

**Q8. Please provide any additional comments you have about any of the options you rated in the survey**

Density	Schools cannot support more students, period. Greatly concerned how much more Far West traffic will be generated by office worker trips from west of neighborhood.
Density	All of the issues in question 7 are closely related. All of them need to be reduced dramatically to maintain the quality of life in Northwest Hills. This area is already extremely congested. We need fewer people, less traffic, and more trees than we have now in this area.
Density	All of these issue is important. It's hard to say the density and height aren't equal to traffic. Then the loosing of trees. . . well, that is what makes this office park more like a park.
Density	Anderson Ln is already very very crowded. A PUD would make Spicewood the same and Anderson worse.
Density	Context should have been provided with the density. It's about a 400% increase.
Density	Current proposal does not address impact of property on other public service such as the local library (Old Quarry Branch) and the Murchison Public Pool.
Density	Every person I have spoken to in the neighborhood about this project wants the proposal killed. They don't want to try and make a bad deal better, they just want the project killed. If this project is allowed to go forward in ANY form, the overcrowding at Doss will become even WORSE, the traffic congestion will become even WORSE, and our quality of life will decrease. NWACA needs to kill this project.
Density	I am fine with density but would like to see a true mix of uses. Right now the uses are fairly segregated. Mixed use is something like the Triangle or the Domain not this plan, which has a huge block of office and a separate block of residential.
Density	I find it irresponsible for the city to consider any increase in allowable height or density given the dangerous and high traffic already in this area and the fact that all 3 vertical schools serving the area are already overcrowded.
Density	I moved to Northwest Hills because it is a haven from the traffic, density and congestion of so many areas of Austin.
Density	I see the main problem here of an unbridled development that will ultimately leave us with a heavily overdeveloped city not attractive to anyone. And there is no turning back; once built these buildings will be there indefinitely. Ultimately, its our city to live in and keep it that way.
Density	If the PUD developers would reduce the current density and height proposal ... and if they would actually build an additional campus for 5/6 grades - which would alleviate overcrowding at all area campuses - I would consider the PUD. Traffic also needs to be addressed.
Density	I'm actually in favor of MORE density, if traffic and other impacts are handled -- design and impact payments. Austin really needs more density, but it needs to be accompanied by impact payments, clever design with pedestrian and bike traffic in mind as well as vehicles. Simply slightly less density without impact control is worse.
Density	Our neighborhood and schools are too crowded as it is. We can't take any more people living in this neighborhood above and beyond the housing that exists already. We don't have adequate schools to house the current population's children. This is too big and will cause too much traffic and congestion in our neighborhood.
Density	Please do NOT add more housing. It is congested enough with traffic and densely populated schools.
Density	Ranking 1-5 above does not take into account all being very important, equally--we are already too crowded, too dense, have too much traffic and our schools are overcrowded as well--the impact on the environment is self-evident. Stop this plan now to preserve what little we have left in this section of Austin, and to hopefully prevent it from happening ALL over. Thank you.
Density	Schools will become more crowded. do not need less trees, keep the neighborhood a family single family place. traffic is bad and will become worse.
Density	the current combination of homes and commercial should not be changed. there are already too many apartments. the proposed PUD will damage the neighborhood
Density	The traffic impact and the school impact have not been addressed well enough by the developer.
Density	This location is on a major thoroughfare. This is an appropriate place for additional density. As Austin continues to grow, nor everyone wants to live and work in the far-flung suburbs or in downtown. This is the type of location that justifies more density.
Density	This project should not be allowed to be built in an area so densely populated and the schools are already too crowded with too many temporary buildings and little room for play grounds.

**Q8. Please provide any additional comments you have about any of the options you rated in the survey**

Density	We cannot absorb the additional traffic and density without sacrificing the quality of the neighborhood and putting our high school drivers in danger. Mopac is already u passable at Spicewood Springs so that non neighborhood traffic is using Mesa as an alternative to Mopac. We've had 3 car accidents on Mesa just in my family. Our kids use Mesa to get to Anderson, Murchison and Doss (which are already overcrowded). The proposed development would be a disaster for our neighborhood. Please don't allow the greed of an unscrupulous few to try to turn our neighborhood into Dallas.
Density	I am in favor of more low-cost housing for Austin.
Development	Question 5. The option "Makes no difference to me" I took as meaning regardless of any changes I am still opposing the PUD
Development	#6 though I selected 9 stories, I will support what the zoning committee of NAWCA seems appropriate for the area. I do understand the need to redevelop the area and that we must get a bit denser. I support having residential be senior only. OUR schools CANNOT support increase in families. We do however NEED more shops/restaurants.
Development	Actually, we oppose the basic concept of a "PUD"
Development	All of #7 are incredibly important to us. We do not support the PUD in any way, nor with any changes to their proposal.
Development	Allowing this size of development in an already over-crowded area is completely IRRESPONSIBLE.
Development	Any development here other than parkland is a negative to the area, so the less the better if any.
Development	Any increased density in the neighborhood, especially the increase in multi-family units, will adversely affect the quality of life in our neighborhood in the following ways. 1) Many children now walk or ride their bikes to school with limited sidewalk protection. An increase in the number of children attending our schools and increased traffic will increase the likelihood of trauma to our children. 2) Neighborhood residents and families walk, run, or ride their bikes on a daily basis for health, community building, and recreational purposes. This is a current condition of our neighborhood that would be upset by the increase in traffic due to the fear of decreased safety for pedestrians. To change this practice, which is conducive to the emotional and physical health of our residents, for the sake of the financial gain of a developer, should not represent the values of Austin local government. 3) One of the most important features of our neighborhood is a relative respite from the high congestion of Austin neighborhoods. Our home was purchased in 1990 with promises of a "neighborhood" environment in the planning laws. A change to this now is breaking that trust between home owner in NW Hills and the local government, making future investments suspect. In summation, I support maintaining the current restrictions of land use as they are now, not what the developer has proposed on any level.
Development	Build it somewhere else.
Development	Can't help but note that the 200 foot building is subdued in color so that it almost blends into the scene. The other building examples are bright and pop out visually. Was this on purpose?
Development	Challenging to rank items in #7 as many (if not most) of the issues are so closely intertwined. Not much difference between 1-5.
Development	City Council & Mayor please use conventional zoning.
Development	Developers knew the rules when they bought the property. It's simple... FOLLOW THE RULES or move on.
Development	Development is inevitable. Reduce the impact, but don't go into this thinking this developer and/or any future developers will go away or quit. Thank you for the survey and supporting the best interest of the neighborhood.
Development	Developments such as these will help take the pressure off downtown, cut traffic, shorten commutes, etc. It is along the highway and should not add too much to neighborhood traffic. We can't be all NIMBY forever.
Development	Hard to choose what is most important. They all are and all are negatively impacted by this development. This is a thriving neighborhood that will only be harmed by this development. Impact on school enrollment is only rate last, for example, because I don't have school-age children anymore.
Development	I do not want any new developments in our neighborhood. They represent higher taxes for the homeowner and tax breaks for the developer.
Development	I don't believe that there is any need for re-development in this area. We have enough problems now without adding to them with an unnecessary development.

**Q8. Please provide any additional comments you have about any of the options you rated in the survey**

Development	I am against any additional variance to these owners. They should act within the current restrictions. PERIOD. I see nothing offered (or can be offered other than building new school(s) on the site and giving it to the city) that would solve the over crowding issues this project will create for the city. Also #7 above is an unfair question. I consider all of the issues a problem. Because something is 5th doesn't make it a non-issue.
Development	I am totally and completely opposed to the proposed Austin Oaks Development.
Development	I am very supportive of some of the items proposed on the site - especially restaurants and retail. The school assistance money could help us solve some real problems with our local schools - but it is not enough and too far out in time as proposed. The overall density of the project needs to be reduced to be closer to the Google building. I do not care as much about the bright. Nwaca is doing an excellent job of managing this issue - thank you working hard on it and continuing to manage the conversation in an unbiased way that educates our membership. This PUD would be a win for our neighborhood - far better than the likely result if we allow the developers to redo it as currently zoned without our input. That is a guaranteed disaster, won't include anything we want or need and will almost certainly be worse than what is there now.
Development	I don't like the forced choice of the above options. All of are utmost importance to me, all are related and affect the quality of life for people in this community, of which the developer knows little about, and cares even less.
Development	I don't understand why zoning needs to change. Lots of changes can be made to the property with current zoning.
Development	I object to the granting of a PUD designation for the property. I would not object to the redevelopment of the site within existing zoning regulations.
Development	I think the changes suggested are fine and believe the neighborhood is somewhat over reacting on this
Development	I totally oppose the PUD because it violates the Imagine Austin comprehensive plan.
Development	I wish this project would go away.
Development	I would like to see more retail, restaurants, shops and walkable/bike-able destinations in the neighborhood. The development is not perfect but is an improvement to the eyesore that is there now.
Development	I would rate all as equally important. My top 3 are all so interrelated that I would rank them equal and then a close second would be the impact on school enrollment. This survey doesn't really allow one to actually communicate their feelings about this project. I would have put in #6 more clarity on the height. Is there any limitations on the site? How many 5 story buildings can there be? Does it change the amount of density allowed if there are 10, 5 story buildings putting the same amount of square footage as the current plan would provide. This wouldn't improve density or traffic.
Development	If this development goes through it will dramatically reduce our quality of life.
Development	It was difficult to answer question 7. I oppose any development by this PUD as it is a major detriment on the area because of all factors listed...building height, density, school enrollment traffic, and environment. What I do not see is any major benefit to the community. We already have enough retail, restaurant, apartments. This overdevelopment takes away our current limited resources...schools, natural environment and overloads schools. There is a point where enough is enough, and this is it. the only benefit I see is to the developer, who will make millions at the community's expense. we will never be able to replace what we have once it is overdeveloped. please, do not allow this. we voted a new city council in on the promise it would not be business as usual with RE developers. It is time to show us they mean it. You represent our interests, not theirs. and there is overwhelming dissent for this proposal.
Development	Make the developers do all these things before they begin any construction. Improvements first, new construction only after all other promises kept
Development	Makes sense to me to reduce the traffic to downtown. Houston and other large urban areas have been successful in establishing neighborhood/office areas that help to minimize traffic
Development	Me and my family are totally against PUD.
Development	My family and are are 100% AGAINST this project!
Development	No PUD zoning. Conventional Zoning. Why doesnt this survey ask about anything other than PUD zoning?
Development	No PUD. Follow the existing zoning requirements. Make sure traffic is not negatively impacted.
Development	no to PUD

**Q8. Please provide any additional comments you have about any of the options you rated in the survey**

Development	No!
Development	No, No, No, No PUD
Development	None of the "tweaks" listed under item 5 matter to me since I unequivocally oppose the PUD in the first place. The scale of what is being proposed is several orders of magnitude beyond the capacity of the land, current infrastructure, and proposed infrastructure improvements. If the developer is not willing to abide by current zoning restrictions, then he can sell the property to another developer who is willing to abide by current zoning restrictions. This will also ensure that redevelopment occurs at an appropriate (realistic) scale.
Development	Not a significant enough change to change our opinion of the proposal. It does not fit within the neighborhood or within the Imagine Austin plan.
Development	Oppose anything of that scope on site.
Development	Our neighborhood is not downtown - many of us chose to move here because of all of the gorgeous trees, nature and beautiful streets. If we had wanted to live among skyscrapers in the concrete jungle we would have chosen downtown. Please do not let investors decide how our neighborhood should be shaped - they don't have to live here after it is destroyed. Keep Austin neighborhoods the beautiful and tranquil places that they are - don't turn us into another Houston or Dallas!!!
Development	Overall I think the development will enhance our Neighborhood
Development	Please ask Council to all vote unanimously NO on the PUD.
Development	Quality of life, overcrowding of schools, traffic
Development	Remodel existing structures.
Development	Restaurants yes, some retail okay, huge development on West side of MoPac in residential area, no. Domain was referenced. It is on East side of MoPac.
Development	The developer knew the zoning restrictions when purchasing the property. There should be no obligation on the City's part to negotiate incremental changes to the request. It should be summarily denied.
Development	The developer should be required to comply with the building restrictions that are currently in effect. No variance should be granted.
Development	the potential, may be, could be neighborhood improvements are firstly not a certainty and secondly just window dressing shrouding a downtown view office complex.
Development	The PUD is bad for our neighborhood. The traffic that it would bring is unacceptable. Austin needs smart growth. The Austin Oaks PUD is NOT smart.
Development	The residents of this area need places to work. if you deny these opportunities you increase traffic in other parts of the area. Additionally, if those from further out were able to stop their commute here, then it would be easier for residents to travel downtown or further south.
Development	There is no reason to extend the PUD zoning as they have currently in place plenty of latitude with their current zoning to upgrade the development
Development	There is plenty of room on Anderson or Burnet, other words, more commercial property for these type of development.
Development	There should be no change in the current zoning.
Development	This development as it stands even with the revisions will completely change the feel of the neighborhood and will reduce the quality of life for those living in the neighborhood. I am staunchly AGAINST this development.
Development	This development is not in line with the neighborhood nor the environment they think they are giving the neighborhood
Development	this is a neighborhood not downtown Austin. Please abide by the limitations already set forth.
Development	This is not the right location for this amount of development and kind of. Sorry. Not interested in a Domain feel in this neighborhood.
Development	This project should be held to the existing zoning standards put in place to protect the character of the neighborhood. I am opposed to any exceptions.
Development	This proposal is out of scale with its surroundings and provides no real benefit for the neighborhood, which does not need additional restaurants, bike paths or school children.
Development	This PUD is not good for the surrounding neighborhoods and is not good for the city.

**Q8. Please provide any additional comments you have about any of the options you rated in the survey**

Development	This PUD plan will have a negative impact on all aspects of this neighborhood. The existing zoning is the best fit for the neighborhood and this particular property. The updated proposal provides little improvement from the original PUD plan.
Development	This is an established premier Austin close-in neighborhood, with a certain integrity to it's lifestyle for long standing residents. Encroaching upon this traditional, conventional, prevailing culture and way of life for the benefit of real estate speculators and entrepreneurs is short-sighted. It is especially short-sighted, in light of the as yet unknown impact of the unfinished newly Tolled lanes to Loop 1 and their impact to the nearby Spicewood Sprs./Anderson/Loop 1 Intersection, existing neighborhoods and existing businesses in proximity to Austin Oaks along both sides of the current Loop 1. Austin owes a debt of gratitude to the settlers and residents of Northwest Hills who established and maintained this desirable neighborhood and led the way in creating a favorable residential and commercial environment for Austin's development 50 plus years ago, before MoPac was even built or Austin Oaks was a glimmer of it's original format. Preserving that heritage in near proximity to a "renewed" Austin Oaks is a legacy is a benefit the NW Hills residents have a right to expect from their original and continued investments in this area. These were the 1st entrepreneurs of the area to take a chance that the area would be developed with continuity and integrity. So far, they have not been disappointed. Do not disappoint them now! Do not OVERDEVELOP or HIGH RISE this property BEYOND the scope of its INTENDED use for the NEIGHBORHOOD and NEIGHBORS!
Development	Though I rated them 1 to 5, they are all highly significant as they will all affect this community in a highly negative way.
Development	We are not entirely opposed to restaurant space, but are firmly against any tall structures. As it stands now, our schools can not handle any increases to enrollment.
Development	WE DO NOT WANT THIS PUD!!!!!!
Development	We have already experienced the "little" changes to school and traffic in the last 20+ years. We feel it has changed the entire desirability of our neighborhood (decreased significantly) and taken away the "family/community"-oriented living style which was there when we moved here. More money into the system (taxes) does NOT improve the qualities, just reduces the feeling of personal control over OUR neighborhood.
Development	We need affordable office space that Austinoaks provides NOW. Redevelopment will only DRIVE UP RENTS. No to the PUD REZONING. Conventional zoning only.
Development	Would accept 6-7 stories.
Development	Would much rather see this firm develop the area at Mullen Dr. and Anderson Ln. There is a golden opportunity there for redevelopment to high-end condominiums or townhomes. Great central location, by commuter rail, and existing apartments are dilapidated.
Economic	I don't understand what is wrong with the economic feasibility of the existing development.
Environmental	Impervious coverage
Environmental	Spicewood Springs is a historical and archaeologically sensitive location. Archaeological sites were destroyed in the initial building. I'd like to see this not happen again.
Environmental	The impact on the environment and trees is irreversible.
Height	A 200 foot urban building is entirely unacceptable in our residential neighborhood. 5 stories max ( we'd rather less)
Height	I am disappointed that # 6 did not have the 2 or 3 story option, but I remain apposed
Height	I presume this property has already been sold or else there is an option on it, dependent on the outcome of revised zoning. Could there be 1 or 2 new office bldgs added to the site within current height restrictions etc.
Height	I would prefer maximum height at this site and in this neighborhood to be no more than 3 stories.
Height	On question #6, I may be OK with the 9 stories that Google has, but it would just depend on the topography of the land - parts of that property would better hide a taller building than others. On the Direct Assistance to schools issue, I don't like the proposal because it could end up being smaller than nine million, could take even longer to materialize, and could be split between many schools until it no longer can provide the needed impact.

**Q8. Please provide any additional comments you have about any of the options you rated in the survey**

Height	The number of ideal maximum stories depends in part on the number of total buildings. One two building of 9 stories with a few buildings of fewer stories might be OK. 10 or 20 buildings of 9 stories each would obviously be excessive.
Height	The proposed height would be the tallest building between here and Waco!
Height	This area is zoned with a 5-story limit for a reason - anything taller does not fit the community or area. There is no community benefit or improvement from the PUD. It only benefits the developers and investors who I'd venture to guess, don't live anywhere near here. The PUD is a DUD. Its gotta go.
NWACA	Dear Board, This survey was one of the worst survey's ever written. It was written to get information on negotiation not for dealing with the building restrictions as they are. And what gets me the most is how much you are all lying. So technically you are selling this to neighbors now with fear mongering about school over crowding but if they won't be done with the building for years and they do not need to pay financial assistance for the schools till 2032, then you are all lying to yourselves and others about what you are truly proposing. You should all be ashamed of yourselves. Who knows where our schools will be in 2032. They may not be overcrowded at all. 9 million now... inflation and cost of living go up and this could all be pennies in the bucket for them. A park... that's BS too. I don't want to take my kid to a park right under the freeway. You have got to be kidding. The increased traffic will require bike lanes to be removed on Hart Lane. This stinks for those kids and adults who use the bike lanes. I noticed there is no date on school crossings. Will it be now or in 2032. Because in 2032 my kids will have graduated college and that would too have been a boat you all have missed in your lack of foresight. I really don't know who wrote the survey or who is no this committee but they need to be removed. It's bias towards the developers and not for the neighborhood at all. And somehow it wouldn't surprise me one bit if there was some type of underhanded money going in their direction. I am strongly against the PUD and this survey that doesn't give us an option to say that a certain idea shouldn't be on the table. Disappointed indeed!
NWACA	Does the leadership of NWACA consider it an "impossibility" to actually stop it, so that they are "cooperating" with the project proposers to the extent that they are suggesting modifications to the PUD proposal details?
NWACA	Good job by NWACA Board
NWACA	I feel like a lot of the communication about this issue has be incredibly one-sided and this survey is biased as if you assume we're against it from the beginning.
NWACA	Poor survey
NWACA	Question #7 is invalid. I care for all of those issues equally and rate them #1.
NWACA	Question 5 is biased.
NWACA	The above questions are. Misleading. At least 3 and probably 5 of them would rank #1 on objections, yet it is rigged so that only one number cap'n be used.
NWACA	There is no "no opinion" option on some of the questions, like number 6, so you are arbitrarily forcing an answer, which provides misleading results.
NWACA	These are difficult to rate because all are extremely important to me and to our community.
NWACA	They are ALL important issues
NWACA	This survey is biased in favor of the development and developer. Shane on NWACA.
NWACA	To be honest, I'm insulted by this survey. Trying to downplay the number of tall buildings the developer proposes? If you are doing 3D images, map out all the proposed buildings with density and without green space. Add in the traffic jams, too. This is misleading. It makes me wonder if you represent the neighbors or the developer! Rank the issues in order of importance? These are just about all equally important. With density and height comes awful impact on traffic, schools, environment. There is nothing the developer can do which will make us support the PUD. They have existing zoning within which they can work to build whatever. I do not see changes as being beneficial to our lives. Traffic impact, especially, will be devastating, not to mention just overall detrimental to our lovely neighborhood and quality of life. One of us grew up in NWHills; the other grew up in Allandale and went to Anderson. We chose to move back to this part of town and have raised our kids here, but if these changes come our way, quality of life is decreased and staying here doesn't look so positive to us. We are life-long NWHills residents - not happy with this PUD and with your attempts to make it palatable. It's putting lipstick on a pig!
NWACA	We hope people of all opinions have responded to the survey.

**Q8. Please provide any additional comments you have about any of the options you rated in the survey**

NWACA	Why are we voting again? I don't feel NWACA is protecting our neighborhood. We voted once against the PUD and you are making deals, negotiating a PUD with the developer and the head of the special committee is clearly for the PUD.
Public Safety	As the former Commander of the Northwest sector of Austin (Far West Blvd, north to the city limits) I see no review by the Austin Police Department. Even with a reduction to a proposed 300 residential units, there are many public safety concerns resulting from such a residential/commercial project. These concerns not only impact the project but the contiguous neighborhoods.
Schools	I feel the offer to increase the use of the playground at Doss is ill advised - the neighbor children do not use the playground after school hours and it only will encourage more folks who when they visit the neighborhood leave their trash, climb the fence between the two school yards, chase the deer and act as if the area was Zilker park without the policing or maintenance of Zilker Park - we will need extra policing and park maintenance - The children now attending Doss have large home backyards and their parents feel secure seeing them playing within their and their neighbor's eyesight. The only folks who use the park are renters from the nearby condos who come with their little ones on Saturday and Sunday or the children of those who come from other areas of town to play softball - This playground improvement plan sounds too much like an advertisement to sell the housing to residential clients in your project - A real improvement could be to plant trees along the fence line of both Doss and Murchison with some understory bushes that would help to keep the areas nature in balance and yes, keep the noise level down that has increased in recent years, as well as block any lights that may be included in your plan that I sincerely hope you putting on a movement devise so that we are not robbed of the night sky. Best would be to actually build another building to accommodate classrooms that are now being added 2 to 4 a year and with your projection, another set of temporary buildings will be added that have unfortunately become permanent - These buildings are not only ugly but it means students must go to lunch or switch classes in all kinds of weather and the buildings encroach on playground space in addition to interfering with ground water collection. This PUD project that includes housing will add several problem. All five are equally important - We have a unique natural environment that to disrupt would border on the criminal - it was one of the reasons for the building restrictions - please honor what we see as a benefit to keeping a balance between density and nature - Extra taxes from this project does not buy back the natural landscape and wildlife - trying to not disturb by adding trees only makes the land into sterile parkland - And the traffic has become impossible on Mesa, Spicewood and 360 in the evening - the only real solution is to build a long 1800 foot side road or ramp on both sides of 360, to the PUD. Yes, 1800 ft. minimum. Have you considered a switch? There is land on Braker and Stonelake not bordering on an established residential neighborhood that would be far more appropriate for the kind of Project you would like to build - there is not the traffic problem and that area already has commercial and most of all the area does not interfere with the wildlife along Bull Creek.
Schools	Both Doss and Hill Elementary schools have 'temporary' buildings as a result of already-crowded schools. PUD will only exacerbate the situation.
Schools	Doss and Murchison are both terribly overcrowded. Hill not far behind. This is untenable without AISD funding building expansion and upgrade (not just more portables)
Schools	Doss is already overcrowded. How will this be mitigated?
Schools	Elementary is so over crowded! I believe that owners can accomplish a lot i under the existing regs. I do not think we can continue to turn NEIGHBORHOODS INTO HIGH DENSITY DEVELOPMENTS.
Schools	I am very concern to the increase to the existing schools because they are so over crowded as is and they need to stay smaller to be so exemplary.
Schools	The PUD proposal is terrible. Hill and Doss Elementary are severely overcrowded as it is. Murchison Middle School is overcrowded, too. NW Hills and Westover Hills will be severely impacted by this development. It is wrong that developers would do this to an established neighborhood. It's just an investment to them. They don't care how the neighborhood will be negatively impacted because they don't live in it. I hope Sheri Gallo will be a strong and effective ally on this serious issue.
Schools	The Trust fund should not have a developer board member and should be guaranteed (not have to apply to use). Too many ways the money could ultimately not benefit the schools. Plus overcrowding is far more likely than developer indicates using general aids rules as a good number of apartment dwellers are attracted to this area solely for the schools.

**Q8. Please provide any additional comments you have about any of the options you rated in the survey**

Schools	This property, should it move forward, should be zoned to schools other than those west of Mopac. They are very over-crowded and cannot take more children. The re-zoning to reduce school enrollment should start here.
Schools	I provided rankings for #7 because I had to but all are nearly equally important. The developer makes big promises for improvements to streets and schools but it's never that easy: the city and AISD will have to be involved. I have little confidence that all these things will actually come to fruition. Short of adding on to the school buildings, "improvements" will not help overcrowding. Is it even legal for developers to provide funds for school improvements?? Private donations to public schools are limited; education equal rights groups watch these things like a hawk and cry foul when private funds are given to "privileged" schools. These proposed plans are likely to be denied by the school board. Recent city bond proposals that would have paid for significant improvements were voted down and city at large would not care about additional crowding by this development. No new schools in the works for this area anytime in the near future. The neighborhood as a whole is quiet and generally uncontested. Is it too much to ask to keep it that way. The developers don't live here; it's not their neighborhood.
Schools	Set school zoning in this area for Gullett/Read/Pillow Lamar/McCallum?
Schools	The over-crowding at Doss, Hill, Murchison and eventually Anderson schools is the MOST important issue. Doss is the most over-crowded school in Austin and it needs help reducing the enrollment, not increasing the enrollment. Get the apartments btwn Hart Lane and Mopac out of Doss and then I'll be interested.
Schools	The PUD lies with the Doss school boundaries. I would like to see a push for funds to be dedicated and given to Doss in the next 5 years for an addition to the school. Any aid for the playground or blacktop is a joke. Those are the next things at that school right now.
Traffic	Austin is impossible to drive in now. With this we will have to wait hours just to merge onto MOPAC.
Traffic	Concerned about Far West AM and PM traffic noise increases since we live right on Far West.
Traffic	Currently, about once a month I am almost rear-ended when turning onto Hart Ln from Hidden Holw by a driver traveling too quickly. If the PUD moves forward and traffic is increased over 30-fold on Hart Ln, should I anticipate being struck by another vehicle at least once a day? This developer intends to put the safety and well being of my family at risk by continuing with the PUD.
Traffic	Enforce the speed limits throughout this area!
Traffic	Existing roadway between MoPac and Loop 360 can barely handle the existing traffic flow. The 2-lane portion of Spicewood Lane from Mesa to Loop 360 is not capable of the increase in traffic that the proposed PUD would create.
Traffic	I actually think the PUD is fine (if we had the roads to support the extra traffic). What I object to are the whacko liberals in Austin who won't expand the freeways and roads to handle the enormously increased population and traffic that started in the 90s and continues unabated today. We need to double or triple the capacity of MoPac, I-35, and 183 before we spend another dollar on idiotic programs like "affordable housing" or an unrealistic light rail system for Austin. Build/expand the god damn roads and then worry about minor things like this PUD.
Traffic	I live in a residential neighborhood. If the PUD wants to come into the neighborhood, there should be some traffic improvements, like speed bumps, need to be placed at thoroughfairs in the area (mesa, greystone, hart, etc)
Traffic	I work off MoPac and Far West. It already takes a few changes of the light at the intersection to get on Mopac going North. Once Greystone and Exec. Center Dr. back up to get on the Mopac South access road more traffic will head over to Far West via Woodhollow. This will happen because it is already difficult to get on the access road with traffic coming at 40-50 miles per hour. Four times the density can only make the traffic situation much worse.
Traffic	Increased traffic, especially cut-through traffic in the neighborhood, is my main concern. Also, I am absolutely opposed to any kind of big box retail or large chain restaurants (like Friday's or Applebee's or anything like that).
Traffic	Info and questions on the traffic impacts?
Traffic	It was almost impossible to answer # 7 with ranking because ALL of these items are very important to me. Tried to put # 1 on all of them, but of course I couldn't.



**Q8. Please provide any additional comments you have about any of the options you rated in the survey**

Traffic	Most concern is the overall traffic - however, building height is concern because that inevitably means more traffic and sets a precedent for other buildings ...like being use for the google bldg! Desire is to have least impact overall. Personally the school funding 'offer' is a bribe that is not pertinent to this deal and should not be used as such.
Traffic	Needs residential and retail on site or traffic will be a nightmare...live here..stay here. My biggest concern is we don't have room for cars coming to offices from outside neighborhood. We definitely don't have the capacity for lunc traffic if no facilities within development.
Traffic	No More Traffic
Traffic	No significant mitigations or questions about traffic?
Traffic	The streets in and around this development are major gateways into numerous residential areas. Higher density development will add to an already congested area. I understand for redevelopment -- which will undoubtedly happen at some point -- to be economically feasible, increased height/density is needed BUT should not come at the cost of a beautiful area and its neighbors.
Traffic	The traffic is already too congested and increased development will only increase the problem.
Traffic	The volume and speed of cars in the neighborhood has increased the past couple years, and I have strong concerns of what would happen if the PUD moved forward especially when the area at Far West and Mopac has already been designated as the high density area for the neighborhood.
Traffic	This area is already suffering from increased traffic. The area can not absorb the additional growth planned.
Traffic	This is NOT the neighborhood for this. Too big an impact on small city streets.
Traffic	Traffic is a major problem.
Traffic	Traffic is already bad. It takes for ever to go through the red lights even as is now.
Traffic	Traffic is already terrible in our neighborhood and our schools are at maximum capacity. Please leave our neighborhood alone.
Traffic	Traffic is so horrible as it is now and to add more is completely out of the question. We do not want the PUD.
Traffic	Traffic on and access to MOPAC from Greystone is already bad and the PUD makes it much worse.
Traffic	Traffic will be a nightmare. How large a bridge at Spicewood will they build? What about traffic saturation of the neighborhood? Etc.!!
Traffic	We already have serious traffic problems and very limited access east of Mopac - This has to be addressed before any further development anywhere west of Mopac