



**ATD Engineering Review - Amber Hutchens - 512-974-5646**

ATD1. The site is subject to the approved TIA with zoning case C814-2018-0121. Demonstrate compliance with approval memo dated May 8, 2019. Provide a copy of fiscal receipts to ensure the site complies with the required mitigations.

U1: Response noted. Comment will be cleared with fiscal posting.

U2: Noted.

U3/U4/U5. Noted.

ATD6. U5: Comment addressed.

**Drainage Engineering Review - Jay Baker - 512-974-2636**

**GENERAL**

DE 1. This site is proposing PUD zoning which may require design elements related to drainage and water quality. Provide copy of the PUD Ordinance and ensure that all required design changes are incorporated into the plans.

**Update #1:** Response indicates that the PUD has not been approved yet so the comments will not be specific until the PUD ordinance has been approved.

**Update #2:** Still in process.

**Update #3:** Still in process.

**Update #4:** Response indicates awaiting approval of the PUD.

**Update #5:** Response indicates that the PUD ordinance has been approved but a final copy not yet received. Draft provided but does not include the referenced Exhibits A and B. Part 9, Paragraph D has specific requirements about water quality and drainage. Include with the update a response that indicates how those requirements have been met. The paragraph indicates that alternative methods for detention will require approval of the Director of the Watershed Protection Department. It also indicates that up to 3000 SF of impervious cover not treated may be allowed by payment in lieu of structural controls, also with the approval of the Director of the Watershed Protection Department. Contact me to go over in more detail prior to submitting the update.

**ENGINEERING REPORT**

DE 2. CLEARED. PUD ordinance has confirmed that the drainage will be allowed to discharge to the northwest corner.

DE 3. Contact [www.atxatxfloodpro.com](http://www.atxatxfloodpro.com) to obtain DIGS information for the storm sewer system in this area and Stormcad modeling information if available. A Stormcad analysis (pre and post conditions) will be required to confirm capacity of the receiving storm sewer systems, incorporating additional improvements as needed.

**Update #1:** Response indicates that the DIGS information is not available for the storm sewer system that is being tied into. It will need to be surveyed and modeled for pre and post development conditions, demonstrating that the 100 year runoff will be contained in a drainage easement. Is the storm sewer system in a drainage easement? It appears that this is related to the site plan to the north (SPC-2010-0061C, New Theatre at Zac Scott). In addition, the previous site plan for this site was (SP-95-0047CS, Schlotzsky's National), so both drainage plans should be reviewed for compatibility with this site plan. I have requested the plans and files for both of these site plans.

**Update #2:** Response indicates that the downstream system is in an easement and that has been provided but the questions about capacity and compatibility have not been addressed.

**Update #3:** Response does not address downstream capacity as designed by the adjacent site plan. This would be a pre and post analysis for this site plan, taking into account that some flows

are being redirected to the northwest corner. In addition, drainage easement to tie into the storm sewer system on that site has not been provided.

**Update #4:** Response does not completely address this comment. It is understood that the flows will be reduced to existing at that point of discharge but the capacity of the downstream system has not been compared to the discharge and a drainage easement has not yet been obtained from the adjacent property owner although under discussion. In addition, the South Lamar Corridor project may provide an additional discharge alternative.

**Update #5:** PUD ordinance has allowed discharge to the northwest corner. Subsequent meeting with PARD has resulted in allowing the discharge to that corner and connecting by pipe to the storm sewer system on the adjacent property which is in a "Declaration of Easement", so additional easement will not be required. Final approval of the design is dependent on no adverse impact to the adjacent property based on the proposed design.

## **SITE PLAN**

DE 7. The plans indicate 4 stories of underground garage with a multi-story building and plaza? Close coordination will need to occur with the Arch and MEP plans to ensure that all drainage is addressed. Provide copy of the MEP drainage plan when available.

**Update #1:** Response indicates that this in process. Provide copy of MEP drainage plan for review and comparison with the civil plans.

**Update #2:** Response indicates that MEP plans are being prepared and will be provided when available.

**Update #3:** Response indicates that the cistern design is being finalized.

**Update #4:** Response indicates that the cistern design is still being finalized pending approval of the PUD.

**Update #5:** Response indicates that the cistern will have 5 levels vertical configuration with a pump room located on Level 5. Engineer has indicated that the final design is still in progress. Once the final MEP plan is received, contact me to go over in more detail to assure Civil and MEP design concurrence.

## **DRAINAGE PLAN(S)**

DE 8. All drainage from this site will need to be treated for water quality and discharged into the storm sewer system without impact to adjacent streets and buildings. Revise the water quality and drainage plan accordingly and provide pre and post hydrologic analysis at each discharge point demonstrating that the 100 yr HGL will be contained within the ROW or drainage easements. Additional detention may be required at each point of analysis. Refer to DCM 1.2.2.A and

DCM 1.2.3.C.

**Update #1:** Response indicates that these details have been worked out with the PUD but I am not sure how that would be the case since is PUD is a zoning case without a lot of drainage or water quality details other than superiority requirements required by the PUD

**Update #2:** No specific response and requested supporting information not received.

**Update #3:** Response indicates that on-site flows to be collected and taken to the discharge point with some exceptions. All flows will be collected, and this will need to be shown on the drainage plan.

**Update #4:** Response indicates that the areas along South Lamar to be untreated and talks about the sidewalks, but the impervious cover and controls for this site would not include ROW which should drain to South Lamar.

**Update #5:** Response confirms that some areas to be untreated and will require fee in lieu of structural controls. Does that include RSMP and Fee in Lieu of Water Quality?

DE 9. Provide copies of the drainage plans for SP-95-0047CS and SPC-2010-0061C and also the site to the west to ensure drainage compatibility with those adjacent developments. Contact me to go over these comments in more detail prior to submitting an update.

**Update #1:** I did receive excerpts of the SPC-2010-0061C plans but cannot locate drainage infrastructure to convey off-site drainage in a drainage easement. I have requested the plans and files for both cases See DE 3.

**Update #2:** No specific response and requested supporting information not received.

**Update #3:** I see the response to DE 3 but also need supporting calculations of the downstream system demonstrating no adverse drainage impact.

**Update #4:** See DE 3.

**Update #5:** Concurrence to the pipe connection to the downstream system has been obtained. Still need to receive hydraulic analysis of the downstream system demonstrating that the discharges will be contained in the storm sewer system without adverse downstream drainage impact.

DE 10. The subsurface pond will require a maintenance plan and RC. Submit the documents for review.

**Update #1:** Requested RC received but will be held pending outcome of the approved drainage and detention plan.

**Update #2:** No specific response and requested supporting information not received.

**Update #3:** Subsurface pond maintenance RC received with this submittal but Exhibit A, which is the maintenance plan, was not included.

**Update #4:** SPM RC with Exhibit A received with this submittal and forwarded to the Law Department for review on 12/4/20.

**Update #5:** Response indicates that Law Department approval has been obtained and final signatures are still in process. Indicate a note on the cover sheet with RC document number referenced when recorded.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENT FOR UPDATE 2:**

DE 1U. Existing and proposed flows should be based on SCS methodology and not Rational methodology in accordance with the DCM. Provide detailed hydrologic analysis with adjacent capacity taken into account to demonstrate no adverse drainage impact at the point of discharge.

**Update #3:** Hydrology revised to SCS. The CN of 97 for existing conditions is too high and should be adjusted based on CN weighting. In addition, the assumed C value of .79 for this drainage area on the adjacent site plan should be considered to confirm that the proposed

discharge will not exceed the adjacent site plan assumptions. If not, additional compensatory detention will need to be incorporated into this design.

**Update #4: Sheets 12 and 13:** see the updated tables but the proposed discharges at point 2 and 3 should be zero because all of the discharge is being directed to point 1? Also, none of the tables on this an SCS calculation showing the tc, I and CN assumptions (weighted).

**Update #5:** I see the updated calculations to be SCS now. Response indicates that DA 2 and DA 3 proposed will still be uncontrolled. I understand that the sidewalk along the perimeter areas can be uncontrolled draining to the ROW but the DA-2 area including the driveway should be controlled by establishing a high point in the driveway to redirect runoff to the proposed controls.

DE 2U. Provide drainage and water quality plan in accordance with the application packet. Contact me to go over in more detail prior to submitting the update.

**Update #3:** Response indicates that the cistern design is still in process. Keep in mind that rainwater harvesting cannot be used for detention so additional detention will need to be added to control the flows and not cause adverse drainage impact.

**Update #4:** Response indicates that the cistern design is still being finalized pending approval of the PUD.

**Update #5: Sheets 14 and 16:** This sheet does not show how the runoff from the open areas will be collected and conveyed to the proposed cistern. In addition, MEP roof drain plan will need to be shown and coordinated with the building design. The PUD reviewer had indicated that rain gardens were proposed for the open area but do not see them yet on the plan. Engineer has indicated that the final MEP design is still in process.

DE 3U. CLEARED. Subsequent research and dialog with PARD had confirmed a "Declaration of Easement" is in place on the adjacent property and that no additional easements will be required. Management has confirmed that a pipe connection to the downstream system will be allowed. Applicant has indicated that coordination with the adjacent property owner and occupants will occur during construction.

DE 4U. It is unclear how the subsurface cistern proposed will meet the water quality and detention requirements. Have you considered a subsurface sed/fil/detention system?

**Update #3:** Response indicates that only rainwater harvesting is proposed but keep in mind that that will be drawn down in 72 hours so you will need to develop that into the rainwater harvesting system, utilizing irrigation, etc...taking into account the soil conditions on the site. In addition, rainwater harvesting only addresses water quality and is not considered part of the detention system.

**Update #4:** Response indicates that the underground cistern system will provide detention controls and the required water quality volume and will be designed pending the PUD approval.

**Update #5:** Response indicates that the final design is still in process. Detailed comments will be deferred until the design drawings are received. Include a plan and profile of the proposed system and discharge pipe to confirm that the 25/100 yr HGLs will be contained in the system. Include manhole at the property line to ensure maintenance access for the proposed system.

**Environmental Review - Hank Marley - 512-974-2067**

EV 1-EV 3 Comment cleared.

EV 4 Diversion of stormwater from one watershed to another is limited to the lesser of the following: either 20% of the gross site area or 1 acre. The diversion must maintain existing drainage patterns to the extent feasible. Demonstrate compliance with this requirement. Note that impervious cover limits (as well as Q tables) for this project must be based on pre-grading watershed boundary conditions. [LDC 25-8-365]

**Update 5 Comment pending approval of PUD.**

EV 5 – EV 10 Comments cleared.

**Landscape**

EV 11 Provide a full planting plan with a list of proposed plants and demonstrate compliance with the landscape superiority of the proposed PUD.

**Update 5 Comment pending approval of PUD.**

EV 12 – EV 14 Comments cleared.

EV 15 The ESC fiscal estimate is approved. This comment is pending posting of ESC fiscal surety.

Note that fiscal surety is accepted during the following hours:

Monday – Thursday 8:00 – 11:30 a.m. & 1:00 – 3:30 p.m.

Friday 8:00 – 11:30 a.m.

**Update 5 Comment pending approval of PUD.**

**Industrial Waste Review - Rachel Reddig - 512-972-1074**

IW1. The status of this project is changed to “Informal Update” in AMANDA. This change in status does not imply an approval. The design engineer is responsible for submitting any revised plans and final plans directly to the Industrial Waste reviewer. Please contact me via email (Rachel.Reddig@austintexas.gov) to receive final approval signatures.

IW2. The site plan as shown meets Industrial Waste requirements. Henceforth, any changes made with respect to: water service and meters, backflow preventers, auxiliary water (e.g. reclaim, rain water, well water, etc.), wastewater lines / service connections, or the location of wastewater sampling / inspection ports (2-way cleanouts, large diameter cleanouts, and wastewater manholes) must be resubmitted to Industrial Waste for review.

**PARD / Planning & Design Review - Thomas Rowlinson - 512-974-9372**

PR1: U2: Cleared.

PR2: U2: Cleared.

PR3: U2: Cleared.

PR4: To comply with 25-2-721 (G), please provide evidence that air conditioning and heating equipment, utility meters, loading areas, and external storage are screened from public view. Move and screen exhaust vent from public area.

**U5: Screening is needed from public areas such as the plaza to be dedicated by easement under the PUD. Demonstrate screening from all public areas including plaza.**

PR5: U3: Cleared.

PR6: Cleared.

PR7: U3: Cleared.

PR8: Additional comments may be issued depending on PUD zoning currently in review.

U4: Comment remains. PUD zoning still in review.

**U5: Per the ordinance, Part 6, D a rooftop amenity is required. How will the public access the rooftop? What legal instrument will enforce ordinance agreement? Contact this reviewer to discuss: [thomas.rowlinson@austintexas.gov](mailto:thomas.rowlinson@austintexas.gov)**

How will the reservation system operate? What signage, restroom facilities, and other appurtenances will be afforded to users of the rooftop amenity? Call out on site plan the items listed.

Part 10, B, C, and D requires an easement for the public plaza and access. Delineate the easement area on the site plan, and label "Public Access Easement Doc. \_\_\_\_\_". Easement shall be recorded prior to approval of site plan. Plaza appears to be used for an open loading area, which would "interfere with the ability of the public to access the Public Plaza." Relocate the loading area so that it does not interfere with public access.

Although not in the ordinance, this reviewer understands that parking for Dougherty Arts Center/PARD is to be made available as part of this project. Delineate the PARD reserved parking in the site plan. What legal instrument will enforce ordinance agreement?

PR9 (U1): Sheet 15 shows an outlet pipe to be constructed on parkland. Construction on parkland is forbidden. If pursuing a Chapter 26 process, contact this reviewer:

[thomas.rowlinson@austintexas.gov](mailto:thomas.rowlinson@austintexas.gov)

**U5: Response acknowledged. Before clearing this comment, please provide approval from the Zach Scott Theater that the drainage pipe may be installed. Infrastructure work such as this requires approval from ZST to comply with lease terms.**

**Site Plan Review - Jeremy Siltala - (512) 974-2945**

SP1-SP9. cleared

SP10. Zoning compliance pending approval of PUD zoning application C814-2018-0121.

**U5: comment pending** approval of proposed zoning change

SP11-SP19. cleared

INFO: License Agreement must be approved prior to site plan approval and release.

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

RW1: Utility Coordination Case UCC-190822-09-03 is not complete. Utility Coordination case shall be complete and Completeness Letter issued by Utility Coordination staff to clear this comment.

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

WW1. Per Utility Criteria Manual 2.5.1(F)(14) and §25-1-61:

A PUD for this development is awaiting hearing and must be approved. The utility plan must follow the PUD requirements when approved.

WW2. Per Utility Criteria Manual Section 2, §25-4, §25-9, and the Uniform Plumbing Code:

The review comments will be satisfied once Pipeline Engineering has approved the water and wastewater utility plan. For plan review status, contact George Resendez with Pipeline Engineering at 512-972-0252.

**GENERAL**

WQ 1. This site is proposing PUD zoning which may require design elements related to drainage and water quality. Provide copy of the PUD Ordinance and ensure that all required design changes are incorporated into the plans.

**Update #5:** Response indicates that the PUD ordinance has been approved but a final copy not yet received. Draft provided but does not include the referenced Exhibits A and B. Part 9, Paragraph D has specific requirements about water quality and drainage. Include with the update a response that indicates how those requirements have been met. The paragraph indicates that alternative methods for detention will require approval of the Director of the Watershed Protection Department. It also indicates that up to 3000 SF of impervious cover not treated may be allowed by payment in lieu of structural controls, also with the approval of the Director of the Watershed Protection Department. Contact me to go over in more detail prior to submitting the update.

**ENGINEERING REPORT**

WQ 2. Enhance the report to be more specific about how water quality requirements are met for this site including any specific requirements from the PUD.

**Update #5:** Response indicates that the PUD has been approved but the updated report has not been received yet. See WQ 1.

**Integrated Pest Management (IPM)**

WQ 3. Water quality controls for this project will be Green Storm Water Quality Infrastructure (ECM 1.6.7) so an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan and associated Restrictive Covenant (RC) will be required for this application. The City of Austin now has an online process for IPM submittals. Please submit online at:

<http://www.austintexas.gov/ipm>

Once the IPM has been completed, a IPM RC shall be recorded to tie the IPM to the application. Please go to the following web site for the IPM Document to complete:

<http://www.austintexas.gov/page/common-easement-and-restrictive-covenants>

Once the IPM RC has been completed, submit for review and to be forwarded to the Law Department for final review and signatures.

Once the IPM RC has been recorded, add reference note to the cover sheet with document number noted.

This comment will be cleared when the copy of the recorded restrictive covenant is provided and document number noted on the cover sheet.

**Update #5:** Response indicates that the IPM RC has been approved by the Law Department and signatures are being obtained. Add a note to the cover sheet referencing the RC document number when recorded.

## **WATER QUALITY PLANS**

WQ 4. All drainage from this site will need to be treated for water quality. The current plan only shows a portion of the impervious cover on the site to be treated for water quality. Revise the water quality plan accordingly to ensure that all developed areas on the site have water quality controls. This will need to be closely coordinated with the MEP drainage plan. Contact me to go over in more detail prior to submitting the update.

**Update #5:** Response indicates that up to 3000 SF can be uncontrolled with payment in lieu of. I see options to treat the driveway by establishing a high point at the ROW, with the other areas requiring a Appendix T worksheet calculation for review. See WQ 1.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR UPDATE 2:**

WQ 1U. It is unclear how the proposed cistern will meet the water quality and detention requirements for this site. Have you considered a sed/fil/detention system?

**Update #5:** Response indicates that detailed plans are still in process so detailed comments will be deferred until those plans are received. Contact me to go over in more detail prior to submitting the update.

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

A Bluebeam to AW review comments is available below.

<https://studio.bluebeam.com/share/qxboz5>

**Planner 1 Review - Elsa Garza – Elsa.Garza@austintexas.gov**

P1. Fill out the Site Plan Approval blocks with the following information in **bold**.

- **Sheet numbering**
- File number: **SP-2019-0297C**
- **Application date**
- Under Section **112** of Chapter **25-5** of the City of Austin Code
- Case Manager: **Jeremy Siltala**
- **Zoning**

P2. **ELECTRONIC SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENT**

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**