheila Anderson. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 1/2 Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say

that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole

/ Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)) The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Jason Bybel 2/26/24 4:52pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Jason Bybel. I am a resident of Travis Country West and Vice President of my community's Homeowner's Association. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed

affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The

Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)).

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of *Corbula harveyi* (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet.

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to **Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis**, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors,

the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Jason Bybel
5305 Fort Benton Dr.
Austin, Texas 78735

Email from Wayne Kiser 2/26/24 5:01pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Wayne Kiser and I am an interested party. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case

Managers. Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

- 1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after 12/08/23 when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than 01/10/24. These documents were dated 12/20/23.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on 01/17/24. This documented was dated 01/12/24. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on 01/18/24.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on 01/19/24 where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on 01/19/24. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on 02/07/24, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on 01/19/24 & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of November, 2023. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of 09/20/23, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997. The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming staircase topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24 and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City

Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

Wayne Kiser

Email from Barbara Bearden 2/26/24 5:19pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

Our names are Jim and Barbara Bearden. We are residents of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has

a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree

Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-

288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Jim and Barbara Bearden

5605 Fort Benton Dr.

Email from Hajali Patel 2/26/24 5:25pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is __Hajiali Patel_____. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The**

Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00**p.m.** Sincerely,

_Hajiali. Patel_____

Email from Hajiali Patel 2/26/24 5:33pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Hajiali Patel. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for**

Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in

the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

_Hajiali Patel_____

Email from Nino De Falcis 2/26/24 5:33pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Nino De Falcis. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the

Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution [20110113](#)-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing

projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: [SP-2023-0448C.SH](#) that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire

process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Nino De Falcis

Email from Allison Zagrodzky 2/26/24 5:34pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Allison Zagrodzky. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one

reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced [8413 Southwest Parkway](#). This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I

am humbly requesting that you show public support for all “Interested Parties,” Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Allison Zagrodzky

Email from Hajali Patel j 2/26/24 5:34pm

Haji Ellis,

My name is _Hajiali Patel,

. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not

received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

____Haji Patel_____

Email from Joe Williams 2/26/24 5:41pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Dr. Joseph Williams. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2)

. I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one

reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced [8413 Southwest Parkway](#). This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I

am humbly requesting that you show public support for all “Interested Parties,” Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Dr. Joseph Williams

Email from Neil Flores 2/26/24 5:42pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Neil Flores. I am a resident of Travis Country West and an interested party regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for**

Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing,

housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments

non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-**

288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

Neil Flores
8713 Cobblestone
Austin, Tx 78735

Email from Batul Patel 2/26/24 5:44pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is __Batul Patel__. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for

permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced [8413 Southwest Parkway](#). This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the

Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS.**Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

__Batul Patel_____

Email from Carey Burnett 2/26/24 5:49pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Carey Thomas Burnett. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying

Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Carey Burnett | (512) 809-7672
5416 Fort Benton Drive, ATX 78735

Email from Wendy Prabhu 2/26/24 5:38pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Wendy Prabhu and I own a home in Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a

deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)). The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with

abundant steinkerns of *Corbula harveyi* (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Wendy Prabhu

Email from Raj Prabhu 2/26/24 6:17pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Raj Prabhu and I own a home in Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or

recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413

Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)). The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of *Corbula harveyi* (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental

Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Raj Prabhu

Email from Ricardo Vilorio 2/26/24 6:30pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Ricardo Vilorio. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue

that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed

to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Ricardo Vilorio

8520 Cobblestone Dr.
Austin, Texas 78735

Email from 2/26/24 6:35pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Darin Mills. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning

Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The

Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill

Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Darin Mills
5821 Sunset Rdg
Austin, TX 78735

Email from Lori McKey 2/26/24 7:08pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Lori McKey. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed

density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes

- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community

stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this

case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Lori McKey

Email from David McKey 2/26/24 7:18pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is David McKey. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution [20110113-040](#), which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case

C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced [8413 Southwest Parkway](#). This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

David McKey

Email from Matthan Myers 2/26/24 7:21pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Matthan Myers. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account

address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Best,

Matthan Myers

Email from Andrie Cantu 2/26/24 7:22pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Andrie Cantu. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission this Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest,

challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon

and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly

requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Andrie Cantu

Email from Verlaine MacClements 2/26/24 7:27pm

My name is Verlaine MacClements. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement**

request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced [8413 Southwest Parkway](#). This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding

any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Verlaine MacClements

Email from Jonathan MacClements 2/26/24 7:31pm

My name is Jonathan MacClements. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great

consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the

properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced [8413 Southwest Parkway](#). This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties

received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to,

the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Jonathan MacClements

Email from Eric Logue-Sargeant 2/26/24 7:36pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Eric Logue-Sargeant. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Eric Logue-Sargeant

Email from Dayna Svatek 2/26/24 8:02pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Dayna Svatek. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The**

Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00**p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Patty Gibson 2/26/24 8:10pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Patricia Gibson and I called your office this afternoon. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Ms. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following

areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced [8413 Southwest Parkway](#). This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country

Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning**

Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m. I appreciate your prompt attention to this very important matter for citizens that live in your district.

Email from Donna Clement 2/26/24 8:12pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Donna Clement. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission this Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support,

- protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Homeowners Association was not contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and gave a breakdown of what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced [8413 Southwest Parkway](#). This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments

submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stair step topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of

Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Donna Clement

5816 Medicine Creek Drive

Austin, Tx 78735

Email from Robert Anderson 2/26/24 8:23pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Robert Anderson. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support,

protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413

Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Corbula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold

Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,
Robert C Anderson

Email from Erin Modde 2/26/24 8:25pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Erin Modde. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding. I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity to analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith

communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/23** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to

Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Erin Modde

Email from Hunter Beck 2/26/24 8:32pm

Paige,

My name is Hunter Beck. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes

- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country

Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Hunter Beck

Email from Don Modde 2/26/24 8:34pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Don Modde. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for

integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/23** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received

on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming staircase topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to

soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were not required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please**

publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m. Sincerely,

Don Modde

Email from David Pollard 2/26/24 8:39pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is David Pollard. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for**

Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing,

housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments

non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-**

288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,
David Pollard

8009 Cobblestone

Austin, TX 78735

Email from Melinda Knight 2/26/24 9:04pm

Dear Ms.Ellis,

My name is Melinda Knight. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2), to which I am an interested party. I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the

part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community

stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan.

Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties:

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Thank you.

Melinda Knight

330.565.0238

Email from Andy Moore 2/26/24 9:05pm
Paige Ellis,

My name is Andy Moore. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing has its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

This postponement should be granted specifically because if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders:The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were not required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing has its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS.

Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

Email from Xavier Ayrault 2/26/24 9:16pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Xavier Ayrault. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations, and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity to analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge, or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “Do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regard to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In the Fall of 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials, and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T.

Housing Financing and broke down what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective within the 438-unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) which should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day before the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997. The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)) The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming staircase topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and the Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Xavier Ayrault

Email from Bill Sealy 2/26/24 9:17pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is William Sealy. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413

Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams

sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders:

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

William Sealy

Email from Michelle Suydam 2/26/24 9:29pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as

evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see the attached photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23.

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home-Owners Association was not contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding

the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet. "

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Michelle Suydam

Email from Orion Suydam 2/26/24 9:00pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see the attached photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23.

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home-Owners Association was not contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project

was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet. "

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Orion Suydam

Email from Panayiotis Lambropoulo 2/26/24 9:57pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Panayiotis Lambropoulos. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The

Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of

rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Email from Crystal Ebert 2/26/24 10:13pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Crystal Ebert. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as

evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations

included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective within the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))
 The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,
 Crystal Ebert

Email from Matt Waldbaum 2/26/24 10:21pm
 Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Matt Waldbaum. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you

that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes

- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-

85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question,

The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997. The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)) The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Matt Waldbaum

--

Matt Waldbaum

Email from Chaoming Zhang 2/26/24 10:21pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a

rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see the attached photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23.

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home-Owners Association was not contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming staircase topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of *Corbula harveyi* (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet. "

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Chaoming Zhang

Email from Can Liu 2/26/24 10:26pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see the attached photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23.

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home-Owners Association was not contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Corbula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet. "

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission

hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Can Liu

Email from Peter Joseph 2/26/24 10:31pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Peter Joseph. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before

the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing

projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a

deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors,

the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Rami Mutyala 2/26/24 10:37pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is RAMI MUTYALA. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of

Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update

“interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City

Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Thanks & Regards,
Rami Mutyala

Email from Peter Narvarte 2/26/24 11:52pm

My name is Peter Narvarte and I am a resident of Travis Country West. My HOA has brought this Zoning case to my attention so I thought I would research the details. I work on the development side of the business in Austin so I am familiar with the documents and process. In addition to the basic oversights in official notifications from the City Office I offer the 2 points below to be considered before this decision is approved.

1) When I look through the information I see that Manifold is requesting a change to the Restrictive Covenant to allow a rezoning change BEFORE DSD has had a chance to vet the details. When I read through the first round of comments from DSD entities there are some critical items here that should be vetted before Counsel allows a change to the Restrictive Covenant/Zoning. The comments lead me to realize that the reason this is currently under a restrictive covenant for Office is due to the natural restrictions unique to this location and allowing Multifamily would surely make a number of these issues worse.

2) On top of this, there is a "Determination of Planning Commission" submitted by Armbrust & Brown that is signed and submitted verifying that there is no Approved Neighborhood Plan for this property. This seems incorrect as Ordinance 20161013-025 (amending Ordinance 20081211-096) took effect on October 24, 2016 and encompasses these properties. This NP plan under Part 4 amends Chapter 7 to create bike lanes, sidewalks, and to perform a traffic calming study in my neighborhood, on Sunset Ridge, and on Travis Cook Road. IF they were held responsible by this document, they would have had to file a Neighborhood Plan Amendment PRIOR to submitting this change to the Restrictive Covenant. This is obviously an additional step that could delay their progress significantly and feels like the misstep is on purpose.

Allowing this Restrictive Covenant Change to move from Office Zoning to Multifamily Zoning without the 2 points above being understood or considered would be irresponsible. At a minimum this Developer should be held accountable to meet with the Neighborhood Planning Committee, address Hill Country Ordinance, and meet with their neighbors to understand what our concerns are.

Thanks for reading this, I hope you will support holding this Team responsible and at least postpone this case until the Developer can perform the important diligence necessary to support their case.

Pete
5708 Fort Benton Dr.

Email from Michael Tarsha 2/27/24 12:44am
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Michael Tarsha. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes

and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Devina Do 2/27/24 3:12pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Devina Do. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes

- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the

city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997. The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS.

Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m..

Sincerely,

Devina Do

Email from David Arnold 2/27/24 6:21am

Dear Jonathan Tomko,

My name is David Arnold. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Tomko, given that Councilwoman's husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The

Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of

rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Justin Jensen 2/27/24 7:25am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Justin Jensen. I am a Interested Party regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) and owner of 5415 Travis Cook Rd (PIDs: 103831, 103832, & 103834). These lots total over 11 acres and share an approximately 600 foot border with the subject property, and they are not represented by an HOA.

I know you have received messages from many of my neighbors, and I have included an edited version or their comprehensive letter below to express my unity with their points. My edits mainly point out that these are the views of my lots. And I removed the section reminding you of ethical responsibilities, because I give you the benefit of the doubt that that is not necessary. I also wanted to include the following critical point of my own.

The communication from the City of Austin to the interested parties of this case has been insufficient. Here is a summary of my communication with Site Plan Manager Chris Sapuppo:

12/24 I emailed Chris Sapuppo requesting Site Plan

12/27 His assistant, Mase Cone, replied that he can set up virtual meeting to share site plan. I said ok.

12/28 Mr. Sapuppo said he prefers not to have meeting and to contact my HOA.

12/28 I informed that I am not part of an HOA and would like to see site plan asap.

12/28 He replied that there are too many interested parties and he will have virtual meeting and will notify me when it takes place.

2/7 I requested Site Plan again

2/7 Mr Sapuppo said they can't share it and that they answered these questions in virtual meeting in late January. They did not invite me to the virtual meeting.

2/7 Mr Sapuppo says sorry for not including me, copying the HOA which I have previously informed him I am not part of.

My property shares a larger border with the subject property than any other. It is outrageous that I am not included on all interested party communications regarding this development. This development could have a significant impact on my farm, livelihood, and the local ecology and wildlife that I have worked very hard to protect. I do not take this lightly.

Please postpone this restricted covenant agreement hearing.

Thank you,
Justin Jensen
5415 Travis Cook Rd
713-416-8282

I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that my voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support.

Although Affordable Housing has its merits, the proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has no place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

My neighbors have requested a postponement that will go to a discussion before the The City Planning Commission this Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great

consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes

Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in a well-documented timeline.

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

- 1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

I was not contacted before or after 12/08/23 when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway.

On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413

Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than 01/10/24. These documents were dated 12/20/23.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November 0f 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on 01/17/24. This document was dated 01/12/24. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on 01/18/24.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on 01/19/24 where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on 01/19/24. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on 02/07/24, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on 01/19/24 & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of November, 2023. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of 09/20/23, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24 and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on

2/7/24, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. Affordable Housing has its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all “Interested Parties,” Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Email from Helen Logue 2/27 7:43am

- Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is __Helen Logue_____. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before

the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing

projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous

communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental

Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Joshua Gindele
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Joshua Gindele I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed**

Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

Joshua Gindele

Email from Caryn Rippstein 2/27/24 8:20am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Caryn Rippstein. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for**

Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing,

housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments

non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-**

288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

Caryn Bland Rippstein

5800 Sunset Ridge

Email from Jame Do 2/27/24 8:34pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is James Do. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common

themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing

everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997. The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming staircase topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and

City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community

stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between

parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS.

Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m..

Sincerely,

Do Family

Email from Amanda Ewers 2/27/24 8:43am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Amanda Ewers. I am a homeowner and resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers.

Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-

288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file

regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS.

Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

Dylan and Amanda Ewers

Email from Chris Newport 2/27/24 9:00am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Chris Newport. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging

communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after 12/08/23 when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than 01/10/24. These documents were dated 12/20/23.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on 01/17/24. This documented was dated 01/12/24. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on 01/18/24.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on 01/19/24 where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything

to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on 01/19/24. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on 02/07/24, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on 01/19/24 & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of November, 2023. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of 09/20/23, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)) The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Corbula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stair step topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."


This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24 and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,



Chris Newport
806.438.0281

Email from Gregg Gill 2/27/24 9:04am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is GREGG A. GILL. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case#: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case#: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes lo fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case#: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 1217123:

Our neighborhood is entitled lo one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C 14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 • C 14-85-288 .166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the fetter of the Jaw. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case#: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case# C14- 85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after 12/08/23 when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file#: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023--0448C.SH that referenced 6413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than 01/10/24. These documents were dated 12/20/23.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that

this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on 01/17/24. This documented was dated 01/12/24. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding#: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on 01/18/24.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on 01/19/24 where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address

"Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress/ Egress Codes. Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on 01/19/24. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on 02/07/24, regarding case#: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case#: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on 01/19/24 & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of November, 2023. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of 09/20/23, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))
 The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Corbula bed C. alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography: limestone aphanitic to fine-grained. hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic. and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; Lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C. with abundant steinkerns or Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet. "Thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24 and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress & Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case#. C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case#: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24. as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes

and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C 14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all

"Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 • C14-85-288.166(RCA2) • Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment • Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

 RICHARD TUFTON

Email from Richard Tufton 2/27/24 9:12am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Richard Tufton. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers.

Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after 12/08/23 when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than 01/10/24. These documents were dated 12/20/23.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on 01/17/24. This documented was dated 01/12/24. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on 01/18/24.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on 01/19/24 where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on 01/19/24. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on 02/07/24, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case

#: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on 01/19/24 & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of November, 2023. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of 09/20/23, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)) The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of *Corbula harveyi* (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24 and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders:

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties:

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,
Richard Tufton

Email from Sarah Harris 2/27/24 9:14am
Dear Ms. Ellis,

My name is Sarah Harris. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission today (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it

comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see the attached photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23.

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Ms. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted

to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City

Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Sarah Harris

Email from Gabriel Carrillo 2/27/24 9:20am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Erik Gabriel Carrillo. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning

Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The

Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon

and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 4 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City

Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held today, Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Erik Gabriel Carrillo

Email from Sheila Anderson 2/27/24 9:23am

Dear Paige Ellis,

In addition to the concerns listed below in my email from yesterday, I would like to add another to the list. On July 27, 2023 I observed and photographed a Federally Endangered Golden-cheeked Warbler in my backyard. I live within 500 feet of this proposed development in Travis Country West, so as an interested party I am urging a postponement until a Golden-cheeked Warbler study can be completed on the Sunset Ridge property in question.



Sincerely,

Sheila Anderson

Email from Annie Coleman 2/27/24 9:42am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Annie Coleman. I am a senior resident of Travis Country West with security and environmental concerns about the subject below. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that

the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Keena Chung 2/27/24 9:44am
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Keena Ennis Chung, and I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City of Austin Case Managers.

Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West HomeOwners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file

regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)) The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as

"Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Corbula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming staircase topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were not required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**
Sincerely,

Keena Ennis Chung

• • •

Keena E. Chung, MSN, RN, CFNP, CPNP-AC
Nurse Practitioner

Email from Peter Chung 2/27/24 9:11am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Peter Chung, and I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City of Austin Case Managers.

Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes

- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West HomeOwners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This document was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)) The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as

"Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Corbula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were not required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Peter Chung

Email from Catalina Wise 2/27/24 10:13am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Catalina. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before

the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case

C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received

on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders:The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors,

the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Paulina Wise 2/27/24 10:35am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Paulina Wise. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning

Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132 Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing,

housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after 12/08/23 when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than 01/10/24. These documents were dated 12/20/23.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on 01/17/24. This documented was dated 01/12/24. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on 01/18/24.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on 01/19/24 where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on 01/19/24. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on 02/07/24, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on 01/19/24 & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of November, 2023. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of 09/20/23, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)) The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24 and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,
Paulina Wise

Email from Jeanne Douthitt 2/27/24 11:46am
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is __Jeanne Douthitt__. I am a resident of District 8. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree

Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-

288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.** Sincerely,

Email from Belle Bybel 2/27/24 11:59am

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Belle Bybel. I am a long time resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a **well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers.** Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The safety of the residents of Travis Country West will be negatively impacted by this development. We are a small neighborhood that does not have the infrastructure (roadways) to support additional traffic. For years we have asked the city for assistance in traffic mitigation and it has fallen on deaf ears. We have a significant issue with "cut through" traffic that would only drastically increase with this development. If your answer is public transit, then you are

mistaken. The closest bus station is an almost 30 minute walk on roadways with NO SIDEWALKS!!! I wish we could utilize public transit, but there is NO SAFE way to do so. Assuming public transit is viable options for future residents is misguided and negligent. Bottom line, there is no SAFE public transit option near our neighborhood OR this potential development. PLEASE come see for yourself. Also, we have already experienced MANY close calls, near misses and actual vehicle incidents due to the level of traffic. It is a matter of time before someone is seriously hurt. By supporting this development you would be supporting increased traffic through our neighborhood thus endangering the lives in our community, members of your district.

Further, the facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after 12/08/23 when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than 01/10/24. These documents were dated 12/20/23.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on 01/17/24. This documented was dated 01/12/24. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on 01/18/24. This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on 01/19/24 where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on 01/19/24. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on 02/07/24, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on 01/19/24 & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of November, 2023. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of 09/20/23, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as

"Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24 and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were not required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties,"

Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,
Belle Bybel

Email from Rachel Carson 2/27/24 12:15pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Rachel Carson. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes

- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

- 1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after 12/08/23 when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than 01/10/24. These documents were dated 12/20/23.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on 01/17/24. This documented was dated 01/12/24. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on 01/18/24.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on 01/19/24 where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on 01/19/24. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on 02/07/24, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on 01/19/24 & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of November, 2023. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of 09/20/23, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24 and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case

that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,
Rachel Carson

Email from Jarrod Ekwurzel 2/27/24 12:32pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Jarrod Ekwurzel. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying

Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Jarrold Ekwurzel

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: C14-85-288.166(RCA2)

Contact: Jonathan Tomko, 512-974-1057

Public Hearing: February 27, 2024, Planning Commission

Michael Holman

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

5704 Sunset Rdg, Austin, TX 78735

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

[Signature]

Signature

2/22/24

Date

Daytime Telephone (Optional): _____

Comments: I object to the amendment of the 1987

Restrictive Covenant. Concerns:

- Negative impact on surrounding environment;
- Multi-family housing adjacent to single-family housing;
- Compromised safety resulting from increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic;
- Reduced value to adjacent single-family property.

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

City of Austin, Planning Department

Jonathan Tomko

P. O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767

Or email to:

jonathan.tomko@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: C14-85-288.166(RCA2)

Contact: Jonathan Tomko, 512-974-1057

Public Hearing: February 27, 2024, Planning Commission

Jane Holzman

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

5704 Sunset Rdg, Austin, TX 78735

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

Jane Holzman

Signature

2/22/2024

Date

Daytime Telephone (Optional): 512 422-5054

Comments: I object to the amendment of the 1987 Restrictive Covenant. Concerns:

- Negative impact on surrounding environment;
- Multi-family housing adjacent to single-family housing;
- Compromised safety resulting from increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic;
- Reduced value to adjacent single-family property;

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

City of Austin, Planning Department

Jonathan Tomko

P. O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767

Or email to:

jonathan.tomko@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: C14-85-288.166(RCA2)

Contact: Jonathan Tomko, 512-974-1057

Public Hearing: March 26, 2024, Planning Commission

Public Hearing: April 4, 2024, City Council

Bryan Lorello

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

5513 Fort Benton Drive, Austin, TX 78735

Your address(es) affected by this application

[Signature]

Signature

3/20/24

Date

Daytime Telephone: 512-426-5057

Comments: Environmental concerns over construction

Concerns over added congestion on SWPW, along w/
danger of cut-through of cars in Travis County West
Neighborhood.

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

City of Austin - Planning Department

Jonathan Tomko

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-8810

Or email to:

jonathan.tomko@austintexas.gov

02/27/24 12:59PM

Hello Mr. Tomko,

I have already sent a message requesting postponement of Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I have been left off of interested party communications despite being the direct neighbor and contacting the Site Plan Manager to be added as an interested party. I need time to coordinate with my council.

If postponement is denied, I would like to be added as a speaker at tonight's meeting, and I have included my presentation in both PDF and PowerPoint formats.

Additionally, can you please help to make sure I am included in future communications regarding this case?

Please confirm receipt, and thank you for your help!

Sincerely,
Justin Jensen
713-416-8282
5415 Travis Cook Road
PIDs: 103831, 103832, & 103834

2/27/24 1:00pm

Dear Council Member Ellis,

This is Levente and Jeff McCrary. We are residents of the Travis Country West neighborhood.

This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level. Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24).

Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a

photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23: Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West. This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following: • Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132 • Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes • Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections • Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology." The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline: In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down: 1.)

Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin): The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after 12/08/23 when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework. On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than 01/10/24. These documents were dated 12/20/23. When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024. As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on 01/17/24. This documented was dated 01/12/24. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on 01/18/24. This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on 01/19/24 where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on 01/19/24. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on 02/07/24, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on 01/19/24 & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of November, 2023. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of 09/20/23, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological

Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain: 3.2 Site Geology Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997. The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u)) The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of *Corbula harveyi* (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet." thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet." This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24 and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice. 2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice. In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. Please publicly support the

postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,
Levente and Jeff McCrary

2/27/24 1:18pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Javier Cantu. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared

boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

- 1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before

or after 12/08/23 when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On 12/23/24 some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than 01/10/24. These documents were dated 12/20/23.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on 01/17/24. This documented was dated 01/12/24. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on 01/18/24.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on 01/19/24 where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on 01/19/24. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on 02/07/24, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree

Survey, requested on 01/19/24 & again on 02/07/24, until 3 days ago on 02/23/24. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of November, 2023. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of 09/20/23, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on 02/07/24 and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to

Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on 2/7/24, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.

Sincerely,
Javier Cantu
2/27/24 1:20pm
Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Eric Schank. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest,

challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say

that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree

Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Corbula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of

rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Eric Schank

2/27/24 1:38pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

I'm Doug Duke, and I'm a a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission tonight. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that

referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held tonight, Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Doug Duke

(512) 423-9663

8009 Cobblestone

Austin, Texas 78735

2/27/24 2:08pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Ryma Biederman. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully -

Ryma Biederman

2/27/24 2:55pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Michael Glenn. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Michael A. Glenn
4624 Peralta Lane
Austin, TX 78735

2/27/24 2:56pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Jeffrey Straathof. I am a resident in Amarra that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Jeffrey Straathof
4517 Amarra Dr
Austin, TX 78735

2/27/24 2:56pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Rosendo Parra. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Rosendo Parra

02/27/24 2:59pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Ginger Douglas and I am a resident in Amarra that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,
Ginger Douglas

2/27/24 3:03pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Chuck Harris. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community

dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Chuck Harris

2/27/24 3:04pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Chuck Harris. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Chuck Harris

2/27/24 3:08pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Paul Tucker. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request**

for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Paul Tucker M.D.
Texas Heart & Vascular
Office voicemail :512-623-5398

2/27/24 3:08pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Michael Puzio, I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes

- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Michael Puzio
4601 Peralta

2/27/24 3:14pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is johanne ferland. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,
GREG KOZICZ
 Chairman of the Board | Alberici Corporation

2/27/24 3:20pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Chris Warren. I am a resident in Amarra that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Chris Warren

2/27/24 3:36pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

Our names are Doug and Susan Hinzle. We are residents of the Amarra Drive neighborhood that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood

organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

We respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Doug and Susan Hinzle
8416 Valerio Dr
Austin, TX 78735

2/27/24 3:46pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Kristen Alexandrov and I own the property at 8700 Southwest Parkway, near the proposed Sunset Ridge development (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest,

challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,
Kristen Alexandrov

2/27/24 3:54pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Molly Adams. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Molly Adams

2/27/24 3:55pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Sofia Wise. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from

the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the

letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the

restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Sofia Wise

2/27/24 3:57

Dear Council Member

My name is Gary Urano. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and

extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Gary Urano
8616 Acuarela Ct
Austin, TX 78735

2/27/24 3:58pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Julie Yarbrough. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: **C14-85-288.166(RCA2)**. I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill

Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as

"Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress

Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,
Julie Yarbrough
5809 Medicine Creek Dr
Austin, TX 78735

2/27/24 4:07pm
Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Lauren Zima. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing to notify you that our voices and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard.

No development of this proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. **A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case deserves fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment.**

This postponement should be granted because of a well-documented lack of communication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity to analyze the proposed and restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

I respectfully request your support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Thank you,
Lauren Zima

2/27/24 4:13pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Tamra Harris. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that **our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.**

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account

address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Tamra Harris

2/27/24 4:14pm

Dear Mr. Tomko,

My name is Laura Perlman. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution [20110113-040](#), which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Laura Perlman

2/27/24 4:16pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Jeff Turk. I live on Peralta Lane in the Amarra neighborhood, directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support.

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as **notification of this meeting was not provided to all**

residents within 500 feet of the proposed development as required by City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132 and state notification laws. Despite the fact the city's code has not been followed, postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code.

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

--Jeff Turk

Jeff Turk
Chairman

2/27/24 4:17pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Steve Kelly. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I

am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research

and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

__Steve Kelly__

2/27/24 4:17pm

Dear Council Members,

My name is Charlene Key. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have

great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Charlene Key

Charlene M. Key, Ph.D.

2/27/24 4:18pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is __Beverly Kelly__. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account

address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

_Beverly Kelly__

2/27/24 4:18pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel,

My name is Sean Toney. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Sean Toney

2/27/24 4:24pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Maureen Martin. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City

Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

William and Maureen Martin
8600 Carranzo Dr
Austin 78735

2/27/24 4:27pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Diana Puzio. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Diana Puzio
915-383-0154

2/27/24 4:29pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Stephen Potts. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood

organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Stephen R. Potts
4716 Amarra Drive

2/27/24 4:33pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Michael Beaumont. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue

that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Michael Beaumont

2/27/24 4:40pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

We are Margie & Pedro Diaz --residents in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). We are writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such

postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA

are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

We respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

2/27/24 4:40pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Kim Pryor. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

No proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:



This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should also be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest,

challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to the Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say

that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree

Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Corbula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of

rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved

planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS. **Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,

Kim Pryor

2/27/24 4:52pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Patricia Mancl. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and

extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Patricia Mancil

2/27/24 4:52pm

My name is Krista Thomas. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request**

for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Krista Thomas

2/27/24 4:54pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is _Ava Blair_____. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

____Ava Blair_____

2/27/24 4:55pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is ___Tyson Blair_____. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

____Tyson Blair_____

2/27/24 4:57pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Heather Kasten. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association

of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Heather Kasten

2/27/24 4:58pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Dave Mancl. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement

request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Dave Mancl

2/27/24 5:03pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Frederic GUERARD. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest,

challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections

- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Frederic GUERARD

2/27/24 5:05pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Melinda Grace. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Guy and Melinda Grace
4517 Peralta Ln.
Austin, Texas 78735

Melinda Grace

2/27/24 5:25pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Francois Du Pasquier I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not

provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution [20110113-040](#), which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Francois Du Pasquier

2/27/24 5:26pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is __Cecil Christensen_____. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,
Cecil Christensen

2/27/24 5:52pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Joan Dumais. I am a resident of Travis Country West on Cobblestone. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question "do the facts meet the code - and that's calling balls and strikes. That's not any sort of political ideology."

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an "interested party" no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had "site control" in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis Country West HOA was never notified regarding

any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered "interested parties" have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update "interested parties" in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address "Interested Party" questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with "we are doing everything to meet City Code," which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin

Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997.

The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and

marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming

stairstep topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include

molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more

dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more

massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula

harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City

Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS.

Thank you!

Joan Dumais
8205 Cobblestone
Austin, TX 78735

2/28/24 8:00am

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Erika Blankenship. I am a resident in Amarra Drive that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that

is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association

of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Erika Blankenship

2/28/24 12:31pm

Dear Paige Ellis,

My name is Alan Do. I am a resident of Travis Country West. This email is regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Our official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

Our neighborhood is entitled to one postponement. That postponement has been requested and will go to a postponement discussion before the The City Planning Commission This Tuesday (2/27/24). Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the city. Please see a photograph of the sign posted on the East parcel of case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) on 12/7/23:

This postponement should be granted specifically because, if the Restrictive Covenant Amendment were to pass with the Planning Commission, then case

#: C14-85-288.166(RCA2) would receive one reading before the City Council with no ability to create a valid petition for The Neighbors Of Travis Country West.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132
- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

Mrs. Ellis, given that your husband Edward Espinosa was appointed to The Ethics Commission by Mayor Kirk Watson, please ensure that our voice is measured within the letter of the law. Please support all City Code and City Ordinances that govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). Edward Espinosa was quoted as saying that The Ethics Commission is about answering the question “do the facts meet the code - and that’s calling balls and strikes. That’s not any sort of political ideology.”

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments with regards to the following in a well-documented timeline:

In Fall 2011, the City conducted meetings to engage community participants in discussions on expectations related to a community engagement plan and process among proposed affordable housing developers, City officials and area stakeholders. Participants in the discussions included neighborhood leaders, tenants of permanent supportive housing, housing developers, service providers, and members of business and faith communities. Common themes for desired outcomes in the above conversations included the following areas where Manifold Investments and the City Of Austin have let our community and many other constituents of District 8 down:

1.) Transparency of information about a proposed development (whether provided by the developer or the City of Austin):

The Travis Country West Home Owners Association was not contacted nor contacted before or after **12/08/23** when Zoning Change signage of a Public Hearing referenced file #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) regarding 8401 & 8401 ½ Southwest Parkway. When Nancy Estrada was contacted, she had very little information regarding the application. She could only say that the applicant had applied for S.M.A.R.T. Housing Financing and breakdown what that would look like from an affordable housing perspective with-in the 438 Unit framework.

On **12/23/24** some residents of Travis Country West began receiving a Notice Of Filing Of Administrative Approval Of Site Plan under Case #: SP-2023-0448C.SH that referenced 8413 Southwest Parkway. This document had a deadline to register as an “interested party” no later than **01/10/24**. These documents were dated **12/20/23**.

When Site Plan Manager, Chris Sapuppo and Assistant Site Plan Manager, Mase Cone were contacted, they were pushing a narrative that nothing would happen anytime soon and that this project was years away. The application that Manifold Investments submitted to the city indicated they had “site control” in November Of 2023, and that they intend to break ground for this project in September of 2024.

As the Travis Country West Community attempted to organize, a new Notice Of Filing Of Application for Commission Approval Of A Site Plan Hill Country Roadway was received on **01/17/24**. This documented was dated **01/12/24**. The new notice no longer included a deadline. The Travis

Country West HOA was never notified regarding any erroneous communications from the city. To further complicate matters, throughout this entire process, numerous registered “interested parties” have been left off of e-mails and/or not received official communications. Chris Sapuppo did not update “interested parties” in the case file regarding #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) that should have been available under The Freedom Of Information Act until requested to do so on **01/18/24**.

This was one day prior to the scheduled meeting on **01/19/24** where Manifold Investments was scheduled to address “Interested Party” questions. Manifold Investments non-answered nearly every question with “we are doing everything to meet City Code,” which has been found to be false on issues including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements.

Moreover, a Tree Survey was requested on **01/19/24**. No Interested Parties received a tree study before the Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24**, at which time a Tree Survey was again requested. Further, no Interested Parties were notified about The Environmental Commission Meeting discussion on **02/07/24**, regarding case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA), to amend the Restrictive Deed Covenant associated with the East parcel. Although, the public was notified of a Zoning Change regarding the property in question, The Environmental Commissioners indicated that no notification was required because case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is not a Zoning Case. No Interested Parties received the Tree Survey, requested on **01/19/24** & again on **02/07/24**, until 3 days ago on **02/23/24**. The Tree Survey Document has a preparation date of **November, 2023**. The accompanying Environmental Resources Inventory has a preparation date of **09/20/23**, and screams sinkhole / Karst Formations when considering this is the site of Canyon Springs noted on the U.S. Geological Survey and the following information is known regarding the terrain:

3.2 Site Geology

Geological information pertaining to the area was obtained from the Geologic Atlas of Texas, Austin Sheet, published by University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology (BEG) (Figure 4), 1997. The subject property is situated on the Glen Rose Formation, upper (Kgr(u))

The Bureau of Economic Geology defines Glen Rose Formation (Kgr(u)), as "Limestone, dolomite, and marl subdivided into two units by Cobula bed C; alternating resistant and recessive beds forming staircase topography; limestone aphanitic to fine-grained, hard to soft and marly, light gray to

yellowish gray; dolomite; fine-grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include molluscan steinkerns, rudistids, oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic, and less fossiliferous than the lower part, thickness about 220 feet; lower part more massive and about 160 feet thick, includes at top Corbula bed, C, with abundant steinkerns of Corbula harveyi (hill) in an interval up to 5 feet thick; thickness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."ckness of Glen Rose Formation 380+/- feet."

This information should have been given as requested prior to The Environmental Commission Meeting on **02/07/24** and is grounds for a postponement, in addition to, the disregard of numerous other City Codes and City Ordinances including, but not limited to Hill Country Roadway Ordinances, Impervious Coverage Codes, Ingress / Egress Codes, Traffic Impact Analysis, and S.M.A.R.T. Housing Application Requirements. Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) is a rezoning case that does not have to follow the rules and regulations of rezoning up to this point and any opposition to this development is not being given a voice.

2.) Consistency with existing neighborhood plans and other city-approved planning documents designed by community

stakeholders: The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant in Case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA) are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

3.) Effective and predictable methods of communication between

parties: Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs alliance. Because this is now not being considered a rezoning case, The City Of Austin and Manifold Investments were have not been required to notify residents of the Environmental Commission hearing that took place on **2/7/24**, as well as, many other aspects of due process that have been averted. We deserve due process and a voice.

In conclusion, my concerns pertaining to the proposed Sunset Ridge Apartments are non-partisan policy issues. My official position on this matter is that although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that

govern the properties in case #: C14-85-288.166(RCA2). I am humbly requesting that you show public support for all "Interested Parties," Neighbors Of Travis Country West, Neighbors Of Barton Creek Southwest, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS.

Please publicly support the postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Restrictive Deed Covenant Amendment - Sunset Ridge at The Planning Commission Meeting to be held Tuesday, February 27th at 6:00 p.m..

Sincerely,

Alan Do

2/28/24 3:43pm

Dear Council Member Ellis and Commissioner Hempel -

My name is Paula Collins, my husband Michael Collins and I, are resident in Amarra Drive (4624 Amarra) that is directly across the street from the proposed Sunset Ride Apartments (Case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2)). I am writing with the greatest sense of urgency to notify you that our voice and those of surrounding neighborhoods are not being heard. We need your support at the city level.

Although Affordable Housing may have its merits, no proposed multi-family development of the proposed density, size, and scope has a place in this protected and extremely environmentally sensitive region as evidenced by the City Codes and Ordinances that govern the properties in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2).

The case is planned on the agenda of the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 27th. A postponement has been requested as notification of this meeting was not provided to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed development. However, such postponement has been opposed by the Applicant. Our case is unique and must have great consideration when it comes to fair and due process as it is a rezoning case that is being presented as a Restrictive Covenant Amendment. Evidence that this is a rezoning case comes directly from the City.

This postponement should be granted specifically because of a well-documented lack of communication and general miscommunication on the part of both Manifold Investments and City Of Austin Case Managers. **Key reasons to grant a postponement request for Agenda Item #21 - C14-85-288.166(RCA2) - Sunset Ridge include, but are not limited to the following:**

- Failure to provide notice not later than the 11th day before the date of the hearing to all property owners within 500 feet, residents who have a City utility account address within 500 feet, and registered environmental or neighborhood

organizations whose declared boundaries are within 500 feet as per City of Austin Land Development Code § 25-1-132

- Affected residents, neighborhood organizations and environmental organizations have not had sufficient opportunity analyze such proposed restrictive covenant changes
- Proceeding on this agenda item with such a defect in state-mandated written notice statutes prevents the opportunity for interested parties to support, protest, challenge or recommend changes to such restrictive covenant amendments without affording these protections
- Failure to follow the mandatory notice requirements would render any actions void under Chapter 211 of the Local Government Code

The facts of this case will show that The Good Neighbor Policy, offered in response to Austin City Council resolution 20110113-040, which called for a broad community dialogue that includes stakeholders from neighborhoods to establish successful approaches for integrating affordable housing throughout the city, has been completely disregarded in case # C14-85-288.166(RCA2). The resolution that called for research and reporting on best practices in engaging communities and building support for permanent supportive housing projects has been repeatedly disregarded by The City of Austin and Manifold Investments in well-documented events.

The requests to amend the restrictive deed covenant are not in line with the Oak Hill Neighborhood Plan, nor are they in line with The Imagine Austin Comprehensive City Plan. Southwest Parkway is a Hill Country Roadway that is not an Imagine Austin Corridor.

Due to the methodology employed by Manifold Investments, this case will not go before the City Council. The Travis Country West HOA, and The Barton Creek Southwest HOA are opposed to this development. They have the full support of the Oak Hill Association of Neighbors, the Oak Hill Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, and Save Our Springs Alliance.

In conclusion, there needs to be due process and meaningful neighborhood engagement with any such developments affecting the delicate ecosystem of this Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone that serves as a haven for local wildlife and endangered species.

I respectfully request your public support for all the Interested Parties, Neighbors Of Amarra Drive, Travis Country West, OHAN, OHNPCT, and SOS in the postponement request such that neighbors can be sufficiently engaged and provided an opportunity to analyze such proposed changes.

Respectfully,

Paula & Michael Collins

2/28/24 4:12pm

PC Item 21, Leigh Ziegler Chair, OHNPCT February 27, 2024

Postponement is requested since so much remains in the dark relative to the RC Revision. This is a poor premise to claim equity and a particularly inappropriate derailment of the process to get Residential Use in an OFFICE designated Neighborhood Plan- otherwise, not allowed.

One can only hope any change to a restrictive covenant would serve to balance goals from the Future Land Use Map with a well designed project. This revision truly addresses not 1 but 2 tracts both with non-conforming land use which should be reviewed jointly to proceed effectively in revision.

Clearly, the project fails to meet criterion necessary to enable a Compact Connected lifestyle required for any application that meets affordability unlocked and achieves Smart Housing.

There is no available transit planned for this project, no access to groceries or events without having full use of a car. Affordability unlocked does not apply.

It seems irresponsible that this location is not being seen for its geologic features and constraints- like blind roadway access and surrounding location. Current evaluation is under the guise of affordability- a showcase to get 438 residential units quickly and inappropriately applied to the current Office designation.

The area is marked by significant MF housing. This would decrease safety on a limited capacity road bounded by limestone ridges, rimrock and drop-offs- without area for expansion. This is undeniably delinquent to the safety of existing and new residents.

A back door approach without appropriate review and detail includes failure to allow interested parties review of the current file application in person in advance despite formal review status.

For this reason alone a postponement is in order.

2/29/24 6:20pm

Chris Sapuppo and Jonathan Tomko:

I have many questions that the case file may address. It is inappropriate to do a PIR as an interested party especially since the case will be advanced before that is fulfilled and most importantly, the notice includes case review by appointment with the Case Assistant, Mase Cone. I did request it of both of you so that you would be informed and have the opportunity to direct staff. I am unclear about any deviation from this practice. In any case I would also like to learn the details of changes made regarding the IP zoning status under the OFFICE land use of tract 1 being reviewed by Planning Commission and the basis for those changes. I have seen the drainage notes but there is no topo map or identification of change in drainage from the Barton Watershed to the Williamson Creek Watershed if that is in fact the case. I just want to get some facts correct before advancement of this project.

Perhaps you can address the above concerns while I attempt to sort out the disclosure process out from my end.

Thank you,

Leigh

3/1/24 12:57pm

From Jonathan Tomko

To: Leigh Ziegler

Hi Leigh,

I apologize it has taken me so long to get back to you, I have a heavy caseload and I wanted to do some more research before getting back to you so I could be comprehensive. I'm not sure who Chandler is, he is not a reviewer on either the rezoning case or the associated site plan review. Both the zoning case and the site plan review are completely different processes and, in this case, as is sometimes the case, concurrent processes.

This is the history on this piece of property as I understand it:

September 17, 1987 - by [Ordinance No. 870917-D](#) the base zoning was changed from Interim RR (Rural Residence District) to IP (Industrial Park).

June 10, 2010 - Council unanimously approved an amendment to a portion of the restrictive covenant through [C14-85-288.166\(RCA\)](#) as it relates to certain uses and development standards, Zoning was changed from IP-NP to GO-NP, but then Council ended up approving GO-CO-NP. This was through rezoning case [C14-2010-0042](#) and [Ordinance No. 20100610-059](#). The conditional overlay stipulated 3 things:

A. A site plan or building permit for the Property may not be approved, released, or issued, if the completed development or uses of the Property, considered

cumulatively with all existing or previously authorized development and uses, generate traffic that exceeds 2,200 trips per day.

B. Section 25-2-1025(A) (Natural Area) of the Code is modified:

(1) to allow water quality and detention pond facilities for an office use to count toward fulfillment of the 40 percent natural area requirement; and

(2) to reduce the natural area requirement to 30 percent for a religious assembly use and allow water quality and detention pond facilities to count toward fulfillment of this requirement.

February 27, 2024, now postponed to March 26, 2024 - through a restrictive covenant amendment, (which is a recorded agreement between the City and the applicant) **C14-85-288.166(RCA2)** - Planning Commission will be reviewing the request to amend the RCA as outlined in [redlined RCA](#) attached to the staff report. Concurrently a site plan review is being undertaken: **SPC-2023-0448C.SH**

That's a comprehensive overview. Let me know if you have any other questions.

Jonathan