

ZONING CHANGE REVIEW SHEET

CASE: C814-06-0175.07 – East Avenue PUD Amendment #7,
Parcel A

DISTRICT: 9

ZONING FROM / TO: PUD-NP, to allow an increase in the maximum building height for Parcel A from 160 to 270 feet and to remove the vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue.*

*On February 10, 2026, the applicant amended their request to accept the Staff's recommendation of a maximum building height of 195 feet for Parcel A.

ADDRESSES: 3500, 3500 ½, 3502, 3506, 3700 North IH 35 Service Road Southbound; 1010 ½, 1012, 1012 ½, 1018, 1018 ½ Concordia Avenue

SITE AREA: 0.9410 acres

PROPERTY OWNER: 1010 Concordia LP, a Texas Limited Partnership (Taylor Wilson)

AGENT: Drenner Group, PC (Leah Bojo)

CASE MANAGER: Nancy Estrada (512-974-7617, nancy.estrada@austintexas.gov)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Staff recommendation is to grant a seventh amendment to planned unit development – neighborhood plan (PUD-NP) combining district zoning, as shown in the Proposed PUD Amendment summary of this report.

Staff is recommending a maximum building height of 195 feet for Parcel A.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

February 10, 2026: *APPROVED THE SEVENTH AMENDMENT TO PUD-NP DISTRICT ZONING AS STAFF RECOMMENDED, including a maximum building height of 195 feet for Parcel A*

[J. HILLER; F. MAXWELL - 2ND] (10-1) D. SKIDMORE – NAY; A. LAN – ABSENT; ONE VACANCY ON THE DIAS

January 13, 2026: *APPROVED A POSTPONEMENT REQUEST BY THE NEIGHBORHOOD TO FEBRUARY 10, 2026*

[F. MAXWELL; P. BRETON - 2ND] (11-0) TWO VACANCIES ON THE DIAS

CITY COUNCIL ACTION:

April 9, 2026:

March 26, 2026: *APPROVED A POSTPONEMENT REQUEST BY THE APPLICANT TO APRIL 9, 2026.*

VOTE: 10-0. [Council Member Fuentes; Council Member Duchon – 2nd] Council Member Harper-Madison was off the dais.

ORDINANCE NUMBER:

ISSUES:

On February 10, 2026, the applicant submitted a letter accepting the Staff's recommendation of a maximum building height of 195 feet for Parcel A.

Please refer to Attachment A.

The original PUD amendment application proposed an increase in the maximum building height for Parcel A from 160 feet to 300 feet. On November 3, 2026, the applicant submitted a letter amending this request to a maximum building height of 270 feet.

Please refer to Attachment B.

CASE MANAGER COMMENTS:

The East Avenue Planned Unit Development (PUD) is located in central Austin at the intersection of Concordia Avenue and the southbound IH 35 frontage lanes. The PUD is approximately 22 acres south of East 38th Street and north of East 32nd Street on the west side of the IH 35 southbound frontage road. The subject property within the PUD is approximately 0.94 acres located at the northwest corner of Concordia Avenue and IH 35 and is identified as Parcel A.

There are single family residences and some commercial uses near the intersection of East 38th Street and the IH 35 frontage road to the north (CS-MU-V-CO-DB90-NP; CS-MU-NP); to the south within the PUD is a mixed-use development and several multifamily residential buildings along the IH 35 frontage road and Harmon Avenue (PUD-NP); and to the west are single family residences, two-family residences, and townhomes (CS-MU-NP; SF-3-CO-NP). ***Please refer to Exhibits A (Zoning Map) and A-1 (Aerial).***

The applicant is requesting an amendment to increase the maximum allowable building height on Parcel A from 160 feet to 270 feet for a future multifamily development. Currently, vehicular access to Concordia Avenue would be prohibited. The amendment also proposes to remove this development regulation from the PUD.

In addition, the Applicant proposes installing a Capital Metro bikeshare station within the PUD right-of-way to enhance bicycle mobility in the area, along with a \$100,000 contribution to the Art in Public Places (AIPP) program.

The Staff recommendation is to grant a maximum building height of 195 feet for Parcel A. The East Avenue PUD has had two prior amendments in which the allowable building height

has been increased. The initial maximum height established for Parcel A was 65 feet and this was amended in October 2022 to be increased to 120 feet. In November of 2023, the allowable building height was increased to 160 feet since TxDot removed some right-of-way along IH 35 from the property.

The East Avenue PUD was established with designated areas of greater building heights, primarily within the southern portion of the PUD and along IH 35, while the northern portion of the PUD stepped down to lower heights for transition with the surrounding neighborhood. Parcel G, which is the most southern parcel along IH 35, includes two designated areas within the parcel that allow building heights of up to 185.5 feet and 195 feet. ***Please refer to the last page of Attachment D (Exhibit C-2: Land Use Plan).***

Parcel A is located adjacent to lower-scale residential and mixed-use development, including areas east of IH-35, and a maximum building height of 270 feet would represent a scale that is not consistent with the surrounding area. Staff's recommendation to limit the maximum building height for Parcel A to 195 feet is consistent with the highest height currently allowed within the PUD. This modification would still allow for additional density along a major arterial while providing a more appropriate scale and transition to surrounding development.

PROPOSED PUD AMENDMENT

Height Limits: Part 8.L.5 will be amended to reflect the maximum building height of 195 feet for Parcel A.

Vehicular Access: Part 11.G will be amended to remove this item so that vehicular access to Concordia Avenue will not be prohibited.

Austin Energy Green Building: Part 8.Q. of the original PUD ordinance will be revised to reflect current green building requirements for Parcel A. PUD language will be updated to accomplish the following:

All buildings on the property will achieve a two-star or greater rating under the Austin Energy Green Building program using the applicable rating version in effect at the time a rating registration application is submitted for the building.

Exhibit C-2: Land Use Plan – Maximum Building Area and Height Zones will be amended to reflect the maximum building height of 195 feet for Parcel A.

BASIS OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. *The proposed zoning should be consistent with the purpose statement of the district sought.*

Per the Land Development Code, PUD district zoning was established to implement goals of preserving the natural environment, encouraging high quality, sustainable development and innovative design, and ensuring adequate public facilities and services. The City Council

intends PUD district zoning to produce development that achieves these goals to a greater degree than and thus is superior to development which could occur under conventional zoning and subdivision regulations. The PUD provides a canvas for the design of a large-scale project, with the end goal to allow flexibility, and also inform and communicate the possibilities for development.

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

Parcel A is located along a major arterial; however, it is also adjacent to lower-scale residential and mixed-use development, including areas east of IH-35. While staff supports intensive multifamily development along major arterials, a maximum building height of 270 feet would be out of scale with the surrounding area. Limiting the maximum building height for Parcel A to 195 feet is consistent with the highest height currently permitted within the PUD and allows additional density along the arterial while maintaining an appropriate scale and transition to surrounding development.

EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USES:

	ZONING	LAND USES
<i>Site</i>	PUD-NP	Undeveloped
<i>North</i>	CS-MU-NP; CS-MU-V-CO-DB90-NP	Single family residences; Restaurant
<i>South</i>	PUD-NP	Multifamily
<i>East</i>	Not Applicable	Southbound IH 35 service road and main lanes (including elevated portion)
<i>West</i>	SF-3-CO-NP; CS-MU-NP	Single family residences; Townhomes; Small multifamily building

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING AREA: Central Austin Combined (Hancock)

WATERSHED: Boggy Creek – Urban

CAPITOL VIEW CORRIDOR: No

SCENIC ROADWAY: No

SCHOOLS: Lee Elementary School Kealing Middle School McCallum High School

COMMUNITY REGISTRY LIST:

Austin Modern Lofts Condominiums
 Hancock Neighborhood Association
 North Austin Neighborhood Alliance
 Neighborhood Empowerment Foundation
 Austin Independent School District

Austin Lost and Found Pets
 Cherrywood Neighborhood Association
 Austin Neighborhoods Council
 CANPAC
 SEL Texas

Sierra Group, Austin Regional Group
 Friends of Austin Neighborhoods
 Neighbors United For Progress
 Overton Family Committee
 Upper Boggy Creek Neighborhood Planning Team

Del Valle Community Coalition
 Homeless Neighborhood Association
 Preservation Austin
 Concordia Neighborhood Association

AREA CASE HISTORIES:

NUMBER	REQUEST	COMMISSION	CITY COUNCIL
C814-06-0175 – 3400 North IH 35 Service Road Southbound	LO-MU-NP, GO-NP, CS-MU-NP to PUD-NP	To Grant PUD-NP	Apvd PUD-NP as PC recommended (3-26-2007).
C814-06-0068 – St. David’s PUD	GO-MU-NP, CS-NP, CS-CO-NP, GR-CO-NP to PUD-NP	To Grant PUD-NP, with stipulations	Apvd PUD-NP, with amended stipulations (4-5-2007).
C14-2024-0043 – 1015 E 38th Street; 3703 Harmon Avenue	CS-MU-V-CO- NP to CS-MU-V-CO- DB90-NP	To Grant CS-MU-V-CO-DB90-NP as staff recommended	Apvd CS-MU-V- CO-DB90-NP as PC recommended (8-29-2024).
C14-2024-0044 – 3800, 3808, 3810 N IH 35 Service Road SB; 1015, 1017 E 38th Half Street; 1014, 1016 E 38th Street	CS-MU-V-CO- NP to CS-MU-V-CO- DB90-NP	To Grant CS-MU-V-CO-DB90-NP as staff recommended	Apvd CS-MU-V-CO-NP as PC recommended (8-29-2024).

RELATED CASES:

The subject property is located within the boundaries of the Central Austin Combined (Hancock) Neighborhood Planning Area (NP-04-0021).

PUD Zoning cases

Council approved the East Avenue PUD which includes approximately 22 acres of land on March 26, 2007 (Ordinance No. 20070326-002). The subject request is the seventh amendment, titled East Avenue PUD Amendment #7, Parcel A, comprised of 0.94 acres.

There were six previous applications to amend the East Avenue PUD:

- 1) Amendment #1 – C814-06-0175.01 – Application withdrawn.
- 2) Amendment #2 – C814-06-0175.02 – Administratively approved amendment dated February 27, 2009 to modify setback along the north property line. The amendment

modified the cross section of Concordia Avenue and Concordia Avenue private drive extension. The amendment also relocated alleyways on Parcels B1 and B3. Additional architectural features were included on the eastern side of the East Avenue Development adjacent to IH-35 access road.

- 3) Amendment #3 – C814-06-0175.03 – City Council approved amendment on October 27, 2022 to **increase the maximum allowable height of Parcel A from 65 feet to 120 feet**, establish requirement to pay a fee-in-lieu of parkland dedication for Parcel A, provide onsite affordable housing on Parcel A or pay fee-in-lieu, use on-site alternate water sources for development on Parcel A to meet 100% of non-potable uses, comply with bird collision deterrence standards and glass reflectivity limits.
- 4) Amendment #4 – C814-06-0175.04 – City Council approved amendment on August 31, 2023, to add administrative and business office use to the pedestrian-oriented uses list for Parcel H. The amendment also updated the Austin Energy Green Building requirement for Parcel H.
- 5) Amendment #5 – C814-06-0175.05 – City Council approved amendment on November 9, 2023 to **increase the maximum allowable height of Parcel A from 120 feet to 160 feet**, except for portion dedicated as right-of-way along eastern boundary line to maintain 120 feet maximum height.
- 6) Amendment #6 – C814-06-0175.06 – Administratively approved amendment dated September 12, 2024 to allow development to comply with modified Great Streets Program criteria.

Subdivision

Parcel A is also known as Lot 11, Block B, East Avenue Subdivision recorded in May 2008 as Document No. 200800152 in the Travis County Plat Records (C8-2007-0203.0A).

ADDITIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:

Comprehensive Planning

Project Name and Proposed Use: 1012 CONCORDIA AVENUE. C814-06-0175.07. Project: East Avenue PUD Amendment #7, Parcel A. The Applicant is proposing to amend 0.94 acres of a previously approved PUD, to increase the maximum allowable height of Parcel A from 160 feet to 270 feet and to remove the vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue. Existing: undeveloped. Proposed: multifamily.

Yes	Imagine Austin Decision Guidelines
Complete Community Measures *	
Y	Imagine Austin Growth Concept Map: Located within or adjacent to an Imagine Austin Activity Center, Imagine Austin Activity Corridor, or Imagine Austin Job Center as identified the Growth Concept Map. Names of Activity Centers/Activity Corridors/Job Centers *: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downtown Regional Center
Y	Mobility and Public Transit *: Located within 0.25 miles of public transit stop and/or light rail station. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 0.25 miles of bus stop along Red River ST

Y	Mobility and Bike/Ped Access * : Adjoins a public sidewalk, shared path, and/or bike lane. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalk present along N Interstate 35 Frontage RD
Y	Connectivity, Good and Services, Employment * : Provides or is located within 0.50 miles to goods and services, and/or employment center. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.4 miles to Delwood Shopping Center
Y	Connectivity and Food Access * : Provides or is located within 0.50 miles of a grocery store/farmers market. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.4 miles to Fiesta Mart Grocery Store
Y	Connectivity and Education * : Located within 0.50 miles from a public school or university. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.5 miles to Russell Lee Elementary School
Y	Connectivity and Healthy Living * : Provides or is located within 0.50 miles from a recreation area, park or walking trail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 0.5 miles of Hancock Golf Course
Y	Connectivity and Health * : Provides or is located within 0.50 miles of health facility (ex: hospital, urgent care, doctor’s office, drugstore clinic, and/or specialized outpatient care.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.4 miles to St. David’s Medical Center
Y	Housing Choice * : Expands the number of units and housing choice that suits a variety of household sizes, incomes, and lifestyle needs of a diverse population (ex: apartments, triplex, granny flat, live/work units, cottage homes, and townhomes) in support of Imagine Austin and the Strategic Housing Blueprint.
	Housing Affordability * : Provides a minimum of 10% of units for workforce housing (80% MFI or less) and/or fee in lieu for affordable housing.
	Mixed use * : Provides a mix of residential and non-industrial uses.
	Culture and Creative Economy * : Provides or is located within 0.50 miles of a cultural resource (ex: library, theater, museum, cultural center).
	Culture and Historic Preservation : Preserves or enhances a historically and/or culturally significant site.
	Creative Economy : Expands Austin’s creative economy (ex: live music venue, art studio, film, digital, theater.)
	Workforce Development, the Economy and Education : Expands the economic base by creating permanent jobs, especially in industries that are currently not represented in a particular area or that promotes a new technology, and/or promotes educational opportunities and workforce development training.
	Industrial Land : Preserves or enhances industrial land.
Y	Not located over Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone or Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone
10	Number of “Yes’s”

Austin Transportation – Engineering Review

The site is subject to the approved TIA with zoning case # C814-06-0175. A TIA compliance memo indicating how many trips have been used, how many trips are left, documentation of all fiscal receipts and mitigations, etc, will be required at the time of site plan application. The TIA may need to be revised upon further review.
 Reference: TCM 10.4.4

TPW-TDS has no objection to the removal of Part 11 (G) “Vehicular access is prohibited to Concordia Avenue if required by the City of Austin at the time of site plan approval.” from Ordinance 20221027-049.

The Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) calls for 58 feet of right-of-way for Concordia Avenue. It is recommended that 29 feet of right-of-way from the existing centerline should be dedicated for Concordia Avenue 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)
Concordia Avenue	Level 1 – Residential Collector	58’	51’	27’	No	No	Yes
N IH 35 SVRD SB	Level 4 – Major Arterial (TXDOT)	N/A	314’ (including SB and NB corridor width)	175’ (including SB and NB corridor width)	Yes	Yes	Yes

Austin Parks & Recreation – Planning & Design Review

The key parkland provision of the original PUD was changed with a previous amendment – Parcel A must comply with current code with regards to parkland. In this location, Austin Parks and Recreation (APR) will be requiring fees in lieu of land dedication.

Austin Energy – Green Building

We request that Part 8.Q of the original ordinance be updated to reflect current green building requirements. The rating exhibit in the original ordinance is more than 15 years old and does not reflect current best practices or standards in Green Building. It would also be impractical to administer as it predates our online rating system. We request the requirement be updated to this current PUD language which we believe meets the intent of the requirement in the original ordinance.

All buildings in the East Avenue PUD will achieve a two-star or greater rating under the Austin Energy Green Building program using the applicable rating version in effect at the time a rating registration application is submitted for the building.

Completed projects in the PUD have already been meeting this standard.

Austin Energy – Review

Austin Energy will approve PUD amendment with a condition for a Capacity Report to be submitted during the site plan process.

Site Plan – Review

Site plans will be required for any new development except for residential only project with up to 4 units.

Any new development is subject to Subchapter E. Design Standards and Mixed Use unless specifically exempted by the PUD Ordinance.

Additional comments will be made when the site plan is submitted.

Drainage – Engineering Review

Increase in height does not affect drainage engineering requirements.

Water Quality – Review


Increase in height does not affect water quality requirements.

EXHIBITS AND ATTACHMENTS TO THE STAFF REPORT:

Exhibit A: Zoning Map
Exhibit A-1: Aerial Map

Attachment A: Applicant's 2nd Letter to modify PUD Amendment Request
Attachment B: Applicant's 1st Letter to modify PUD Amendment Request
Attachment C: Applicant's Initial Summary Letter
Attachment D: Original Ordinance - East Avenue PUD (Ordinance No. 20070326-002)
Attachment E: 3rd Amendment - East Avenue PUD (Ordinance No. 20221027-049)
Attachment F: 5th Amendment - East Avenue PUD (Ordinance No. 20231109-040)




Correspondence



PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

ZONING CASE#: C814-06-0175.07



-  SUBJECT TRACT
-  PENDING CASE
-  ZONING BOUNDARY





1" = 400'

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 Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.





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

East Avenue PUD Amendment #7, Parcel A

ZONING CASE#: C814-06-0175.07
 LOCATION: 3500, 3500 1/2, 3502, 3506, 3700 NIH 35 Svrd SB;
 1010 1/2, 1012, 1012 1/2, 1018, 1018 1/2, Concordia Ave
 SUBJECT AREA: 0.9410 Acres
 MANAGER: Nancy Estrada



1" = 400'

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

ATTACHMENT A



February 10, 2026

Ms. Lauren Middleton-Pratt
Planning Department
City of Austin
1000 E 11th Street
Austin, TX 78702

Via Electronic Delivery

Re: East Avenue PUD Amendment #7, Parcel A – Applicant amendment letter to the Fourth PUD Amendment for Parcel A, a 0.94-acre portion of the 22.00-acre East Avenue PUD known as Lot 11 of the East Avenue Subdivision located at 3500, 3500 ½, 3502, 3506 and 3700 North IH-35 Service Road SB and 1010 ½, 1012, 1012 ½, 1018, and 1018 ½ Concordia Avenue in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas (the “Property”).

Dear Ms. Middleton-Pratt:

As representatives of the owner of the Property known as “Parcel A” in the East Avenue PUD (the “PUD”), we respectfully submit this second amendment letter for the PUD amendment application currently under review, assigned zoning case no. C814-06-0175.07, for the project titled *East Avenue PUD Amendment #7, Parcel A*, initially submitted on August 15, 2025, and first amended on November 3, 2025.

Specifically, the requested fourth amendment to Parcel A of the PUD was to: 1) increase the maximum allowable height from 160 feet to 270 feet, and 2) remove the vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue. With this second amendment, we accept City staff’s recommendation that the maximum allowable height be increased from 160 feet to 195 feet.

Please let me know if you or your team members require additional information or have any questions. Thank you for your time and attention to this project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Leah M. Bojo".

Leah M. Bojo

cc: Joi Harden, Planning Department (*via electronic delivery*)
Nancy Estrada, Planning Department (*via electronic delivery*)

ATTACHMENT B



November 3, 2025

Ms. Lauren Middleton-Pratt
Planning Department
City of Austin
1000 E 11th Street
Austin, TX 78702

Via Electronic Delivery

Re: East Avenue PUD, Parcel A, 4th Amendment – Applicant amendment letter to the Fourth PUD Amendment for Parcel A, a 0.94-acre portion of the 22.00-acre East Avenue PUD known as Lot 11 of the East Avenue Subdivision located at 3500, 3500 ½, 3502, 3506 and 3700 North IH-35 Service Road SB and 1010 ½, 1012, 1012 ½, 1018, and 1018 ½ Concordia Avenue in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas (the “Property”).

Dear Ms. Middleton-Pratt:

As representatives of the owner of the Property known as “Parcel A” in the East Avenue PUD (the “PUD”), we respectfully submit this letter to amend the PUD application currently under review, assigned zoning case no. C814-06-0175.07, for the project titled *East Avenue PUD, Parcel A, 4th Amendment*, initially submitted on August 15, 2025.

The requested fourth amendment to Parcel A of the PUD is to: 1) increase the maximum allowable height from 160 feet to 300 feet, and 2) remove the vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue. With this amendment, we are requesting:

- the maximum allowable height be reduced from 300 feet to 270 feet; and
- to remove the portion of the Property being condemned by TxDOT for right of way, known as, “a 0.1890 of one acre (8,235 square foot) parcel of land, being a portion of Lot 11, Block B, East Avenue Subdivision, a subdivision of record in Document No. 200800152, Official Public Records, Travis County, Texas, said Lot 11 conveyed to 1010 Concordia LP by Special Warranty Deed dated January 13, 2022, as recorded in Document No. 2023004574, Official Public Records, Travis County, Texas.”

In addition, with this request we propose installing a CapMetro bikeshare station within the right of way of the PUD to enhance bicycle mobility in the area in response to community feedback emphasizing the importance of multimodal connectivity. We also propose a \$100,000 contribution to the Art in Public Places (AIPP) program, with the intent that funds be used to improve the experience of pedestrians and cyclists utilizing the new I-35 shared use path.

November 3, 2025

Page 2

Please let me know if you or your team members require additional information or have any questions. Thank you for your time and attention to this project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Leah M. Bojo".

Leah M. Bojo

cc: Joi Harden, Planning Department (*via electronic delivery*)
Nancy Estrada, Planning Department (*via electronic delivery*)

ATTACHMENT C



August 15, 2025

Ms. Lauren Middleton-Pratt
Planning Department
City of Austin
1000 E 11th Street
Austin, TX 78702

Via Electronic Delivery

Re: East Avenue PUD, Parcel A, 4th Amendment – Fourth PUD Amendment for Parcel A, a 1.13-acre portion of the 22.00-acre East Avenue PUD known as Lot 11 of the East Avenue Subdivision located at 3500, 3500 ½, 3502, 3506 and 3700 North IH-35 Service Road SB and 1010 ½, 1012, 1012 ½, 1018, and 1018 ½ Concordia Avenue in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas (the “Property”).

Dear Ms. Middleton-Pratt:

As representatives of the owner of the Property, we respectfully submit the enclosed zoning amendment application to the East Avenue PUD (the “PUD”), which is the fourth amendment to “Parcel A,” of the land use plan referenced in City of Austin (the “City”) zoning case numbers C814-06-1075.03, C814-06-1075.05, and C814-06-1075.06. The Property is addressed as 3500, 3500 ½, 3502, 3506 and 3700 North IH-35 Service Road SB and 1012, 1012 ½, 1018, and 1018 ½ Concordia Avenue. The Property is within the full purpose jurisdiction of the City as well as the Project Connect St. David’s Equitable Transit Oriented Development (ETOD) Station Area.

The entirety of the PUD includes 22 acres of land, however Parcel A encompasses only a portion, being 1.13 acres. The remaining portion of the PUD is not included in this amendment request. The Property is also known as Lot 11, Block B of the East Avenue Subdivision, per City of Austin case number C8-2007-0203.0A and recorded as Document No. 200800152 of the Official Public Records of Travis County, Texas.

The purpose of this PUD amendment is to: 1) increase the maximum allowable height of Parcel A from 160 feet to 300 feet, and 2) remove the vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue. The additional height and the access prohibition is necessary to ensure the financial feasibility of delivering the multifamily development and advances City goals for compact and connected growth by concentrating density in a location served by existing infrastructure and transit. The PUD in its entirety continues to be limited to 85% impervious cover and a 2.8:1 FAR, all of which will remain unchanged. A redline of the ordinances related to the above-mentioned changes accompanies this submittal.

Additionally, this rezoning request aligns with the City’s ETOD goals for the St. David’s Station Area typology by including affordable housing options along a highly populated, high-growth MetroRapid corridor (Red River), according to the Station Typology Data in Appendix D, page D8 of the 2023 ETOD Development Study.


August 15, 2025

Page 2

A Traffic Impact Analysis ("TIA") was completed by Kaylie Coleman on July 21, 2025, with the note that the Property must demonstrate compliance with the TIA approved with PUD case number C814-06-0175.

Please let me know if you or your team members require additional information or have any questions. Thank you for your time and attention to this project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Leah M. Bojo".

Leah M. Bojo

cc: Joi Harden, Planning Department (*via electronic delivery*)
Cynthia Hadri, Planning Department (*via electronic delivery*)

ATTACHMENT D

ORDINANCE NO. 20070326-002

AN ORDINANCE REZONING AND CHANGING THE ZONING MAP FOR THE PROPERTY COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE EAST AVENUE PUD LOCATED AT 3400 NORTH IH-35 IN THE HANCOCK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AREA FROM LIMITED OFFICE-MIXED USE-NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (LO-MU-NP) COMBINING DISTRICT, GENERAL OFFICE-NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (GO-NP) COMBINING DISTRICT, AND GENERAL COMMERCIAL SERVICES-MIXED USE-NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (CS-MU-NP) COMBINING DISTRICT TO PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (PUD-NP) COMBINING DISTRICT; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

PART 1. The zoning map established by Section 25-2-191 of the City Code is amended to change the base zoning district from limited office-mixed use-neighborhood plan (LO-MU-NP) combining district, general office-neighborhood plan (GO-NP) combining district, and general commercial services-mixed use-neighborhood plan (CS-MU-NO) combining district to planned unit development-neighborhood plan (PUD-NP) combining district on the property described in File C814-06-0175 on record at the Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department, as 22 acres of land, more or less, being more particularly described in Exhibit A (*Description of Property*) incorporated into this ordinance (the "Property"), locally known as the property located at 3400 North IH-35, in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, and generally identified in the map attached as Exhibit B (*Zoning Map*).

PART 2. This ordinance, together with the attached Exhibits A through F, is the land use plan for the East Avenue planned unit development district (the "PUD") created by this ordinance. The PUD shall conform to the limitations and conditions set forth in this ordinance and in the East Avenue planned unit development land use plan. Except as otherwise specifically provided by this ordinance, all other rules, regulations and ordinances of the City in effect on the effective date of this ordinance apply to the PUD.

PART 3. The Property is subject to Ordinance No. 040826-59 that established the Hancock neighborhood plan combining district.

PART 4. The attached exhibits are incorporated into this ordinance in their entirety as though set forth fully in the text of this ordinance. The exhibits are as follows:

Exhibit A:	Description of Property
Exhibit B:	Zoning Map
Exhibit C-1:	Land Use Plan: Internal Street or Driveway and Block Plan
Exhibit C-2:	Land Use Plan: Maximum Building Area and Height Zones
Exhibit C-3:	Land Use Plan: Ground Floor Pedestrian-Oriented Use Frontages
Exhibit C-4-A:	Section AA: North/South Internal Street or Driveway
Exhibit C-4-B:	Section BB: East/West Streets or Driveways
Exhibit C-4-C:	Section CC: Internal Oval Street or Driveway
Exhibit C-4-D:	Section DD: Internal Street or Driveway at Church Property Edge
Exhibit C-5:	Land Use Plan: Alternative Internal Street or Driveway and Block Plan With Church Access Easement
Exhibit D:	Grow Green Native and Adapted Landscape Plants
Exhibit D-1	Invasive Species/Problem Plants
Exhibit E:	Tree Survey
Exhibit F:	Operational Criteria for Hotel

PART 5. Definitions.

A. In this ordinance:

1. **PARCEL.** The PUD is divided into twelve parcels, identified on Exhibit C-1 (*Land Use Plan: Internal Street or Driveway and Block Plan*) as Parcels A, B1, B2, B3, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, and J.
2. **LIVE WORK UNIT** means single family residential, or a townhouse residential use with ground level workspace or commercial space and upper level living space. The work space or commercial space and living space must be used and occupied by the same owner or occupant.
3. **SITE** means all the Property included in the PUD.
4. **PARCEL BLOCK LENGTH** means the linear distance of the boundary of a Parcel measured as it abuts an internal street or driveway frontage that generally runs north and south; and **PARCEL BLOCK WIDTH** means the linear distance of the boundary of a Parcel measured as it

abuts an internal street or driveway frontage that generally runs east and west.

- B. All other terms have the meaning provided in the Code.

PART 6. In accordance with Section 25-2-411 (A) (*Planned Unit Development District Regulations*) of the City Code, the following regulations apply to the PUD instead of otherwise applicable City regulations.

- A. Section 25-2-243 (*Proposed District Boundaries Must Be Contiguous*) of the City Code does not apply to the PUD.
- B. Section 25-2, Article 10 (*Compatibility Standards*) of the City Code does apply to the PUD with exception of heights and setbacks.
- C. Section 25-4, Article 3, Division 5 (*Parkland Dedication*) of the City Code as amended, does not apply to the Property or the PUD, and no parkland dedication or payment instead of dedication of land is required for the development of the PUD.

PART 7. Permitted, Conditional, and Prohibited Uses. A use that is not included as a permitted or conditional use in this Part is a prohibited use in the PUD. A prohibited use may not be established as a principal use or as an accessory use to a principal use.

- A. Except as modified in Subsections C and D of this Part the following uses are permitted uses in the PUD:

Bed and breakfast (Group I and II)
Condominium residential
Duplex residential
Multi-family residential
Single family residential
Townhouse residential
Administrative and business offices
Art gallery
Art workshop
Business or trade school
Business support services

Communication services
Consumer convenience services
Consumer repair services
Financial services
Food sales
General retail sales (convenience)
General retail sales (general)
Personal improvement services
Personal services
Pet services
Printing and publishing
Professional office
Research services
Restaurant (limited)
Restaurant (general)
Software development
College and university facilities
Communications services facilities
Congregate living
Cultural services
Day care services (commercial, general and limited)
Family home
Group Home, Class I (general and limited)
Group Home, Class II
Private and public primary educational facilities
Private and public secondary educational facilities
Religious assembly
Telecommunication tower (to the extent authorized by City Code)

- B. The following uses are permitted and must comply with the conditions set forth below:
1. An automotive sales use may only be conducted within an enclosed building. Incidental maintenance or service associated with the use is prohibited.
 2. On Parcel C north of the area designated as the 88 foot height zone on Exhibit C-2 the only permitted use is a residential use.

3. A food preparation use is only permitted on Parcels G and H.
4. A hotel-motel use is only permitted on Parcel D. If Parcel D is developed with a hotel-motel use, a cocktail lounge use, an indoor entertainment use, an outdoor swimming pool use (together with one or more associated hot tubs), and a laundry service use are each permitted as accessory uses to the hotel-motel use on Parcel D. A cocktail lounge use is not permitted as a principal use in the PUD.
5. A residential use includes the following uses that are authorized and may be permitted as an accessory use to the principal residential use:
 - i. Personal improvement services use;
 - ii. Sales, management, and leasing offices;
 - iii. Indoor entertainment use;
 - iv. Outdoor swimming pool use (together with one or more associated hot tubs); and
 - v. Outdoor basketball or sport court use without lighting for night use.
6. Indoor sports and recreation use is limited to: (i) one bowling alley not to exceed 5,000 square feet of gross floor area, and (ii) an indoor racquetball or sports court use as an accessory use to a health or physical fitness studio use.
7. The total square footage for medical office use in the PUD may not exceed 175,000 square feet of gross floor area.
8. A theater use is limited to one movie theater use in the PUD not exceeding 28,000 square feet of gross floor area.
9. Any single ground floor commercial use on Parcel I located north of the internal demarcation line shown on Exhibit C-3 may not exceed 15,000 square feet of gross floor area.

10. A condominium residential use, multifamily residential use, hotel-motel use, and any accessory use to those uses are permitted in a tower on Parcel D that exceeds a height of 90 feet.
11. A condominium residential use or multifamily residential use, and any accessory use to those uses, are the only permitted uses in the two towers on Parcel G that exceed a height of 80 feet.
12. On Parcels B1 and B3 the only permitted use is a townhouse residential use. Subsection (A) of Section 25-2-775 (*Townhouses*) is waived and the townhouse site does not have to be platted to create individual townhouse lots if the townhouse development site is established as a condominium regime. Exclusive use areas will be created that function as lots for purposes of compliance with Section 25-2-775 (B) and (D) through (G).
13. On Parcel B2, permitted uses are a live-work unit, single family residential or townhouse residential use. Subsection (A) of Section 25-2-775 (*Townhouses*) is waived and the townhouse site does not have to be platted to create individual townhouse lots if the townhouse development site is established as a condominium regime. Exclusive use areas will be created that function as lots for purposes of compliance with Section 25-2-775 (B) and (D) through (G).

C. This subsection relates to a pedestrian-oriented use.

1. Seventy-five percent of the ground floor area as depicted on Exhibit C-3 (*Ground Floor Pedestrian-Oriented Use Frontages*) and shown as cross-hatched areas must be used for the following pedestrian oriented uses: art gallery, food sales, general retail sales (convenience or general), residential uses, restaurant (limited or general); and
2. The remaining twenty-five percent of the ground floor area as depicted on Exhibit C-3 may be any pedestrian-oriented use from the list of uses set forth in Section 25-2-691 (C) (*Waterfront Overlay(WO) District Uses*) of the City Code as it exists on the effective date of this ordinance, excluding a cocktail lounge use. Additional uses may not be added by the Land Use Commission under Section 25-2-691 (C)(12) .

3. A driveway may be located in the area designated for pedestrian-oriented uses.

D. The following uses are conditional uses in the PUD:

Commercial off-street parking
Off-site accessory parking
Custom manufacturing
Guidance services
Hospital services (limited)
Transportation terminal

E. The following activities are prohibited in the PUD:

1. A drive-in service is prohibited.
2. A helicopter facility as set forth in Section 25-2-861 (*Facilities for Helicopters and Other Nonfixed Wing Aircraft*) is prohibited.

PART 8. Site Development Regulations. Except as set forth in the ordinance, the Property is subject to community commercial-mixed use (GR-MU) site development regulations.

- A. The PUD shall be developed according to the land use plan shown as Exhibits C-1 through C-4-A through C-4-D and as set forth in this part.
- B. Section 2.3.1.B.2.b. of Subchapter E (*Design Standards and Mixed Use*) of Chapter 25-2 does not apply to this PUD.
- C. Section 4.2.1.D.6.c of Subchapter E (*Design Standards and Mixed Use*) of Chapter 25-2 does not apply to this PUD, provided, however, that at least 650 square feet of site area is required for each dwelling unit.
- D. The site development regulations established by Section 25-2-775 (*Townhouses*) with the exception of Section 25-2-775(C) apply to Parcels B1, B2, and B3.

- E. The total maximum impervious cover that may be developed overall on the Property is 85 percent. Individual lots may exceed 85 percent impervious cover.
- F. The maximum floor-to-area ratio that may be developed overall on the Property is 2.8 to 1.0.
- G. Except on Parcels B1, B2, and B3, the maximum building coverage for each parcel is 100 percent, subject to compliance with Subsection D and Exhibits C-4-A through C-4-D.
- H. Except on Parcels B1, B2, and B3, the minimum lot size is 0 square feet.
- I. Except on Parcels B1, B2, and B3, the minimum lot width is 0 feet.
- J. There is no maximum number of residential units per acre, unless otherwise limited by other requirements established for this PUD.
- K. Outdoor amplified sound is not permitted in the PUD.
- L. Height limits and setbacks shall comply with Exhibit C-2 (*Maximum Building Area and Height Zones*) and as follows.
 - 1. Building height shall be measured from the lowest point of the north/south internal street or driveway sidewalk grade adjacent to the building to:
 - a. for a flat roof, the highest point of the coping;
 - b. for a mansard roof, the deck line;
 - c. for a pitched or hip roof, the average height of the highest gable; or
 - d. for other roof styles, the highest point of the building.
 - 2. Development of Parcel D is limited to a maximum height of 90 feet, except that one hotel/condominium residential tower above a maximum height of 90 feet may be constructed to a maximum height of 182 feet if the application for site plan approval for development of Parcel D complies with the following:
 - a. the minimum distance between the finished ground floor of the building and the structural portion of the ceiling is 18 feet;

- b. the minimum distance between the finished floor of one or more ballroom/meeting rooms and the structural portion of the ceiling is 33 feet;
- c. the minimum distance between the finished floor and the structural portion of the ceiling for all hotel rooms shall be 9 feet;
- d. no more than 65% of the gross floor area constructed above a height of 90 feet may be dwelling units;
- e. no more than 50% of the combined gross floor area of all structures on Parcel D may be dwelling units;
- f. the structure contains spaces designed, identified, and intended for each of the following uses: restaurant, cocktail lounge, spa, fitness center, and swimming pool; and
- g. the applicant provides a letter commitment to the Watershed Protection and Development Review Department for review and approval that contains all of operational criteria as set forth in Exhibit F (*Operational Criteria for Hotel*).

3. Building Area.

- a. For a tower on Parcel D, the building coverage above 90 feet may not exceed 20,000 square feet.
- b. The building coverage above 80 feet of the two residential towers located on Parcel G may not exceed 32,000 square feet.
- c. The building coverage above 80 feet of a single tower located on Parcel G may not exceed 17,600 square feet.
- d. Except as authorized by Subsections e and f, no commercial use on a ground floor may have a ground floor footprint that exceeds 15,000 square feet of gross floor area.
- e. One food sales use established in the PUD may have a ground floor footprint that exceeds 15,000 square feet of gross floor area up to a maximum of 45,000 square feet of gross floor area, but may not exceed 200 linear feet of frontage along an internal street or driveway or a public street.
- f. In addition to the food sales use authorized by subsection e, four commercial uses may each have a ground floor footprint of up to a maximum of 20,000 square feet of gross floor area.

4. Setbacks. Setback requirements and required alleys are established by and illustrated on Exhibit C-2 (*Land Use Plan; Maximum Building Area and Height Zones*). If a setback is not shown on the exhibit, the setback is 0 feet. The five foot setbacks from the alleys abutting Parcels B1 and B3 as illustrated on Exhibit C-2 shall be landscaped except for driveways and utility crossings.

M. Internal Street or Driveway and Block Plan. (*Exhibit C-1*)

1. Internal streets or driveways within the PUD shall be developed with streetscape improvements and street design that comply with the applicable standards established by Exhibits C-4-A through C-4-D and with City of Austin Great Streets Program criteria that do not conflict with a requirement established by Exhibits C-4-A through C-4-D, except that site furnishings may be modified by the owner with the approval of the City. No certificate of occupancy for a structure on a parcel shall be issued until all internal streets or driveways abutting that structure are completed in compliance with this subsection.
2. Streetscapes for internal streets or drives, sidewalks and adjacent landscape zones shall be built according to Exhibits C-4-A through C-4-D, and according to the City of Austin's Great Streets Program criteria, which establishes street tree species, caliper, spacing, location from curb, planting detail, etc. The parallel parking (including drop-off and customer service zones) illustrated in Exhibits C-4-A through C-4-D may be eliminated if replaced by landscaped zones or publicly-accessible hardscape zones (e.g., plaza, sidewalk extension). The parallel parking including drop-off and customer service zones may be eliminated if required by City of Austin for safety purposes. The type and location of site furnishings (benches, internal street or driveway lighting, waste bins, etc.), may be modified from the Great Streets Program standard furnishings by the owner with the approval of the City. An internal street or driveway in the PUD shall be deemed to be an "Internal Circulation Route" for purposes of applying Subchapter E (*Design Standards and Mixed Use*) of Chapter 25-2.
3. A minimum 5-foot wide continuous unobstructed path must be maintained for all sidewalks within the PUD.

4. Internal drive alignments and curb cuts are subject to approval by all applicable governmental entities. The internal street or driveway alignments may be modified as long as no parcel block length or width is increased or decreased by more than five percent, unless the modification is required to satisfy a requirement of a governmental entity or to protect a tree pursuant to Subsection 8.
 5. All internal street or driveways shall be constructed using City of Austin construction standards (e.g., paving depth), except as modified by the applicable design standards established by Subsection 1.
 6. All internal streets or driveways may be public or private, and shall be accessible for public use and shall not be gated.
 7. Drop-off and customer service zones may be provided within the eight foot wide parallel parking lanes as needed for safety purposes.
 8. The twenty-six existing trees identified on Exhibit E (*Tree Survey*) must be preserved on the site. Internal street or driveway and parking locations may be adjusted to preserve existing trees identified on Exhibit E.
 9. A minimum of one acre identified on Exhibit C-1 as Parcel E and Parcel J must be provided as public open space. A minimum of 75% of this public open space must be a landscaped area. For purposes of this requirement, "public open space" means an outdoor area located on the ground (but not on a roof, balcony, deck, porch, or terrace) that is designed and accessible to the public for outdoor recreation, pedestrian access, and excludes parking facilities, driveways, utility, and service areas.
- N. Development in the PUD shall incorporate vegetative filter strips, retention/irrigation systems, biofiltration, rainwater harvesting, or porous pavement for pedestrian surfaces. When one or more of those methods is utilized to the full extent feasible as determined by the Developer and approved by the City of Austin Watershed Protection and Development Review Department, the Developer may rely on traditional water quality methods to comply with remaining water quality requirements. If rainwater harvesting is incorporated, all cisterns shall be screened from public view (for example, within a garage, underground, or behind a decorative façade).

- O. At the time an application for approval of a site plan is submitted for development of the Property, or any portion of the Property, an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan shall be submitted to the Watershed Protection and Development Review Department for review and approval. The IPM plan shall comply with the guidelines in Section 1.6.9.2 (D) and (F) of the Environmental Criteria Manual that are in effect on the date of this covenant.
- P. At the time an application for approval of a site plan is submitted for development of the Property, or any portion of the Property, a landscape plan shall be submitted to the Watershed Protection and Development Review Department for review and approval. Ninety percent of the total plant material used, exclusive of turf, shall be native to Central Texas or on the Grow Green Native and Adapted Landscape Plants list, attached as Exhibit "D". Plants on the Invasive Species/Problem Plants list, attached as Exhibit "D-1", may not be included.
- Q. All new residential and commercial development shall comply with Austin Energy Green Building Program in effect on March 26, 2007, to achieve a minimum two-star rating.
- R. 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 30,906 trips. All development on the Property is subject to the recommendations contained in the memorandum from the Transportation Review Section of the Watershed Protection and Development Review Department, dated March 26, 2007 which was based on a Traffic Impact Analysis ("TIA") prepared by WHM Transportation Engineering, Inc., dated August 2006, or as amended and approved by the Director of the Watershed Protection and Development Review Department. The TIA shall be kept on file at the Watershed Protection and Development Review Department.
- S. Notice of all site plan applications to develop Property within the PUD shall be sent by the City to the owners of land within 1,000 feet of the boundary of the PUD. The City shall be responsible for providing this notice and shall use its best efforts to do so. A failure or deficiency by the City in providing

notice to the owner of land more than 300 feet from the boundary of the PUD shall not be a basis, by itself, for delay or adverse action by the City in processing or approving a site development application.


- T. As an alternative, a building permit for a structure on Parcel C may be issued using the building envelope, setback, location, and dimensions illustrated by Exhibit C-5 (*Land Use Plan: Alternative Internal Street or Driveway and Block Plan With Church Access Easement*) only after the roadway shown in Exhibit C-4-D is constructed abutting the western boundary of the PUD north of Luther Lane to Concordia Avenue and is accessible for public use. No certificate of occupancy for any structure on Parcel C shall be issued until the all improvements required by Exhibit C-4-D are installed.

PART 9. The Council finds that the need for development certainty for the Property creates an emergency. Because of this emergency, this ordinance takes effect immediately on its passage for the preservation of the public peace, health, and safety.


PASSED AND APPROVED

March 26, 2007


§
§
§



Will Wynn
Mayor





APPROVED:



David Allan Smith
City Attorney

ATTEST:


Shirley A. Gentry
City Clerk



 1" = 400'	SUBJECT TRACT 	PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT EXHIBIT B		CITY GRID REFERENCE NUMBER
	PENDING CASE 	CASE #: C814-06-0175	DATE: 06-08	K25
	ZONING BOUNDARY 	ADDRESS: 3400 N IH 35 SVRD	INTLS: SM	
	CASE MGR: J. ROUSSELIN	SUBJECT AREA (acres): 22.205		



* APPROXIMATE TOWER LOCATIONS AND FOOTPRINTS
 SB = SETBACK
 - - - - BUILDABLE AREA LIMIT

EAST AVENUE PUD
 EXHIBIT C-2: LAND USE PLAN
 MAXIMUM BUILDING AREA AND HEIGHT ZONES
 Prepared by ROMA Design Group

ORDINANCE NO. 20221027-049

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 20070326-002 TO MODIFY THE LAND USE PLAN FOR THE EAST AVENUE PUD IN THE CENTRAL AUSTIN COMBINED NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AND CHANGING THE ZONING MAP FROM PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (PUD-NP) COMBINING DISTRICT TO PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (PUD-NP) COMBINING DISTRICT FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1012, 1012 1/2, 1016, 1018, 1018 1/2 CONCORDIA AVENUE AND 3500, 3500 1/2, 3502, 3506, 3508 1/2 NORTH INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 35 SERVICE ROAD SOUTHBOUND.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

PART 1. The East Avenue planned unit development (“East Avenue PUD”) was approved by City Council on March 26, 2007, under Ordinance No. 20070326-002 (the “Original Ordinance”). The first amendment proposed in Case No. C814-06-0174.01 to the Original Ordinance was withdrawn. An amendment was approved administratively on February 27, 2009.

PART 2. The East Avenue PUD is comprised of approximately 22 acres of land located generally in the vicinity of 3400 North Interstate Highway 35 in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas and more particularly described by metes and bounds in the land use plan incorporated into the Original Ordinance. This ordinance only affects Parcel A, identified in the East Avenue PUD as described in Part 3 below.

PART 3. The zoning map established by Section 25-2-191 of the City Code is amended to change the base district from planned unit development-neighborhood plan (PUD-NP) combining district to planned unit development-neighborhood plan (PUD-NP) combining district on the property generally known as Parcel A of the East Avenue PUD, described in Zoning Case No. C814-06-0174.03, on file at the Housing and Planning Department, as follows:

LOT 11, BLOCK B, EAST AVENUE SUBDIVISION, a subdivision in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, recorded in Document No. 200800152 of the Official Public Records of Travis County, Texas (the “Property”),

locally known as 1012, 1012 1/2, 1016, 1018, 1018 1/2 Concordia Avenue and 3500, 3500 1/2, 3502, 3506, 3508 1/2 North Interstate Highway 35 Service Road Southbound, in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, and generally identified in the map attached as **Exhibit “A”**.

PART 4. This ordinance and the attached exhibits amend the Original Ordinance for the Property. Development of and uses within the Property shall conform to the limitations and conditions set forth in this ordinance and in **Exhibit “B”**. If this ordinance and the attached exhibits conflict, the ordinance applies. Except as otherwise provided by this ordinance and the Amended Land Use Plan, all other rules, regulations and ordinances of the City apply to the Property.

PART 5. The attached exhibits are incorporated into this ordinance in their entirety as though set forth fully in the text of this ordinance. Exhibit C-2: Maximum Building Area and Height Zones of the Original Ordinance is amended as shown on **Exhibit “B”**. The attached exhibits are as follows:

Exhibit A: Zoning Map for Parcel A

Exhibit B: Amended Exhibit C-2: Maximum Building Area and Height Zones

PART 6. Part 6. C. of the Original Ordinance is amended to read as follows:

- C. Section 25-4, Article 3, Division 5 (*Parkland Dedication*) of the City Code as amended, does not apply to the Property or the PUD, and no parkland dedication or payment instead of dedication of land is required for the development of the PUD. Except for Parcel A, which is required to pay a fee in lieu of parkland dedication, per Title 25, Article 14, of the City Code, as amended.

PART 7. Part 8. C. of the Original Ordinance is amended to read as follows:

- C. Section 4.2.1.D.6.c of Subchapter E (*Design Standards and Mixed Use*) of Chapter 25-2 does not apply to this PUD, provided, however, that at least 650 square feet of site area is required for each dwelling unit. Except for Parcel A, which is not subject to any site area requirements.

PART 8. Part 8. L. Building Area of the Original Ordinance is amended to add new Sections 5 to read as follows:

5. Development of Parcel A is limited to a maximum height of 120 feet.

PART 9. Part 8. of the Original Ordinance is amended to add new Section U. to read as follows:

- U. To the extent on-site alternative water sources are sufficient, and available, including AC condensate, foundation drain water, rainwater, and stormwater

development on Parcel A shall use on-site alternate water sources to meet 100 percent of non-potable uses, including irrigation, cooling, toilet/urinal flushing, and other significant non-potable water uses identified in Austin Water Utility's Water Balance Calculator Tool.

PART 10. The Original Ordinance is amended to add new Part 10 to read as follows:

PART 10. Landowner shall provide onsite affordable housing on Parcel A, for square footage of the building in excess of 65 feet in height, or pay fee in-lieu for square footage of the building in excess of 65 feet in height prior to initial site plan approvals as follows:

- A. Provide a minimum of five percent of the residential units, for at least 99 years from the date of initial sale, for ownership and occupancy by households earning 80 percent or less of the current Austin-Round Rock Metropolitan Statistical Area Median Family Income as determined by the Director of the Housing and Planning Department, including approval of a plan for managing homeowner association fees or including an assumption that a homeowner will be required to pay an ownership association fee when determining the maximum affordable sales price; or
- B. Pay as fee in-lieu to the City's Housing Trust an amount of seven dollars (\$7.00) per square foot of bonus area.

PART 11. Development of the Property shall comply with the following regulations:

- A. No exterior of a buildings shall include Mirrored Glass as defined in Section 25-1-21(67) (*Definitions*).
- B. Landowner shall comply with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Bird Collision Deterrence standards on all buildings and structures.
- C. Landowner shall restrict glass reflectivity to 13.5 percent in the LEED-identified "critical compliance zone" from ground level to 36 feet above grade on all buildings and structures.
- D. Landowner shall restrict glass to an average 13.5 percent reflectivity on all buildings and structures.
- E. Landowner shall design buildings and structure with additional bird-friendly design elements:

- i. a podium overhang to shield the critical compliance zone;
- ii. fully shielded lighting;
- iii. full cut off landscape lighting;
- iv. no exterior building-up lighting; and
- v. building articulation that reduce the size of the building's reflective plane.

F. Landowner shall construct a vegetative wall along the west side of the first two stories of all buildings and structures.

G. Vehicular access is prohibited to Concordia Avenue if required by the City of Austin at the time of site plan approval.

PART 12. Except as otherwise provided for in this ordinance, the terms and conditions of Ordinance No. 20070326-002, as amended, remain in effect.

PART 13. Except as specifically modified by this ordinance, the Property is subject to Ordinance No. 040826-59 that established zoning for the Hancock Neighborhood Plan.


PART 14. This ordinance takes effect on November 7, 2022.

PASSED AND APPROVED

October 27

, 2022

§
§
§




Steve Adler
Mayor


APPROVED: Anne L. Morgan
Anne L. Morgan
City Attorney

ATTEST: Stephanie Huff for
Myrna Rios
City Clerk

EXHIBIT "B"



* APPROXIMATE TOWER LOCATIONS AND FOOTPRINTS
SB = SETBACK
--- BUILDABLE AREA LIMIT



EAST AVENUE PUD
EXHIBIT C-2: LAND USE PLAN
MAXIMUM BUILDING AREA AND HEIGHT ZONES
Prepared by ROMA Design Group

ORDINANCE NO. 20231109-040

AN ORDINANCE REZONING AND CHANGING THE ZONING MAP FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3500, 3500 1/2, 3502, 3506, AND 3700 NORTH INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 35 SERVICE ROAD SOUTHBOUND AND 1012, 1012 1/2, 1018, AND 1018 1/2 CONCORDIA AVENUE IN THE CENTRAL AUSTIN COMBINED NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AREA FROM PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (PUD-NP) COMBINING DISTRICT TO PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (PUD-NP) COMBINING DISTRICT, TO CHANGE A CONDITION OF ZONING.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

PART 1. The East Avenue planned unit development ("East Avenue PUD") was approved by City Council on March 26, 2007, under Ordinance No. 20070326-002 (the "Original Ordinance"). The first amendment proposed in Case No. C814-06-0174.01 to the Original Ordinance was withdrawn. A second amendment was approved administratively on February 27, 2009. A third amendment was approved by City Council on October 27, 2022, under Ordinance No. 20221027-049. A fourth amendment was approved by City Council on August 31, 2023, under Ordinance No. 20230831-116.

PART 2. The East Avenue PUD is comprised of approximately 22 acres of land located generally in the vicinity of 3400 North Interstate Highway 35 in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas and more particularly described by metes and bounds in the land use plan incorporated into the Original Ordinance. **This ordinance only affects Parcel A, identified in the East Avenue PUD** as described in Part 3 below.

PART 3. The zoning map established by Section 25-2-191 of the City Code is amended to change the base district from planned unit development-neighborhood plan (PUD-NP) combining district to planned unit development-neighborhood plan (PUD-NP) combining district on the property described in Zoning Case No. C814-06-0175.05, on file at the Planning Department, as follows:

LOT 11, BLOCK B, EAST AVENUE SUBDIVISION, a subdivision in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, recorded in Document No. 200800152 of the Official Public Records of Travis County, Texas (the "Property"),

locally known as 3500, 3500 1/2, 3502, 3506, and 3700 North Interstate Highway 35 Service Road Southbound and 1012, 1012 1/2, 1018, and 1018 1/2 Concordia Avenue in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, and generally identified in the map attached as **Exhibit "A"**.

PART 4. This ordinance and the attached exhibit amends the Original Ordinance, as amended, for the Property. Development of and uses within the Property shall conform to the limitations and conditions set forth in this ordinance. If this ordinance and the attached exhibit conflicts, the ordinance applies. Except as otherwise provided by this ordinance, all other rules, regulations, and ordinances of the City apply to the Property.

PART 5. The Original Ordinance as amended by Ordinance No. 20221027-049 added Section L. 5. to PART 8 establishing a maximum building height on the Property. PART 8. L. 5. of the Original Ordinance is amended to read as follows:

- 5. Development of Parcel A is limited to a maximum height of [120] 160 feet; except the maximum height is limited to 120 feet for that portion of Parcel A along the eastern boundary line and measuring 40.5 feet along the northern property line and 8.75 feet along the southern property line, as depicted on Exhibit "B" or that portion dedicated as right-of-way.

PART 6. Except as otherwise provided for in this ordinance, the terms and conditions of Ordinance No 20070326-002, as amended, remain in effect.


PART 7. Except as specifically modified by this ordinance, the Property is subject to Ordinance No. 040826-59 that established zoning for the Hancock Neighborhood Plan.

PART 8. This ordinance takes effect on November 20, 2023.


PASSED AND APPROVED

_____, November 9, 2023

§
§
§



Kirk Watson
Mayor

APPROVED: _____

 Anne L. Morgan
 City Attorney



ATTEST: _____

 Myrna Rios
 City Clerk

EXHIBIT "B"



Leah M. Bojo
lbojo@drennergroupp.com
512-807-2918

DRENNER
GROUP

March 23, 2026

Ms. Lauren Middleton-Pratt
Planning Department
City of Austin
6310 Wilhelmina Delco Drive
Austin, TX 78752

Via Electronic Delivery

Re: East Avenue PUD Amendment #7, Parcel A – Applicant postponement request letter for the Fourth PUD Amendment to Parcel A, a 0.94-acre portion of the 22.00-acre East Avenue PUD known as Lot 11 of the East Avenue Subdivision located at 3500, 3500 ½, 3502, 3506 and 3700 North IH-35 Service Road SB and 1010 ½, 1012, 1012 ½, 1018, and 1018 ½ Concordia Avenue in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas (the “Property”).

Dear Ms. Middleton-Pratt:

As representatives of the owner of the Property known as “Parcel A” in the East Avenue PUD (the “PUD”), we respectfully request a postponement for the PUD amendment application currently under review, assigned zoning case no. C814-06-0175.07, on the March 26, 2026, City Council agenda to the April 9, 2026, City Council agenda.

Please let me know if you or your team members require additional information or have any questions. Thank you for your time and attention to this project.

Sincerely,



Leah M. Bojo

cc: Joi Harden, Planning Department (*via electronic delivery*)
Nancy Estrada, Planning Department (*via electronic delivery*)

From: Leah Bojo
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2026 2:44 PM
To: Charles d'Harcourt; Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Drew Raffaele; HNA Zoning Committee; HNA Executive Committee; Deller, Natalie <Natalie.Deller@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Re: Agreement on C814-06-0175.07 postponement

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi, yes we agree. Thank you!

Leah M. Bojo, AICP, Director of Land Use & Entitlements
2705 Bee Caves Road, Suite 100, Austin, TX 78746
Drenner Group, PC | www.drennergroupp.com

From: Charles d'Harcourt
Date: Monday, January 12, 2026 at 3:12 PM
To: Nancy Estrada <nancy.estrada@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Leah Bojo, Drew Raffaele, HNA Zoning Committee, HNA Executive Committee, Natalie Deller <natalie.deller@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Agreement on C814-06-0175.07 postponement

Hi Ms. Estrada (CC: Leah Bojo and Drew Raffaele of the Drenner Group, the Hancock Neighborhood Association's zoning and executive committees, and Natalie Deller from the district 9 council office),

I don't think we've met or corresponded before, but I'm the president of the Hancock Neighborhood Association, a volunteer organization representing residents of the Hancock neighborhood, which includes the 1012 Concordia Avenue property whose rezoning is requested through case C814-06-0175.07.

Our neighborhood association's executive committee and Leah Bojo and Drew Raffaele, who represent the owners of this property, met today and agreed to a postponement of the review of this case to the planning commission's February 10th meeting.

This will give our association members time to discuss and vote on an official association position on the case, and time for further discussion between the

neighborhood and the applicants if these are necessary.

Please feel free to contact me by email or at the phone number below if you have any questions about this or the neighborhood association, and thanks for your work managing this case,

- Charles

Charles d'Harcourt, Hancock Neighborhood Association volunteer and current president

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: [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'Harcourt

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 [Fight the Height.docx](#). [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

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."

From: [Deanna Nied](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: 1012 Concordia Feedback for 2/10/26 Planning Commission Meeting
Date: Monday, February 9, 2026 10:31:14 AM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Estrada,

A note for the Planning Commission regarding **1012 Concordia**:

As a homeowner in the Hancock neighborhood, **I respectfully request that you deny the request of the developers of 1012 Concordia to increase the height of the proposed building.**

I am extremely concerned about the proposed height and how it would negatively affect our neighborhood. As proposed, this excessively tall building would be completely out of proportion and look out of place. It will also bring additional congestion to our area which already experiences high traffic.

Hancock is a beautiful, quaint historic neighborhood. Please help us preserve this historic neighborhood by denying this request.

Thank you,
Deanna Nied
Homeowner
3501 Woodrow Street
Austin, TX 78705

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: [Steve Nied](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: 1012 Concordia
Date: Saturday, February 7, 2026 7:25:48 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 urge the Planning Commission to recommend denial of the request of the developers of 1012 Concordia to increase the height of the proposed building. The requested height is extreme and does not at all fit with the character of the area. As a resident of the Hancock neighborhood, I would be personally affected by the increase in congestion from the already congested roadways in the area. The infrastructure is just not sufficient to support such density.

Regards,

Steve Nied
3501 Woodrow St
Austin, TX 78705

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: [Deanna Nied](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: 1012 Concordia Feedback for 2/10/26 Planning Commission Meeting
Date: Monday, February 9, 2026 10:31:14 AM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Estrada,

A note for the Planning Commission regarding **1012 Concordia**:

As a homeowner in the Hancock neighborhood, **I respectfully request that you deny the request of the developers of 1012 Concordia to increase the height of the proposed building.**

I am extremely concerned about the proposed height and how it would negatively affect our neighborhood. As proposed, this excessively tall building would be completely out of proportion and look out of place. It will also bring additional congestion to our area which already experiences high traffic.

Hancock is a beautiful, quaint historic neighborhood. Please help us preserve this historic neighborhood by denying this request.

Thank you,
Deanna Nied
Homeowner
3501 Woodrow Street
Austin, TX 78705

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: [Steve Nied](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: 1012 Concordia
Date: Saturday, February 7, 2026 7:25:48 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 urge the Planning Commission to recommend denial of the request of the developers of 1012 Concordia to increase the height of the proposed building. The requested height is extreme and does not at all fit with the character of the area. As a resident of the Hancock neighborhood, I would be personally affected by the increase in congestion from the already congested roadways in the area. The infrastructure is just not sufficient to support such density.

Regards,

Steve Nied
3501 Woodrow St
Austin, TX 78705

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: [Helen Gaebler](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Opposition to requested 270 foot Height Allowance at the old Concordia Site
Date: Monday, February 9, 2026 5:48:08 PM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Good afternoon.

I am writing to express my opposition to a proposed change in height at the old Concordia site (now East Ave.). The applicants seeking this THIRD height adjustment have already received 2 prior approvals but have not yet provided any information or planning documents to show what is contemplated in that space. There is absolutely no reason why a building at that location would warrant a 270 foot height allowance. They already have been granted 160 feet, more than twice the height of the original structures, and they now are asking for an additional 110 feet in height. To grant this request is entirely without basis and inconsistent with the nature of the surrounding neighborhoods and current commercial and educational uses. Not even the nearby University of Texas has any structures of this height. In fact, a 270 foot building would be the tallest building in the city outside of downtown Austin and the Domain. Indeed, it would be one of the tallest buildings situated anywhere between Austin and Dallas.

To the extent the area around that property is under development with the I-35 corridor expansion, the goal of the city's cap-and-stitch planning is to enrich this area with increased walkability, neighborhood access, and urban connectivity. A building of this size is entirely unnecessary and inconsistent with the surrounding area and should not be allowed. I encourage the city's planning department and its city council to oppose any additional height increases at this site.

Thank you,

Helen Gaebler

[REDACTED]
Austin, TX 78705
[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: [Maryanna Dickens](#)
To: [Estrada, Nancy](#)
Subject: Re: Restrict height of bldgs on old Concordia Property.
Date: Tuesday, February 10, 2026 12:24:16 PM

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

External Email - Exercise Caution

Sent from my iPhone

> On Feb 10, 2026, at 12:21 PM, Maryanna Dickens <maryannarosedickens@gmail.com> wrote:
> Yes please restrict immediately!!! For helicopters also!!! Now!!! M. R. Dickens!!! Carolyn Ave!!!!
> .

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
Sent: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 2:50 PM
To: Ibojo; Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Voting 'NO' to remove the vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue

External Email - Exercise Caution

Leah Bojo(Drenner Group PC) and Nancy Estrada(City Planning Dept.),

Once again we vote 'NO' in regards to *Case Number: C814-06-0175.07* dated Jan. 2nd, 2026. This is requesting to remove the vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue.

We have several significant concerns regarding its potential impact on our block of Concordia Ave.

Our primary issues are:

Traffic and Parking:

- The current traffic volume on our block is already significant.
- Additionally, parking is prohibited on one side of Concordia Avenue due to the narrow width of the street, a restriction established by the City. The proposed change would further exacerbate these existing conditions.
- The loss of the few remaining on-street parking spaces would have a substantial negative impact on residents.
- Moreover, the additional vehicle traffic generated by an apartment complex of this size would significantly increase congestion and raise safety concerns, potentially rendering Concordia Avenue unsafe for residents, pedestrians, and drivers.

Troubadour Apartments and Waste Management:

- The Troubadour apartment complex routinely places more than six large garbage dumpsters along the Concordia Avenue end of the street during scheduled waste collection. This practice occupies approximately three parking spaces, leaving an estimated five remaining spaces for residents in an area that already experiences limited parking availability. Given the number of residents in the immediate vicinity, this reduction significantly impacts access to parking.
- Additionally, the current waste collection process frequently results in debris, including broken glass, being left in the roadway, creating both safety and sanitation concerns. The presence of multiple large dumpsters in this location also negatively affects the appearance of the street. The proposed change would likely exacerbate these existing issues.

- We have previously requested that the Troubadour relocate the dumpsters to an alternative location for waste pickup; however, this request was denied. Property management indicated that the placement of the dumpsters in this area was directed by the City.

Homeowners' Association (POA) Status:

- The intersection of Harmon Avenue and Concordia Avenue is part of the East Avenue POA, which is considered a private street. All residents on Concordia Avenue are members of this POA, and this fact should be taken into consideration. I will be submitting this to our East Avenue POA.

In regards to the proposed height increase:

We oppose the proposed building height of 300 feet. This height is inconsistent with the current character of the neighborhood, where no other buildings approach this scale. Such a dramatic increase would significantly alter the area's visual harmony. The Troubadour apartments are only 6 stories tall which is approximately 70ft. Your original 160ft proposal is as high as any building should be in this area.

Furthermore, we are concerned about the density and pollution increase of the proposed project. The number of apartments would introduce a substantial influx of new residents, which could overwhelm the existing infrastructure and change the residential nature of our community. This will also bring an immense amount of air pollution with that massive increase in apartment units.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our feedback.

Thank you
The Buchanan/Brigg Family
1002 Cocordia Ave, Austin, TX 78705

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"](mailto:cybersecurity@austintexas.gov).

From: Jill B.

Sent: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 12:54 PM

To: Leah Bojo; Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>

Cc: Gregory Buchanan; Jennifer Briggs; dilawar.a.syed; Salma Agha;Carolynn Morizzo; Jennifer Arthur In 1008

Subject: Voting 'NO' to remove the vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue

Leah Bojo(Drenner Group PC) and Nancy Estrada(City Planning Dept.),

Once again we vote 'NO' in regards to *Case Number: C814-06-0175.07* dated Jan. 2nd, 2026. This is requesting to remove the vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue.

We have several significant concerns regarding its potential impact on our block of Concordia Ave.

Our primary issues are:

Traffic and Parking:

- The current traffic volume on our block is already significant.
- Additionally, parking is prohibited on one side of Concordia Avenue due to the narrow width of the street, a restriction established by the City. The proposed change would further exacerbate these existing conditions.
- The loss of the few remaining on-street parking spaces would have a substantial negative impact on residents.
- Moreover, the additional vehicle traffic generated by an apartment complex of this size would significantly increase congestion and raise safety concerns, potentially rendering Concordia Avenue unsafe for residents, pedestrians, and drivers.

Troubadour Apartments and Waste Management:

- The Troubadour apartment complex routinely places more than six large garbage dumpsters along the Concordia Avenue end of the street during scheduled waste collection. This practice occupies approximately three parking spaces, leaving an estimated five remaining spaces for residents in an area that already experiences limited parking availability. Given the number of residents in the immediate vicinity, this reduction significantly impacts access to parking.
- Additionally, the current waste collection process frequently results in debris, including

broken glass, being left in the roadway, creating both safety and sanitation concerns. The presence of multiple large dumpsters in this location also negatively affects the appearance of the street. The proposed change would likely exacerbate these existing issues.

- We have previously requested that the Troubadour relocate the dumpsters to an alternative location for waste pickup; however, this request was denied. Property management indicated that the placement of the dumpsters in this area was directed by the City.

Homeowners' Association (POA) Status:

- The intersection of Harmon Avenue and Concordia Avenue is part of the East Avenue POA, which is considered a private street. All residents on Concordia Avenue are members of this POA, and this fact should be taken into consideration. I will be submitting this to our East Avenue POA.

In regards to the proposed height increase:

We oppose the proposed building height of 300 feet. This height is inconsistent with the current character of the neighborhood, where no other buildings approach this scale. Such a dramatic increase would significantly alter the area's visual harmony. The Troubadour apartments are only 6 stories tall which is approximately 70ft. Your original 160ft proposal is as high as any building should be in this area.

Furthermore, we are concerned about the density and pollution increase of the proposed project. The number of apartments would introduce a substantial influx of new residents, which could overwhelm the existing infrastructure and change the residential nature of our community. This will also bring an immense amount of air pollution with that massive increase in apartment units.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our feedback.

Thank you
The Brault Family
1000 Concordia Ave, Austin, TX 78705

From: Jennifer Briggs
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2025 4:51 PM
To: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Re: Vote Regarding Proposed Changes to 1012 Concordia Ave Austin - C814-06-0175.07 - East Avenue PUD Amendment #7, Parcel A

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Ms. Estrada,

I appreciate the chance to comment on the proposed changes to 1012 Concordia Ave.

I live at 1002 Concordia Ave. and I must oppose these changes.

This is basically doubling the height of the project which obviously doubles the impact of traffic and overall quality of life in the neighborhood.

I work in the architecture field, and I certainly understand the housing affordability problem in Austin. I appreciate this project is trying to address that, but it is simply too large for the intended area and not what was initially proposed.

I hope the neighbors will be a consideration related to this issue.

Thank you,

Jennifer Briggs

From: Frankie Arthur
Sent: Sunday, September 14, 2025 7:44 AM
To: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Frankie Arthur
Subject: Proposed Changes to 1012 Concordia Ave - C814-06-0175.07

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Nancy~

As a homeowner on Concordia we “HIGHLY” oppose of this change. This will “negatively” impact our quiet neighborhood and was “wrongly” introduced to our community in the beginning. We as homeowners will continue to oppose of this project from now on. Hopefully, you will abolish this and fight for us as homeowners and our property values.

Thank you,

Frankie Arthur
1008 Concordia

For any additional questions or concerns, contact CSIRT at
["cybersecurity@austintexas.gov"](mailto:cybersecurity@austintexas.gov).

From: Dilawar Syed
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2025 7:51 PM
To: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Salma Agha
Subject: Vote Re. Proposed Changes to 1012 Concordia Ave - C814-06-0175.07

External Email - Exercise Caution

Dear Nancy,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to 1012 Concordia.

As a nearby resident and neighbor, I must respectfully oppose the revisions.

The near-doubling of the project's original height represents a dramatic increase and raises questions about whether the developer's plans were presented transparently from the outset. The resulting impact on traffic, congestion, and the overall quality of life for current residents is significant and cannot be overlooked as the council evaluates these updates.

I fully support efforts to address Austin's housing challenges. But such efforts must be pursued with transparency, consistency, and accountability—ensuring that current residents and families are not penalized for inadequate planning or asked to shoulder disproportionate burdens to accommodate these changes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dilawar Syed

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"](mailto:cybersecurity@austintexas.gov).

From: Jill B.

Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2025 8:00 PM

To: Leah Bojo

Cc: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>;Carolynn Morizzo; Gregory Buchanan; Jennifer Briggs; Salma Agha; dilawar.a.syed; David Brault; Jennifer Arthur In 1008; Drew Raffaele

Subject: Vote Regarding Proposed Changes to 1012 Concordia Ave Austin

External Email - Exercise Caution

Our vote is NO on these proposed changes:

After careful consideration and discussion, we've decided to cast a vote 'against' the proposed change. We have several significant concerns regarding its potential impact on our block.

Our primary issues are:

- **Traffic and Parking:** The current traffic volume on our block is already high. Additionally, parking is prohibited on our side of Concordia Avenue due to the street's narrowness, a restriction established by the city. The proposed change would likely exacerbate these existing issues.
- **Waste Management:** The Troubadour apartment complex across the street places over six large dumpsters on that section of Concordia Avenue at least twice a week. The current waste collection process already results in frequent debris and broken glass being left on the street. The proposed change could intensify this problem.
- **Homeowners' Association (POA) Status:** The intersection of Harmon Avenue and Concordia Avenue is part of the East Avenue POA, which is considered a private street. All residents on Concordia Avenue are members of this POA, and this fact should be taken into consideration. I will be submitting this to our POA.

In regards to the proposed height increase:

We oppose the proposed building height of 300 feet. This height is inconsistent with the current character of the neighborhood, where no other buildings approach this scale. Such a dramatic increase would significantly alter the area's visual harmony.

Furthermore, we are concerned about the density and pollution increase of the proposed project. The number of apartments would introduce a substantial influx of new residents, which could overwhelm the existing infrastructure and change the residential nature of our community. This will also bring an immense amount of air pollution with that massive increase in apartment units.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our feedback.

Thank you
The Brault Family

1000 Concordia Ave, Austin, TX 78705

On Wed, Sep 10, 2025 at 6:39 PM Leah Bojo wrote:

Hi Jill,

I hope you're well. As we work through design changes related to the TXDOT right of way taking we are asking for more flexibility for vehicular access to the site. Currently access is prohibited on Concordia Ave and we would like to remove that prohibition.

Leah M. Bojo, AICP, Director of Land Use & Entitlements

[2705 Bee Caves Road, Suite 100, Austin, TX 78746](mailto:leah.bojo@drennergrouppc.com)

Drenner Group, PC | www.drennergrouppc.com

From: Alejandra De Angulo
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2026 3:37 PM
To: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Objection to Rezoning Request: Case number (C814-06-0175.07)

External Email - Exercise Caution

Ms. Estrada,

As a resident within 500 feet of the proposed building, I am writing to formally express my objection to the applicant's request to significantly increase the maximum allowable building height for Parcel A of the East Avenue PUD, Case Number C814-06-0175.07 (hearing date 1/13/26)

The proposed increase, from an already substantial 160 feet to an extreme height of up to 270 feet, is completely out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood. The tallest existing building in this area is approximately 70 feet. A structure nearly four times that height would dramatically and irreversibly alter the neighborhood's established character, scale, and traditional development patterns.

This proposal raises several serious concerns:

1. **Blocking Sunlight:** A building of this height would cast extensive shadows on surrounding homes and buildings, reducing natural light and negatively impacting the quality of life.
2. **Loss of Privacy:** The extreme height creates direct privacy impacts for nearby shorter residential buildings that were never designed to coexist with a 250+ foot structure.
3. **Street Capacity and Safety:** The surrounding streets are narrow and already strained. They are not designed to safely or efficiently accommodate the increased traffic this development would generate.
4. **Parking Deficiencies:** The proposal does not adequately address parking needs, which will inevitably spill into surrounding residential streets.
5. **Traffic Congestion:** Increased density without proportional infrastructure improvements will worsen congestion and reduce safety for residents, pedestrians, and cyclists.

Planned Unit Developments are intended to result in superior development compared to conventional zoning. This request does the opposite by prioritizing maximum height and

intensity over compatibility, livability, and neighborhood context.

I urge the Planning Commission to deny this request or require substantial reductions that align with the existing neighborhood scale and infrastructure capacity.

Development should respect and enhance the community and not overwhelm it.

Thank you for your time and for including this objection in the official record. Please feel free to contact me if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,
Alejandra
Resident 3500 Harmon Avenue, 78705
Alejandra De Angulo, PhD

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"](mailto:cybersecurity@austintexas.gov).

-----Original Message-----

From: Kevin McKinney
Sent: Friday, January 9, 2026 1:51 PM
To: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Subject: 1010 Concordia

External Email - Exercise Caution

Nancy,

I live and own in the Hancock neighborhood. I do not want a 20 story building as my view and it does not fit the neighborhood at all. We will be opposing your recommendation.

Kevin McKinney
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: Terri Myers
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2026 2:01 PM
To: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Subject: C814-06-0175.07 1010 Concordia Avenue

External Email - Exercise Caution

Ms. Estrada and members of the Planning Commission,

I have lived in the Hancock neighborhood for 35 years and want to register my opposition to both the increased height requested by Denner Group for 1010 Concordia Avenue and the removal of the current vehicular access prohibition to Concordia Avenue.

The applicant has already received considerable exception to the traditional building patterns in the Hancock/Eastwoods neighborhoods, which, until the Concordia PUD was created, largely consisted of one- and two-story homes, and a handful of three-story apartment buildings. The height increase is entirely out of character with those traditional patterns and would set a precedent that would be detrimental to our traditional built landscape.

In addition, I object to the request for access to Concordia Avenue; the number of new units proposed by the applicant would dump a huge amount of traffic on an already burdened Red River Street.

Sincerely,

Terri Myers
823 Harris 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".

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Wright
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2026 12:40 PM
To: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Case Number: C814-06-0175.07

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Nancy,

I received a Notice of Public Hearing for Rezoning in the mail regarding case C814-06-0175.07 to be heard on January 13, 2026 by the Planning Commission.

I'm reaching out because your contact information is listed on the notice. As a homeowner and resident on the adjoining Harmon Avenue, I am writing to express my objection to this proposed re-zoning due to concerns regarding traffic flow on Concordia Avenue as well as the proposed height of the building. Concordia Avenue is a two-lane residential street that currently directs traffic flow into a residential, private street and planned unit development (PUD), the East Avenue PUD. The street does not have the capacity to handle a significant increase of traffic which would accompany a large building, and the street is often blocked with on-street parking and trash pickup vehicles.

Further, I'd appreciate the consideration of building setbacks due to the proposed revised height of the building and its impact on views, light and aesthetics.

Thanks very much,

Brian Wright

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: Corry McClellan

Sent: Monday, January 12, 2026 8:46 AM

To: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>; Garcia, Ella <Ella.Garcia@austintexas.gov>; Harden, Joi <Joi.Harden@austintexas.gov>; Brown, Destiny <destiny.brown01@austintexas.gov>

Cc: Ramirez, Elaine <Elaine.Ramirez@austintexas.gov>

Subject: Re: Zoning Case - C814-06-0175.07 - East Avenue PUD Amendment #7, Parcel A

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Nancy,

I am a concerned resident within 500' of this development, and I live in a private HOA within the East Avenue PUD and Hancock neighborhood. I am an accredited urban planner working in private practice, an alternate on the City of Austin's BOA, and Director-Elect of the 33-county division of Texas' American Planning Association.


I reached out to you last year when this rezoning was first posted in the hopes of mitigating this mess, but here we are. I am writing to you and the Planning Commission to:

1. Request an indefinite postponement of this rezoning until:
 - a. This case is escalated to the Planning Director and/or the City appoints a mediator to force the developer to engage with surrounding residents proactively
2. Stress that Concordia Avenue is absolutely inappropriate for vehicle traffic associated with the proposed development on the grounds that (Ref. attachment):
 - a. **Orange:** Concordia Avenue already fails to function as a two-lane roadway, and that is before considering the height increase being requested here. Pictured here is the daily trash truck that fully blocks both travel lanes for five minutes at a time – directly where the proposed driveway would be
 - b. **Blue:** The intersection of Concordia/Harmon is owned half by the City and half by the East Avenue PUD. Addressing existing safety concerns here has been a nightmare, with the City only able to provide a two-way stop and crosswalk striping on two sides
3. Request greater vertical setbacks on any additional height granted. I would love to provide more specifics, but neither the City nor the developer has provided a site plan or additional specifications in the five years that I have lived here

4. Request whatever information was provided to the City that allowed this rezoning to get so far without community involvement. Any planner should know that the traffic impact from this development, paired with the future I-35 frontage lanes, will be crippling to Concordia Avenue – approving this case as requested would spit in the face of Vision Zero and Planning 101.

I look forward to testifying to these points in person tomorrow. Thank you for your consideration.

Corry McClellan, AICP



From: Wen Chen
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2026 3:10 PM
To: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Subject: East Avenue PUD

External Email - Exercise Caution


Hi Nancy,

I am a concerned resident within 500' of this development. I live in a private HOA within the East Avenue PUD and Hancock neighborhood. I am a licensed attorney in Texas. I am writing to you and the Planning Commission to:

1. Request an indefinite postponement of this rezoning until:
 - a. This case is escalated to the Planning Director and/or the City appoints a mediator to force the developer to engage with surrounding residents proactively
 - b. The complete case file and staff report is provided online with the same 10-day consideration period as the mailed notice. Your staff report was only added on Friday.
2. Stress that Concordia Avenue is absolutely inappropriate for vehicle traffic associated with the proposed development on the grounds that (Ref. attachment):
 - a. Orange: Concordia Avenue already fails to function as a two-lane roadway, and that is before considering the height increase being requested here. Pictured here is the daily trash truck that fully blocks both travel lanes for five minutes at a time – directly where the proposed driveway would be
 - b. Blue: The intersection of Concordia/Harmon is owned half by the City and half by the East Avenue PUD. Addressing existing safety concerns here has been a nightmare, with the City only able to provide a two-way stop and crosswalk striping on two sides
3. Request greater vertical setbacks on any additional height granted. I would love to provide more specifics, but neither the City nor the developer has provided a site plan or additional specifications in the five years that I have lived here
4. Request whatever information was provided to the City that allowed this rezoning to get so far without community involvement. Any planner should know that the traffic impact from this development, paired with the future I-35 frontage lanes, will be crippling to Concordia Avenue – approving this case as requested would spit in the face of Vision Zero and Planning 101.

I look forward to testifying to these points in person tomorrow. Thank you for your consideration.

Wen Chen
UT Law | Class of 2016



From: Dinesh Sanjyal
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2026 3:21 PM
To: Estrada, Nancy <Nancy.Estrada@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Objection: hearing- C-814-06-0175.07

External Email - Exercise Caution

Hi Nancy,

I am a concerned resident within 500' of this development; I live in a private HOA within the East Avenue PUD and Hancock neighborhood.

I am writing to you and the Planning Commission to:


1. Request an indefinite postponement of this rezoning until:
 - a. This case is escalated to the Planning Director and/or the City appoints a mediator to force the developer to engage with surrounding residents proactively
 - b. The complete case file and staff report is provided online with the same 10-day consideration period as the mailed notice. Your staff report was only added on Friday.
2. Stress that Concordia Avenue is absolutely inappropriate for vehicle traffic associated with the proposed development on the grounds that (Ref. attachment):
 - a. Orange: Concordia Avenue already fails to function as a two-lane roadway, and that is before considering the height increase being requested here. Pictured here is the daily trash truck that fully blocks both travel lanes for five minutes at a time – directly where the proposed driveway would be
 - b. Blue: The intersection of Concordia/Harmon is owned half by the City and half by the East Avenue PUD. Addressing existing safety concerns here has been a nightmare, with the City only able to provide a two-way stop and crosswalk striping on two sides
3. Request greater vertical setbacks on any additional height granted. I would love to provide more specifics, but neither the City nor the developer has provided a site plan or additional specifications in the five years that I have lived here
4. Request whatever information was provided to the City that allowed this rezoning to get so far without community involvement. Any planner should know that the traffic impact from this development, paired with the future I-35 frontage lanes, will be crippling to

Concordia Avenue – approving this case as requested would spit in the face of Vision Zero and Planning 101.

I look forward to testifying to these points in person tomorrow. Thank you for your consideration.

Thanks,

Dinesh Sanjyal



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: C814-06-0175.07
Contact: Nancy Estrada, 512-974-7617
Public Hearing: January 13, 2026, Planning Commission

Bart Whatley

Your Name (please print)

I am in favor
 I object

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

Bart Whatley

1/9/26

Signature

Date

Daytime Telephone (Optional): _____

Comments: The notifications are short on zoning cases, so the neighborhood I am in has not been able to schedule a meeting on this, nor has the applicant reached out the the neighborhood.

There is no backup on the PC website.

The height request is out of character with anything in the area, and this same applicant got additional height on this property 5 years ago (without requirements for affordability). Nothing ever happened.

The property has had entitlements increased multiple times since 2006, and the request does not mesh with good planning principles.

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

City of Austin
Austin Planning
Nancy Estrada
P. O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767

Or email to:
Nancy.estrada@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: C814-06-0175.07
Contact: Nancy Estrada, 512-974-7617
Public Hearing: January 13, 2026, Planning Commission

Wenhui Chiang
Your Name (please print)

I am in favor
 I object

3607 Harman Ave. Austin, Tx 78705
Your address(es) affected by this application (optional)

Wenhui Chiang 1-11-26
Signature Date

Daytime Telephone (Optional): _____

Comments: _____

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned to:
City of Austin Or email to:
Austin Planning Nancy.estrada@austintexas.gov
Nancy Estrada
P. O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767