

LOST CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

September 9, 2026

The Honorable Kirk Watson, Mayor
Members of the Austin City Council
City of Austin
301 W. Second Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Via email

CityView Rezoning Case C14 2025 0089

1120 and 1122 South Capital of Texas Highway

Dear Mayor Watson and Council Members:

On behalf of the Lost Creek Neighborhood Association (LCNA), we respectfully ask the City Council to deny the current rezoning request for the CityView property. The application would change the site from LO/LR zoning to LR-V-DB90 and could enable a mixed-use redevelopment of approximately 475 apartments, commercial space, and buildings approaching 70 feet in height. This is a major increase in development intensity at a uniquely constrained location. Council should not grant those entitlements before the City has established, on the public record, that the redevelopment can integrate safely and responsibly into Austin and the surrounding community.

LCNA supports responsible growth and recognizes Austin's need for additional housing, including affordable housing. Our position is not that this property can never change or that housing can never be built here. Our concern is that the City's review appears to rely on a developer-friendly decision matrix that treats satisfaction of threshold zoning criteria as the principal question, while deferring the project's real-world consequences to later stages. At CityView, safety, traffic, emergency access, wastewater capacity, environmental compatibility, and procedural integrity are not secondary details. They are interconnected conditions that should inform whether this scale of entitlement is appropriate in the first place.

The current proposal requires a holistic review

The Zoning and Platting Commission recommended the case by a divided 6-4 vote. The application was amended in June 2026, and the current request seeks greater density than the original filing. Yet the review process has not produced an integrated analysis of how hundreds of new residences would function at this specific site when roadway safety, emergency evacuation, access design, wastewater service, and the protections of the Hill Country Roadway Corridor are considered together.

DB90 should advance more than unit production. Affordable housing should expand access to opportunity and daily needs. This site has limited transit connectivity, is not walkable to grocery stores, schools, or routine services, and offers few practical alternatives to automobile travel. Approving substantially greater height and density in exchange for only the minimum qualifying public benefit risks producing an isolated residential enclave rather than a connected, sustainable community. It would also create a consequential precedent along Loop 360: future applicants could reasonably expect major entitlements based on minimum program compliance even where location-specific constraints remain unresolved.

The requested scale is also materially different from what exists today. The neighborhood's review indicates that the current office buildings are approximately 44 feet tall, significantly below the roughly 70-foot height contemplated by the rezoning. Substantial office space in the CityView complex has also been marketed as available for lease. Before replacing employment space with much greater residential intensity, Council should evaluate the site's actual conditions and the public benefits and burdens of the proposed conversion, not merely its theoretical buildout under current zoning.

LOST CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Roadway safety and access deserve site specific scrutiny

Recent TxDOT crash information reviewed by LCNA documents serious existing conditions on the relevant segment of Loop 360. From 2021 through June 2026, the data reflect six fatalities, seven suspected serious injuries, and sixty-three suspected minor injuries. Those figures do not prove that CityView redevelopment would cause a future crash, and LCNA does not make that claim. They do establish that this is already a high-speed corridor with a meaningful safety history. Adding hundreds of residences and their associated daily vehicle movements warrants careful analysis of site access, turning movements, conflict points, and emergency mobility before the zoning decision is made.

The City's waiver of a Transportation Impact Analysis is therefore especially troubling. As LCNA understands the record, the waiver relied on a comparison against traffic that the existing office buildings could generate if fully occupied. That theoretical baseline does not reflect current occupancy or actual traffic conditions. ZAP Vice-Chair Betsy Greenberg raised this concern during the July 21 hearing. A decision of this magnitude should be supported by analysis grounded in observed conditions and the proposed residential use, including the project's heavy dependence on U-turn movements along Loop 360. Council should not accept a paper comparison that may obscure the practical increase in trips and turning movements.

Emergency evacuation remains unresolved

The access question is inseparable from neighborhood evacuation. Approximately 1,300 homes rely on only three streets for evacuation, and Lost Creek Boulevard is the community's primary gateway. A wildfire, gas leak, major collision, or other emergency could constrain that route and rapidly narrow residents' options. The June 30 gas-leak incident provided a recent reminder that this concern is not abstract.

The City should evaluate the combined effect of new site traffic, U-turn-dependent access, existing corridor conditions, and emergency operations. The wrong sequence is to increase development intensity now and study those combined consequences later. Before approval, Council should require a documented assessment by the appropriate transportation and public-safety professionals addressing evacuation routes, emergency ingress and egress, incident conditions on Loop 360, and whether the proposed access plan preserves adequate mobility for both the project and the surrounding community.

Wastewater service and capacity must be established on the record

Wastewater feasibility is now a central unanswered infrastructure question. Austin Water has stated in writing that the CityView site appears to flow to the Lost Creek system. Austin Water has also confirmed that there are no existing or proposed Service Extension Requests (SERs) for this site. LCNA recognizes that the absence of an SER, standing alone, does not legally bar rezoning and that utility arrangements are often refined during development review. But that procedural reality does not answer the physical question posed by approximately 475 apartments.

Before granting the requested entitlements, Council should obtain clear, staff-verified answers to the following: Which wastewater collection and treatment system will serve the redevelopment? What capacity is presently available in the applicable collection, conveyance, treatment, and disposal components? What improvements, easements, interlocal arrangements, permits, or service extensions would be necessary? Who would be responsible for them, and can they be delivered without shifting cost, operational risk, or environmental consequences to existing customers and the surrounding community?

Wastewater capacity is not a matter of neighborhood preference. It is a measurable infrastructure constraint with potential consequences for public health, environmental protection, project feasibility, and existing utility service. If the City does not yet know how the project will be served or whether the receiving system has sufficient capacity, that uncertainty should weigh against approving the current intensity. Council should require Austin Water and any other responsible utility entity to place the service path and capacity determination in the public record before acting.

LOST CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Environmental and Hill Country compatibility cannot be deferred

The CityView property occupies a sensitive gateway on the Loop 360 Hill Country Roadway Corridor. Height, massing, impervious cover, drainage, landscaping, open space, wastewater, and emergency access interact at this location. Evaluating each subject in isolation understates their cumulative effect. A holistic review should determine whether the proposed development intensity can preserve the corridor's environmental and visual purposes while protecting downstream and adjacent properties and maintaining safe access.

If Council is unwilling to deny the application outright, it should at minimum require substantially stronger, enforceable conditions that reduce height and visual massing, protect landscaping and open space, address drainage and environmental impacts, improve pedestrian and transportation connections, provide meaningful affordability beyond the minimum where feasible, and resolve traffic, emergency-access, and wastewater requirements before development rights vest. Such conditions would not cure every concern, but they would better align the project with DB90's public purpose and the Hill Country Roadway Corridor.

The procedural record requires independent Council review

LCNA also asks Council to address significant legal and procedural concerns raised in the record. First, the City has recognized a valid protest under Texas Local Government Code Section 211.006(d), requiring the statutorily prescribed supermajority vote. Lost Creek residents' disannexation does not erase the rights afforded by state law, notwithstanding statements made during the zoning process suggesting that residents had no or diminished rights.

Second, ZAP Chair Hank Smith disclosed that he is a director of Atwell, LLC, a company leasing space in the existing development. He nevertheless participated in deliberations and made assertions favorable to the application. At a minimum, those facts create an appearance-of-impartiality concern that deserves formal review under applicable City ethics requirements, including the City's stated principles of separating personal interests from official decision-making and maintaining public confidence that governmental authority serves the public rather than private interests. Council should not rely reflexively on the ZAP recommendation without resolving whether recusal was required and whether the proceeding was affected.

Third, LCNA understands that required zoning-notice signs were posted before the April 7 ZAP meeting but not before the July 21 meeting. Texas Local Government Code Section 211.073 and City Ordinance No. 20260326-053 should be reviewed to determine whether all applicable on-site notice requirements were satisfied for the hearing and amended request. Council should not act on a recommendation that may rest on defective notice or an incomplete procedural record.

These issues - together with the amended application's relationship to the original filing, the valid protest, the questionable traffic baseline, and the unresolved safety and infrastructure record - expose any approval to avoidable legal and practical risk. They warrant independent analysis by the City Attorney and Council rather than an assumption that the prior recommendation is sufficient.

LCNA respectfully requests denial

The community has organized, gathered signatures, participated throughout the zoning process, met with Council offices, and developed a factual record concerning traffic, crash history, wildfire evacuation, access, height, neighborhood safety, and wastewater feasibility. This is broad, informed, and persistent participation - not generalized opposition to change.

For these reasons, LCNA respectfully asks the City Council to deny the current CityView rezoning application. The proposal is not ready for approval because the City has not shown, through a coordinated and public evaluation, that this level of redevelopment can be integrated into the surrounding transportation network, emergency-response system, wastewater infrastructure, environmental setting, and community without unacceptable consequences.

LOST CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

At an absolute minimum, Council should decline to approve the case unless and until the following matters are answered on the record:

- a transportation analysis based on actual site conditions and the proposed residential program, including access and U-turn movements on Loop 360;
- a coordinated evacuation and emergency-access assessment addressing the approximately 1,300 homes that depend on three exit routes and Lost Creek Boulevard as the primary gateway;
- a staff-verified wastewater service and capacity determination identifying the receiving system, available collection and treatment capacity, required improvements, and the status or necessity of an SER;
- a cumulative review of height, massing, drainage, environmental impacts, infrastructure, and Hill Country Roadway Corridor compatibility; and
- resolution of the valid-protest, notice, ethics, and other procedural issues described above.

Austin needs housing, but housing policy does not require Council to ignore location. The central question is not whether the applicant can satisfy a checklist for greater entitlements. It is whether this proposal, at this site and at this intensity, can become part of the City and our community without compounding significant safety, traffic, environmental, and infrastructure concerns. On the present record, the City has not made that showing.

Respectfully,



Shriya Josephsen
President
Lost Creek Neighborhood Association
[REDACTED]
708-502-4275

cc: City Attorney Deborah Thomas
Austin Water
Austin Transportation and Public Works Department
Austin Fire Department



LOST CREEK Limited District

1305 Quaker Ridge Drive • Austin, Texas 78746-6211 • Tel: (512) 327-6243 • www.LostCreekLD.org

May 13, 2026

Beverly Villela
Senior Planner – Current Planning
Austin Planning Department
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767

Re: Lost Creek Limited District Concerns – Case No. C14-2025-0089

Dear Ms. Villela,

On behalf of the Lost Creek Limited District (LCLD) Board of Directors, I am writing to formally outline the Board's concerns regarding the proposed rezoning associated with Case C14-2025-0089, commonly referred to as the City View development proposal.

At the outset, the Board would like to clearly state that the LCLD is not categorically opposed to the redevelopment of the site. We recognize the importance of responsible growth and understand the need for thoughtful redevelopment within the City of Austin. However, the Board believes that several significant issues remain unresolved and warrant additional review and coordination before further consideration of the rezoning request proceeds.

The Board's primary concerns include the following:

1. **Traffic Impacts and Transportation Analysis**
The Board remains concerned regarding the lack of a comprehensive Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) evaluating both site-specific and cumulative impacts associated with this development and surrounding projects. Existing roadway infrastructure in the Lost Creek area is already constrained, and the addition of significant new residential density without a validated transportation analysis raises substantial concerns regarding congestion, circulation, and roadway safety.
2. **Public Safety and Emergency Access**
Public safety constraints related to ingress and egress remain a critical concern for the Board, particularly during emergency situations such as wildfires, major traffic incidents, or other evacuation events. Lost Creek has limited access points, and additional density may further impact emergency response capabilities for Fire and EMS services, evacuation timing, and overall community safety during extreme conditions. The wildfire risk mapping and evacuation concerns previously submitted underscore the importance of evaluating these issues comprehensively prior to additional entitlements being granted.
3. **Environmental and Watershed Considerations**
The Board requests additional review and transparency regarding environmental impacts associated with the project, including considerations involving the Barton Creek Watershed, Edwards Aquifer recharge features, and sensitive habitat areas, including the Golden-cheeked

Warbler. The environmental sensitivity of this corridor necessitates careful evaluation before substantial increases in density are approved.

4. Coordination with TxDOT

The Board also requests confirmation and documentation of coordination with TxDOT on access management and planned improvements for Loop 360, Lost Creek Boulevard, and the RM 2244 (Bee Cave Road) corridor. Existing and future roadway projects in the area may substantially affect traffic operations and neighborhood accessibility, and these factors should be incorporated into any comprehensive review process.

5. Incomplete or Undefined Zoning Elements

Finally, the Board remains concerned about several incomplete or undefined elements in the zoning request, including matters related to the Hill Country Roadway Corridor (HCRC) regulations and the request to change from LO and LR to LO-V-DB90 zoning designation, which references height allowances and waivers that are not typically allowed in the HCRC. While we understand current discussions indicate a maximum building height of approximately 70 feet with waivers, the Board seeks formal clarification confirming how the sought “DB90” is allowable and being advanced as part of this application.

The LCLD Board also wishes to address any potential concerns regarding the District’s authority to raise these matters. Based on established precedent involving Municipal Utility Districts and Limited Districts throughout Austin, requesting a comprehensive traffic safety and public safety analysis falls squarely within the Board’s responsibility to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the residents we serve.

Accordingly, the Board respectfully requests that further substantive consideration of the rezoning application pause until these concerns are meaningfully addressed by the City and the applicant. This request should not be interpreted as opposition to the project itself, nor is the Board presently requesting a postponement for the purpose of delaying proceedings. Rather, the Board seeks validation that these issues are legitimate, material concerns deserving of appropriate analysis, coordination, and mitigation before any additional action proceeds.

The Board remains committed to constructive engagement with City staff, the applicant, and other stakeholders to pursue a project that appropriately balances redevelopment objectives with public safety, infrastructure capacity, environmental stewardship, and neighborhood compatibility.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "C. Vetromile", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Christopher Vetromile
President
Lost Creek Limited District (LCLD) Board of Directors

cc: Lost Creek Limited District Board of Directors
Lost Creek Neighborhood Association Working Group
City of Austin Zoning and Platting Commission
The Drenner Group