

From: [Charles d'Harcourt](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Case C814-06-0175.07
Date: Friday, February 6, 2026 11:52:30 AM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear ms. Estrada,

The membership of the Hancock Neighborhood Association has voted to oppose the request in case C814-06-0175.07 to increase the maximum allowable height of the property in question from 160 feet to 270 feet and to allow currently prohibited vehicular access from that property to Concordia Avenue.

We will be presenting the reasons for the opposition at the planning commission meeting where this will be reviewed, which I believe is currently set to be the February 10th meeting.

Please do not hesitate to reach out to me if I have any questions.

Thanks and best regards,

- Charles d'Harcour

Charles d'Harcourt, Hancock Neighborhood Association volunteer and current president
+1 512 484 9625, [REDACTED]

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. For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [Rosie Johnson](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Stepping Stone Schools Opposition Letter Austin Zoning Case # C814-06-0175.07
Date: Tuesday, January 13, 2026 8:17:12 AM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

January 13, 2026

Dear Nancy,

Protecting a Safe and Nurturing Environment for Children

On behalf of **Stepping Stone School**, which has **served the Austin community for more than 45 years**, we **strongly oppose the proposed zoning change** requested by the applicant in **Case Number C814-06-0175.07**. This request—**now for the fourth time**—to **increase the building height from 160 feet to 300 feet** represents a **substantial change** in scale that would significantly alter the surrounding environment. A **development of this magnitude** would increase traffic, noise, and overall activity **in close proximity to a childcare facility serving young children daily**.

As an early childhood education center, **our highest priority is the safety and well-being of the children in our care**. A predictable, low-impact environment is essential to **ensuring that children can rest, learn, and play without disruption**. After careful review, we have several concerns:

1. Height and Scale:

The **proposed near-doubling of the building's original** height to 300 feet is inconsistent with the existing character of the neighborhood. No other buildings in the area approach this scale. Such a dramatic increase would **alter the visual harmony of the community and negatively impact the safety and overall quality of life for current residents, as well as the children and families served by Stepping Stone School**.

2. Traffic and Parking:

The request to remove the vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue would create significant issues in an already congested area. Concordia Avenue currently experiences **high traffic volume**, and parking is prohibited on one side of the street due to its narrow width. Increased density from this project would further **exacerbate traffic congestion and parking challenges**, raising **safety concerns during peak drop-off and pick-up times for both residents and the families we serve**.

3. Waste Management:

The Troubadour apartment complex across the street already places multiple large **dumpsters on Concordia Avenue at least twice weekly**. This practice occupies limited parking space **and frequently results in debris and broken glass on the street**. A larger development would likely intensify these issues, further compromising **safety and cleanliness** in the immediate area.

4. Density and Environmental Impact:

The proposed increase in units and residents would **strain existing infrastructure, increase pollution, and disrupt the residential nature** of the neighborhood. These impacts would negatively affect

children, families, and the broader community.

We support Austin's efforts to address housing challenges; however, development decisions must **carefully consider their impact on existing neighborhoods and facilities that serve young children**. The scale of this proposed project is simply too large for the area and would place disproportionate burdens on the surrounding community, including a long-standing childcare center.

For these reasons, we **respectfully urge the City of Austin to deny the requested zoning changes for 1012 Concordia Avenue**. Thank you for considering the perspective of both a nearby neighbor and a long-standing childcare provider committed to serving Austin families.

Thank you!

Warm regards,

Rosie Johnson

Business & Operations Manager



www.steppingstoneschool.com

1910 Justin Lane | Austin, TX 78757
O: 512-459-0258 F: 512-467-1824

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.

For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

Letter in opposition to 1012 Concordia - C814-06-0175.07

Dear Ms. Estrada,

I wish to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning at 1012 Concordia Avenue.

1. The request fundamentally departs from the Concordia PUD master plan

The site at 1012 Concordia Avenue was originally planned as part of the Concordia Planned Unit Development, with building heights up to approximately 65 feet and a clear intent to manage scale transitions adjacent to existing residential areas. That framework was the result of coordination between the City and surrounding communities and has guided successful development within the PUD to date.

The current request represents the third major height increase for this site, from 65 feet to 120 feet in 2020, to 160 feet in 2023, and now up to 270 feet. A building of this magnitude would be more than four times the height originally planned for the site and would dramatically exceed the scale envisioned by the adopted PUD framework.

2. Incremental height escalation is wrong at this location

A 270-foot building would be the tallest structure in the city outside of downtown, West Campus, and The Domain, and far taller than anything in the surrounding Hancock neighborhood or even the high-density, high-amenity Mueller development, which has no heights near what is being requested.

3. The proposal grants major entitlements without a defined or implementable project

The requested rezoning seeks to grant maximum height entitlements in the absence of a defined or fully planned project. The applicant has acknowledged that plans for a 270-foot building are not yet developed and would only be pursued if the rezoning is approved.

4. The proposal fails to deliver public benefit or advance City priorities

High rises on small sites are challenged to provide meaningful ground floor active uses do to the ground floor infrastructure needed. Mid-rise does not have the ground floor challenges that high rise does.

The site's location immediately adjacent to I-35 places it at the center of a once-in-a-generation opportunity to align land use decisions with the City's broader goals for the I-35 redesign, including improved urban form, connectivity, and long-term community benefit. Development decisions on parcels abutting I-35 will play an outsized role in determining whether this

investment supports those goals or simply locks in isolated intensity without corresponding public benefit. The goal is to connect east and west along I-35, and a potential wall of height will simply divide east and west.

The City already permits towers of this magnitude in areas specifically planned for extreme height and intensity, where zoning anticipates tall buildings, multimodal access, and a full range of services. Granting comparable entitlements in a low-rise, predominantly residential area governed by a PUD framework is neither necessary nor consistent with the City's planning approach, and provides substantial private benefit without corresponding public return.

5. Approval would undermine trust during ongoing comprehensive planning efforts

The City is currently undertaking major updates to its comprehensive planning framework through **City of Austin's** long-range planning efforts, including revisions to the **Imagine Austin** framework. These processes rely on public trust that adopted plans, district frameworks, and negotiated development standards will be respected over time.

Approving a project that so clearly departs from an established PUD master plan, particularly through successive rezoning requests, sends the opposite signal: that even carefully negotiated plans offer no durable guidance. This undermines not only this neighborhood's confidence, but the City's broader ability to engage communities constructively in comprehensive planning going forward.

6. Financial viability is not a planning justification

The applicant has suggested that additional height is required for project viability, citing both financial considerations and the loss of developable land associated with the I-35 expansion. However, private profitability is not a planning criterion. Moreover, the applicant moved forward with this project fully aware of the site's constraints, including the impacts of the I-35 project. These known conditions do not justify a rezoning that so dramatically departs from the adopted planning framework. Increases to entitlements, like this, increases land costs and fuels speculation. This directly works against affordability.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge denial of the requested rezoning and to uphold the integrity of the Concordia PUD framework and the broader planning principles it represents.

Sincerely,
Bart Whatley

From: [Dilawar Syed](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: 270 ft Tower
Date: Saturday, January 31, 2026 5:05:37 PM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Nancy,

I am a faculty at UT Austin. I moved to this neighborhood because of its proximity to campus, walkability, and a thriving new community of neighbors. I am stunned— to put it mildly— to learn that a 270 ft tower will be built right next to my townhouse (1004 Concordia Ave). I just simply cannot imagine how these small streets will handle thousands of journeys of new residents, seriously jeopardizing commutes and safety of residents. This proposed construction also destroys the character of this neighborhood.

It is also disturbing that the developer has dramatically changed the scope of this project after getting an initial approval. As an Austin resident, I find that disingenuous and a breach of trust in planning decisions made by the commission and the city council.

Would the planning commission have approved a 25-30 floor tower when the developer first sought the approval?

I am supportive of more housing but without destroying the quality of life of all residents— present and future— and jeopardizing their public safety.

Thank you for communicating my concerns to the commission.

Dilawar Syed
(650) 521 4760

Dilawar Syed

Senior Economic Policy Advisor & Faculty
The LBJ School of Public Affairs & McCombs School of Business, UT Austin
Former Deputy Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration
Former Special Representative for Commercial Affairs, U.S. Department of State
(650) 521 4760 [REDACTED] | [LinkedIn](#)

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.

For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at
"cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [Gregory Buchanan](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rezoning and High-Rise Development Adjacent to Our Townhouse
Date: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 9:20:50 AM

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Estrada,

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rezoning and development of the property adjacent to my townhouse, which would allow for construction of a building approximately 270 in feet tall.

I am deeply concerned that this project is out of scale with the existing neighborhood and will significantly alter the character of what has long been a quiet, low-density residential area. A structure of this height is inconsistent with surrounding development and would have lasting impacts on residents who chose this neighborhood for its livability and sense of community.

In addition, the proposed development raises serious traffic and infrastructure concerns. The increase in population density will inevitably place added strain on already limited road capacity, parking availability, and public services. Local streets that currently serve residential traffic are not designed to handle the volume that a project of this magnitude would generate, creating safety risks for residents, pedestrians, and cyclists.

I am also concerned about the cumulative impacts of this development, including noise, congestion, loss of privacy, and reduced quality of life for neighboring homeowners. These impacts should be carefully evaluated before any rezoning is approved.

I respectfully ask that you deny the rezoning request or, at a minimum, require a significantly reduced scale and a comprehensive traffic and neighborhood impact study before proceeding further.

Thank you for your time and for considering the concerns of those of us who live in and care deeply about this neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Greg Buchanan
1002 Concordia Avenue

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.
For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [Graham Emmons](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Oppose 1012 Concordia Ave Rezoning
Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2026 8:37:49 PM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed rezoning of 1012 [Street Name/Project Name].

While I generally support new construction, increased density, and improved walkability within our community, I find the proposed height for this specific project to be excessive. The scale of the building is significantly out of proportion with the surrounding neighborhood and presents a level of verticality that is not appropriate for this location.

I request that you take these concerns into consideration and reconsider the current height allowances for this rezoning application.

Sincerely,

Graham Emmons

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.

For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [Cynthia Lindlof](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Increased height at 1012 Concordia
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 8:03:12 AM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

I live in the neighborhood of the building planned at 1012 Concordia and fiercely oppose a tower that is more than 4 times taller than what was originally planned for this area. It is much too tall for the area and there is no way to negotiate anything that will offset the 210 extra feet in height. There is not really a plan in place.

I beseech you not give permission to build this.

Respectfully,

Cynthia Lindlof

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. For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [Alan Hecht](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: I strongly oppose the 1012 Concordia Ave. Rezoning
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 9:47:30 AM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello,

I just learned about the developer request to build up to 270' at 1012 Concordia Ave. This request is just off-scale ridiculous. I live nearby in the North Loop neighborhood, and I think that the planning commission should reject this request.

Thank you.
Alan Hecht
403 Nelray Blvd.

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.
For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [natalie](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Oppose 1012 Concordia Ave Rezoning
Date: Friday, February 6, 2026 12:18:32 AM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hello, I'm writing to adamantly oppose the rezoning of this location, just two blocks from my house on French Place, for high-rise construction. We have enough of those in Downtown, and one in my neighborhood would be outrageously irresponsible and extremely inconsiderate.

Thank you for your consideration,

Natalie Peterson

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.
For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [Lindsey Monteleone](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Oppose 1012 Concordia Ave Rezoning
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 10:11:16 PM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Nancy,

I'm writing to voice my request, as a resident of the Hancock neighborhood, that the third height limit increase for 1012 Concordia Ave be denied. We are a residential neighborhood that would be negatively impacted by a building of such enormous height. For the sake of the local residents and our families, please consider my request alongside the other protests you receive from people who want to keep the big buildings downtown.

Thank you.

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.
For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [Cindy Wilkinson](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 4:33:00 PM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Estrada,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rezoning at 1012 Concordia Avenue. Here are the key reasons I oppose the height increase.

1. The request fundamentally departs from the Concordia PUD master plan

The site at 1012 Concordia Avenue was originally planned as part of the Concordia Public Utility District (PUD), with building heights up to approximately 65 feet and a clear intent to manage scale transitions adjacent to existing residential areas. That framework was the result of coordination between the City and surrounding communities and has guided successful development within the PUD to date.

The current request represents the third major height increase for this site, from 65 feet to 120 feet in 2020, to 160 feet in 2023, and now up to 270 feet. A building of this magnitude would be more than four times the height originally planned for the site and would dramatically exceed the scale envisioned by the adopted PUD framework.

2. Incremental height escalation sets a dangerous precedent

Approval of this rezoning would set a dangerous precedent for incremental height escalation within planned districts. If a site can move from 65 feet to 270 feet through successive rezonings, the original PUD framework becomes effectively meaningless, and similar requests elsewhere become difficult to deny.

This is particularly concerning given that a 270-foot building would be the tallest structure in the city outside of downtown, West Campus, and The Domain, and far taller than anything in the surrounding Hancock neighborhood or even the high-density, high-amenity Mueller development.

3. The proposal grants major entitlements without a defined or implementable project

The requested rezoning seeks to grant maximum height entitlements in the absence of a defined or fully planned project. The applicant has acknowledged that plans for a 270-foot building are not yet developed and would only be pursued if the rezoning is approved.

Granting such a substantial increase in height without a defined project raises the risk that the rezoning functions primarily as an entitlement expansion rather than an implementable plan. If the site is later sold or redesigned under these expanded entitlements, the City and surrounding community would be forced to reengage in a new, resource-intensive planning and permitting process, despite having already conceded the most consequential development parameter: height. That outcome

undermines planning predictability and places an unnecessary burden on future public review.

This concern is compounded by the fact that repeated rezoning requests for the same site impose a cumulative burden on residents and neighborhood associations, requiring ongoing engagement simply to preserve previously agreed-upon planning outcomes. This dynamic disproportionately favors applicants with resources and erodes meaningful public participation.

4. The proposal fails to deliver public benefit or advance City priorities

The proposed development is entirely residential and does not include meaningful mixed-use components. This is inconsistent with the intent of the Concordia PUD master plan and with the development model the City has repeatedly stated it prefers for projects of this scale and prominence.

The site's location immediately adjacent to I-35 places it at the center of a once-in-a-generation opportunity to align land use decisions with the City's broader goals for the I-35 redesign, including improved urban form, connectivity, and long-term community benefit. Development decisions on parcels abutting I-35 will play an outsized role in determining whether this investment supports those goals or simply locks in isolated intensity without corresponding public benefit.

Approving extreme height increases on this site in the absence of a comprehensive, mixed-use plan risks squandering that opportunity by granting permanent entitlements that do not clearly advance the broader objectives of the I-35 redevelopment.

More broadly, the City already permits towers of this magnitude in areas specifically planned for extreme height and intensity, where zoning anticipates tall buildings, multimodal access, and a full range of services. Granting comparable entitlements in a low-rise, predominantly residential area governed by a PUD framework is neither necessary nor consistent with the City's planning approach, and provides substantial private benefit without corresponding public return.

5. Approval would undermine trust during ongoing comprehensive planning efforts

The City is currently undertaking major updates to its comprehensive planning framework through **City of Austin's** long-range planning efforts, including revisions to the **Imagine Austin** framework. These processes rely on public trust that adopted plans, district frameworks, and negotiated development standards will be respected over time.

Approving a project that so clearly departs from an established PUD master plan, particularly through successive rezoning requests, sends the opposite signal: that even carefully negotiated plans offer no durable guidance. This undermines not only this neighborhood's confidence, but the City's broader ability to engage communities constructively in comprehensive planning going forward.

6. Financial viability is not a planning justification

The applicant has suggested that additional height is required for project viability, citing both financial considerations and the loss of developable land associated with the I-35 expansion. However, private profitability is not a planning criterion. Moreover, the applicant moved forward with this project fully aware of the site's constraints, including

the impacts of the I-35 project. These known conditions do not justify a rezoning that so dramatically departs from the adopted planning framework.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the City to deny the requested rezoning.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Cindy Wilkison

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. For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [R.K](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Opposition to height increase
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 4:11:25 PM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Estrada,

I am emailing to note my clear opposition to the proposed rezoning at 1012 Concordia Avenue. Please see below a detailed list of reasons why the height increase request should be rejected.

The points below explain why this rezoning represents a significant departure from the Concordia PUD master plan, establishes a problematic precedent for incremental height escalation, and risks undermining public trust in the City's planning process at a critical moment.

1. The request fundamentally departs from the Concordia PUD master plan

The site at 1012 Concordia Avenue was originally planned as part of the Concordia Public Utility District (PUD), with building heights up to approximately 65 feet and a clear intent to manage scale transitions adjacent to existing residential areas. That framework was the result of coordination between the City and surrounding communities and has guided successful development within the PUD to date.

The current request represents the third major height increase for this site, from 65 feet to 120 feet in 2020, to 160 feet in 2023, and now up to 270 feet. A building of this magnitude would be more than four times the height originally planned for the site and would dramatically exceed the scale envisioned by the adopted PUD framework.

2. Incremental height escalation sets a dangerous precedent

Approval of this rezoning would set a dangerous precedent for incremental height escalation within planned districts. If a site can move from 65 feet to 270 feet through successive rezonings, the original PUD framework becomes effectively meaningless, and similar requests elsewhere become difficult to deny.

This is particularly concerning given that a 270-foot building would be the tallest structure in the city outside of downtown, West Campus, and The Domain, and far taller than anything in the surrounding Hancock neighborhood or even the high-density, high-amenity Mueller development.

3. The proposal grants major entitlements without a defined or implementable project

The requested rezoning seeks to grant maximum height entitlements in the absence of a defined or fully planned project. The applicant has acknowledged that plans for a 270-foot building are not yet developed and would only be pursued if the rezoning is approved.

Granting such a substantial increase in height without a defined project raises the risk that the rezoning functions primarily as an entitlement expansion rather than an implementable plan. If the site is later sold or redesigned under these expanded entitlements, the City and surrounding community would be forced to reengage in a new, resource-intensive planning and permitting process, despite having already conceded the most consequential development parameter: height. That outcome undermines planning predictability and places an unnecessary burden on future public review.

This concern is compounded by the fact that repeated rezoning requests for the same site impose a cumulative

burden on residents and neighborhood associations, requiring ongoing engagement simply to preserve previously agreed-upon planning outcomes. This dynamic disproportionately favors applicants with resources and erodes meaningful public participation.

4. The proposal fails to deliver public benefit or advance City priorities

The proposed development is entirely residential and does not include meaningful mixed-use components. This is inconsistent with the intent of the Concordia PUD master plan and with the development model the City has repeatedly stated it prefers for projects of this scale and prominence.

The site's location immediately adjacent to I-35 places it at the center of a once-in-a-generation opportunity to align land use decisions with the City's broader goals for the I-35 redesign, including improved urban form, connectivity, and long-term community benefit. Development decisions on parcels abutting I-35 will play an outsized role in determining whether this investment supports those goals or simply locks in isolated intensity without corresponding public benefit.

Approving extreme height increases on this site in the absence of a comprehensive, mixed-use plan risks squandering that opportunity by granting permanent entitlements that do not clearly advance the broader objectives of the I-35 redevelopment.

More broadly, the City already permits towers of this magnitude in areas specifically planned for extreme height and intensity, where zoning anticipates tall buildings, multimodal access, and a full range of services. Granting comparable entitlements in a low-rise, predominantly residential area governed by a PUD framework is neither necessary nor consistent with the City's planning approach, and provides substantial private benefit without corresponding public return.

5. Approval would undermine trust during ongoing comprehensive planning efforts

The City is currently undertaking major updates to its comprehensive planning framework through City of Austin's long-range planning efforts, including revisions to the Imagine Austin framework. These processes rely on public trust that adopted plans, district frameworks, and negotiated development standards will be respected over time.

Approving a project that so clearly departs from an established PUD master plan, particularly through successive rezoning requests, sends the opposite signal: that even carefully negotiated plans offer no durable guidance. This undermines not only this neighborhood's confidence, but the City's broader ability to engage communities constructively in comprehensive planning going forward.

6. Financial viability is not a planning justification

The applicant has suggested that additional height is required for project viability, citing both financial considerations and the loss of developable land associated with the I-35 expansion. However, private profitability is not a planning criterion. Moreover, the applicant moved forward with this project fully aware of the site's constraints, including the impacts of the I-35 project. These known conditions do not justify a rezoning that so dramatically departs from the adopted planning framework.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the City to deny the requested rezoning and to uphold the integrity of the Concordia PUD framework and the broader planning principles it represents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Robert Kaler
Architect

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. For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [carol journeay](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Opposition to 1012 Concordia height increase
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 3:46:20 PM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Estrada,

I am writing to note my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning at 1012 Concordia Avenue. Below I detail why this rezoning request should be rejected.

1. The request fundamentally departs from the Concordia PUD master plan

The site at 1012 Concordia Avenue was originally planned as part of the Concordia Public Utility District (PUD), with building heights up to approximately 65 feet and a clear intent to manage scale transitions adjacent to existing residential areas. That framework was the result of coordination between the City and surrounding communities and has guided successful development within the PUD to date.

The current request represents the third major height increase for this site, from 65 feet to 120 feet in 2020, to 160 feet in 2023, and now up to 270 feet. A building of this magnitude would be more than four times the height originally planned for the site and would dramatically exceed the scale envisioned by the adopted PUD framework.

2. Incremental height escalation sets a dangerous precedent

Approval of this rezoning would set a dangerous precedent for incremental height escalation within planned districts. If a site can move from 65 feet to 270 feet through successive rezonings, the original PUD framework becomes effectively meaningless, and similar requests elsewhere become difficult to deny.

This is particularly concerning given that a 270-foot building would be the tallest structure in the city outside of downtown, West Campus, and The Domain, and far taller than anything in the surrounding Hancock neighborhood or even the high-density, high-amenity Mueller development.

3. The proposal grants major entitlements without a defined or implementable project

The requested rezoning seeks to grant maximum height entitlements in the absence of a defined or fully planned project. The applicant has acknowledged that plans for a 270-foot building are not yet developed and would only be pursued if the rezoning is approved.

Granting such a substantial increase in height without a defined project raises the risk that the rezoning functions primarily as an entitlement expansion rather than an implementable plan. If the site is later sold or redesigned under these expanded entitlements, the City and surrounding community would be forced to reengage in a new, resource-intensive planning and permitting process, despite having already conceded the most consequential development parameter: height. That outcome undermines planning predictability and places an unnecessary burden on future public review.

This concern is compounded by the fact that repeated rezoning requests for the same site impose a cumulative burden on residents and neighborhood associations, requiring ongoing engagement simply to preserve previously agreed-upon planning outcomes. This dynamic disproportionately favors applicants with resources and erodes meaningful public participation.

4. The proposal fails to deliver public benefit or advance City priorities

The proposed development is entirely residential and does not include meaningful mixed-use components. This is inconsistent with the intent of the Concordia PUD master plan and with the development model the City has repeatedly stated it prefers for projects of this scale and prominence.

The site's location immediately adjacent to I-35 places it at the center of a once-in-a-generation opportunity to align land use decisions with the City's broader goals for the I-35 redesign, including improved urban form, connectivity, and long-term community benefit. Development decisions on parcels abutting I-35 will play an outsized role in determining whether this investment supports those goals or simply locks in isolated intensity without corresponding public benefit.

Approving extreme height increases on this site in the absence of a comprehensive, mixed-use plan risks squandering that opportunity by granting permanent entitlements that do not clearly advance the broader objectives of the I-35 redevelopment.

More broadly, the City already permits towers of this magnitude in areas specifically planned for extreme height and intensity, where zoning anticipates tall buildings, multimodal access, and a full range of services. Granting comparable entitlements in a low-rise, predominantly residential area governed by a PUD framework is neither necessary nor consistent with the City's planning approach, and provides substantial private benefit without corresponding public return.

5. Approval would undermine trust during ongoing comprehensive planning efforts

The City is currently undertaking major updates to its comprehensive planning framework through City of Austin's long-range planning efforts, including revisions to the Imagine Austin framework. These processes rely on public trust that adopted plans, district frameworks, and negotiated development standards will be respected over time.

Approving a project that so clearly departs from an established PUD master plan, particularly through successive rezoning requests, sends the opposite signal: that even carefully negotiated plans offer no durable guidance. This undermines not only this neighborhood's confidence, but the City's broader ability to engage communities constructively in comprehensive planning going forward.

6. Financial viability is not a planning justification

The applicant has suggested that additional height is required for project viability, citing both financial considerations and the loss of developable land associated with the I-35 expansion. However, private profitability is not a planning criterion. Moreover, the applicant moved forward with this project fully aware of the site's constraints, including the impacts of the I-35 project. These known conditions do not justify a rezoning that so dramatically departs from the adopted planning framework.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the City to deny the requested rezoning and to uphold the integrity of the Concordia PUD framework and the broader planning principles it represents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

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. For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [Peter Journeay-Kaler](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Oppose 1012 Concordia Ave Rezoning / Height Increase
Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2026 11:09:19 PM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Estrada,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rezoning at 1012 Concordia Avenue. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input on this request. The points below explain why this rezoning represents a significant departure from the Concordia PUD master plan, establishes a problematic precedent for incremental height escalation, and risks undermining public trust in the City's planning process at a critical moment.

1. The request fundamentally departs from the Concordia PUD master plan

The site at 1012 Concordia Avenue was originally planned as part of the Concordia Public Utility District (PUD), with building heights up to approximately 65 feet and a clear intent to manage scale transitions adjacent to existing residential areas. That framework was the result of coordination between the City and surrounding communities and has guided successful development within the PUD to date.

The current request represents the third major height increase for this site, from 65 feet to 120 feet in 2020, to 160 feet in 2023, and now up to 270 feet. A building of this magnitude would be more than four times the height originally planned for the site and would dramatically exceed the scale envisioned by the adopted PUD framework.

2. Incremental height escalation sets a dangerous precedent

Approval of this rezoning would set a dangerous precedent for incremental height escalation within planned districts. If a site can move from 65 feet to 270 feet through successive rezonings, the original PUD framework becomes effectively meaningless, and similar requests elsewhere become difficult to deny.

This is particularly concerning given that a 270-foot building would be the tallest structure in the city outside of downtown, West Campus, and The Domain, and far taller than anything in the surrounding Hancock neighborhood or even the high-density, high-amenity Mueller development.

3. The proposal grants major entitlements without a defined or implementable project

The requested rezoning seeks to grant maximum height entitlements in the absence of a defined or fully planned project. The applicant has acknowledged that plans for a 270-foot building are not yet developed and would only be pursued if the rezoning is approved.

Granting such a substantial increase in height without a defined project raises the risk that the rezoning functions primarily as an entitlement expansion rather than an

implementable plan. If the site is later sold or redesigned under these expanded entitlements, the City and surrounding community would be forced to reengage in a new, resource-intensive planning and permitting process, despite having already conceded the most consequential development parameter: height. That outcome undermines planning predictability and places an unnecessary burden on future public review.

This concern is compounded by the fact that repeated rezoning requests for the same site impose a cumulative burden on residents and neighborhood associations, requiring ongoing engagement simply to preserve previously agreed-upon planning outcomes. This dynamic disproportionately favors applicants with resources and erodes meaningful public participation.

4. The proposal fails to deliver public benefit or advance City priorities

The proposed development is entirely residential and does not include meaningful mixed-use components. This is inconsistent with the intent of the Concordia PUD master plan and with the development model the City has repeatedly stated it prefers for projects of this scale and prominence.

The site's location immediately adjacent to I-35 places it at the center of a once-in-a-generation opportunity to align land use decisions with the City's broader goals for the I-35 redesign, including improved urban form, connectivity, and long-term community benefit. Development decisions on parcels abutting I-35 will play an outsized role in determining whether this investment supports those goals or simply locks in isolated intensity without corresponding public benefit.

Approving extreme height increases on this site in the absence of a comprehensive, mixed-use plan risks squandering that opportunity by granting permanent entitlements that do not clearly advance the broader objectives of the I-35 redevelopment.

More broadly, the City already permits towers of this magnitude in areas specifically planned for extreme height and intensity, where zoning anticipates tall buildings, multimodal access, and a full range of services. Granting comparable entitlements in a low-rise, predominantly residential area governed by a PUD framework is neither necessary nor consistent with the City's planning approach, and provides substantial private benefit without corresponding public return.

5. Approval would undermine trust during ongoing comprehensive planning efforts

The City is currently undertaking major updates to its comprehensive planning framework through **City of Austin's** long-range planning efforts, including revisions to the **Imagine Austin** framework. These processes rely on public trust that adopted plans, district frameworks, and negotiated development standards will be respected over time.

Approving a project that so clearly departs from an established PUD master plan, particularly through successive rezoning requests, sends the opposite signal: that even carefully negotiated plans offer no durable guidance. This undermines not only this neighborhood's confidence, but the City's broader ability to engage communities constructively in comprehensive planning going forward.

6. Financial viability is not a planning justification

The applicant has suggested that additional height is required for project viability, citing both financial considerations and the loss of developable land associated with the I-35 expansion. However, private profitability is not a planning criterion. Moreover, the applicant moved forward with this project fully aware of the site's constraints, including the impacts of the I-35 project. These known conditions do not justify a rezoning that so dramatically departs from the adopted planning framework.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the City to deny the requested rezoning.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Peter Journey-Kaler

North University Neighborhood 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.
For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at
"cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

From: [Hugh Bender](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: 1012 Concordia
Date: Thursday, February 5, 2026 7:56:36 PM
Attachments: [Fight the Height.docx](#)

External Email - Exercise Caution

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

Just say NO! 1012 Concordia - See illustration attached

1. No negotiations - there is nothing they can give the residents to offset 210 feet of extra height over the original agreement. **This is a solid NO.**
2. On what planet is this good planning. **ANSWER: None.** Staff, Planning Commission and Council please ask for any documentation supporting this from a planning point of view. Plus - they don't even have a plan.
3. The original PUD (Planned Unit Development) and current buildings were **65 feet** tall. This property somehow got the COA to approve **120 feet** and then even more amazing **160 feet in height**. Now, with no plan, they are asking for **270 feet**. These would be the tallest buildings outside of downtown and probably the tallest building from here to Dallas.

Thanks, Hugh

Hugh Bender

[REDACTED]
Austin, Texas
512.983.7596

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.
For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at "cybersecurity@austintexas.gov".

FIGHT THE HEIGHT.

270' DOES NOT BELONG HERE.



- DEVELOPERS WANT TO BUILD UP TO 270' AT 1012 CONCORDIA AVE
- UNPRECEDENTED OUTSIDE DOWNTOWN/WEST CAMPUS/THE DOMAIN
- BUILDER REQUESTS: 65' ⇒ 120' ⇒ 160' ⇒ 270'

SPEAK UP

COMMUNITY MEETING:
FEB 10 | 6PM | CITY HALL



From: [Michelle Mace](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: 1012 Concordia Avenue - Oppose Rezoning
Date: Friday, February 6, 2026 10:56:16 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Estrada,

Hopefully, you are already on top of this issue that looks to risk realistic revenue and public trust for the City b/c it's proposing entitlements that don't seem to make sense and currently have no end user! For an entitlement of this significance, it seems a serious and committed end user should be disclosed and come forth transparently for neighborhood discussion if it is to be considered given this rezoning represents a significant departure from the Concordia PUD master plan.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rezoning at 1012 Concordia Avenue. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input on this request.

1. The request fundamentally departs from the Concordia PUD master plan

The site at 1012 Concordia Avenue was originally planned as part of the Concordia Public Utility District (PUD), with building heights up to approximately 65 feet and a clear intent to manage scale transitions adjacent to existing residential areas. That framework was the result of coordination between the City and surrounding communities and has guided successful development within the PUD to date.

The current request represents the third major height increase for this site, from 65 feet to 120 feet in 2020, to 160 feet in 2023, and now up to 270 feet. A building of this magnitude would be more than four times the height originally planned for the site and would dramatically exceed the scale envisioned by the adopted PUD framework.

2. Incremental height escalation sets a dangerous precedent

Approval of this rezoning would set a dangerous precedent for incremental height escalation within planned districts. If a site can move from 65 feet to 270 feet through successive rezonings, the original PUD framework becomes effectively meaningless, and similar requests elsewhere become difficult to deny.

This is particularly concerning given that a 270-foot building would be the tallest structure in the city outside of downtown, West Campus, and The Domain, and far taller than anything in the surrounding Hancock neighborhood or even the high-density, high-amenity Mueller development.

3. The proposal grants major entitlements without a defined or implementable project

The requested rezoning seeks to grant maximum height entitlements in the absence of a defined or fully planned project. The applicant has acknowledged that plans for a 270-foot building are not yet developed and would only be pursued if the rezoning is approved.

Granting such a substantial increase in height without a defined project raises the risk that the rezoning functions primarily as an entitlement expansion rather than an implementable plan. If the site is later sold or redesigned under these expanded entitlements, the City and surrounding community would be forced to reengage in a new, resource-intensive planning and permitting process, despite having already conceded the most consequential development parameter: height. That outcome undermines planning predictability and places an unnecessary burden on future public review.

This concern is compounded by the fact that repeated rezoning requests for the same site impose a cumulative burden on residents and neighborhood associations, requiring ongoing engagement simply to preserve previously agreed-upon planning outcomes. This dynamic disproportionately favors applicants with resources and erodes meaningful public participation.

4. The proposal fails to deliver public benefit or advance City priorities

The proposed development is entirely residential and does not include meaningful mixed-use components. This is inconsistent with the intent of the Concordia PUD master plan and with the development model the City has repeatedly stated it prefers for projects of this scale and prominence.

The site's location immediately adjacent to I-35 places it at the center of a once-in-a-generation opportunity to align land use decisions with the City's broader goals for the I-35 redesign, including improved urban form, connectivity, and long-term community benefit. Development decisions on parcels abutting I-35 will play an outsized role in determining whether this investment supports those goals or simply locks in isolated intensity without corresponding public benefit.

Approving extreme height increases on this site in the absence of a comprehensive, mixed-use plan risks squandering that opportunity by granting permanent entitlements that do not clearly advance the broader objectives of the I-35 redevelopment.

More broadly, the City already permits towers of this magnitude in areas specifically planned for extreme height and intensity, where zoning anticipates tall buildings, multimodal access, and a full range of services. Granting comparable entitlements in a low-rise, predominantly residential area governed by a PUD framework is neither necessary nor consistent with the City's planning approach, and provides substantial private benefit without corresponding public return.

5. Approval would undermine trust during ongoing comprehensive

planning efforts

The City is currently undertaking major updates to its comprehensive planning framework through **City of Austin's** long-range planning efforts, including revisions to the **Imagine Austin** framework. These processes rely on public trust that adopted plans, district frameworks, and negotiated development standards will be respected over time.

Approving a project that so clearly departs from an established PUD master plan, particularly through successive rezoning requests, sends the opposite signal: that even carefully negotiated plans offer no durable guidance. This undermines not only this neighborhood's confidence, but the City's broader ability to engage communities constructively in comprehensive planning going forward.

6. Financial viability is not a planning justification

The applicant has suggested that additional height is required for project viability, citing both financial considerations and the loss of developable land associated with the I-35 expansion. However, private profitability is not a planning criterion. Moreover, the applicant moved forward with this project fully aware of the site's constraints, including the impacts of the I-35 project. These known conditions do not justify a rezoning that so dramatically departs from the adopted planning framework.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the City to deny the requested rezoning.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Michelle

North University Neighborhood Resident



Michelle M. Mace
President, M3B Inc.

480.460.8100 (office)

www.m3binc.com

1101 W. 34th Street #206
Austin, TX 78705

"Wherever you go, go with all your heart."