

From: Sarah Coleman
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 10:14 AM
To: Chaffin, Heather <Heather.Chaffin@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Mary Tally; Grant, William <william.grant@austintexas.gov>; Darcy Gardiner
Subject: postponement request

Dear Ms Chaffin-

I am writing to respectfully request your support in postponing consideration of the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the Girl's School of Austin, currently scheduled for the July 23 City Council Meeting to the August 27th or September 10th meetings which we understand to the slots available after the budget meetings.

At the April 28 Planning Commission hearing, the Commission requested extensive additional information from the school, and the school made numerous on-the-record commitments to follow up. Due to the extent of the outstanding information and unresolved neighborhood concerns, Rusty and Mary Tally, neighbors to the Girl's School of Austin, requested the appeal to the Planning Commission's decision. Nearly three months later, neighbors have received almost none of the promised information, despite direct follow-up requests. Please see below for the full list of outstanding items.

Outstanding applicant items from the April 28 Planning Commission hearing:

1. Bump-out and queuing data — Neighbors asked for data on how a 3-car bump-out would handle roughly 50 new vehicles in line. The school's engineer offered only "professional experience," and on May 3 the school said a data-driven response on the loading zone was still in progress. No data has been provided.
2. Six-month traffic monitoring — The plan committed the school to reassess traffic conditions on an ongoing basis, with reassessment triggered by any failing condition. No plan has been shared for how six-month assessments will occur or how the neighborhood and City will access that reporting.
3. Memorandum of Understanding — In response to Commissioner Hiller and others, the school agreed on the record ("absolutely") to consider an MOU formally documenting the traffic plan. No MOU has been drafted or circulated.

4. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan — In response to Commissioner Skidmore, the school expressed interest in developing a formal TDM plan with its consultants. There is no indication one has been drafted.
5. Movability / carpool program — A commissioner recommended the school explore Movability to facilitate carpooling by zip code, and the school agreed to look into it. No substantive follow-up has been reported.
6. Bus service — Several commissioners asked the school to evaluate bus or shuttle options, which the school acknowledged as worth exploring. No steps or outreach have been reported regarding a daily route/shuttle for students.
7. Off-site parking — The school admitted at the hearing it had "not engaged just yet" with nearby property owners about off-site staff parking. It is unknown whether any outreach exists or is being negotiated for daily staff parking
8. Codified traffic policies — The school stated it was a priority to write drop-off procedures, routing protocols, and staggered dismissal times into formal school policy rather than relying on word of mouth. No policy document has been shared.

The extent of this missing information is central to our appeal, and without it, neither the neighborhood nor the Council can have a meaningful, informed discussion on July 23. These are not minor details they were significant enough that the Planning Commission itself requested them, and they form the basis of the record the Council will be asked to review.

We believe that this postponement serves everyone's interest: it avoids spending the Council's time on an incomplete record and ensures that when the item does come forward, the discussion is informed and productive.

Sincerely,

Sarah Coleman