

CITY OF AUSTIN – WATERSHED PROTECTION AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW DEPARTMENT
SITE PLAN APPLICATION – MASTER COMMENT REPORT



CASE NUMBER: **SPC-2010-0061C**
REVISION #: **00** UPDATE: **U0**
CASE MANAGER: **Nikki Hoelter** PHONE #: **974-2863**

PROJECT NAME: **New Theatre @ Zach Scott**
LOCATION: **202 S LAMAR BLVD**

SUBMITTAL DATE: **March 23, 2010**
REPORT DUE DATE: **April 20, 2010**
FINAL REPORT DATE: **April 20, 2010**

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, Watershed Protection and Development Review Department, P.O. Box 1088, Austin, Texas 78704.

UPDATE DEADLINE (LDC 25-5-113):

It is the responsibility of the applicant or his/her agent to update this site plan application. **The final update to clear all comments must be submitted by the update deadline, which is September 7, 2010.** 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.

EXTENSION OF UPDATE DEADLINE (LDC 25-1-88):

You may request an extension to the update deadline by submitting a written justification to your case manager on or before the update deadline. Extensions may be granted for good cause at the Director's discretion.

UPDATE SUBMITTALS:

A formal update submittal is required. You must make an appointment with the Intake Staff (974-2689) to submit the update. Please bring a copy of this report with you upon submittal to Intake.

Please submit 7 copies of the plans and 8 copies of a letter that address each comment for distribution to the following reviewers. Clearly label information or packets with the reviewer's name that are intended for specific reviewers. **No distribution is required for the Planner 1 and only the letter is required for Austin Water Utility.**

REVIEWERS:

Drainage Construction: Ron Czajkowski
Environmental: Keith Mars
Fire for Site Plan: James Reeves
PARC / Planning & Design: Jenna R.Neal
Planner 1: Cindy Casillas
Site Plan: Nikki Hoelter
R.O.W. : Mark Boitnott
Transportation: Amber Mitchell
Water Quality: Ron Czajkowski
Austin Water Utility: Howard Neil Kepple

Site Plan Review - Nikki Hoelter - 974-2863

- SP 1. The site plan will also require Design Commission, Parks Board, and Environmental Board review and recommendation, prior to being scheduled for Planning Commission.
- SP 2. This site is zoned P, Public, and is greater than one acre in size; therefore, a Conditional Use Permit is required to establish the site development regulations for all portions of the site zoned P, according to the Land Development Code {Section 25-2-625}. The CUP will be placed on the Planning Commission agenda once all recommendations are received from the other Boards and all comments are clear.
- SP 3. FYI - This site is located in the South Lamar Combined - Zilker Neighborhood Plan, which is in the planning process. Please contact Paul Di Giuseppe, at 974-2865 for additional information for the plan.
- SP 4. Plumbing and fire lines installed after June 2, 1997, may not cross lot lines without approval by Water and Wastewater Dept. and Fire Department. Sheet 7 appears to show wastewater line crossing lot lines. FYI – the Unified Development Agreement will not address this issue. Please contact Monty Lowell, at 974-2882 for additional information on addressing this comment.
- SP 5. Please dimension all existing and proposed structures.
- SP 6. Please list the submittal date on the coversheet, March 11, 2010. Show the case number on all sheets.
- SP 7. On the site plan sheet, sheet 3, clearly delineate the CS-1 zoning district boundary.
- SP 8. Update all site data tables to reflect this area is zoned CS-1.
- SP 9. Provide the new site plan release block on all sheets; if a copy is needed please contact this reviewer.
- SP 10. Change the department name from Watershed Protection and Development Review to Planning and Development Review Department on the signature line and all notes.
- SP 11. On the site plan sheet, identify the limits of construction and the acreage.
- SP 12. On the coversheet, for the legal description of the Zach Property, provide the recording information.
- SP 13. Please explain why 2 addresses are listed on the cover under Project Address, a South Lamar and Toomey Road address.
- SP 14. Provide a depiction of the entire site for reference only within the plan set.
- SP 15. Show the height of the fly tower and the structure separately within the site data table.
- SP 16. Note on the cover sheet and site plan sheet: The site is composed of ??? lots/tracts. It has been approved as one cohesive development. If portions of the lots/tracts are sold,

application for subdivision and site plan approval may be required. Once recorded add the document number for the UDA to the note.

- SP 17. For the proposed site plan, please record a Unified Development agreement that clearly ties these lots together for the construction, use, and maintenance of the proposed Detention facility. Please submit this document to this reviewer. This reviewer will coordinate with the Legal Department for review and approval. For any legal document questions please contact Annette Bogusch – PDRD Legal Liaison (974-6483). Please be aware this process takes some time and now requires lien-holders information/consent.
- SP 18. Ensure all existing and future dedicated easements, including joint access, drainage, conservation, utility, communication, etc are shown? Indicate volume and page or document number, or dedication by plat. All buildings, fences, landscaping, patios, flatwork and other uses or obstructions of a drainage easement are prohibited, unless expressly permitted by a license agreement approved by the City of Austin authorizing use of the easement. ******Please provide recording information on the plan and a copy of the recorded WWL and WL easement once approved.**
- SP 19. A determination has not been made whether additional CS-1 zoning will be required for the sale of alcohol within the theatre and in the plaza area. Pending.

Subchapter E, Commercial Design Standards

- SP 20 This site was granted Alternative Equivalent Compliance under the assumption that the new theatre was coming in as a singular site plan. As the entirety of the campus is being submitted in the plan and will be part of a UDA, the site is over 5 acres, making the principal street Internal Circulation Routes, not the Core Transit Corridor (S Lamar). Please contact me, to discuss requesting Alternative Equivalent Compliance for this component of the Commercial Design Standards.
- SP 21. A license agreement will be required to be approved and recorded prior to site plan approval and release, for the trees and street furniture installed in the right of way. Please contact Andy Halm at 974-7185 for further information
- SP 22. Utilities must be underground from building to property line. Utilities within the right-of-way must be placed underground or to rear of site to the maximum extent practicable. If overhead utilities remain, no portion of the building may be located within a 10-foot radius of the energized conductor. (§ 2.2.2.B.3.; p. 16)
- SP 23. Building entryway, at least one customer entrance should face the principal street and connect directly to the sidewalk along the principal street, unless a-d are met in Section 2.2.6.B.1.- **Does not apply, AEC granted.**
Additionally, building entrances should be located at intervals of no more than 75 feet along the elevation facing the principal street. Section 2.2.6.B.2 - **Does not apply, AEC granted.**
- SP 24. Verify compliance with screening requirements of Subchapter E, section 2.6.2 by a) Screening from view of person standing on property line on far side of adjacent public street: solid waste collection areas and mechanical equipment and rooftop equipment, not including solar panels (§ 2.6.2.A.; p. 52); b) Incorporate loading docks, truck parking, storage, trash collection/compaction, etc., into building/landscape design. And c) add the following note: Screening for solid waste collection and loading areas shall be the same as, or of equal quality to, principal building materials.

SP 25. Because this site is larger than 5 acres, please show a minimum of 2% of net site area shall be devoted to following private common open space or pedestrian amenities: a) Natural, undisturbed private common open space, b) Landscape area beyond minimum landscape requirements, meeting specified standards (p.53), c) Playground, patio, plaza, meeting specified standards (p.53), d) Combination of above (§ 2.7.3.A.; p. 53-54)

The following not counted for open space/pedestrian amenity: a) Private yards, b) Public/private streets, c) Parking areas and driveways for dwellings, d) Water quality/stormwater detention ponds (§ 2.7.3.C.; p. 54), e) Area shall meet specified location and design criteria (§ 2.7.3.B. and D.; p. 54-55)
Area shall be maintained by owners of development (§ 2.7.3.E.; p. 55)
Fee in lieu option available within urban roadways boundary (§ 2.7.3.F.; p. 54)

SP 26. Include the following note on the site plan page: "All exterior lighting will be full cut-off and fully shielded in compliance with Subchapter E 2.5. All site lighting to be located on the building will be in compliance with Subchapter E 2.5, and will be reviewed during building plan review. Any change or substitution of lamp/light fixtures shall be submitted to the Director for approval in accordance with Section 2.5.2.E." Also include Figure 42 from Section 2.5.

WATERFRONT OVERLAY DISTRICT

SP 27. Please state how this plan addresses these goals in order for staff to make a favorable recommendation.

25-2-715 (B) The board shall consider a request for review and recommendation under Subsection (A) at the earliest meeting for which notice can be timely provided and shall base its recommendation on the goals and policies of the Town Lake Corridor Study.

The site plan will be scheduled for the Waterfront Planning Advisory Board once the majority of the review comments are addressed.

SP 28. This site is located in the Butler Shores Subdistrict, please clearly address how this plan meets the subdistricts regulations [LDC 25-2-733]

*Show all primary and secondary setback lines on the site plan.

SP 29. This subsection applies to a nonresidential use in a building adjacent to parkland adjoining Town Lake (1) For a ground level wall that is visible from park land or a public right of way that adjoins parkland, at least 60 percent of the wall area that is between 2 and 10 feet above grade must be constructed of clear or lightly tinted glass. The glass must allow pedestrians a view of the interior of the building. (Comment should be addressed with an architectural rendering of the building clearly labeled within the plan set.) [LDC Section 25-2-733(E)(1)]

SP 30. Entryways or architectural detailing is required to break the continuity of nontransparent basewalls. (3) Except for transparent glass required by this subsection, natural building materials are required for an exterior surface visible from park land adjacent to Town Lake. [LDC Section 25-2-733(E)(2)(3)] (Comment should be addressed with an architectural rendering of the building clearly labeled within the plan set.)

- SP 31. In the North Shore Central, South Shore Central, Auditorium Shores, Butler Shores, and City Hall Waterfront Overlay subdistricts, at least 50 percent of the net usable floor area of a structure adjacent to Town Lake must be used for pedestrian-oriented uses. Note the net usable floor area of the ground floor of each proposed structure and the respective percentage of proposed pedestrian uses on the ground level. [Section 25-2-691, 692].
- SP 32. Provide architectural information for the exterior of buildings (including building materials and type of glass) sufficient to demonstrate compliance with waterfront design requirements. [Sec. 25-2-721(E)(1-4)].
- SP 33. Show the location and screening of all trash receptacles, air conditioning units exterior storage, etc. [Sec. 25-2-721]
- SP 34. Under LDC Section 25-2-691(C) Pedestrian Oriented Uses does not include the existing and proposed use of Theatre or Office. The Planning Commission may determine that both can be permitted uses. This will required PC approval, and will be scheduled at the same time of any other requested variances.
- SP 35. Therefore, based on LDC 25-2-692(H), in the Butler Shores subdistrict not less than 50 percent of the net usable floor area of the ground level of a structure adjacent to Town Lake must be uses for pedestrian oriented uses.
- SP 36. Please specify the type of office use (administrative/business, professional, or medical) on the site plan sheet.

Water Quality Review - Ron Czajkowski - 974-6307

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.

WQ 1. The configuration of the ponds needs revision to avoid short-circuiting of flow and dead zones within the sedimentation basins. Inlets and filtration basins should be at opposite ends of the ponds for proper sedimentation (see ECM 1.6.2.D). Alternatively, multiple inlets at the corners of the sedimentation ponds can be provided to distribute the incoming flows if biofiltration basins centered within the sedimentation pond centers are desired.

WQ 2. Provide splitter structures for Ponds A and B to capture and isolate the water quality volume (ECM 1.6.2.B). Inlets alone will not be sufficient to capture floating debris within the ponds.

WQ 3. Provide flow spreaders to return flows to sheet flow conditions with a maximum velocity of 2 ft/sec for the 25-year storm at the entrance to the sedimentation basins (ECM 1.6.7.C.3.A).

WQ 4. Provide sufficient bottom elevations in the sedimentation basins to verify 2% slope (ECM 1.6.7.C.3.A) and the pond volumes.

WQ 5. Provide calculations demonstrating that the splitter designs will be capable of passing the peak flow rate of a twenty-five (25) year storm into the water quality pond (ECM 1.6.2.B).

WQ 6. Provide detailed plant selection (type and quantities of each) for the sedimentation and biofiltration ponds (see ECM 1.6.7.C.5.A, D, and E). Include plans showing complete plant layout in the ponds (see ECM 1.6.7.C.5.C).

WQ 7. Take out the 3" topsoil layer in the biofiltration pond details (Sheets 12, 13, and 14). Label the hedgerow at the rock flow spreader.

WQ 8. Provide the minimum criteria for the 18" sand bed in the biofiltration ponds (see ECM 1.6.7.C.4) on the plan sheets. Modify the sequence of construction to account for certification and acceptance of the biofiltration media and other biofiltration issues (see ECM 1.6.7.C.4 and 1.6.3.C.6.D).

WQ 9. Ponds A and B do not have an underdrain system. Provide data (test borings, published data, etc.) showing that the permeability of the underlying stratigraphy will allow drainage of the ponds within 48 to 72 hours.

WQ 10. Pond C has an underdrain pipe. Note the following:

- (1) Provide cleanouts every 50 feet and at every bend. Include at least one cleanout which is accessible when the pond is full. (See ECM 1.6.7.C.4.B.)
- (2) Provide a removable PVC cap with an appropriately sized orifice at the end of the underdrain pipe for a 48-hour drawdown time (ECM 1.6.7.C.4.C). Provide calculations demonstrating a 48-hour drawdown time from water quality elevation to top of sand bed. Include access at the PVC cap location.
- (3) The elevations of the sand bed and the flowline at the upgradient end of the pipe are incompatible with the thicknesses indicated in the inset detail.

WQ 11. Provide a geotextile fabric between the sand bed and underlying gravel layer in the ponds (ECM 1.6.7.C.4.B). Include properties of the geotextile (ECM 1.6.7.C.4.B and 1.4.5.P).

WQ 12. It is not clear how the 25 and 100-year flow rated in the pond calculation tables (Sheets 12 to 14) were determined.

WQ 13. The required biofiltration pond areas in the pond calculation tables appear to be in error. For a partial sedimentation/biofiltration pond, the required area is given by $WQV/(4 + 1.33H)$, where H is the distance from the splitter weir to the top of sand bed (1.6.7.C.2). Please review/correct.

WQ 14. As presently designed, the water quality and overflow weir elevations given in the pond calculation tables (Sheets 13 and 14) should be 453.68 (not 454.25) for Pond B and 451.15 (not 454.25) for Pond C.

WQ 15. The drainage area to Pond C is 1.73 acres based on the drainage area map (areas A and P5 on Sheet 11). However, the pond calculation table (Sheet 14) used a total of 0.79 acres (including only a portion of area A) as the basis for pond sizing. It is not clear why only a portion of area A was used in the pond calculations.

WQ 16. Note that for cost recovery from the city for construction of water quality facilities, the water quality controls must treat at least 10 acres of previously untreated offsite areas (ECM 1.9.2.A).

WQ 17. An Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan is required for this project (ECM 1.6.7.C.1). For guidance on this issue, please contact this reviewer to receive a memo issued by John Gleason regarding IPM plan assistance. Once received, the IPM plan will be forwarded to John Gleason, Environmental Resource Management, for review and approval.

WQ 18. A Restrictive Covenant (RC) is required for implementation of the IPM plan (1.6.7.C.1). Contact this reviewer for a standard RC form if needed.

WQ 19. Provide a Restrictive Covenant (RC) or Unified Development Agreement (UDA) which addresses construction, use and maintenance of the water quality facilities. Contact this reviewer for standard legal forms if needed.

Environmental Review - Keith Mars - (512) 974-2755

EV 0 Please be advised that additional comments may be generated as update information is reviewed. If an update has been rejected, reviewers are not able to clear comments based on phone calls, e-mails, or meetings, but must receive formal updates in order to confirm positive plan set changes.

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

EV 1 Provide a fiscal estimate for erosion/sedimentation controls and revegetation based on Appendix S-1 of the Environmental Criteria Manual. The approved amount must be posted with the City prior to permit/site plan approval. [LDC 25-7-65, ECM 1.2.1.]

EV 2 Specify the area (S.F. or S.Y.) within the LOC and match with that submitted for the re-vegetation quantity on the E/S cost estimate. [LDC 25-7-65, 25-2-1002, ECM 1.2.1.1]

EV 3 For sites with a limit of construction greater than one acre, the fiscal estimate must include a clean-up fee [ECM 1.2.1, appendix S-1]

EV 4 Payment of the landscape inspection fee is required prior to permit/site plan approval. Payment of the fee is made through Intake. Upon payment, please forward a copy of the receipt to the environmental reviewer. Payment is \$500.

EROSION / SEDIMENTATION (E/S) CONTROLS [LDC 25-7-61,65, 25-8-181,182,183,184]

EV 5 A CofA SWPPP is required for sites greater than 1 acre. ESC plan will not be reviewed until a SWPPP is received.

EV 6 Move the SCE outside the CRZ of tree 787.

EV 7 Do you have any offsite drainage coming onsite? If so, demonstrate how you will control for offsite flows.

EV 8 Add note on Sequence of construction and ESC plan stating: *"If disturbed area is not to be worked on for more than 14 days, disturbed area needs to be stabilized by revegetation, mulch, tarp or revegetation matting."* [ECM 1.4.4.B.3., Section 5, I.]

EV 9 Please include the updated erosion control notes per ECM appendix P-1 (adopted 3/24/09).

EV 10 Revise the sequence of construction to include scheduling and conducting the final inspection with EV Inspector prior to the removal of erosion controls.

Landscape Requirements [LDC 25-8-604, 621 / 25-2, Article 9]

EV 11 Add a note stating: The OWNER will continuously maintain the required landscaping in accordance with LDC Section 25-2-984.

EV 12 Identify on the landscape plan the method of landscape protection, and provide the following note on both the site plan and the landscape plan: *All landscaped areas are to be protected by six-inch wheel curbs, wheelstops or other approved barriers as per ECM 2.4.7. 7*

EV 13 Since there are two streetyards (Riverside Drive and Lamar Blvd.), provide separate calculations for each streetyard area per ECM Appendix C. and ECM 2.4.1(B). [reviewers – can accept one calculation but ask for separate ones if you feel that one streetyard is lacking landscaping]

EV 14 Call out the quantity of plants on the plant list.

Arborist/Tree Preservation

EV 15 Comment pending conversations with the city arborist regarding the 39" American elm (*Ulmus americana*).

EV 16 Parking is proposed within the ½ critical root zone of trees 787 and 900. Revise to avoid impacts within the ½ CRZ. The reviewer suggests removing the proposed parking spot impacting the ½ CRZ of tree 787 and adjusting the parking for tree 900.

EV 17 Tree Remediation – 25-8-604 and ECM 3.5.4.(C), ECM Appendix P-6:
Insert the following as number 1A in the Sequence of Construction.

For all existing Class I trees:

1. *Supplemental Nutrients per guidelines below.*
2. *An organic mulch layer of one to three inches in depth is to be applied within the entire area of the critical root zone (within construction area).*
3. *Utilization of a rock saw is required to sever tree roots cleanly adjacent to proposed grade cuts. Application depth to be 18 inches. Chain link protective fencing (in addition to planking).*
4. *Humate/nutrient solutions are to be applied at recommended manufacturer rates. Apply as a pressurized soil injection within the available critical root zone area. Where soil injection is not practical, soil drench application is required. Nutrient solutions are to have a macro nutrient level which does not exceed 4% per volume. Trees which are to receive remedial care are to be identified graphically on the plans.*

EV 18 Place the following note on the landscape plan

Special Construction Techniques ECM 3.5.4(D)

Prior to excavation within tree driplines, or the removal of trees adjacent to other trees that are to remain, make a clean cut between the disturbed and undisturbed root zones with a rock saw or similar equipment to minimize root damage.

In critical root zone areas that cannot be protected during construction with fencing, and where heavy vehicular traffic is anticipated, cover those areas with four (4) inches of organic mulch to be produced on site, to minimize soil compaction.

Perform all grading within critical root zone areas with small equipment to minimize root damage.

Water all trees most heavily impacted by construction activities deeply as necessary during periods of hot, dry weather. Spray tree crowns with water periodically to reduce dust accumulation on the leaves.

When installing concrete adjacent to the root zone of a tree, use a plastic vapor barrier behind the concrete to prohibit leaching of lime into the soil.

EV 19 Proposed mitigation is not acceptable. Mitigation is required at the following rates.

Class I and II trees	19"+ diameter	Replace at 100%
Class I and II trees	8-18" diameter	Replace at 50%
Class III and IV trees	19"+ diameter	Replace at 50%
Class III and IV trees	8-18" diameter	Replace at 25%

EV 20 Graphically differentiate replacement trees from landscape trees. ECM 3.3.2(D)(2)

EV 21 For urban forest accounting purposes, please provide the following information after all Landscaping and/or tree-related comments are cleared.

1. Total tree inches surveyed
2. Total tree inches removed, Class 1 & 2
3. Total tree inches removed, Class 3 & 4
4. Total tree inches planted on site

E-mail copy this reviewer. This comment pending receipt of e-mail copy. ECM 3.5.0

Fire For Site Plan Review - James Reeves - 974-0193

April 12, 2010

UPDATE 0

REJECTED

1. Unobstructed turning radii of 50 feet outside and 25 feet inside must be provided for all turns.
2. Fire hydrant locations do not meet the requirement that all points of the first floor exterior walls be within 400 feet of a hydrant and within 500 feet of a second hydrant. Only 1 hydrant is shown. There appears to be an existing hydrant nearby. If so, verify that it is accessible and is adjacent to a fire lane.

3. Provide hydraulic fire flow calculations for the needed fire flow to the buildings. Include in these calculations the friction loss through fire lines to ensure adequate flow to hydrants. All hydrants and nodes that are included in the calculations need to be identified for verification by this office. Include in the calculations any backflow preventers installed in lines. The required fire flow is shown in two places with conflicting information. Provide accurate fire flow.

4. Provide a post indicator valve in underground lead-in. A wall post indicator valve or exterior door with direct access to riser room will be accepted as alternate.

Flood Plain Review - David Marquez - 974-3389

No comments

Industrial Waste Review - Michael Neberman - 972-1060

3/26/10
Update #0
Approved

IW 1. No Comment.

Mapping Review - Richard Sigmon - 974-2288

Approved

PARD / Planning & Design Review - Jenna R.Neal - 974-9457 (PARD Forestry) Emily King - 974- 9548

PA1: Please show on the site plans the primary and secondary setbacks for the waterfront overlay district – Butler Shores.

PA 2: Please provide additional information on the 'no build' portion of the subject boundary that was mentioned in the Waterfront Overlay Advisory Board meeting, 04.12.10.

PA3: Please show on the site plans the location of the 'no build' as mentioned in the meeting on 04.12.10.

PA 4: Will the storm water ponds be a public facility or privately maintained?

PA 5: Will informational/educational signage be included with these ponds?

PA 6: The parking calculations include existing PARD parking? Is it necessary to include parking that is not within the subject boundary?

PA 7: Please break out the PARD parking lot and street parking from the existing parking table.

PA 8: Why is the PARD parking lot (possibly the street parking stalls) and the softball fields parking lot listed under the proposed parking calculations?

PA 9: If the parking for the softball fields is included in the calculations, then how will the Theatre meet their parking requirements during AISD softball games/tournaments etc?

PA 10: Since the street parking is heavily used by park and trail users, how will these street parking spaces be addressed during construction?

PA 11: Will there be flaggers on site at all times?

PA 12: LOC extends beyond subject boundary – is this not a conflict?

PA 13: Why does the LOC boundary exceed the western parking lot and include the sidewalk that is the ADA entrance to the PARD Main Office front doors?

PA 14: The LOC boundary include the entrance to the trail; which is not apart of the subject boundary. This is the only formal/ADA compliant entrance to the trail in this area, please consider adjusting LOC to not include and/or impact the trail entrance.

PA 15: Please show all the sidewalks around the PARD Main Office and the most western parking lot. Your parking lot calculations include these areas therefore the walks from these lots connecting to the Theatre site need to be shown to determine sidewalk and trail detours.

PA 16: Tree #583 is a memorial tree that was purchased and planted over 15 years ago by a citizen. This information has been conveyed to the Theatre administration staff since the initial discussions of the proposed new theatre. What protection measures will be taken to insure this tree is not removed? If relocated, what protection measures will be taken to insure the tree survives the transplant?

The Following Comments are from Emily King. If there are any questions regarding the following comments, you may contact her at Emily.king@ci.austin.tx.us or 512.974.9548

PA 17: Tree survey is inaccurate. The following problems must be corrected:

- a. Trees are missing from the Tree List
- b. Trees are missing from the Site Plan
- c. Some trees show up on the Tree List and not on the Site Plan
- d. Some trees show up on the Site Plan and not on the Tree List
- e. Some trees do not show up on either the Tree List or the Site Plan
- f. At least one tree is shown on the Site Plan but not the Tree List and is not present at the site
- g. ALL tree sizes are inaccurate. DBH inaccuracies range from 1" to 8"
- h. Not all species are identified
- i. The LOC extends north of Riverside Dr/main driveway but the tree survey does not-these trees need to be accounted for

PA 18: Tree survey is inconsistent. The following inconsistencies must be addressed:

- a. Tree 896 is shown to preserve on Site Plan but is listed on the Tree List as being removed
- b. Tree 583 is shown on the Site Plan as being removed but listed on the Tree List as being preserved
- c. Tree 569 is shown on the Site Plan as being removed but listed on the Tree List as being preserved

PA 19: Tree 787 is being encroached upon by the "stabilized construction entrance"; can the entrance be shifted west so that the CRZ of 787 is preserved?

PA 20: Tree 573 is the healthiest Bigtooth maple on the site; I would like to see options to preserve this tree.

PA 21: Tree 583 is a specimen Bur oak; see PA 16

PA 22: Please denote trees to be removed on the Tree List in a format that can be viewed on black and white prints (an "*" or an "R" will do).

PA 23: Due to inaccuracies with the tree sizes, all tree protection fencing must be redrawn to appropriate scale.

PA 24: Appraised values for trees to be removed & approved for removal will be submitted for mitigation once it is clear which trees can not be preserved.

R.O.W. Review - Mark Boitnott - 974-7180

Redlines ready for pick-up at 505 Barton Springs Road, One Texas Center, Suite 850
Return mark-ups with revised plan set and re-submit formally thru intake.

Transportation Review - Amber Mitchell - 974-3428

Accessibility

TR1. When more than one building or facility is located on a site, at least one accessible route of travel must be provided between accessible elements, facilities, and buildings. Show the accessible route on the site plan. [IBC1104.2] *Identify the accessible route between all buildings on the site.*

TR2. Slopes on accessible routes may not exceed 1:20 unless designed as a ramp. [ANSI 403.3]

TR3. The maximum slope of a ramp in new construction is 1:12. The maximum rise for any ramp run is 30 in. The maximum horizontal projection is 30 feet for a ramp with a slope between 1:12 and 1:15, and 40 feet for a ramp with a slope between 1:16 and 1:20. Provide a detail of the ramp. [ANSI 405.2 - 405.6] *Provide a detail for all ramps used on the site, including the ramp to main entrance of the building.*

TR4. Accessible parking spaces must be provided in accordance with IBC Table 1106.1. Identify the accessible spaces among the entire development.

TR5. Every accessible parking space must be identified by a sign, centered at the head of the parking space. The sign must include the international symbol of accessibility and state RESERVED, or equivalent language. Characters and symbols on such signs must be located 60" minimum above the ground so that they cannot be obscured by a vehicle parked in the space. [IBC 1110.1, ANSI 502.7]. Include as a note on the plan, or show a detail of the sign.

TR6. Curb ramps must be provided wherever an accessible route crosses a curb. [ANSI 406.1]. Identify the location of all curb ramps on the site.

TR6. Curb ramps must be located so as to provide a continuous accessible path of travel. Show the curb ramp at S Lamar and Riverside Drive Extension, as well as the receiving ramps. TCM, 4.3.0.G.

Sidewalks

TR7. Show the location of 4 foot sidewalks according to City Standards along Riverside Drive Extension. LDC, Sec. 25-6-352; TCM, 4.2.1. *It is unclear if the sidewalk is two feet off the curb, please clarify on the plan set.*

TR8. Raised curbs on driveways must terminate at sidewalks. Indicate the termination of curbs and show the standard driveway detail. Do not show curb ramps at the driveway. TCM, 5.3.1.E; COA Std. No. 433-2.

Parking & Loading

TR9. Include a table showing the proposed land uses, the floor area in square feet for each land use, the parking ratio, the number of parking spaces required, and the number of parking spaces provided by type (standard, compact, handicapped). LDC, 25-6-472, Appendix A. *Update the parking table to include the use category from Appendix A. The ratios look correct so long as the ZPACC is a warehouse.*

TR10. 1 off-street loading space is required. Each off-street loading space must consist of a rectangular area not less than 12 feet wide and 45 feet long, with a vertical clearance of not less than 15 feet. Identify the loading space and show dimensions on the site plan. LDC, Section 25-6-531, 532. TCM, 9.3.0 #1.

TR11. Please provide information regarding how parking will be handled during construction.

Driveways

TR12. Driveway approaches must be separated by a minimum of 200 feet, measured from edge to edge at the property line. TCM, Table 5-2. *This applies to the drive on S. Lamar Blvd.*

TR13. The one-way, right-in only drive accessing S. Lamar is not designed to prohibit right outs, nor does it meet the TCM for one-way drives. Please update the drive to meet the requirements in Table 5-2 in the TCM, provide safe access, and discourage exit movements.

TR14. Show the current driveway detail (City of Austin Standard No.433S-2, adopted 02/24/2010).

Commercial Design Standards

TR15. This site was granted Alternative Equivalent Compliance under the assumption that the new theatre was coming in as a singular site plan. As the entirety of the campus is being submitted in the plan and will be part of a UDA, the site is over 5 acres, making the principal street Internal Circulation Routes, not the Core Transit Corridor (S Lamar). Please contact the case manager, Nikki Hoelter, to discuss requesting Alternative Equivalent Compliance for this component of the Commercial Design Standards.

TR16. At least one customer entrance must face principal street and connect directly to the sidewalk along the principal street unless: a continuous shaded sidewalk links the principal street and the building's principal entrance, the entrance must be less than 100 feet from the street facing façade line of the building, and a row of shade trees between the building and the parking area shall be provided at an average spacing of not greater than 30 feet on center.

(§2.2.6.B.1; p 40). *The site does not appear to meet this requirement. Please demonstrate compliance with the update.*

TR17. A shaded sidewalk shall be provided alongside at least 50 percent of all building frontages adjacent to or facing the principal street or adjacent parking. When adjacent to parking, the shaded sidewalk shall be raised above the level of the parking by way of a defined edge. ADA ramps along the building must also be shaded. (§3.2.3.A; p 58).

TR18. Applicability: Projects with net site area ≥ 3 acres in non-residential districts; projects with net site < 3 acres if parking placed between building and principal street. All sites shall:

- Provide public/private street connections to existing public/private streets on adjacent sites, or stub-outs if connection not feasible (§ 2.3.2.B.1.; p. 45-46).
- If public street is adjacent to property line, provide direct pedestrian and bicycle access from street to customer entrance (§ 2.3.2.B.1.b.; p. 46).
- All sites or developments subject to this section must also select and comply with at least two of the bicycle/pedestrian improvement options listed in the table provided in §2.3.2.B.2 on page 47. If the site provides more than %125 of the parking required in Appendix A (Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements), the site must select and comply with three of the options. (§2.3.2.B.2; p. 46)

TR19. A license agreement will be required for the trees installed in the right of way. Please contact Andy Halm at 974-7185 for further information.

TR20. Additional comments may be provided when more complete information is obtained.

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

WW1. The water and wastewater utility plan must be reviewed and approved by the Austin Water Utility/Pipeline Engineering for compliance with City criteria. All water and wastewater construction must be inspected by the City of Austin.

FYI: For plan review status contact Pipeline Engineering at 972-0220. The Landowners Engineer will be notified by Pipeline Engineering once the red-lines/comments are ready for pickup at the Austin Water Utility Waller Creek office located at 625 E.10th St., Austin, TX 78701. Response comments and corrections, along with the original redlines, must be returned to the assigned Pipeline Engineering reviewer at the Waller Creek office.

Drainage Construction Review - Ron Czajkowski - 974-6307

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.

DC 1. Sheet 10 – Use the T_c equations given in DCM 2.4.2.A and 2.4.2.B (not the SCS equations) when using the Rational Method for determining runoff. Also check the T_c values used in the runoff calculation table for Areas C and D (they are different from the calculated values in the Time of Concentration table).

DC 2. Storm sewer pipes must have a minimum diameter of 18 inches (DCM 5.3.3). Label all pipes to be RCP (DCM 5.2.0.G).

DC 3. Please show pipe profile(s) with 25 and 100 year depths of flows, velocities, and Q's (DCM 5.2.0). Also, show 25 year HGL (and 100 year HGL if pipe is flowing full).

DC 4. Please provide an inlet calculation table. An example of a calculation table for inlet flow design is shown in [Table 4-1](#) of the DCM.

DC 5. Provide a manhole at the intersection of the 24" and two 18" storm sewer lines near Pond C.

DC 6. Several retaining walls are indicated on Sheet 6. Provide structural detail for all walls greater than 4 feet in height or more than 100 feet long.

DC 7. Add note indicating that all flow from the building rooftop will be routed to the downspouts and the conveyance at the eastern end of the building (Sheet 9). Show elevations and/or flow indicators (Sheet 9) in the area corresponding to drainage area P4 to show drainage towards the inlets in the center of the area.

Electric Review - David Lambert - 322-6109

EL 1. FYI: Once the owner or his representative has received the design of the electric facilities to provide power to this project, contact Kathy Strittmatter at 322-6410 for preparation of the commercial blanket electric easement which must be executed before permanent electric service may be turned on.

EL 2. FYI: Any relocation of electric facilities shall be at landowner's/developer's expense.

EL 3. FYI: Joe McNair at ph. 505-7526 is your Austin Energy contact person for electric service design.

EL 4. Comments clear.