

January 4, 2021

Clarissa E. Davis City of Austin Development Services Department 505 Barton Springs Road, Austin, Texas 78704

Re: Response to Comment U2

Zilker Studios (SP-2020-0246CSH) 1508 S Lamar Blvd, Austin, TX 78704

#### Dear Clarissa:

As part of the formal update for the above `referenced site plan application, we have included this letter to address the comments below.

### R.O.W. Review - Isaiah Lewallen - 512-974-1479

RW1: Utility Coordination case UCC-201001-05-01 is not complete. Utility Coordination case shall be complete and Utility Coordination staff shall have issued a Completeness Letter to clear this comment.

Response: We are coordinating with the utility providers.

## City Arborist Review - Dillon Olsen - 512-974-2515

CA4 U0, U1: Trees proposed to be preserved must meet the following criteria:

- (a) A minimum of 50% of the critical root zone must be preserved at natural grade, with natural ground cover;
- (b) Cut or fill is limited to 4 inches from the ½ critical root zone to the ¼ critical root zone; and
- (c) No cut or fill is permitted within the ¼ critical root zone.

[ECM 3.5.2, ECM Appendix V Figure 3-6]

Thank you for working toward meeting tree preservation criteria with the site design. As they are currently shown, changes to the site create impacts beyond what is allowable under tree preservation criteria discussed in the Environmental Criteria Manual, section 3.5.2.

- The building footprint proposed does not allow for the preservation of tree #5009, an 18" American Elm on the adjacent property, shown to be preserved. Please show that this tree will be mitigated for if the site layout cannot be altered to preserve this tree. Mitigation should be in accordance with minimum rates described in ECM 3.5.4 (see CA8).
  - **Pending.** Please label T5009 as either removed, or mitigated but to remain, on the tree protection plan.

### T5009 has been labeled on the tree protection plan.

- Please provide the approximate lateral distance needed to excavate for the construction of the proposed building and basement. Does this encroach into the ½ CRZ's of Heritage Trees #5001 and/or #5008? If so, please alter the design to meet the cut/fill requirement.
  - **Pending.** Please determine if the excavation required adjacent to Heritage Trees #5001 and #5008 will require additional distance, which could encroach farther into the critical root zones.
  - An exhibit has been sent to the reviewer with elevations of the deck adjacent to the trees, existing elevations, finished floor elevation of the building and column locations.



• The proposed landscape design does not leave a minimum of 50% of the CRZ's of Heritage Trees #5001, and #5008 at natural grade, and with natural ground cover – please revise.

**Pending.** Apologies for any confusion – this was in regard to "A minimum of 50% of the critical root zone must be preserved at natural grade, with natural ground cover;"

Comment noted. A min. of 50% of the crz will be preserved at natural grade, with natural ground cover.

CA5 U0, U1: U0: Demonstrate how the construction of the proposed building, including the installation of scaffolding, does not require removal of more than 25% of the canopy of the preserved trees, specifically Heritage Trees #5001 and #5008. [ECM 3.4.3, 3.5.2]

Please provide a tree canopy assessment from a qualified third-party arborist. Please remove any material storage, concrete/paint washout, spoils, portable toilet, etc. needed for construction from under the canopies of trees to be preserved.

**U2: Comment pending.** Thank you for providing the canopy assessment from the 3<sup>rd</sup>-party arborist. I have emailed them requesting clarification on proposed pruning, as some potential cuts shown may or may not overlap between the different images/figures provided.

Response: A revised canopy assessment with photos of defects/features have been sent to the reviewer.

CA6 U0, U1:

Please provide the following items for an administrative variance review request:

- d) A third party arborist report on the heritage trees' condition.
  - a. Please provide an ISA tree risk assessment qualification form.
  - b. Include photographs clearly indicating any defects

**U2: Comment pending.** This may be cleared by emailing me required documentation as an **informal update**. Thank you for providing the variance request memo. Please provide: an ISA tree risk assessment qualification form, and photographs clearly indicating any defects/features.

Response: ISA tree risk assessment qualification form and photographs have been provided.

CA7 U0, U1: Please provide the Tree Care Plan that the Landscape Plan calculations allude to. The care plan needs to be included in a Landscape Plan sheet in order to document it. The care plan must address the specific impacts that are happening to the tree(s) relative to the proposed or current work. Soil aeration/decompaction, deep root fertilization, mulch, and biochar use are remedial methods which may aid in caring for tree impacted by construction.

**U2: Comment pending.** This may be cleared by emailing me required documentation as an **informal update**. Thank you for providing the tree care plan from a third-party arborist. Please provide the total cost for the tree care plan services, as well as a copy signed by someone on your team (to signify that the tree care plan is to be implemented) in the tree care plan. The care plan should be included as a sheet within the landscape plan for this project.

Response: Total cost for tree care plan services has been signed and provided as part of landscape sheets.

- CA8 U0, U1: Please update the tree mitigation calculations to account for any removals not currently shown. The Tree Mitigation Plan needs to comply with Chapter 25-8, Subchapter B, Article 1, Division 2, of the City of Austin Land Development Code and Section 3 of the City of Austin Environmental Criteria Manual. Tree mitigation must be provided (at minimum) at the following rates:
  - o Heritage trees: 300%
  - 19 inches and greater, ECM Appendix F trees: 100%
  - o 8 to 18.9 inches, ECM Appendix F trees: 50%
  - 19 inches and greater, all other trees: 50%
  - 8 to 18.9 inches, all other trees: 25% [ECM 3.5.4]



Note: No mitigation is required for the removal of non-native invasive species.

If any Heritage Trees are to be removed, please add this as a note on the Tree Protection & Erosion Control Plan and the Landscape Plan. Include any tree removals considered dead, diseased, or an imminent hazard (DDI).

Further tree mitigation review and comments are pending.

**U2: Comment pending.** Please include T5009 and T5011 in the removal list/calculations.

	<b>62. Comment pending.</b> Please include 15009 and 15011 in the removal list/calculations.													
PRIVATE TREES IN SURVEY						PRIVATE TREES REMOVED								
(Survey Date: 10/19, 4 Ward, LLC)					HERITAGE ECM 3.5.1 (A) (2) TREE CATEGORIES									
Tag #	SPECIES	CAL 1	CAL 2	CAL 3	CAL 4	CALIPER TOTAL	HERITAGE 24"+		APDX-F 8"-18.9"	NON- APDX-F 19"+	NON- APPDX-F 8"-18.9	APDX-F <8"	NON APDX-F <8"	INVASIVE
5000	Japanese Yew	15				15.00					15.00			
5001	Live Oak	31				31.00								
5002	Live Oak	18				18.00			18.00					
5003	Live Oak	17				17.00			17.00					
5004	Live Oak	24				24.00			24.00					
5005	Live Oak	9				9.00			9.00					
5006	Live Oak	8				8.00			8.00					
5007	Live Oak	12				12.00			12.00					
5008	Live Oak	33				33.00								
	Total caliper inches removed per category						0.00	0.00	88.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total caliper inches removed						103.00								

COA Minimum Replacement								
Replacement %	300%	100%	50%	50%	25%	50%	25%	0%
Subtotal Replacement Inches	0.00	0.00	44.00	0.00	3.75	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Replacement (caliper inches)	47.75							

Response: T5009 and T5011 have been added in the removal list/calculations.

CA9 U0, U1: For urban forest accounting purposes, please provide the following information on the plan after all landscaping and/or tree-related comments are cleared: Surveyed:

- Total Appendix F tree inches surveyed;
- Heritage tree inches surveyed;
- Non-Appendix F tree inches surveyed;
- Invasive tree inches surveyed;

### Removed:

- Total Appendix F inches removed;
- Heritage Tree inches removed;
- Total Non-Appendix F inches removed;
- *Invasive inches removed;*
- Total Dead, Diseased, or Imminent Hazard (DDI) inches removed;
- DDI Appendix F inches removed;
- DDI Heritage tree inches removed;
- DDI Non-Appendix F inches removed;
- DDI Invasive inches removed;

### Mitigation

- Total mitigation replacement inches planted;
- Total replacement inches planted on site (private trees);
- Total replacement ROW inches planted;
- Private inches owed to Urban Forest Replenishment Fund (UFRF)



- Public inches owed to UFRF
- Total non-mitigation inches planted on site; [ECM 3.5.4]

U2: Comment pending. Information to be updated after mitigation has been finalized.

Response: Trees 5011 and 5009 will be mitigated. Project will pursue fee in lieu to be applied towards Tree Care Plan for trees 5001 and 5008.

## CA10 U1: Comment added. Demolition:

- On the Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan, please add call-outs to any paving, utilities, structures, foundations, etc. within the ½ CRZs of trees to be preserved specifying the use of only hand-tools, referencing Special Construction Techniques ECM 3.5.4(D).
- Show the location of tree protection fencing on the Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan.
  - Extend all tree protection fencing to the full extent of the critical root zone (CRZ) where possible.
  - If fencing cannot be installed around the full CRZ:
    - Place the fencing at the ½ CRZ and add 8" of hardwood mulch from the ½ CRZ to the full CRZ.
    - Provide call-outs stating: "2x4x6 or greater size lumber shall be strapped vertically to the tree and 8" of hardwood mulch shall be applied within the Full CRZ."
    - Tree protection fencing or use of lumber strapped to trees applies to ROW trees.
- Please remove any material storage, concrete/paint washout, spoils, portable toilet, etc. needed for demolition from the CRZs of trees to be preserved.

**U2: Comment pending.** Please add this information to the Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan. Since deconstruction/demolition is to occur within the tree protection areas shown on the E&SC Plan, different locations of tree protection should be shown on the Demolition Plan.

Response: Additional ESC controls have been added to the Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan.

### Water Quality Review - Kena Pierce - 512-974-7273

WQ 2. Please update the engineering report (and resubmit it with the next update) with justifications for Fee-in-lieu using requirements from ECM 1.6.4.

Update 1: Comment pending. Justification for FIL is not in the report. Please see ECM 1.6.4 and describe how the site qualifies for FIL in the report for future documentation.

**Update 2: Comment pending.** Justification for Payment in Lieu should reference the items in ECM 1.6.4. Response: Justification has been updated.

WQ 3. Provide an updated Appendix T with an updated adjustment factor which is located at the following website. <a href="http://www.austintexas.gov/department/stormwater-management">http://www.austintexas.gov/department/stormwater-management</a>

Update 1: Comment pending. Appendix T provided but it is incorrect. This site does not drain to a regional water quality facility. Please update the Appendix T. In addition the sections on Building Component and Site Area Component are not completed. Lastly, decking is considered impervious cover with a coverage of 50%. Is this included? Please see the instructions on the second worksheet in the Appendix T Excel spreadsheet and resubmit.

**Update 2: comment pending.** Appendix T submitted via email and the reviewer is working with the applicant on approving it. Once approved please add the signed Appendix T to the plans and a note on the front cover stating that PIL was approved for "x" amount of impervious cover and paid on "date". Then send the reviewer proof of payment and the comment can be cleared.

Response: The owner is working with City of Austin on WQ fee. We will keep the reviewer updated on the progress.



#### Electric Review - Andrea Katz - 512-322-6957

EL 6. U2: **Comment stands.** Please show extent of brick transformer screen including door swings on site plan, grading plan, and landscape plan. What are its dimensions?

Response: Door swings for the transformer screen are shown on the plans. The dimensions are shown on the Architectural Floor Plan.

### ATD Engineering Review - Amber Mitchell - 512-974-3428

- ATD 3. The ASMP (adopted 04/11/2019) requires 100' of right-of-way for South Lamar Blvd. Dedicate 50 feet of right-of-way from the existing centerline in accordance with the ASMP (LDC 25-6-55). Provide a street deed showing right-of-way to be dedicated to the DSD transportation reviewer for processing through City legal.
  - U1: Response noted; staff will review the dedication exhibit when it is emailed to this reviewer.
  - U2: Response noted; comment will be cleared with recordation of document and recordation number added to site plan.

Response: The front end documents have been sent to the reviewer.

# Drainage Engineering Review - Kena Pierce - 512-974-7273

DE 1. If the Watershed Protection Department approves participation in the program, please submit a copy of the approval letter and payment receipt to this reviewer. In addition, please place the following note on the cover sheet:

Participation in the Regional Stormwater Management Program was granted for this site on \_\_\_\_\_(date) by the City of Austin Watershed Protection Department, Office of the Director.

If RSMP participation is not approved, detention will be required in order to meet DCM 1.2.2.D. The site still must show control of the

Update 1: Comment pending. Waiting on RSMP approval and receipt of payment.

Response: Fee will be paid once RSMP is approved.

DE 3. Could you please provide more information as to what the 18" storm sewer is connecting to in the ROW. This reviewer does not see the 54" storm sewer line in COA Property Profile or AMANDA GIS. Is it new? Thank you for the information.

Update 1: Comment pending. Please submit the plans for this to the reviewer separately. Is this infrastructure already constructed and accepted by COA? Since this connection depends on the construction and acceptance of infrastructure outside of this site plan, DE approval will be dependent on the completion of this infrastructure.

**Update 2: Comment pending.** Plans submitted. Please add a note on the cover sheet stating how this plan is using infrastructure that will be completed under another site plan with the SP number. Then this note will be cleared.

Response: Note has been added to the cover sheet.

## Environmental Review - Pamela Abee-Taulli - 512-974-1879

### Fees and ESC Fiscal Surety [LDC 25-1-82, 25-7-65, 25-8-234]

EV 8 Payment of the landscape inspection fee is required prior to permit/site plan approval. To obtain the invoice, receive the SMART Housing waiver for all or part of the landscape inspection fee, and get



payment instructions, contact Intake at LURIntake@austintexas.gov or by calling 512-974-1770. Notify Environmental Reviewer to clear this comment.

Update 1-2 Comment pending. Response: The fee has been paid.

EV 10 Provide a fiscal estimate for erosion/sedimentation controls and revegetation based on ECM Appendix S-1. For sites with a limit of construction greater than one acre, the fiscal estimate must include a \$3000 per acre of LOC clean-up fee. The approved amount must be posted with the City prior to permit/site plan approval. [LDC 25-8-186, ECM 1.2.1, ECM Appendix S-1]

Update 1 Comment pending.

**Update 2 Comment pending.** The revegetation line item quantity must equal the entire LOC area less any existing impervious cover proposed to remain. This is necessary in the event that construction ceases after vegetation has been removed from within the LOC. Increase the revegetation line item quantity.

Response: Revegetation line item quantity has been increased and the revised estimate has been sent to the reviewer.

# Fire for Site Plan Review - Constantino Mendoza - (512) 974-2574

FR2. Fire Department access roads must be provided within 150 ft of all points of a building. IFC 503.1.1

Update #1: The exhibit provided shows the site is out of access by approximately 100ft. Engineer and AFD are discussing options for alternative method of compliance.

Update #2: Updated site plan was not provided in AMANDA for review. Please send reviewer a signed and sealed copy of the Alternative Method of Compliance for review.

Response: Signed and sealed copy of AMOC has been sent to reviewer.

### Regional Stormwater Management Review - Kevin Autry - 512-974-2726

Comment in review:	RS8. If the Watershed Protection Department appro	oves participation in the program, please
submit a cop	by of the approval letter and payment receipt to the o	drainage reviewer. In addition, please
place the foll	lowing note on the cover sheet: "Participation in the	Regional Stormwater Management
Program thro	ough payment was granted for this site plan on	(date) by the City of Austin
Watershed P	Protection Department, Office of The Director. The RS	SMP case number for this project is <b>RS</b> -
2020-0062R.	<i>"</i>	

RS 9. Below are StormCad review comments from the Local Flood Risk Reduction section of WPD.

### **General StormCAD Model Comments**

1. Please use the appropriate tailwater elevation at the outfall. Refer to DCM 5.5 for defining tailwater in outfall pipes.

Response: There is no tailwater. The outfall is a headwall and not within floodplain.

2. Please use the correct head loss method in accordance with DCM Table 5-3 for manholes: MH-2, MH-3, MH-4, MH-5 and MH-6.

Response: Headlosses have been updated according to the DCM. All Manholes have greater than one inflow so are subject to "Case 3" requirements under DCM Table 5-3. They have been set to



### HEC-22, Third Edition headloss calculation method within the model.

3. Please use the correct head loss method in accordance with DCM Table 5-3 for inlets: CB-1, CB-2, CB-3, CB-4, CB-5 and CB-6.

Response: All inlets subject to Case 3 so set to HEC-22, Third Edition headloss method within the model.

4. Please add a transition nodes at the all bends to account for headloss at the bends. Refer to DCM Table 5-3 for the correct head loss coefficient.

Response: All bends assumed to be Single angle miter bends. According to DCM-Figure 5-2 the head loss coefficients for standard angles would be:

11.25 = 0.03 22.5 = 0.08 45= 0.24

These values were applied to every bend within the model with the exception of t-6 and t-5 which were not standard bends. They are conservatively made to be 0.5 coeffecients within the model.

## **Existing Modified Model Comments**

 Drainage area CM-6 has a runoff coefficient value of 5 and a time of concentration value of 0.97. Please check.

Response: These were flipped to the correct runoff coefficient of .97 and time of concentration of 5 minutes for the 100 year FLUM.

### **Proposed Model Comments**

1. The flowline elevation of pipe segment "PR-1" at manhole "MH-2" does not match the elevation called out on the plan sheet. Please check.

Response: Flowline Elevations now match.

2. The pipe segment "EX-1" has been changed from an 18" in the "Modified Existing" model to a 30" in the "Proposed" model. Is this correct?

Response: No, this was an erroneous carry over from a preliminary model. It has been reverted to be 18".

3. Please connect the lateral directly to the mainline instead of inlet.

Response: The lateral from our site is proposed to correct directly to the mainline via existing manhole.

## Site Plan Review - Clarissa E. Davis - 512-974-1423

ZONING

SP1. Because GR and CS have different zoning regulations, divide the site data table to show the calculations for each zoning.

U2: Comment remains. Provide the calculations for building coverage for each zoning in the site data table.

Response: Calculations have been revised.



SP5. A use on the ground floor must be different from a use on an upper floor. The second floor may be designed to have the same use as the ground floor so long as there is at least one more floor above the second floor that has a different use from the first two floors. [4.3.3.B.]

U2: The leasing office is not a use. Please provide two separate uses.

Response: An AEC has been requested for this requirement.

SP6. To take advantage of VMU standards Ten percent of the residential units in the VMU building shall be reserved as affordable, for a minimum of 40 years following the issuance of the certificate of occupancy, for rental by households earning no more than 80 percent of the Annual Median Family Income. Please revise SMART Housing letter. [4.3.3.F.2.a]

U2: SMART Housing letter provided does not meet the VMU standards for affordable housing. Please revise.

Response: Affordable Unlocked letter will be emailed to the reviewer.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE**

SP7. Label the room with the proposed transformer pad.

U2: Please provide more information about the transformer enclosure (material, height, etc.)
Response: Information about the transformer enclosure including material, height and dimensions has been provided on the architectural floor plan.

SP12. All easements must be recorded prior to site plan approval.

U2: Pending.

Response: Easements will be recorded prior to site plan approval.

SP13. All signatures must be on the cover sheet prior to site plan approval.

U2: Pending.

Response: Signatures will be obtained prior to site plan approval.

SP14. Please show the A customer entrance that opens directly onto the sidewalk; A depth of not less than 24 feet to comply with VMU standards. [4.3.3.C.1]

Response: An AEC has been requested for this requirement.

If you have any question about any of the items included in this submittal, please call us at 512-761-6161. Sincerely,

Nhat Ho, PE

