

MASTER REVIEW REPORT

CASE NUMBER: C814-2018-0121
CASE MANAGER: Heather Chaffin

PHONE #: 512-974-2122

REVISION #: 00

UPDATE: 01

PROJECT NAME: 218 S. Lamar

SUBMITTAL DATE: March 13, 2019
REPORT DUE DATE: April 2, 2019
REPORT DATE: May 10, 2019
REPORT LATE: 38 DAYS

LOCATION: 218 SOUTH LAMAR

STAFF REVIEW:

- This report includes all comments received to date concerning your planned unit development (PUD) request. The PUD will be brought to public hearing when all requirements identified in this report have been addressed. However, until this happens, your rezoning request is considered disapproved.
- PLEASE NOTE: 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 (referenced above) at the CITY OF AUSTIN, PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT, P.O. BOX 1088, AUSTIN, TX.

REPORT:

- The attached report identifies those requirements that must be addressed by an update to your application in order to obtain approval. This report may also contain recommendations for you to consider, which are not requirements.
- ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS MAY BE GENERATED AS A RESULT OF INFORMATION OR DESIGN CHANGES PROVIDED IN YOUR UPDATE.

Urban Design Review - Anne Milne - 512-974-2868

UD1: Administrative and business offices are not a pedestrian oriented use (25-2-691(C)). Specify the proposed amount of ground floor office/co-working space. Is any outdoor space proposed for the co-working land use (recommended)?

U0: Approximately, what percent of the ground floor will be used as co-working space? How much of the street facing façade will be co-working space? How will the proposed supplemental zone activate the streetscape?

U1: Outdoor space comment cleared; provide information about how the exhibits that have been shared can be codified or noted on Land Use Plan. See also Case Manager comments regarding land uses.

UD2: A flat rooftop would be appropriate in this area (25-2-721).

U0: A flat roof to accommodate the planting and rooftop deck is appropriate. The rest of the roof should comply with the waterfront overlay. Please see PARD comment PR1.

U1: Please provide a conceptual elevation to show how the design will meet the intent of the code.

UD3, UD:4 Cleared.

UD5: Demonstrate need for additional height for the elevator on the roof (25-2-531). Elevator structures are typically not that tall.

U0: Attached drawings do not show elevator over run. Please provide.

TIER I:

UD6: Ground floor offices are not a use that generates pedestrian activity and must be limited.

U0: Response noted.

U1: Comment cleared.

UD7: It is not clear by the description how the design will be innovative or provide adequate public facilities.

U0: More information is needed. Please describe how you will meet the requirements in 2.3.1.B. For example, the public plaza shown at rear of building – how is this accessible to the public?

U1: Comment cleared; however, staff has not determined yet if this is considered superior.

UD8: Please coordinate with corridor office. Please coordinate with CapMetro. Traffic impact mitigation and trip demand reduction may also be required.

U0: Response noted.

U1: Comment cleared.

UD9: Cleared.

UD10: Office/admin uses are not pedestrian oriented. If a limited amount of co-working space is provided – outdoor seating should be provided. Sidewalk cafes and seating should be used to create an active urban environment.

U0: Describe or illustrate how you are creating an active urban environment.

U1: Comment cleared; however, staff has not determined yet if this is considered superior.

TIER 2:

UD11: Building Design: The building design should exceed the minimum points required by the Building Design Options of Section 3.3.2 of Chapter 25-2, Subchapter E. The design of the building should incorporate the immediate streetscape character, particularly consistency of skyline and the need for punctuation and accent; the relationship of height to frontage width and building depth. (From Subchapter E and Plaza Saltillo TOD, 5.6.2) Along the principal street, building facades greater than 100 feet in length shall: 1. Include at least one vertical change in plane with a depth of at least 24 inches. The distance from the inside edge of a building projection to the nearest inside edge of an adjacent projection shall not be less than 20 feet and not greater than 100 feet.

(From Subchapter E) Changes of color, texture, or material, either horizontally or vertically, at intervals of not less than 20 feet and not more than 100 feet. A repeating pattern of wall recesses and projections, such as bays, offsets, reveals or projecting ribs, that has a relieve of a least 24". (From Plaza Saltillo TOD, 5.4.3) The façade should include at least 40 percent of the wall area along the principal street that is between two and ten feet above grade shall consist of glazing. The second floor façade along the principal street must provide a minimum of 25 percent glazing between the finished second story floor and the finished third story floor or building eave. At least one-half of the total area of all glazing on ground-floor facades that face the principal street shall have a Visible Transmittance (VT) of 0.6 or higher. Any façade that is built up to an interior mid-block property line is not required to have glazing on that façade if not prohibitions and no contractual or legal impediments exist that would prevent a building being constructed on the adjacent property up to the wall of the façade.

U0: The façade design should exceed the Waterfront Overlay requirements and incorporate the standards described in Section 3.3.2 of Chapter 25-2 Subchapter E and or TOD Active Edge Standards (as described above).

U1: Comment cleared; however, staff has not determined yet if this is considered superior.

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

PR1: PARD will need more information such as building elevations/renderings to approve modifications to 25-2-531 (C) (1) (additional height) and 25-2-721 (E) (2) (flat roof top as distinctive building top).

(U0) It is unclear how the proposed features will be visible and distinctive from the ground level and parkland at 96 feet on a flat rooftop.

(U1) Comment remains. The images included do not indicate how the design will meet the intent of the code. Please see Urban Design comments UD2 and Site Plan comments SP4.

PR2: FYI, 25-2-721 (E) (1) will be enforced. Please provide information that ensures that this provision will be met. (1) Exterior mirrored glass and glare producing glass surface building materials are prohibited.

(U0) Comment cleared. "Exterior mirror glass with a 30% Ext. Reflectance or greater, and glare producing glass surface building materials will be prohibited."

(U1) Per 25-1-21 (67), "mirrored glass means glass with a reflectivity index greater than 20 percent." Please update note to 20% reflectance.

PR3: PARD will not likely approve the proposed modification to 25-2-733 (E) (3). Staff is willing to meet to discuss whether other building materials can be used.

(U0) **Comment cleared.** “This modification is not requested with the formal submittal of the PUD.”

PR4: Other proposed modifications to the Waterfront Overlay do not appear to affect Butler Shores. (25-2- 691 (C) and 2.7.3.D.4, as long as the roof amenity can be considered a distinctive building top.)

(U0) Comment cleared, except for the comment regarding the rooftop.

(U1) **See PR 1.**

PR5: Which part of the site will the ground floor publicly accessible plaza be located?

(U0) In order to comply with Subchapter E, the location of the publicly accessible, ground floor plaza should “be located to adjoin, extend, and enlarge” existing, City of Austin parkland, per Article 2, § 2.7.3.B. Please contact thomas.rowlinson@austintexas.gov to set up a meeting with PARD planning staff for discussion of the ground floor plaza’s access and location.

(U1) **Comment cleared. Location of plaza is appropriate from ground floor layout.**

PR6 (U0): Modification to § 25-2-721(E)(4) is not superior.

(U1): **Please clarify that modification is no longer being requested.**

PR7 (U0): FYI development will require its own fire lanes.

(U1) **Cleared.**

Site Plan Review - Randall Rouda 512-974-3338

SP 1. Materials such as EIFS are not durable and should be used for trim/detail and for upper floors only. Please consider amending the modification of the materials list.

U0: No longer requested.

U1: Comment cleared.

SP 2. Please clarify if reflective restrictions will remain. Materials that are highly reflective are not permitted in the Waterfront Overlays.

U0: Waterfront development guidelines to apply within the proposed PUD.

U1: Comment cleared.

SP 3. “Amenitized” will need to be further clarified. As written, the variance request would permit a flat roof, which is not a distinctive building top. Please add details about what amenities would be considered on the roof, and their likely dimensions, especially height.

U0: The PUD should establish minimum standards for the proposed amenities, with a specific focus on the items visible from waterfront and parkland areas. The specific proposal (pedestal rooftop deck with seating, planters and a shade pergola) may be appropriate but should be codified in a manner similar to the existing regulations which identify specific types of building tops that qualify as distinctive.) (Eg. “Distinctive building tops may include planters with vegetation clearly visible from waterfront and parkland areas and shade structures which are architecturally integrated into the building design while demonstrating the rooftop use and/or providing architectural interest equivalent to other approved options.)

U1: Comment cleared. Site Development Regulations Note 8 is sufficient to address

this concern.

SP 4. Please note, South Lamar is a Core Transit Corridor. Sidewalk design will need to reflect those standards.

U0: Sidewalk will continue to meet CTC detains standards.

U1: Comment cleared per Transportation Reviewer comments and PUD Note 29.

General Comments

SP 5. Site plans will be required for any new development other than single-family or duplex residential.

U1: Informational comment cleared.

Waterfront Overlay

SP 6. The site is located within the Butler Shores subdistrict of the Waterfront Overlay Zone. Except as modified by the PUD, the requirements, use limitations, design requirements and review processes established by Land Use Code sections 25-2-691 et. seq. will apply.

U1: Informational comment cleared.

Transportation Planning - Jaron Hogenson - 512-974-2253

TIA

TR1. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is required and has been received. A zoning application is not complete until the required TIA has been received. [LDC 25-6-113]

U1: Comment remains. See attached ATD memorandum for additional information.

CORRIDOR

TR2. This project is adjacent to a street that has been identified in Austin's Corridor Mobility Program (S Lamar). The sidewalk and bicycle facilities shall comply with the required cross-section at the time of the site plan application. The cross section that will be required is shown below. Find additional information about the Corridor Mobility Program here: <https://data.austintexas.gov/stories/s/Corridor-Mobility-Program/gukj-e8fh/>. Any proposed curb relocations on S Lamar requires coordination with the Corridor Planning Office and Bicycle Program. Additionally, a protected intersection will be required at Toomey, to be reviewed at the time of Site Plan.

U1: Comment remains. Modify note 29 to include the protected intersection at Toomey, to be reviewed at time of site plan. Staff has sent the wording to the corridor office for review. Pending their response.

TR3. Right of way requirements for the Corridor program are currently under review. Right of Way dedication may be required.

U1: Comment remains. Update requested 4/5/19.

TR4. Modify note 29 to state "Improvements along South Lamar Boulevard will be coordinated with the Corridor Program Office. South Lamar will be constructed to the below cross section or as approved by the Corridor Program Office." (add cross section as per note above)

U1: Comment cleared. Deferring comment language to TR2.

TR5. Bicycle facilities will be required along Toomey Road at the site plan stage.

U1: Comment remains. Include a note that “Bicycle facilities along Toomey Road and South Lamar will be reviewed at the time of site plan and construction shall be required in accordance with the Bicycle Master Plan.”

SUPERIORITY

TR6. For the Zach Scott Theater parking, how is this proposed to be offered? Will they be given a special affordable rate? Include a note on the land use plan indicating how this will achieve superiority.

U1: Comment remains. Please further describe “on a paid basis.” Is there an agreement for reduced rates? If the parking is just open, commercially available parking, staff would not agree that this is satisfying the intent of this section.

TR7. The \$20,000 amount for Capmetro will need to be reviewed and approved by CapMetro. Please indicate if you have been working with anyone from Capmetro, and provide correspondence or approval.

U1: Comment remains. Pending verification of approval from Capmetro. Staff will also need to see a receipt of the payment once approved.

TR8. Staff does not agree that #7 Transportation increased bicycle racks achieves superiority. Staff recommends discussing the placement of a B-Cycle station with that firm. Alternatively, bike lockers could be proposed.

U1: Comment remains. B-cycle is not feasible, but staff still does not feel that the bicycle superiority is sufficient, as based on the uses shown in the TIA determination, it would only lead to 8 additional bicycle spaces (4 U racks)

TR9. Clarify how #12 Accessibility achieves superiority. Give specific examples and include in the note.

U1: Comment remains. This would be a code requirement of Subchapter E and is not sufficient for superiority.

TR10. For #12 Accessibility, add a note that an accessible route shall be provided from both Toomey Road and South Lamar.

U1: Comment cleared. Note added.

MISCELLANEOUS

TR11. Remove note 2 and replace with “Access to adjacent streets shall be determined at the site plan stage in accordance with the LDC, TCM, and TIA requirements.”

U1: Comment remains. Driveways are reviewed at the time of site plan. Please detail via email or memo why the site should be entitled two driveways and the proposed locations at this stage.

TR12. Provide a distinctive line for the PUD boundary for readability.

U1: Comment cleared. Boundary revised.

TR13. From the land use plan, remove existing drives to remain. This will be determined at the site plan stage.

U1: Comment remains. See TR11.

TR14. Remove note 1 (see above)

U1: Comment remains.

TR15. Recommend not showing plaza boundary on land use plan as it may need to change during site plan review.

U1: Comment cleared. Recommendation.

TR16. Remove all driveways from the land use plan. Driveways, existing and proposed, will be reviewed at the site plan stage.

U1: Comment remains. See TR11.

TR17. Indicate why existing conditions are shown on plan. These should be removed.

U1: Comment cleared.

TR18. Modify note 19 to include "Public right of way shall not be used for maneuvering."

U1: Comment cleared. Note modified.

TR19. Provide a PDF of the updated plans to this reviewer to be distributed to other departments for review.

U1: Comment remains. Please provide a PDF, we do not have scanning capabilities for these sizes.

TR20. Add note stating that ADA accessible showering/locker room facilities will be provided for building tenants.

Austin Transportation Department – Austin Jones 512-974-1449

1. See attached TIA memorandum and mitigation fee-in-lieu invoice.

2. Superiority recommendations:

a. Transit: Fee of \$27,800.00 to the South Lamar Corridor project to account for a new bus stop. ATD will collect the fee and coordinate with Capital Metro.

b. Active/Bike: Fee of \$25,000.00 to the South Lamar Corridor project for cycle track improvements along Lamar. All fees can be collected by ATD.

c. Trails: Please coordinate with Mike Schofield or Nathan Wilkes at ATD regarding any possible improvements to trails in the vicinity.

d. Parking: ATD would considered parking superior for transportation if it is show as a measure to reduce vehicle trips beyond what is required in the LDC and the TIA. To do this would mean:

1. Priced Parking
2. Unbundled Parking
3. Reduced Parking
4. Shared Parking (case by case basis)

3. Provide a note documenting a maximum amount of parking on the site. ATD does not support any excess parking being determine as superior for other elements identified in the LDC, (eg public amenity).

Heritage Tree Review - Jim Dymkowski - 512-974-2772

HT 1: Thank you, for providing a tree survey for the Heritage tree to the north of the PUD between the northern offsite driveway and the Topher Theater. Some of the information requested in the previous comments for the development assessment have not been provided with this submittal. Please show this tree's current growing area and surrounding hardscape. Please also provide a canopy survey for the tree and include information about how much canopy the PUD would affect if the building setback lines are modified to 0 feet off the property line as proposed by the PUD.

UPDATE 1: Thank you for the canopy survey. This original request came in two parts for evaluation. You have provided a canopy survey on paper without including the information as to how much canopy the PUD would affect if the building setback lines are modified to 0 feet off the property line as proposed by the PUD. For this, the services of a third party arborist would be required. Also, the current survey does not appear to take in all of the hardscape surrounding the open area of this tree for evaluation. Comment pending.

HT 2: Thank you for agreeing commit the PUD development to a larger than standard 1.5 inch size tree planting. The increased size committing to 3-inch trees. City Arborist staff would still like the PUD to propose and commit to greater soil volume and tree size planting for any street tree required per the Subchapter E core transit corridor planting standards. This will require the PUD to investigate now if this is an option. If there will not be room in the ROW area due to utilities or other conflicts than staff would not agree that listing that you will work with the reviewer at the time of site plan on this issue is superior.

UPDATE 1: Staff appreciates your response. Please provide that additional information and reasoning used to make this determination. This should include why alternative options are not feasible to create additional area.

EV Officer - Chris Herrington & Atha Phillips - 512-974-2132

EO 1-EO 4 Cleared.

EO 5 As part of the participation in RSMP, WPD wants the drainage from the entire site carried in a new storm drain to either the system being improved by 211 (Option 1 or extending the system to outfall directly to LBL (Option 2). This would reduce flow to the flooding problem area at the intersection of Barton Springs and South Lamar, reduce the flow that must be handled by the private system through the Zach Theater property (especially important given the implications of Atlas 14), and reduce the amount of water in Lamar Boulevard. Please add language to the PUD that describes this requirement, add map provided if necessary. (Attached to report)

NHCD Review - Travis Perlman 512-974-3156

NHCD will review and process any proposed fee-in-lieu of affordable housing for this non-residential project.

Austin Water Utility Review - Neil Kepple 512-972-0077

FYI: The landowner intends to serve the site with City of Austin water and wastewater utilities. The landowner, at own his expense, will be responsible for providing any water and wastewater utility improvements, offsite main extensions, water or wastewater easements, utility relocations and/or abandonments required by the proposed land uses. SERs may be required depending on the proposed development. Water and wastewater utility plans must be reviewed and approved by the Austin Water Utility in compliance with Texas Commission of Environmental rules and regulations, the City's Utility Criteria Manual and suitability for operation and maintenance. All water and wastewater construction must be inspected by the City of Austin. The landowner must pay the City inspection fees with the utility construction. The landowner must pay the tap and impact fee once the landowner makes an application for a City of Austin water and wastewater utility tap permit.

Typical water system operating pressures in the area are above 65 psi. Pressure reducing valves reducing the pressure to 65 psi (552 kPa) or less to water outlets in buildings shall be installed in accordance with the plumbing code.

All AWU infrastructure and appurtenances must meet all TCEQ separation criteria. Additionally AWU must have adequate accessibility to safely construct, maintain, and repair all public infrastructure. Rules & guidelines include:

1. A minimum separation distance of 5 feet from all other utilities (measured outside of pipe to outside of pipe) and AWU infrastructure;
2. A minimum separation distance of 5 feet from trees and must have root barrier systems installed when within 7.5 feet;
3. Water meters and cleanouts must be located in the right-of-way or public water and wastewater easements;
4. Easements for AWU infrastructure shall be a minimum of 15 feet wide, or twice the depth of the main, measured from finished grade to pipe flow line, whichever is greater.
5. A minimum separation of 7.5 feet from center line of pipe to any obstruction is required for straddling line with a backhoe;
6. AWU infrastructure shall not be located under water quality or detention structures and should be separated horizontally to allow for maintenance without damaging structures or the AWU infrastructure.
7. The planning and design of circular Intersections or other geometric street features and their amenities shall include consideration for access, maintenance, protection, testing, cleaning, and operations of the AWU infrastructure as prescribed in the Utility Criteria Manual (UCM)
8. Building setbacks must provide ample space for the installation of private plumbing items such as sewer connections, customer shut off valves, pressure reducing valves, and back flow prevention devices in the instance where auxiliary water sources are provided.

FYI: Dedication of private streets and public utility easements does not obligate the City to approve the placement of City water and wastewater mains within same. Water and wastewater service shall be provided to each lot at their Right of Way frontage.

DAVID WAHLGREN – SUBDIVISION

Comments cleared.

Case Manager/Zoning Review - Heather Chaffin - 512-974-2122

ZN 1. The property boundaries, the building setbacks, etc. are still unclear. There is one heavy line type that is used for property lines that obscures everything else. Use a different line type, gray scale, or something to make it all clearer. You have that line type listed as Zoning on the legend but it's also used on the surrounding lots.

Cleared.

ZN 2. Delete text "PUD Approval Block."

Cleared.

ZN 3. Change existing use from "Schlotsky's" to "Restaurant-Limited."

Cleared.

ZN 4. Label Jessie Street.

Cleared.

ZN 5. Label easements and provide dimensions.

Clarify if the 25' building line is an actual easement or if it is a building line from zoning. If it is an easement, it will need to be vacated.

ZN 6. Show all existing and proposed easements.

Cleared.

ZN 7. Clarify that the requested building setback is 0 feet—it's not just the Zoning Boundary.

Cleared.

ZN 8. Show Aquifer zone boundary (see Environmental Review comments).

Cleared.

ZN 9. See Urban Design comments regarding elevator structure height. The height should be based on a typical elevator structure, not a percentage of building height.

Urban Design reviewer will evaluate the elevator structure. No comments from Zoning/Case Manager.

ZN 10. Correct acreage on plan to 1.263 acres.

Clarify the site acreage—the tax certificate lists the site as 1.2660 acres. Has ROW been dedicated, or is there some other reason it has changed? Update on plan if necessary.

ZN 11. Show all adjacent driveways.

Cleared.

ZN 12. Dimension all existing and proposed driveways.

Revise the labels on the existing driveways; do not describe as “to remain” or “to close.” Just label as “existing driveway.” ATD/DSD will provide comments about proposed driveway locations.

ZN 13. Per Code, “Co-working space” is not considered a pedestrian oriented use. It is considered administrative/business office. Staff does not support the proposed 60% office use with the remainder to be occupied by lobby, building support services, and pedestrian oriented uses. As proposed, the ground floor could be mostly used for office, lobby, and building services, with only a small remainder used for pedestrian oriented uses. Specify a minimum percentage of pedestrian oriented uses; do not include lobby or building service areas.

Provide information about how the exhibits that have been shared can be codified or noted on Land Use Plan. See also Case Manager comments regarding land uses.

ZN 14. FYI: Additional comments will be generated. Additional superiority items will be required beyond what has been proposed so far.

**FOR UPDATE #2, PLEASE PROVIDE COPIES OF THE UPDATED PLAN/
DOCUMENTS FOR DISTRIBUTION AS FOLLOWS:**

Urban Design- Ann Milne – 1 copy
PARD- Thomas Rowlinson- 1 copy
Site Plan- Randall Rouda- 1 copy
Transportation Planning- Jaron Jogenson- 1 copy
Austin Transportation Department- Austin Jones-2 copies
Heritage Tree- Jim Dymkowski- 1 copy
Environmental Officer- Chris Herrington/ Atha Phillips – 2 copies
Zoning/Case Manager- 2 copies

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MAY BE GENERATED AS INFORMATION IS
PROVIDED.**