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

CASE NUMBER: **SPC-2010-0061C**
REVISION #: **00** UPDATE: **U1**
CASE MANAGER: **Nikki Hoelter** PHONE #: **974-2863**

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

SUBMITTAL DATE: **May 26, 2010**
REPORT DUE DATE: **June 9, 2010**
FINAL REPORT DATE: **June 17, 2010**
8 DAYS HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE UPDATE DEADLINE

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

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

If you have any questions, problems, concerns, or if you require additional information about this report, please do not hesitate to contact your case manager at the phone number listed above or by writing to the City of Austin, 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 15, 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
Fire for Site Plan: James Reeves
PARD / Planning & Design: Jenna R.Neal
Planner 1: Cindy Casillas
Site Plan: Nikki Hoelter
Transportation: Amber Mitchell
Water Quality: Ron Czajkowski
Environmental: Keith Mars
R.O.W. : Tim Vogt
Austin Water Utility: Howard Neil Kepple

Drainage Construction Review - Ron Czajkowski - 974-6307

DC 1. Sheet 10 – Use the Tc 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 Tc 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).

Update 1: Check the C values and corresponding storm flows for drainage area P9 on Sheet 12 (the values for C2 and C10 are greater than the values for C25 and C100). Also check the C values for area P5 (they appear low for the large amount of impervious cover in the area).

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).

Update 1: There are still storm pipes shown less than 18" in diameter. Also, the pipes need to be labeled or indicated as RCP. Note that this does not apply to the biofiltration pond underdrain piping system (DCM 5.2.0.H).

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).

Update 1: Only two pipe profiles are shown on Sheet 10. Please show the rest of the pipe profiles (i.e. include the pipes conveying to the ponds). Include the 100-year storm flows in addition to the 25-year storm flows. Also include the existing pipe in which Line A terminates to verify that the existing pipe has sufficient capacity for the additional developed site flows.

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.

Update 1: Provide calculations verifying that inlet CB3 has sufficient capacity without allowing bypass flow. (The other inlets appear sufficiently sized.)

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

Update 1: The conveyance system has been revised. Provide a manhole at the 45˚ bend in the stormsewer 32 ft upgradient from the curb inlet/splitter box. Provide a manhole at the 45˚ bend in the stormsewer approximately 30 ft upgradient from the headwall at the vegetative filter strip.

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.

Update 1: There appear to be four walls identified on Sheet 6. Note the following:

(1) The wall along the south side of area P4 is approximately 160 ft long. Structural detail is needed.
(2) There is insufficient data to verify the height of the walls along the west side of area P4 and at the stairway on the south side of the proposed theater building. Please provide elevation data.
(3) The wall on the west side of the existing ZPACC metal building appears to be less than 4 ft high. No further action is needed.

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.

Update 1: Is runoff from the roof to be directed to the north end of the building? Please indicate on the plan sheets.

NEW COMMENT:

DC 8. Provide spot elevations (Sheet 8) in the area corresponding to area P4 to verify drainage towards the inlets (see DC 7). Provide additional spot elevations (Sheet 8) in the drainage areas to inlets CB1 and CB3 to demonstrate whether flows from the intended drainage areas will drain or bypass these inlets. It is not clear, for example, whether flow from area B through the curb cut at the northwest corner of area B will drain to or bypass inlet CB3.

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

June 7, 2010 UPDATE 1

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.

NOTE: Items 1 and 2 are interdependent. Please contact reviewer to discuss.

3. The required fire flow is incorrect. The minimum fire flow for any building is 1500 gpm. Provide hydraulic fire flow calculations for the 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.

PARD / Planning & Design Review - Jenna R.Neal - 974-9457

PA 1: Please revise labels to read as:
Waterfront Overlay Primary Setback – Butler Shores
Waterfront Overlay Secondary Setback – Butler Shores

PA2: Does the No Build area include any future signage?

PA 3: Please make sure all respective sheets have the No Build label. Some sheets have only the dashed line. (L-28)

PA 4: cleared

PA 5: PARD Planning and Design will like to see the camera ready illustration of the informational/educational signage prior to installation.

PA 6: cleared

PA 7-9: Please correct Parking Summary Table to have all existing parking information only listed under the Existing Parking category. Existing should not be listed under proposed since it is not being constructed.

PA 10-11: PARD Planning and Design will need to be updated on the street parking spaces and flaggers.

PA 12: LOC extends beyond subject boundary… (Original PARD comment)

a. The storm sewer work and installation that is outside the Land Lease Agreement is work that falls into the Chapter 26 public process and mitigation must be provided for the use of parkland for non-park activities. The project manager or consultant must contact PARD, so that an MOU (Memorandum Of Understanding) application can be sent. The information entered on the application will be used to calculate the mitigation for this work. The MOU must go through community outreach and the Parks Board before going to Council for approval. *(contact Robert Brennes: Robert.brennes@ci.austin.tx.us)*

b. After installation of the additional storm sewer line on parkland, who will assume responsibility for the maintenance and repair of this line? If Watershed Protection has agreed to maintain and repair this line, have they signed off? If not Watershed Protection, then the entity responsible will need to be identified in the Memorandum Of Understanding. There may need to be a separate document for this agreement of responsibility also. *(contact Robert Brennes: Robert.brennes@ci.austin.tx.us)*

PA 13: Site plan does not reflect the changes mentioned in your comments. (C1.09)

a. Where will construction fencing be located if LOC is moved to BOC?
b. PARD recommends placing the construction fencing on the back of the sidewalk for safety purposes due to proposed new walk (C1.06).
c. Insure that with vehicle overhang the existing 4' walk will remain ADA complaint (width) due to the parking stalls being proposed at 17.5' without bumpers.
d. If additional width of walk is required for ADA, anticipate repair to landscape and irrigation.

PA 14:

a. Show LOC to verify impacts of storm sewer man hole at trail entrance does not affect the existing ADA parking stall.
b. Verify capacity of existing 24" RCP
c. Verify outlet at lake is adequate for increased volume

PA 15: Not all sidewalks were included correctly. The walk located directly south of the PARD main office is not shown and the angled walk from the western portion of the PARD main office to Zach does not exist.

PA 16: not addressed

PA 17: C1.10 ~ inconsistent w/ 12" RCP vs 15" RCP (profile). Please correct.

PA 18: How will parking be addressed during construction to accommodate appropriate PARD and Zach staff during construction?

PA 19: Where will construction crew be permitted/restricted to park during construction?

PA 20: What parking agreement has been discussed with the PARD Director to address parking post construction for continued PARD staff use (business hours and night meetings)?

PA 21: Where will the proposed off-site parking that will be used by Valet be located?

PA 22: Please add the following note to sheet L1.28:
Submit sign design and placement to PARD Planning & Design prior to instillation

PA 23: Not all trees are shown. E.g. the large Oak tree located on near the NE corner of the PARD Main Office and the existing parking lot. Please update your tree information.

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 24: The tree survey is still inconsistent. The following items need to be addressed:

a. Tree # 562 is shown on the plan as removed but not listed on the master list as such
b. Tree # 581 is shown as removed on the plan but has tree protection fencing around it
c. Tree #576 is shown as preserved on the plan but listed as removed on the master list
d. Tree #788 is shown on the plan as removed but has tree protective fencing around it

PA 25: Tree # 576: how do you plan to preserve the critical root zone on the south side of this tree where the service drive is planned?

PA 26: Tree # 786: there is adequate tree protective fencing shown around this tree but the plans show the line that connects the two inlets as running through the tree protection fence. Please explain this seeming inconsistency.

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.
Up# 1- Thank you for the summary of Board dates and actions. This comment will be cleared once all boards have reviewed and provided a recommendation for the project.

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.
Up#1 - Pending

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.
Up# 1- Comment cleared, neighborhood planning process on hold per Mr. Di Giuseppe.

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.
Up# 1- Comment cleared.

SP 5. Please dimension all existing and proposed structures.
Up#1 – Comment cleared.

SP 6. Please list the submittal date on the coversheet, March 11, 2010. Show the case number on all sheets.
Up# 1- Please update the case number to SPC…

SP 7. On the site plan sheet, sheet 3, clearly delineate the CS-1 zoning district boundary.
Up# 1- Comment cleared.

SP 8. Update all site data tables to reflect this area is zoned CS-1.
Up#1 – Within the Building Coverage Table on sheet 5, under the CS-1 Zoning, I've determined the building coverage to be 96% and FAR .96:1. CS-1 zoning district permits 95% building coverage, please explain how the building coverage was calculated to get a total of 94.38%. Please reduce the building coverage to comply.

Under the CS zoning FAR column, its shown as 1.62:1, however I've calculated the FAR at .50:1, please explain.

On sheet 5, within the Building Summary Table by Zoning District, under CS-1, the Kleberg Theatre is shown to be 2 stories, however the Building Coverage Table shows it to be one story, please update and/or correct all tables to show the same information for the building height.

On sheet 5, within the Building Summary Table by Zoning district, under P, please explain what is meant by "Level 0" . The new building is proposed to have 3 stories, however the table would appear to show 4 stories, please explain.

On sheet 5, within the Site Data Table Under CS-1 zoning, the permitted impervious cover is 95%, however the impervious cover is at 100%. Please reduce the IC to 95%.

On sheet 5, within the Site Data Table Under CS zoning, the permitted impervious cover is 95%, however the impervious cover is at 99%. Please reduce the IC to 95%.

On sheet 5, within the Site Data Table under P zoning, please explain the difference in the Building Coverage and Roof & Covered Walk, these numbers doe not match.

Please contact me to set up a meeting to discuss the site data tables.

SP 9. Provide the new site plan release block on all sheets; if a copy is needed please contact this reviewer.
Up# 1- Comment cleared.

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.
Up#1 – Comment cleared.

SP 11. On the site plan sheet, identify the limits of construction and the acreage.
Up#1 – Comment clear

SP 12. On the coversheet, for the legal description of the Zach Property, provide the recording information.
Up#1 – The recording information for the recorded plat is Volume 80, Page 120, please update the legal description for Lot A Seiders subdivision. Please remove reference to the 2008040744, its assumed this number is the recording information for the deed.

Please provide a Land Status Determination for the unplatted portion of the property, because the property is not be used by the City of Austin, this is required.

SP 13. Please explain why 2 addresses are listed on the cover under Project Address, a South Lamar and Toomey Road address.
Up#1- Comment cleared, address has been updated to reflect only the 202 S. Lamar address for the theatre.

SP 14. Provide a depiction of the entire site for reference only within the plan set.
Up# 1- Comment cleared.

SP 15. Show the height of the fly tower and the structure separately within the site data table.
Up#1 – Comment cleared.

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.
Up# 1- Comment cleared.

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.
Up# 1- Pending, please submit the document and exhibits as soon as possible. The site plan will not be approved until this document is approved and recorded.

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.***
Up#1 – Pending

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.

Up# 1-

Its staffs understanding that Zach Scott intends to sell alcohol outside in a plaza and on the 2nd floor of the facility too. P, public zoning does not permit a cocktail lounge and the Director has determined alcohol sales cannot be an accessory use, therefore a zoning change will be required if alcohol is to be served outside of the existing CS-1 zoning. P zoning is not within the zoning heicharcy therefore cannot take advantage of the pedestrian oriented use of Cocktail Lounge in the Waterfront Overlay section.

Once the CS-1 zoning is granted, a conditional use permit will be required to permit the cocktail lounge.

Specifically designate all areas in which alcohol will be sold and consumed, specify all other areas as theatre. Parking tables will need to updated as well.

Lastly, because theatre and cocktail lounge uses are not permitted pedestrian oriented uses, the Planning Commission will be to approve a waiver to permit each use. Section 25-2-691(C)(12).

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.

Up#1 – Alternative Equivalent Compliance is approved based on the development complying with Core Transit Corridor regulations along Lamar Boulevard. See request in file.

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

Up#1 – Pending approval of the license agreement.

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)

Up#1 – Show location of all utilities, specifically those along Lamar Boulevard, and that they will be located underground.

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.***

Up#1 – Comment cleared.

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.
Up#1 – Comment Cleared.

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)
Up#1 – Thank you for providing the square footage for the private common open space. Please show the amount of area dedicated to the Lease Area.
Also show the type of amenities that will be provided within the common open space, and/or provide more details on the landscape plan.

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.
Up# 1- Thank you for providing the note on sheet 6. Also include Figure 42 from Section 2.5 on sheet 6.

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.
Up#1 – Pending approval by the WPAB. Please be sure to list the 2 variances being requested when being scheduled for the WPAB.

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.
Up#1 – Clear

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)]]
Up#1- Response noted, however this section is separate from Subchapter E, Commercial Design Guidelines and Alternative Equivalent Compliance. A variance request to this section is required. It will be scheduled for Planning Commission along with the other requested variance and CUP.

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.)
Up#1 – Variance request submitted, Pending approval by the Planning Commission.

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].
Up#1 – See SP 19.

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)].
Up#1 – In response to the distinctive building top required for the building, please provide call outs for the building material types on the architectural rendering, this is in addition to the note provided on sheet 33.

On sheet 31 and 33, please provide the height of the basewall on the architectural drawing, to show compliance that the basewall does not exceed a height of 45 feet.

On sheet 31, its unclear how Note 2 addresses the building façade not extending in an unbroken line. Provide the measurement.

SP 33. Show the location and screening of all trash receptacles, air conditioning units exterior storage, etc. [Sec. 25-2-721]
Up# 1- Comment Cleared.

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. \

Up#1 – See SP 19.

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 used for pedestrian oriented uses.
Up#1 – See SP 19.

SP 36. Please specify the type of office use (administrative/business, professional, or medical) on the site plan sheet.
Up#1 – Comment cleared.

NEW COMMENT:
SP 37. Please provide a parking plan to show how required parking will be addressed during construction.

R.O.W. Review - Tim Vogt - 974-7011

06-04-2010: Informal update.

Traffic control notes have changed; please replace existing notes with new Right-of-Way notes.

Lamar Blvd. opens to three lanes (SB) south of Riverside Dr. The standard detail 804S-1, 1 of 9 does not apply in this case. Since the right hand lane can and is shown to be taken at it origin the lane closure must be engineered and illustrated on the plan.

Standard Right-of-Way Notes.p

Transportation Review - Amber Mitchell - 974-3428

Accessibility
TR1. Comment addressed.

TR2. Slopes on accessible routes may not exceed 1:20 unless designed as a ramp. [ANSI 403.3]
Update 1: Provide grading information for the accessible route along the west of the Kleburg and Whisenhunt buildings.

TR3. Comment addressed.

TR4. Accessible parking spaces must be provided in accordance with IBC Table 1106.1. Identify the accessible spaces among the entire development.
Update 1: 8 spaces are required for the 245 spaces provided on this site. I can identify 8 spaces and the parking table states that there are 10 spaces. Please update the plan so that these two numbers correspond.

TR5. Comment addressed.

TR6. Comment addressed.

TR6. Comment addressed.

Sidewalks
TR7. Comment addressed.

TR8. Comment addressed.

Parking & Loading
TR9. Comment addressed.

TR10. Comment addressed.

TR11. Comment addressed.

Driveways
TR12. Waiver received and approved. Please identify the access gate on the site plan.

TR13. Waiver received and approved. Please identify the access gate on the site plan.

TR14. Comment addressed.

Commercial Design Standards
TR15. Comment addressed.

TR16. Comment cleared; while the entrance is more than 100 feet from the street facing façade line, this is due to the design requirements of the space, and a shaded sidewalk has been provided between the building entrance and the public sidewalk.

TR17. Comment addressed.

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:

- Comment addressed.
- Comment addressed.
- 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)
  Update 1: Response noted; please provide a note on the plan that utility lines will be provided in drive aisles.

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.
Update 1: Response noted; comment will be cleared when license agreement is recorded.

TR20. Comment addressed.

New Comments

TR21: The 74 un-striped spaces must be striped and dimensioned in order to be counted in the parking table. Please provide this information with the next submittal.

TR22. Include the following note on the site plan: Each compact parking space/aisle will be signed "small car only." LDC, 25-6-477.

TR23. The compact parking depicted on the site plan does not match the amount included in the parking table. Please update the plan so that the numbers correspond.

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

WW1. The review comments will be satisfied once the Austin Water Utility/Pipeline Engineering has approved the water and wastewater utility plan. For plan review status, contact George Resendez with Pipeline Engineering at 972-0252. Response comments and corrections, along with the original redlines, must be returned to the assigned Pipeline Engineering reviewer at the Waller Creek office, 625 E 10th St., 4th floor.

Water Quality Review - Ron Czajkowski - 974-6307

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.

Update 1: It appears that the Pond C splitter box/curb inlet can be moved to the east end of the sedimentation pond to increase the settling distance in the sedimentation basin.

WQ 2. CLEARED

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).

Update 1: There doesn't appear to be any flow spreader at the entrance to the sedimentation basin from the splitter box for Pond C.

WQ 4. CLEARED

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).

Update 1: The calculation (Sheet 15) indicates that the splitter box orifice for Pond C is insufficient to pass the 25-year flow without overtopping the splitter weir. See also WQ 12.

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).

Update 1: Sheet L1.28 – Note the following:

(1) Show the rock flow spreader/hedgerow for Ponds A and B on the plans. Provide a section detail (see ECM Figure 1.6.7.C.2).
(2) Provide a breakdown of plant type by sedimentation and filtration area rather than base and sides for Ponds A and B.
(3) Modify plantings based on any revisions to sedimentation and filtration pond areas.
(4) Additional comments regarding trees in the ponds may be generated after meeting with John Gleason.
(5) Big Red Sage (included in the filtration area planting for Ponds A and B) is listed as suitable for sedimentation ponds but not filtration ponds in ECM Table 1-17.

WQ 7. CLEARED

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).

Update 1: Indicate the criteria listed in ECM 1.6.7.C.4 for the biofiltration media on the plan sheet detail on Sheet 15 (do not just reference the ECM). Modify the Sequence of Construction (Sheet 4). Item 7 (rough cut ponds) should come before Item 6. Item 13 (certification) should be included in Item 6 and expanded similar to the following (see ECM 1.6.3.C.6.D): “The biofiltration media must be delivered to, or mixed at, the site prior to the mid-construction conference. The media must be certified as meeting the required specifications by the project Engineer, or his/her designee, and approved by the City Inspector. The media must be stored on-site separate from other materials, and covered to prevent erosion of the mixture by rainfall and runoff. The media must have a prominent tag affixed that reads "BIOFILTRATION MEDIA FOR WATER QUALITY POND." Modify Item 17 as follows: “Complete construction and stabilize all areas draining to the biofiltration basin. Permanent controls will be cleaned out and filter media will be installed after stabilization of the site. Pre-soak the in-place biofiltration media and add additional media as needed until the 18" design depth is achieved. Provide plant material tags for the vegetation to the City Inspector prior to planting. The project Engineer must be present during installation of the biofiltration media and plantings, and approve the installation.”

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.

Update 1: Indicate the depth at which the infiltration tests were conducted. Provide boring data indicating stratigraphy.

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.

Update 1: Provide a removable PVC cap with an orifice on the 6" pipe rather than a pipe with a diameter equal to the required orifice size (a 1" pipe will be difficult to maintain). Make sure access to the orifice (i.e. manhole) is provided. Also review the orifice calculations; the initial, final, and average heads appear to be 1 ft greater than indicated in the calculations.

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).

Update 1: Sheet 15 - Include the geotextile properties on the plan sheet (don't just reference the ECM). Note also that the liner which has been added with the update is not necessary unless the pond is over the Edwards aquifer.

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.

Update 1: Sheet 15 - When determining the 25 and 100-year storm flows in splitter structure design, the entire area draining to the splitter structure should be used. The area draining to the Pond C splitter box appears to be 0.83 acres (see WQ 15 update comment). Note also that the C values used to determine the 25 and 100-year storm flows in the table are low for the approximately 90% impervious cover indicated. Please review/correct.

WQ 13. CLEARED

WQ 14. CLEARED

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.

Update 1: It is not clear how the area of 0.7 acres draining to the pond in the revised table was determined. The total of the two areas (0.51 acres in area P5 and 0.32 acres in area C) draining to the pond is 0.83 acres; if, however, the entire area C is maintenance not requiring water quality controls, the area to be treated would be 0.51 acres. Is part of area C (i.e. 0.19 acres) not maintenance and included in the total area? Also, the indicated area of 34221 ft^2 doesn't appear to correspond to any of the acreage numbers. Please review/clarify and correct as necessary. See also WQ 20.

WQ 16. CLEARED

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.

Update 1: Comment to be cleared upon submittal and approval of IPM plan.

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.

Update 1: Comment to be cleared upon submittal and approval of RC.

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.

Update 1: Comment to be cleared upon submittal and approval of UDA.

NEW COMMENTS:

WQ 20. It is not entirely clear which drainage areas and acreage are presently served by the existing water quality pond which is being removed (please clarify). The area required to be treated by the proposed water quality ponds is equal to the onsite development plus any offsite equivalent acreage the existing pond was designed to serve. See also WQ 15, WQ 22, and WQ 23.

WQ 21. Show the splitter box/curb inlet lip on the revised splitter box detail on Sheet 15.

WQ 22. FYI - Three small sunken “islands” in the parking area have been included in the provided water quality volume calculations for Pond C. While beneficial from the water quality standpoint, they would need to be designed as part of the water quality pond (i.e. flow bypass, sedimentation and biofiltration areas, plantings, etc.) for water quality credit. It is unclear, however, whether these areas will be needed for water quality. Additional comments may follow after addressing all other WQ comments with the final design of Pond C. See also WQ 20.

WQ 23. Review the calculations for Pond B (Sheet 14). Note the following:

(1) There appear to be errors in the provided sedimentation and infiltration pond area and volume calculations. The areas and volumes shown in the table for each pond appear to be the total areas and volumes for both ponds combined.
(2) The required areas and volumes in the table should reflect the actual areas and volumes required to be treated. If the existing water quality pond to be removed is currently providing water quality control for the offsite Schlotsky’s, the required treatment area would be approximately 1.1.acres (this would exceed the maximum 1 acre allowed for rain gardens). If the offsite Schlotsky’s is not currently being treated by the existing water quality pond, then the required treatment area would be approximately 0.44 acres. In the latter case, the offsite flow should be routed around the pond if the pond is not sized for the offsite area.
(3) For an infiltration system, the measured permeability should be reduced by a factor of 2 to account for potential clogging over time (ECM 1.6.7.H.2).
(4) It is not clear how the drainage area to control (13,068 ft^2) and the water quality volume used in the infiltration area calculation (1874 ft^3) were determined.

WQ 24. The bypass inlet for Pond B (CB4) needs to be placed near the entrance to the sedimentation pond (see ECM Figures 1.6.7.H.1 and 1.6.7.H.2).

WQ 25. Note the following with respect to the vegetative filter strip (VFS) for Pond A (Sheet 13):

(1) Indicate the area covered by the VFS by shading or other means. Note that the VFS must be entirely above areas which are subject to inundation (i.e. bypass inlet elevation

plus overflow head). Make sure that the VFS slope is between 1% and 10% (ECM 1.6.7.B.3).

(2) Provide a level spreader at the upgradient end of the VFS. The level spreader must be positioned to capture all flow from the building downspouts. Add a note indicating that all flow from the roof must be directed to the level spreader.

(3) Provide calculations verifying that the maximum hydraulic loading rate for the 2-year, 3-hour rainfall does not exceed 0.05 cfs/ft width (ECM 1.6.7.B.3).

(4) Indicate vegetation type to be placed in the VFS (ECM 1.6.7.B.4). Do not include trees in the VFS.

WQ 26. Review the design and calculations for Pond A (Sheet 13). Note the following:

(1) For an infiltration system, the measured permeability should be reduced by a factor of 2 to account for potential clogging over time (ECM 1.6.7.H.2).

(2) Based on (1), the provided infiltration area will be insufficient. Since the sedimentation basin would not be needed if a VFS is provided, and since the overall provided water quality volume appears to be sufficient, it appears that additional filtration area can be provided by conversion of the sedimentation basin.

(3) Provide a flow spreader across the five 6" pipe outlets to the sedimentation basin.

(4) It is not clear how the drainage area to control (31,761 ft^2) and the water quality volume used in the infiltration area calculation (2599 ft^3) were determined.

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

Update #1: 06/07/2010

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.]

Update #1: Please correct the numerical typo on the fiscal estimate sum. Also, the estimate needs to be sealed.

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]

Update #1: Non-disturbance areas need to be hatched within the LOC.

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]

Update #1: Comment cleared.

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.

Update #1: Comment pending.

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.
Update #1: Comment cleared.

EV 6 Move the SCE outside the CRZ of tree 787.
Update #1: Comment cleared.

EV 7 Do you have any offsite drainage coming onsite? If so, demonstrate how you will control for offsite flows.
Update #1: Comment cleared.

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.]
Update #1: Comment cleared.

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

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.
Update #1: Comment cleared.

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.
Update #1: Comment cleared.

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*
Update #1: Comment cleared.

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]
Update #1: Comment cleared.

EV 14 Call out the quantity of plants on the plant list.
Update #1: Comment cleared.

Arborist/Tree Preservation

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

Update #1: It is the reviewer's understanding the proposed removal of this tree will go before Environmental Board and Planning and Zoning Commission. Please contact the reviewer to prepare variance material.

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.

Update #1: Comment cleared.

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.*

Update #1: Note was not added.

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.

Update #1: Comment cleared.

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%

Update #1: Comment cleared.

EV 20 Graphically differentiate replacement trees from landscape trees. ECM 3.3.2(D)(2)
Update #1: Comment cleared.

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
Update #1: Comment cleared.