

ZONING CHANGE REVIEW SHEET

CASE: C14-2019-0164 Pecan Springs Residential

DISTRICT: 1

ZONING FROM: SF-3-NP

TO: SF-6-NP

ADDRESS: 3500 Pecan Springs Road

SITE AREA: 2.40 Acres

PROPERTY OWNERS/APPLICANT:

9025BFD, LLC

(Peter Gray)

AGENT:

Thrower Design

(Ron Thrower)

CASE MANAGER: Heather Chaffin (512-974-2122, heather.chaffin@austintexas.gov)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff supports the Applicant's request of SF-6-NP. *For a summary of the basis of staff's recommendation, see case manager comments on page 2.*

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION / RECOMMENDATION:

April 28, 2020:

April 14, 2020: To grant postponement request by Staff to April 28, 2020, on consent.

March 10, 2020: To grant postponement request by Neighborhood to April 14, 2020, on consent.

February 25, 2020: To grant postponement request by Neighborhood to March 10, 2020, on consent.

CITY COUNCIL ACTION:

May 21, 2020:

April 23, 2020: To grant postponement by Staff to May 21, 2020, on consent.

March 26, 2020: To grant postponement by Council to April 23, 2020, on consent.

ORDINANCE NUMBER:

ISSUES:

No issues at this time.

CASE MANAGER COMMENTS:

The subject property is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Springdale Road and Pecan Springs Road. The 2.40 acre lot is zoned SF-3-NP and developed with one single family residence. The north half of the property is constrained by a tributary to Fort Branch Creek, including floodplain and creek buffers. West and Southwest of the property, along Pecan Springs Road, are additional SF-3-NP properties developed with single family residences. Northwest of the property are more SF-3-NP lots, and a SF-6-CO-NP parcel. These properties are developed with single family residences. Immediately north of the property are tracts zoned GR-MU-CO-NP that include townhouse/condominium and limited retail land uses. Across Springdale Road to the east is undeveloped land zoned SF-6-NP and land zoned GR-CO-NP that contains religious assembly land use. ***Please see Exhibits A, B, and C—Zoning Map, Aerial Exhibit, and Environmental Exhibit.***

Staff supports the Applicant's request of SF-6-NP zoning. The environmental constraints of the property impact the option of subdividing and developing the site with single family residences. SF-6 zoning allows clustering of residential units to avoid the environmental features. SF-6 zoning has been approved for properties northwest and east; the GR-MU-CO-NP property immediately of the site is developed with townhouse/condominium land use. Staff has received correspondence in opposition to the rezoning request. ***Please see Exhibit D- Correspondence.***

BASIS OF RECOMMENDATION:

1. *The rezoning should be consistent with the policies and principles adopted by the City Council or Planning Commission.*

The Strategic Housing Blueprint promotes a mix of housing types and densities across the city.

2. *Zoning should promote a transition between adjacent and nearby zoning districts, land uses, and development intensities.*

Immediately north of the property are tracts zoned GR-MU-CO-NP that include townhouse/condominium and limited retail land uses. Across Springdale Road to the east is undeveloped land zoned SF-6-NP and land zoned GR-CO-NP that contains religious assembly land use. The recommended zoning change would provide a transition between these areas and the SF-3-NP residential areas to the west.

3. *Zoning should allow for reasonable use of the property.*

The environmental constraints of the property impact the option of subdividing and developing the site with single family residences. SF-6 zoning allows clustering of residential units to avoid the environmental features.

EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USES:

	ZONING	LAND USES
<i>Site</i>	SF-3-NP	Single family residential
<i>North</i>	SF-3-NP, SF-6-CO-NP, GR-MU-CO-NP	Townhouse/condominium residential, Limited retail
<i>South</i>	SF-3-NP, P-NP	Single family residential, Public golf course
<i>East</i>	SF-6-NP, GR-CO-NP	Undeveloped, Religious assembly
<i>West</i>	SF-3-NP	Single family residential

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING AREA: East MLK Combined NP Area

SCHOOLS:

Blanton Elementary School

Pearce Middle School

Reagan High School

TIA: N/A

WATERSHED: Fort Branch Creek

NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS:

Austin Neighborhood Council
 Anberly Airport Association
 Pecan Springs — Springdale
 Neighborhood Association
 East MLK Combined Neighborhood
 Contact Team
 East MLK Combined Neighborhood
 Association
 Sierra Club, Austin Regional Group
 Senate Hills Homeowners' Association

Homeless Neighborhood Association
 AISD
 Preservation Austin
 Neighbors United for Progress
 Del Valle Community Coalition
 Friends of Austin Neighborhoods
 Neighborhood Empowerment Foundation
 Friends of Northeast Austin
 East Austin Conservancy

AREA CASE HISTORIES:RELATED ZONING CASES:

CITY FILE # / NAME	ZONING FROM	ZONING TO	STAFF REC.	PLANNING COMMISSION	CITY COUNCIL
C14-2015-0001 Marlo Heights Rezoning	SF-3-NP	MF-2-NP	Tract 1MF-2-CO-NP; Tract 2 SF-6-CO-NP	09/08/2015: Tract 1MF-2-CO-NP; Tract 2 SF-6-CO-NP as rec-max 38 du, 35/2 story, setbacks	Tract 1MF-2-CO-NP; Tract 2 SF-6-CO-NP as rec, Ord # 2015-1015-064
C14-2011-0165 Randerson Creekside Rezoning	SF-3-NP	MF-2-NP	SF-6-NP	4/24/2012: MF-2-CO-NP (9-0) CO- Vehicular access to Pecan Springs Rd prohibited; max bldg height 37 feet/2 stories; max bldg coverage 40%; max IC	8/23/2012: Approved MF-2-CO-NP as rec, Ord.

3108 E. 51 st Street				55%; min site area 10,500 sf; min 3,500 sf site area / dwelling unit; no parking in street yard; Multifamily use prohibited.	No. 20120823-091
C14-2011-0040 St. Stephens Baptist Church 3103—3107 East 51 st St	SF-3-NP	MF-2-NP	MF-2-NP	7/12/2011: MF-2-NP as recommended (7-0)	7/28/2011: Approved MF-2-NP as rec, Ord. No. 20110728-130

EXISTING STREET CONDITIONS:

Name	ROW	Pavement	Classification	Sidewalks	Bicycle Route	Capital Metro (within ¼ mile)
Pecan Springs	52'	27'	ASMP Level 1	No	Yes	Yes
Springdale Road	78'	40'	ASMP Level 3	Yes	Yes	Yes

OTHER STAFF COMMENTS:ENVIRONMENTAL

1. The site is not located over the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone. The site is located in the Fort Branch Creek Watershed of the Colorado River Basin, which is classified as an Urban Watershed by Chapter 25-8 of the City's Land Development Code.

2. Zoning district impervious cover limits apply in the Urban Watershed classification.

3. According to floodplain maps there is a floodplain within or adjacent to the project location.

Based on the Land Development Code, section 25-8-92, the boundaries of the Critical Water Quality Zone coincide with the boundaries of the 100-year floodplain, calculated under fully developed conditions. Per Land Development Code 25-8-261 development is limited in the Critical Water Quality Zone.

4. Standard landscaping and tree protection will be required in accordance with LDC 25-2 and 25-8 for all development and/or redevelopment.

5. At this time, site specific information is unavailable regarding vegetation, areas of steep slope, or other environmental features such as bluffs, springs, canyon rimrock, caves, sinkholes, and wetlands.

6. This site is required to provide on-site water quality controls (or payment in lieu of) for all development and/or redevelopment when 8,000 s.f. cumulative is exceeded, and on site control for the two-year storm.

SITE PLAN

SP 1. Site plans will be required for any new development other than single-family or duplex residential.

SP 2. Any development which occurs in an SF-6 or less restrictive zoning district which is located 540 feet or less from property in an SF-5 or more restrictive zoning district will be subject to compatibility development regulations.

SP 3. Any new development is subject to Subchapter E. Design Standards and Mixed Use. Additional comments will be made when the site plan is submitted.

SP 4. FYI: Additional design regulations will be enforced at the time a site plan is submitted.

SP 5. The site is subject to compatibility standards. Along the west, northwest, and south property lines, the following standards apply:

- ☐ No structure may be built within 25 feet of the property line.
- ☐ No structure in excess of two stories or 30 feet in height may be constructed within 50 feet of the property line.
- ☐ No structure in excess of three stories or 40 feet in height may be constructed within 100 feet of the property line.
- ☐ No parking or driveways are allowed within 25 feet of the property line.
- ☐ A landscape area at least 25 feet wide is required along the property line. In addition, a fence, berm, or dense vegetation must be provided to screen adjoining properties from views of parking, mechanical equipment, storage, and refuse collection.
- ☐ For a structure more than 100 feet but not more than 300 feet from property zoned SF-5 or more restrictive, height limitation is 40 feet plus one foot for each 10 feet of distance in excess of 100 feet from the property zoned SF-5 or more restrictive. (use 540' radius)
- ☐ An intensive recreational use, including a swimming pool, tennis court, ball court, or playground, may not be constructed 50 feet or less property in an SF-5 or more restrictive zoning district.
- ☐ A landscape area at least 25 feet in width is required along the property line if the tract is zoned LR, GO, GR, L, CS, CS-1, or CH.

SP 6. The site is subject to 25-2 Subchapter F. Residential Design and Compatibility Standards.

TRANSPORTATION

The ASMP calls for 92 feet of right-of-way for Springdale Rd. It is recommended that 46 feet of right-of-way from the existing centerline should be dedicated and/or reserved for Springdale Rd. according to the ASMP at time of site plan or subdivision. While a TIA is not triggered at this time, another TIA determination will be made once a site plan has been submitted and specific land uses are known. Off-site transportation improvements and mitigations may be required at the time of site plan submittal.

The adjacent street characteristics table is provided below:

Name	ROW	Pavement	Classification	Sidewalks	Bicycle Route	Capital Metro (within ¼ mile)
Pecan Springs	52'	27'	ASMP Level 1	No	Yes	Yes
Springdale Road	78'	40'	ASMP Level 3	Yes	Yes	Yes

WATER UTILITY

1. The landowner intends to serve the site with City of Austin water and wastewater utilities. The landowner, at own expense, will be responsible for providing any water and wastewater utility improvements, offsite main extensions, utility relocations and or abandonments required by the land use. Water and wastewater utility plans must be reviewed and approved by the Austin Water Utility for compliance with City criteria. All water and wastewater construction must be inspected by the City of Austin. The landowner must pay the City inspection fee with the utility construction. The landowner must pay the tap and impact fee once the landowner makes an application for a City of Austin water and wastewater utility tap permit.


INDEX OF EXHIBITS TO FOLLOW

- A: Zoning Map
- B. Aerial Exhibit
- C. Environmental Exhibit
- D. Correspondence

B-03

7 of 16

EXHIBIT A



ZONING

ZONING CASE#: C14-2019-0164



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 CTM for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.



Created: 12/9/2019



- SUBJECT TRACT
- ZONING BOUNDARY
- Elevation Contours

Pecan Springs Residential

ZONING CASE#: C14-2019-0164
 LOCATION: 3500 Pecan Springs
 SUBJECT AREA: 2.4 Acres
 GRID: M24
 MANAGER: Heather Chaffin



1" = 400'

This map has been produced by the Communications Technology Management Dept. on behalf of the Planning Development Review Dept. for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.

February 21, 2020

Reference to Case Number: C14-2019-0164

EXHIBIT D

City of Austin

From: AJ Crittendon Jr.

Planning and Zoning Department

Address: 3408 Pecan Spring Rd, Austin, TX

Heather Chaffin

78721

P.O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-8810

Heather.Chaffin@austintexas.gov**Public Hearing Comment**

Amendment Case Number: NPA-2019-0015.02

Rezoning Case Number: C14-2019-0164

Contact: Heather Chaffin, 512-974-2122

Public Hearing: Feb 25, 2020 – Planning Commission

Mar 26, 2020 – City Council

I object

To the rezoning of 3500 Pecan Spring Rd. from SF-3 to SF-6 with the intent of the developer to build 25 units on a buildable area of approximately 1.5 acres. There are only fifty-five residential households in the entire four street neighborhood, Pecan Spring Rd., Touchstone St., Rimrock Trail and Marlow Dr., and twenty-seven in the 500 ft. notification boundary.

This is a semi isolated neighborhood with people that still have gardens and enjoy observing small families of wildlife species driven out by other developments around the area, i.e. Nesting pair of Hawks, mated pair of Gray Fox's, the every elusive & vanishing "Road Runner" and so on.

25 units will add an extra 25 to 50 plus automobiles to the existing one plus mile of 51st St., Springdale Rd, MLK rush hour, lane jumping traffic jam. And where is that many extra automobiles going to park?

The SF-3 zone will still allow the developer to build approximately eight to ten units, divided into the minimum 50 ft width. The SF-6 will diminish the single-family characteristics of the neighborhood with 25 units of Condo "Apartment". If anything, why not SF-5 Urban Family Residence? The developer can still build their "Condos" but 25 is way too many. At 400 to 500K per unit, Where is the affordable housing?

The Loft at St. Stephens, 5000 Pecan Spring Rd at 51st St., is about the same building acreage, 1.5, as 3500 Pecan Spring Rd and they squeezed in 20, three story units. But that area of Pecan Spring Rd did not have any 40-foot trees or close proximity to an active creek flowing through the property or the flood potential to up or down stream neighbors.

Thanks

AJ Crittendon Jr

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 attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the proposed development or change. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

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 or at a 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.

Case Number: C14-2019-0164

Contact: Heather Chaffin, 512-974-2122

Public Hearing: Feb 25, 2020, Planning Commission

Mar 26, 2020, City Council

Chris Ring

Your Name (please print)

4809 Pecan Springs Road

Your address(es) affected by this application

Chris Ring

Signature

☐ I am in favor
☒ I object

2/15/20
Date

Daytime Telephone: *512-627-4005*

Comments: *I oppose changing the zoning.*

The current zoning reflects the type of development the community wishes to see in the future.

There is an abundance of appropriately zoned, undeveloped land in the immediate vicinity.

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

City of Austin

Planning & Zoning Department

Heather Chaffin

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-8810

From: Ellen Scott
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 1:21 PM
To: Chaffin, Heather <Heather.Chaffin@austintexas.gov>
Subject: 3500 Pecan Springs Rd

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

Good afternoon,

My name is Ellen Scott and my family has lived at 3312 Pecan Springs Rd. since 1983. Our property is within 200 feet of the property on 3500 Pecan Springs Rd, where the developer is asking for a zoning change. It is my understanding that I qualify for requesting a valid petition in opposition to the change from SF-3 to SF-6. Please advise as to the steps needed to set this in motion. Is this still on the agenda for April 28?

Thank you for your attention to this matter and please let me know if you require additional information.

Take care,
Ellen Scott

CAUTION: This email was received at the City of Austin, from an EXTERNAL source. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious and/or phishing email, please forward this email to CSIRT@austintexas.gov.

Pecan Springs ❖ Springdale Hills

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Re: Plan Amendment Case: NPA-2019-0015.02

Zoning Case: C14-2019-0164

NPA & Rezoning of 3500 Pecan Springs Road

April 14, 2020

To: Planning Commission Members,

3500 Pecan Springs Road is part of the Marlo Heights neighborhood (within the PSSNA boundaries), which was established in July, 1949 with deed restrictions recorded and filed to protect the integrity of the neighborhood when lots were purchased and, additionally, specified what type of home could be built.

Victoria Haase, of Thrower Designs, came to the February 8th Pecan Springs Springdale Hills Neighborhood Association (PSSNA) meeting to describe the changes her client(s) were proposing to the established Neighborhood Plan (2002), the current zoning and to hear concerns/feedback from the PSSNA members (e.g. increased density from existing SF-3, compatibility with deed restrictions, environmental impact, traffic impact, wildlife impact, proposed product type, flooding impact, etc.).

In that meeting, as well as our March neighborhood association meeting and follow up emails, we asked a number of questions regarding making adjustments to their development plan for impervious cover, flooding, parking & traffic safety, environment, wildlife, other developments, and inclusion of retail.

Responses to PSSNA Questions:

- [20-0218 Letter to PSSNA](#)
- [Response to additional questions – 03252020](#)

Specific neighbor quotes (see detailed typed responses in the [Appendix](#)):

- “At some point, you have to trust that citizens know what is best for themselves and take them at their word they are not arbitrarily opposing projects to deny opportunity to others, but are defending their own investments (well beyond monetary). That they are willing to live with the consequences if time proves them wrong.

It should be up to the applicant to convince the neighborhood- the existing residents, that this is something they should support. If the applicant fails to do that, but the Plan is amended anyway, against the citizens' wishes; then the system is fundamentally flawed. If the default is to approve requests such as this, with unanimous opposition; it defeats the purpose of Zoning Laws and Neighborhood Plans altogether.

The bottom line is the neighborhood- that is, the existing residents, after hearing what must be assumed to be the most impassioned arguments possible for supporting it, voted unanimously to oppose a 20 unit condominium project being built on the site. Do they really need a reason?” - Chris Ring, 4809 Pecan Springs Road.

- “By continuing to build, they are continuing to enhance the problem. We want a transportation study, but none is conducted. The area does not need rooftops but we feel our City doesn't get behind us. They could offer some incentives for commercial places to be built. If we had an eatery or grocery store, we would use that.” - Jacqueline Williams on Carsonhill, Clifton Bailey on Bundyhill, and Ursula Carter on Northdale.

Pecan Springs ❖ Springdale Hills

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

- “Developer claims all automobiles will exit from condos onto Springdale. Previously, Springdale was a 4 lane street, 2 lanes going south, two north. Recently, Springdale was reduced to one lane north and south. This reduction in lanes has provided quite a traffic jam, especially at peak travel times in the morning and afternoon. Vehicles exiting the condos will add significant congestion onto Springdale, no matter which direction the vehicles try to turn as they try to exit.” - Gari Gardner, Marlo Heights neighborhood

The PSSNA’s response is that we unanimously don’t support the above-referenced plan amendment and related zoning case at this time since the concerns/feedback brought up listed above have not adequately been addressed.

We held our April 2020 meeting remotely via Zoom for the first time; we had our normal quorum of members attend remotely even during this stressful and complicated time. We are a tight knit group of neighbors navigating the change in Austin with realistic expectations and high ideals for the community we want to live in. We have engaged with our Councilmember, Natasha Harper-Madison, in the year that she’s been in office, and expressed our willingness to collaborate in order to adjust to the changing circumstances facing Austin.

Our hope is that they’ll reconsider and try and get our NA’s support, prior to moving forward. **If not, we hope the Planning Commission will deny the proposed neighborhood plan amendment and rezoning request.**

Sincerely,



Nathaniel Bradford
PSSNA President
PSSNAPresident@gmail.com
<https://pecansprings.org/>

Appendix I.

Pecan Springs ❖ Springdale Hills

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Chris Ring, 4809 Pecan Springs Road.

It is difficult for me to articulate my opposition to the NP and zoning change because to dwell on any particular topic diminishes the others; to flesh out all the facets, you end up writing a novel. It is like trying to prove a negative, or explain why one might vote for Biden over Trump.

At some point, you have to trust that citizens know what is best for themselves and take them at their word they are not arbitrarily opposing projects to deny opportunity to others, but are defending their own investments (well beyond monetary). That they are willing to live with the consequences if time proves them wrong.

It should be up to the applicant to convince the neighborhood- the existing residents, that this is something they should support. If the applicant fails to do that, but the Plan is amended anyway, against the citizens' wishes; then the system is fundamentally flawed. If the default is to approve requests such as this, with unanimous opposition; it defeats the purpose of Zoning Laws and Neighborhood Plans altogether.

The bottom line is the neighborhood- that is, the existing residents, after hearing what must be assumed to be the most impassioned arguments possible for supporting it, voted unanimously to oppose a 20 unit condominium project being built on the site. Do they really need a reason?

Having said all that, my main objection is that the lot is on the corner of a main corridor where it could be argued higher density is desired, and a quiet residential side street where a higher density is wholly inappropriate (IMO). The problem for the applicant is the lot fronts on the quiet residential street. The applicant has been unable or unwilling to formulate a mechanism that would assure the neighborhood their project will not impact the quiet residential street. If they could simply make that assurance, I believe opposition to their project would diminish considerably.

At some point it was said that it would be counterproductive if the PSSNA had a reputation for not supporting residential re-development in general. It may be useful (or not, because of precedent) to point out that ultimately, PSSNA voted to support Mike Pruitt's zoning change request. Despite having taken place during one of the most favorable economic periods in Austin history, that project has been a failure by anyone's measure. Given that history, in my opinion, it is a cautionary tale; an unfortunate that should be learned from.

Jacqueline Williams, Bundyhill neighborhood

- Austin's growth was considered in our neighborhood plan, it was taken into account when our neighborhood association was formed. We are in a significant flood area, and the water is a huge potential hazard. We banned service / gas stations intentionally. We understand the city's position and wanting to bring people in. Our city has invited the country & the world to this city, but we are concerned this has been done without transportation planning. By continuing to build, they are continuing to enhance the problem. We want a transportation study, but none is conducted. The area does not need rooftops but we feel our City doesn't get behind us. They could offer some incentives for commercial places to be built. If we had an eatery or grocery store, we would use that; today we are in a unique situation where we are asked to not leave our houses due to the Covid-19 virus, but we cannot feed our families by staying in our neighborhood. The City of Austin designated East Austin as the area we should live. The Association planned accordingly, and we stand by the plan today.

Pecan Springs ❖ Springdale Hills

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Ellen Scott

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?tab=rm&ogbl#inbox/WhctKJVqtvRSsfZlvTPmdSBgbwddQrZWWhMcCHTzpRJTpCwdpfjCjldCsgHvSXIFHmSxVpL?projector=1&messagePartId=0.1>

Gari Gardner:

- Developer stated at Loyola Library meeting that he planned only 2.5 parking spaces per 3 bedroom condo. Developer is absolutely not planning for sufficient parking. Ex: for a three bedroom condo with three owners/renters, family members or visitors, where will the extra cars park? The street bordering this property to the south, Pecan Springs Road, is not an option as an alternative for parking. It is a narrow residential street, and increasing traffic will be nothing more than increasing a danger and a bottleneck for vehicles and pedestrians, as there are no sidewalks.
- Developer claims all automobiles will exit from condos onto Springdale. Previously, Springdale was a 4 lane street, 2 lanes going south, two north. Recently, Springdale was reduced to one lane north and south. This reduction in lanes has provided quite a traffic jam, especially at peak travel times in the morning and afternoon. Vehicles exiting the condos will add significant congestion onto Springdale, no matter which direction the vehicles try to turn as they try to exit. Isn't Springdale being referred to as a "Corridor"? If that infers a speedy way to get across Austin, this will not help!

Gari

P. S. - A personal note.....

I am against the idea of "pack and stack" density for the acreage in question at 3500 Pecan Springs Road, or being planned for any established neighborhood.

This neighborhood was built with the designation of one house on one lot, not 20-25-36 homes with ADUs or 20-25-36 condos, townhomes, and/or duplexes on 1 or 2 lots.

I support Austinites that have this ongoing fight to preserve the integrity of the neighborhoods they currently live in.

As a longtime resident of Marlo Heights, I am for the preservation of our neighborhood.

I am against changing the FLUM, and against the proposed re-zoning change from SF3 to SF6.

I have no sympathy for the developer who claims (as he did at the Loyola Library meeting) that the Fort Branch Creek limits the developable land from 36 to 25-20 units,

(which curbs his profit). He would have known this if doing proper research prior to purchase of the land.