

CITY OF AUSTIN – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
SITE PLAN APPLICATION – MASTER COMMENT REPORT



CASE NUMBER: SP-2020-0084D
REVISION #: 00 UPDATE: U3
CASE MANAGER: Ann DeSanctis PHONE #: 512-974-3102

PROJECT NAME: AIM South Lamar C1 Riverside Dr to Barton Springs Road
LOCATION: 204 1/2 S LAMAR BLVD SB

SUBMITTAL DATE: December 9, 2020
REPORT DUE DATE: December 23, 2020
FINAL REPORT DATE: January 29, 2021
37 DAYS HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE UPDATE DEADLINE

STAFF REPORT:

This report includes all staff comments received to date concerning your most recent site plan submittal. The comments may include requirements, recommendations, or information. The requirements in this report must be addressed by an updated site plan submittal.

The site plan will be approved when all requirements from each review discipline have been addressed. However, until this happens, your site plan is considered disapproved. Additional comments may be generated as a result of information or design changes provided in your update.

If you have any questions, problems, concerns, or if you require additional information about this report, please do not hesitate to contact your case manager at the phone number listed above or by writing to the City of Austin, Development Services Department, P.O. Box 1088, Austin, Texas 78767.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION PROCESS PILOT:

We are piloting a new Conflict Resolution Process. Please complete this [form](#) if you have identified two or more comments in your Master Comment Report that are in conflict, meaning that you do not believe that both comments can be satisfied. Conflicts can only be submitted and resolved between review cycles; they cannot be submitted while the site plan is in review.

UPDATE DEADLINE (LDC 25-5-113):

It is the responsibility of the applicant or their agent to update this site plan application. **The final update to clear all comments must be submitted by the update deadline, which is April 21, 2021.** Otherwise, the application will automatically be denied. If this date falls on a weekend or City of Austin holiday, the next City of Austin workday will be the deadline.

UPDATE SUBMITTALS:

A formal update submittal is required. Please bring a copy of this report with you upon submittal to Intake.

A formal update submittal is required. Please bring a copy of this report with you upon submittal to Intake.

Updates may be submitted between the hours of 8:30 am and 4:00 pm. Updates submitted after 3 pm may be processed on the following business day.

Please submit 4 copies of the plans and 5.0 copies of a letter that address each comment for distribution to the following reviewers. Clearly label information or packets with the reviewer's name if intended for a specific reviewer. **No distribution is required for Planner 1 and only the letter is required for Austin Water Utility Development Services.**

Please note: if Austin Water rejects a plan on Update 2, a fee is due at or before resubmittal. Please contact Intake for the fee amount.

REVIEWERS:

Traffic Control : Shawn Jackson

Water Quality : Kena Pierce

AW Pipeline Engineering : George Resendez

Site Plan : Ann DeSanctis

AW Utility Development Services : Bradley Barron

Electric Review - Andrea Katz - 512-322-6957

Comments clear. Be advised, however that the electric facilities shown on this site plan are considered conceptual. The layout shown should not be used for bidding and the final electric design as done by Austin Energy may vary from that shown. Changes to the site plan may be required.

Keep in mind the designer may require and/or request additional information to be able to complete the design and the proposed facility locations may be subject to change based on design.

FYI: Austin Energy must review any changes to this plan that may affect electric requirements. These changes include, but are not limited to, changes in building square footage, building location, detention facilities' location, grading, spoil site locations, etc.

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

Release of this application does not constitute a verification of all data, information, and calculations supplied by the applicant. The engineer of record is solely responsible for the completeness, accuracy, and adequacy of his/her submittal, whether or not the application is reviewed for code compliance by city engineers.

DE 1. Cleared

DE 2. Pending Watershed's acceptance of storm sewer modeling and calculations.

Update 1: Comment pending. Please send reviewer proof of Watershed's acceptance of the models once received.

Update 2: Comment pending.

Update 3: Comment cleared. The reviewer received a confirmation email from Watershed saying the models were accepted.

DE 3. Per DCM 5.7.1.I "New street trees placed within the right-of-way shall have a horizontal clearance of 5 feet from the edge of the tree well to the outer edge of the storm drain, manhole, inlet, or other appurtenance.". Clearly demonstrate this in the landscaping sheets by calling out the distance between trees and curb inlets. The DCM criteria updates can be accessed at this site. <http://www.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=333087>. They are not yet incorporated into Municode. Also note that benches and bike racks have inlet distance requirement in TCM 4.2.2.

Update 1: Comment pending. Thank you for showing the dimensions between the curb inlets and the tree but it appears the measurements are between the inlets and the tree trunks. The criteria specifically calls out the inlet and tree well. Please update. If the minimum clearances cannot be met then a root barrier will be required for that treewell.

Update 2: Comment pending. For all proposed and existing inlets where the proposed tree trunk is less than 10 ft from the inlet, a root barrier will be required. Please address.

Update 3: Comment cleared. Root barrier notes added to plans for trees less than 10 ft from curb inlet.

DE 4. – DE 6. Cleared

DE 7. Please update the waiver note to the cover sheet.

Update 3: Comment cleared. Added.

DE 8. Please call out the demo'd/removed inlets on the demo sheet which appear to be Sheets 82 to 85. Thank you.

Update 3: Comment cleared. Added. Thank you.

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

All comments cleared

Site Plan Review - Ann DeSanctis - 512-974-3102

SP1. Comment cleared.

ADMINISTRATIVE

SP2. Obtain all required signatures on the cover sheet prior to site plan approval.

U1-U3: Comment pending (electronic) signatures.

SP3. Comment cleared.

SP4. Number each sheet submitted and indicate the total number of sheets on each sheet (e.g. 2 of 4). The total number of sheets is missing from sheet 1. The total number is illegible on sheet 13, 16, 18, 226.
U1: Comment not cleared. Please show each, consecutive sheet and a consistent total number of pages across all sheets that matches the actual total number of pages. Please reflect this on the index.
U2: Comment not cleared. The total number of pages indicated on the index and each sheet is 284 but there are only 281 sheets.
U3: Comment cleared.

SP5. – SP9. Comments cleared.

SP10. Addressing has assigned the following address to the project: 204 ½ S Lamar. Show correct street address on each sheet.

U1: Comment not cleared. Please show the assigned project address (204 ½ South Lamar) to every sheet.

U2: Comment remains. Address can be shown in title block but should be shown on all sheets.

U3: Comment cleared.

SP11. – SP20. Comments cleared.

Traffic Control Review - Shawn Jackson - 512-974-7832

Good Afternoon,

This TCP has been rejected. All other comments have been addressed but Phase 7 will need to be revised to account for pedestrian access. Please do not hesitate to contact me via email at shawn.jackson@austintexas.gov so we can discuss.

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

Release of this application does not constitute a verification of all data, information, and calculations supplied by the applicant. The engineer of record is solely responsible for the completeness, accuracy, and adequacy of his/her submittal, whether or not the application is reviewed for code compliance by city engineers.

All WQ comments cleared 1.21.2021 kmp

WQ 1. The site does not meet the Type 1 requirements for Fee-in-Lieu per ECM 1.6.4.B.1 but rather the Type II requirements which require on-site water quality controls. Please submit a water quality control plan for the new and redeveloped impervious cover per LDC 25-8-211. Please see LDC 25-8-64 for more information on different types of improvements that are included and excluded from impervious cover calculations.

Update 1: Comment pending. Applicant is working to include water quality in the design but nothing was submitted with this update. Any impervious cover that cannot be treated will be subject to Fee-in-Lieu.

Update 2: Comment pending.

Update 3: Comment cleared. Rain gardens providing water quality treatment for redeveloped impervious cover.

WQ 2. Cleared.

WQ 3. Technically one R-table per rain garden is required. The currently R-table is a combined R-table for all rain gardens.

Update 3: Comment cleared. T-tables separated.

WQ 4. The rain garden plans need more details in order to clearly demonstrate compliance with ECM 1.6.7.5.H. A plan view clearly showing the inflow and out flows (overflow) for each garden. A profile view with the important elevations such as water quality elevation, top of soil elevations etc... for each rain garden. There are general notes but more specific information is required per ECM. Thank you.

Update 3: Comment cleared. More information and elevations were added for the one general detail.

WQ 5. Please provide a water quality drainage area map to show the drainage area for the rain gardens so the R-table(s) can be verified. Make sure the drainage area for the Taco Pud is included.

WQ 6. Please put the rain gardens on the landscape plans and the storm water infrastructure and drainage area maps please.

Update 3: Comment cleared. Gardens added to the appropriate sheets. Thank you.

WQ 7. Please add the soil important infiltration testing information, such as infiltration rate, test type, testing locations, test depths to the water quality sheets.

Update 3: Comment cleared. Added

WQ 8. Rain Garden Sa is not meeting the freeboard requirement. Please address.

Update 3 part 2: Cleared informally. A berm was added and now this pond meets ECM.

WQ 9. Rain Garden Sb has the following issues that need to be addressed.

- 1. The water quality volume is not being met.**
- 2. The filtration pond area is not being met**
- 3. The freeboard is not being met.**

Update 3 part 2: Cleared informally. A berm was added and now this pond meets the freeboard requirements. This pond is not being used to meet ECM WQV requirements and does not meet all ECM requirements but WPD has stated that they want to keep the pond despite it being slightly undersized for the drainage area.

WQ 10. Rain Garden Ca does not meet the freeboard requirement.

Update 3 part 2: Cleared informally. A berm was added and now this pond meets ECM.

WQ 11. Rain Garden Cb has the following items that need to be addressed.

- 1. The filtration area is too small.**
- 2. The freeboard requirement is not being met.**

Update 3 part 2: Cleared informally. A berm was added and now this pond meets ECM. In addition, the filtration area was adjusted and now meets the requirements.

**WQ 12. Rain Garden Za does not meet the freeboard requirement.
Update 3 part 2: Cleared informally. A berm was added and now this pond meets ECM.**

WQ 13. Rain Garden Zb has the following issues that need to be addressed.

- 1. The water quality volume is not being met.**
- 2. The filtration pond area is not being met**
- 3. The freeboard is not being met.**

Update 3 part 2: Cleared informally. A berm was added and now this pond meets the freeboard requirements. This pond is not being used to meet ECM WQV requirements and does not meet all ECM requirements but WPD has stated that they want to keep the pond despite it being slightly undersized for the drainage area.

AW Utility Development Services - Bradley Barron - 512-972-0078

AW 1. Per Utility Criteria Manual Section 2, §15-9, §25-4, §25-5, §25-9, and the Uniform Plumbing Code:
The review comments will be satisfied once Pipeline Engineering has approved the water & wastewater utility plan. For plan review status, contact George Resendez with Pipeline Engineering at 512-972-0252.

AW Pipeline Engineering - George Resendez - (512) 972-0252

See attachment uploaded in AMANDA folder

Planner 1 Review - Cindy Edmond

ELECTRONIC SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENT

P 1. All Administrative Site Plan Revision, Consolidated Site Plan, Non-Consolidated Site Plan, CIP Streets and Drainage, Major Drainage/Regional Detention, and Subdivision Construction Plan applications require the additional items listed in the Electronic Submittal Exhibit of the application packet (formerly known as flash drive materials). Submit the final electronic submittal with the final PDFs of the plan set at approval and permitting.

END OF REPORT