

MASTER REVIEW REPORT

CASE NUMBER: C814-2018-0121

CASE MANAGER: HEATHER CHAFFIN

PHONE #: 512-974-2122

REVISION #: 00

UPDATE: 2

**FORMAL UPDATE REQUIRED (U#3 )**

PROJECT NAME: 218 S. LAMAR

SUBMITTAL DATE: June 13, 2019

REPORT DUE DATE: July 4, 2019

FINAL REPORT DATE: July 29, 2019

REPORT LATE: 25 DAYS

LOCATION: 218 SOUTH LAMAR BOULEVARD

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.

## Environmental Officer – Atha Phillips & Chris Herrington (512) 974-2132

- EO 1-EO 4 Cleared.
- **EO 5 Please add agreed upon note for detention and water quality as Note #38 on Sheet 2-PUD Notes sheet.**

## 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.

**UPDATE 2: Thank you for the additional information. Staff agrees that it is close but does not appear that the building would greatly affect the canopy of this tree. What the exhibit does not show is the limit of the underground parking garage and potential disturbance that its construction proposes that could affect the tree's canopy. Also, the initial comment requested the information based on the potential canopy the PUD would affect if the building setback lines are modified to 0 feet off the property line as proposed by the PUD. Comment still 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.

**UPDATE 2: Thank you for this commitment. Additional revisions to the note and details for PUD can now be discussed as there is no code required soil amount for the PUD to exceed. Please use the following example of a previously approved PUD that also committed to this soil volume superiority, C814-2017-0001, for additional note and PUD**

language revisions and exhibits and details that would be included in the PUD ordinance. Comment pending.

## Transportation Engineering – Nathan Aubert - (512) 974-7136

ATD 1. The below have been coordinated with the interested parties concerned and would be considered superior. All fees can be collected by ATD.

1. Transit: Fee of \$27,800.00 to the South Lamar Corridor project to account for a new bus stop
2. Active/Bike: Fee of \$25,000.00 to the South Lamar Corridor project for cycle track improvements along Lamar.

ATD 2. Parking: ATD would consider parking superior for transportation if it is shown 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)

ATD 3. ATD is against any excess parking being determined as superior for other elements identified in the LDC, (eg public amenity).

ATD 4. See attached TIA memo and fee information.

## 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]

**U2: Comment cleared. Staff will defer clearing this comment to ATD.**

### **CORRIDOR**

TR2. Include the below streetscape in the land use plan. Contact this reviewer for a more legible copy of it if necessary. 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. The cross section will include a 7' planting zone with street trees, a 10' two-way cycle track, and a 15' clear zone all behind curb. Additionally, a protected intersection will be required at Toomey, to be reviewed at the time of Site Plan.

**U2: Comment cleared. Staff will defer clearing this comment to ATD.**

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

**U2: Comment cleared. Staff will defer clearing this comment to ATD.**

TR4. Bicycle facilities will be required along Toomey Road at the site plan stage. The design is below. Include the below graphic on the land use plan. If a more readable copy is required,

contact this reviewer.

**U2: Comment cleared. Note modified.**

### **SUPERIORITY**

TR5. 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.

**U2: Comment cleared. Staff will defer this comment to ATD.**

TR6. 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.

**U2: Comment cleared. Staff will defer this comment to ATD.**

TR7. 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.

**U2: Comment cleared. Staff will defer this comment to ATD.**

TR8. Clarify how #12 Accessibility achieves superiority. Give specific examples and include in the note.

**U1: Comment cleared. Staff will accept this superiority option.**

### **MISCELLANEOUS**

TR9. 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.”

**U2: Comment cleared. Staff will defer this comment to ATD. The memo has been forwarded to Austin for review.**

TR10. From the land use plan, remove existing drives to remain. This will be determined at the site plan stage.

**U2: Comment cleared. Staff will defer this comment to ATD. The memo has been forwarded to Austin for review.**

TR11. Remove note 1 (see above)

**U2: Comment cleared. Staff will defer this comment to ATD. The memo has been forwarded to Austin for review.**

TR12. Remove all driveways from the land use plan. Driveways, existing and proposed, will be reviewed at the site plan stage.

**U2: Comment cleared. Staff will defer this comment to ATD. The memo has been forwarded to Austin for review.**

TR13. Provide a PDF of the updated plans to this reviewer to be distributed to other departments for review.

**U2: Comment cleared. PDFs may be required by ATD.**

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

### **UPDATE 2 (U2)**

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.

**(U2): Please codify the amenitized rooftop in such a way that it still requires some architectural elements to preserve the intent of the distinctive rooftop requirement. While the amenities and planting would be attractive to the deck users, it does not meet the full intent of the code due to height/visibility issues. PARD and Urban Design agree that it is possible to incorporate some of the elements given as examples in 25-2-721(E)(2). The language may read as:**

***“Amenitized rooftop’ shall be considered as a distinctive building top in the Waterfront Overlay. To qualify as an amenitized rooftop the roof shall contain an active area for seating, lounge and gathering with a shade structure which is architectural integrated with the building and covers a portion of the seating area. The roof shall be framed with planters containing native plants visible from City of Austin parkland and incorporate distinctive elements such as cornices, steeped parapets, hipped roofs, mansard roofs, stepped terraces, and domes.”***

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.

**(U2): PARD cannot accept the request to modify the definition of exterior mirrored glass. While the examples given in the replies to Update 1 may use the same glass as proposed, those projects are outside of the Waterfront Overlay. As such, they were not subject to the restriction on exterior mirrored glass. Also, it may be possible to attain a 3-Star AEGB rating without modifying the reflectance. It is recommended that the architects and engineers meet with AE to discuss the scoring for AEGB ratings.**

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.

**(U2): Cleared.**

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](mailto: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.  
**(U2): Cleared.**

PR7 (U0): FYI development will require its own fire lanes.  
(U1) Cleared.

**PR8 (U2): For Note 15, please specify that the rooftop deck access rules and regulations will be determined through a restrictive covenant jointly agreed upon by the owner and the City prior to site plan approval.**

**PR9 (U2): For Note 26, please specify that the plaza will be publicly accessible through an easement prior to site plan approval.**

**PR10 (U2): PARD requires additional parking for this area and asks that this development provide public parking for the relocation of the DAC, as well as the projected use of the rooftop deck and plaza. Please include a note on the plan that states a certain number of parking spots will be reserved for public use.**

## PAZ Urban Design – Anne Milne (512) 974-2868

UD 1: 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: Open space comment cleared.

**U2: Thank you. Please also provide a minimum percent of active uses – Please see Zoning / Case Manager comment ZN 13.**

UD 2: 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.

**U2: Please describe how the roof will be accessible people other than the building tenants. Please add a note about the distinct roof to the notes.**

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.

**U1: Comment cleared.**

## Neighborhood Housing & Community Development– Travis Perlman (512) 974-3156

NHCD 1. Dwelling units equal to not less 10 percent of the bonus area devoted to a residential rental use shall be leased on an ongoing basis to households earning no more than 60 percent of the median family income for the Austin-Round Rock Metropolitan Statistical Area for a period not less than 40 years from the date a final certificate of occupancy is issued for the

property. The property owner shall enter into a restrictive covenant with the City of Austin enumerating these requirements as necessary to ensure compliance with this provision.

NHCD 2. Dwelling units equal to not less than 5 percent of the bonus area devoted to a residential owner-occupied use shall be sold to income-eligible homebuyers earning no more than 80 percent of the median family income for the Austin-Round Rock Metropolitan Statistical Area. Each affordable owner-occupied unit shall be restricted by a fixed equity and resale agreement approved by NHCD for a period not less than 99 years from the date a final certificate of occupancy is issued for the property. NHCD shall have the right to review and include provisions related to the affordable units in a condominium declaration applicable to the property prior to its filing.

NHCD 3. The property owner shall pay a fee-in-lieu of on-site affordable housing to NHCD not less than an amount equal to the planned unit development fee rate current at the time of site plan submittal times the bonus square footage devoted to a non-residential use.

NHCD 4. NHCD shall have the right to establish additional guidelines and processes to ensure compliance with the affordability requirements applicable to the PUD.

## PAZ Zoning/Case Manager – 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.

**Update #2: Cleared.**

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.

**Update # 2: Cleared; use the more recent information (May 21, 2018 survey).**

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.

**Update#2: Zoning staff will defer to ATD/DSD regarding driveway issues.**

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 the ground floor that will dedicated for pedestrian oriented uses.

**Update #1: Delete Note #7 under Site Development Regulations. Co-working space is considered Administrative/Business Office; there is no need to provide a distinction. Replace with a note stating that Administrative/Business Office land use is permitted on the ground floor. The other elements of Note #7 are addressed by Note #37 under PUD Notes.**

**Regarding Note #37: Staff does not support the land use percentages proposed by the Applicant. Modify from 40% to 50% pedestrian oriented uses.**

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

**Update #2: This comment will remain until all reviewers clear their comments.**

ZN 15. **Provide an item-by-item list/chart of each requested code variance from code--specifically which section is being modified/waived. If modified, describe how (for ex. “reduce setback from 20 feet to 5 feet”). Also provide updated table of which items you are proposing are superior next to each superiority criteria.**

**A FORMAL UPDATE IS REQUIRED.**

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

**FOR UPDATE #3, PLEASE PROVIDE COPIES OF THE UPDATED PLAN/ DOCUMENTS FOR DISTRIBUTION AS FOLLOWS:**

**NHCD- Travis Perlman – Update letter**

**Urban Design- Ann Milne – 1 copy**

**PARD- Thomas Rowlinson- 1 copy**

**Transportation Planning- Jaron Hogenson- 1 copy**

**Austin Transportation Department- Nathan Aubert-2 copies**

**Heritage Tree- Jim Dymkowski- 1 copy**

**Environmental Officer- Chris Herrington/ Atha Phillips – 2 copies**

**Zoning/Case Manager-Heather Chaffin- 3 copies**






---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

**Date:** May 8, 2019  
**To:** Heather Chaffin, Case Manager  
**CC:** Dan Hennessey, P.E., Big Red Dog/WGI  
 Eric Bollich, P.E., PTOE, Austin Transportation Department  
 Upal Barua, P.E., P. Eng., PTOE, Austin Transportation Department  
**Reference:** 218 S Lamar Blvd (PUD) – TIA Final Memo  
 C814-2018-0121

---

**Traffic Impact Analysis:**

The Austin Transportation Department has reviewed the January 30, 2019 (received February 12, 2019) "218 South Lamar Development Transportation Impact Study PUD Traffic Impact Analysis", prepared by Big Red Dog. The proposed land use consists of 167,000 square feet of office space and 13,000 square feet of high-turnover restaurant space. The development will be located near the northwest corner of South Lamar Boulevard and Toomey Road intersection, in southwest Austin. The development is anticipated to be completed by 2020.

The following is a summary of review findings and recommendations:

**Trip Generation:**

Based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10<sup>th</sup> Edition), the development will generate approximately 3,181 adjusted average daily vehicles trips (ADT) upon build out. The table below shows the trip generation by land uses for the proposed development.

Table 1: Adjusted Trip Generation						
Proposed Land Use	Size	24-Hour Two Way Volume	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
			Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit
General Office (710)	167,000 SF	1,942	155	23	26	137
Hight Turnover Restaurant (932)	13,000 SF	1,239	64	52	71	43
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,181</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>180</b>

**Assumptions:**

1. Transit and Active reductions of 15% for office trips and 10% for restaurant.
2. Based on TxDOT AADT volume data, a four (4) percent annual growth rate was assumed to account for the increase in background traffic.
3. Considerations were made for the following projects in the analysis:
  - a. The Carpenter (SP-2016-0073C)
  - b. Dougherty Arts Center (TBD)

**Significant Results:**

The proposed site causes minimal impact to the existing vehicle operations. One area to highlight is the eastbound left at Toomey Road and South Lamar Boulevard where the average vehicle delay increases from 69 seconds to 110 seconds. However, the overall average vehicle delay only increases from 23 second to 26 seconds. ATD has determined that this increase in delay is acceptable.

Improvements have been identified to account for pedestrians and bikes. Sidewalk gaps and pedestrian crosswalks on Toomey Road have been identified. Additionally, contribution will be made to the south Lamar Bond corridor improvements, which include sidewalk and bike lane improvements.

There is an existing transit stop at the northwest corner of Toomey Road and South Lamar Boulevard. The bus stop has been identified to be relocated to the south side of Toomey Road to better address CapMetro's safety and operation concerns.

**Staff Recommendations:**

1. The Applicant shall design and construct 100% of the following improvements as part of their first site development application. Note: Cost estimates **should not** be assumed to represent the maximum dollar value of improvements the applicant may be required to construct.
  - a. Sidewalk (450 feet by 5 feet) on the south side of Toomey Rd. from Barton Place Trail to Jessie Street.; installation of curb ramps across Jessie Street on the south side of Toomey; and crosswalk striping across Jessie Street and Toomey Rd.
  - b. Designated dock-less vehicle parking area at the northwest corner of the Barton Pl. Trail Crosswalk and Toomey Rd.
2. Fee in-lieu contribution to the City of Austin shall be made for the improvements identified in Table 2, totaling \$255,000.00, before third reading.

Table 2: Recommended Improvements				
Intersection	Improvement	Cost	Pro-Rata Share %	Pro-Rata Share \$
North Lamar Blvd. & West 6th Street	Signal Retiming	\$6,250.00	100.0%	\$6,250.00
North Lamar Blvd. & West 5th Street	Signal Retiming	\$6,250.00	100.0%	\$6,250.00
West Cesar Chavez Street & B.R. Reynolds Drive	Signal Retiming	\$5,000.00	100.0%	\$5,000.00
West Cesar Chavez Street & Sandra Muraida Way	Signal Retiming	\$5,000.00	100.00%	\$5,000.00
South Lamar Blvd & West Riverside Drive	South Lamar Blvd Corridor Improvements Program Intersection Improvements	\$2,416,667.00	5.3%	\$128,250.00
	Fish Eye Cameras	\$20,000.00	100.0%	\$20,000.00
South Lamar Blvd & Barton Springs Road	South Lamar Blvd Corridor Improvements Program Intersection Improvements	\$2,166,667.00	1.3%	\$29,100.00
	Fish Eye Cameras	\$20,000.00	100%	\$20,000.00
	Southbound left-turn bay	\$250,000.00	2.9%	\$7,350.00
South Lamar Blvd & Toomey Road	Bus Stop Relocation	\$27,800.00	100.0%	\$27,800.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$4,923,634.00</b>		<b>\$255,000.00</b>

3. Two copies of the final TIA are required to be provided.
4. Development of this property should not vary from the approved uses or deviate from the approved intensities and estimated traffic generation assumptions within the finalized TIA document, including land uses, trip generation, trip distribution, traffic controls, driveway locations, and other identified conditions. Any change in the assumptions made to the TIA document shall be reviewed by ATD and may require a new or updated TIA/addendum.
5. City of Austin reserves the right to reassign any or all the above monies to one or more of the identified improvements in the TIA.
6. The findings and recommendations of this TIA memorandum remain valid until five (5) years from the date of this memo, after which a revised TIA or addendum may be required.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at 512-974-1449.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Austin Jones', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Austin Jones, P.E.  
Austin Transportation Department



## INVOICE

### ATD MITIGATION FEE IN-LIEU

---

**DATE:** May 08, 2019  
**TO:** Dan Hennessey, Big Red Dog/WGI, Applicant  
**CC:** Brandi Bradshaw (ATD Cashier)  
901 S. Mopac Expressway, Bldg. 5, Suite 300, Austin TX 78746  
**FROM:** Austin Jones, P.E. Austin Transportation Department  
**AMANDA CASE#:** C814 2018-0121 (218 South Lamar PUD)  
**FDU:** 7070-2400-9100-4163

---

As a condition of approval for the above referenced zoning case, the applicant shall post a transportation mitigation fee to the amount of **\$255,000.00**, with the City of Austin, in accordance with LDC. If you have any questions, please contact Austin Jones at (512) 974-1449.

**Office Use only:**

Check:

Received by: