

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



CASE NUMBER: **SPC-2010-0061C**  
REVISION #: **00** UPDATE: **U3**  
CASE MANAGER: **Nikki Hoelter** PHONE #: **974-2863**

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

SUBMITTAL DATE: **October 22, 2010**  
REPORT DUE DATE: **November 5, 2010**  
FINAL REPORT DATE: **November 8, 2010**  
**3 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 March 24, 2011.** 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 6 copies of the plans and 7 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:**

PARD / Planning & Design: Jenna R.Neal  
Planner 1: Cindy Casillas  
Site Plan: Nikki Hoelter  
R.O.W. : Tim Vogt  
Drainage Construction: Ron Czajkowski  
Fire for Site Plan: James Reeves  
Transportation: Shandrian Jarvis  
Austin Water Utility: Howard Neil Kepple  
Water Quality: Ron Czajkowski

## Drainage Construction Review - Ron Czajkowski - 974-6307

DC 1 and DC 2. CLEARED

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.

Update 2: Pipe profiles are missing for the 12" line to water quality pond C, the 12" line to rain garden A, and the 8" lines to line B1.

Update 3: A new 6" line tying into Line A at Station 6+33 has been added. Show the drainage area to the 6" pipe, indicate flows, and provide a pipe profile.

DC 4 to DC 7. CLEARED

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.

Update 2: Please review the indicated surface elevation of 454.25 at the top of the steps near the southwest corner of Area P4 (this area will not drain to the inlets in P4 at elevation 456.5 – should the elevation actually be 457.25?). Also show (1) additional elevations and/or high point in the drive between inlet CB1 and Lamar to verify no bypass flow from drainage area P1 to Lamar, and (2) additional elevations along the top of the south wall in area P4.

Update 3. An inlet and 6" line has been added at the southwest corner of Area P4. This will drain part of Area P4 to Pond C rather than Pond B as intended. Please review/correct.

### NEW COMMENTS:

DC 9. A wet well with pump for ground water drainage has been added from the previous submittal. Do not discharge groundwater to Rain Garden A as indicated on the plan sheets. Discharge to the city storm sewer system.

DC 10. The tree wells, porous pavement, and drainage piping in the Lamar R.O.W. that has been added since the previous submittal is non-standard construction. Contact Andy Halm (974-7185) regarding a license agreement for non-standard construction in the R.O.W.

## Environmental Review - Mike McDougal - 974-6380

Update #1: 06/07/2010

Update #2: 08/09/2010

Update #3: 10/26/2010

EV 01 through 21 Update #3      Comments cleared.

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

November 1, 2010

UPDATE 3

### INFORMAL UPDATE

1. Provide a post indicator valve in underground lead-in. The detail on the utility plan is not clear.

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

**PA1 - 11:** cleared

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

**Update 1:**

- a. cleared
- 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](mailto:Robert.brennes@ci.austin.tx.us)*)

**Update 2:** Specify the City department that has agreed to assume responsibility for maintenance/repair

**Update 3:** Awaiting written documentation from Watershed agreeing to the maintenance/repair responsibility

**PA 13 - 15:** cleared

**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?

**Update 1:** not addressed

**Update 2:** not addressed. See PARD response to PA 31

**PA 17:** cleared

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

**Update 1:** Future meetings with PARD need to include Planning and Design

**Update 2:** Formal agreements need to be finalized prior to site plan approval

**PA 19:** cleared

**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)?

**Update 1:** Future meetings with PARD need to include Planning and Design

**Update 2:** Formal agreements need to be finalized prior to site plan approval

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

**Update 1:** not addressed

**Update 2:** Formal agreement shall included language regarding no Valet use of parking within this parcel and will need to be finalized prior to site plan approval

**PA 22 - 23:** cleared

**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](mailto:Emily.king@ci.austin.tx.us) or 512.974.9548**

**PA 24:** cleared

**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?

**Update 1:** The specification for the Ecocrete is generic. Please indicate on the plans the specific plan for this site. Include information pertaining to site prep for the Ecocrete, how much of the subsoil will be compacted, what is the method of application, etc.

**Update 2:** not addressed

**PA 26:** cleared

*(PA 27-34 comments are from the first round that were not addressed and/ or left off during the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of comments. These have been added back in for tracking purposes)*

**PA 27:** 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

**Update 1:** Trees in front of the PARD Main Office must be shown on all relevant site plans and included in the Master Tree List

**Update 2:** not addressed. The trees in front of the PARD main office that have CRZ within the LOC must be surveyed. The survey must include accurate site location, DBH, and plans must clearly depict the CRZ, ½ CRZ, and tree protection fence. If there is demolition planned within the CRZ must be done by hand, and a call out note must be added to demo sheet.

**PA 28 - 30:** cleared

**PA 31:** Tree 583 is a specimen Bur oak; see PA 16

**Update 1:** Pending relocation information

**Update 2:** not addressed. As emailed to Nick on 8/24/10, the proposed location for the bur oak (583) transplant does not provide adequate space for transplant to reach maturity nor does it provide adequate space for the existing surrounding trees (787, 786, 900) to reach maturity. Note that the landscape plan shows the trees represented by CRZ, not canopy size.

**PA 32 - 33:** cleared

**PA 34:** 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.

**Update 1:** Pending final removal list

**Update 2:** Mitigation for trees to be removed from the site is \$16,173. This amount must be paid into the PARD mitigation fund via intake at the One Stop Shop, One Texas Center. This comment will be cleared once receipt of payment is confirmed.

The below table shows the mitigation values for trees proposed for removal:

Tree ID	DBH (in)	Appraised Value	Trees not to be mitigated for at appraised value:			
			tag #	Species	DBH	Reason
564	15	\$1,138.88	561	Chinaberry	14, 15, 18	invasive
565	9	\$1,277.30	562	Mulberry	9, 16	invasive
578	4, 6	\$1,166.78	563	Chinaberry	11, 12, 13	invasive
684	4,4,3,3	\$1,517.76	570	Maple, Bigtooth	8	dead
685	3,3,3	\$281.23	575	Maple, Bigtooth	7	dead
686	3,3,3	\$187.49	581	Plum, Mexican	5, 5, 5, 7	dead
687	3,3,3,3,2,2,2	\$1,403.93	584	Elm, American	39	poor condition
692	11	\$2,067.06	585	Chinese tallow	19	invasive
697	6, 6	\$1,938.94	690	Mulberry	19	invasive
698	4	\$268.07	694	Redbud	4, 4, 6, 6, 6	dead
899	12	\$4,339.65	788	Oak, Spanish	6	dead
903	4,2,2	\$585.76	894	Mulberry	6, 12	invasive
total		\$16,173.00	895	Mulberry	3, 5, 5, 6, 10, 11	invasive
			896	Mulberry	5, 6, 6, 8, 9	invasive
			901	Chinese tallow	3, 3, 6, 6, 7, 8	invasive
			902	Chinese tallow	5, 6, 7, 7, 8, 9	invasive

**The Following Comments are from Rey Hernandez. If there are any questions regarding the following comments, you may contact her at [rey.hernandez@ci.austin.tx.us](mailto:rey.hernandez@ci.austin.tx.us) or 512.974.9464**

**PA 35:** cleared

**PA 36:** C1.03 –

- ☐ Illustrate proposed Limits of Construction

**Update 1:** the LOC at the confluence of trails near the west parking lot (storm drain and manhole installation) needs to either be defined as the temporary trail expansion or a box with a note that states in effect “Decomposed granite gravel to be placed along the north edge of the existing trail from the information monument to xx LF eastward to allow trail users to pass without hindrance or risk.” This area should be cross-hatched or delineated in another form to allow for reviewers to understand the multiple LOC lines shown.

- ☐ Correct the label of ‘Existing Baseball Field’ to read as ‘Existing Softball Field’

**Update 1:** Please make sure landscape sheets reflect this as well

**PA 37:** C1.04 Notes should be revised to include:

- ☐ Note #1 – page number for general notes
- ☐ Note #2 – page number of erosion/sediment control details
- ☐ ‘Protection’ on existing tree with tree protection fencing
- ☐ Correct spelling for re-vegetation

**Update 1:** Notes not addressed.

**PA 38:** cleared

**PA 39:** C1.06 – Indicate % slope on ADA ramps

- ☐ Remove ‘H.C’ from note
- ☐ Missing the Accessible Ramp Detail
- ☐ Keynotes: Indicate location of proposed details
- ☐ Legend vs Keynotes # 3 – Legend Plan indicates pervious pavement however Notes says ‘concrete’
- ☐ Include sheet # to the note that states “Refer to Landscape Plan for Street Tree...”
- ☐ Clarify Notes #11
- ☐ Clarify Notes #16 – ‘Plaza’ not indicated on plans
- ☐ Clarify Notes #16 – Add sheet # for Landscape Plans references
- ☐ ‘Private Common Open Space’ – How can this be private if this is on Public land?
- ☐ Correct the label of ‘Existing Baseball Field’ to read as ‘Existing Softball Field’

**Update 1:** Access ramp not addressed.

**PA 40:** C1.27 – Tree List #s not shown on plan

**Update 1:** Not addressed. Sheet number has since changed...?

**PA 41:** C1.28 –

- ☐ Tree List #s not shown on plan
- ☐ AIPP Benches – how will these be installed? Concrete footing, etc?

**Update 1:** Not addressed. Sheet number has since changed...?

**PA 42:** PARD Main Office limestone vertical sign is not shown on any plans. Is this staying or going? What about the Crape Myrtle trees behind the stone sign?

**Update 1:** All relevant sheets need to show existing signs and document removal of signs.

Proposed sign design need to be coordinated with PARD and approved prior to site plan approval.

**PA 43:** Sheet L1.32 does not show all of relevant lease line. Please either show or reference the appropriate sheet that shows the eastern most edge of lease line that includes the great streets.

**PA 44:** Sheet L1.31, At LOC north of Riverside Drive, note indicates to see civil plans for tree protection. No indication of revegetation of disturbed park land on landscape and or civil sheets.

**The Following Additional 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](mailto:Emily.king@ci.austin.tx.us) or 512.974.9548**

**PA 45:** Tree # 784 must have tree protection fence.

**PA 46:** Tree protection fence for crepe myrtles at entrance is not sufficient to protect the ½ critical root zones. Recheck the ½ CRZ for these multi stemmed trees and redraw tree protection fencing accordingly. This should have been addressed previously with comment PA 33.

**PA 47:** This is regarding the tree transplanting notes: Section B4 – how large will the root ball be for the multi stemmed Texas Mountain Laurel?

**PA 48:** This is regarding the tree transplanting notes: Section F1 – all transplanting work must be done under the supervision of an ISA certified arborist, not a landscape architect.

**PA 49:** This is regarding the tree transplanting notes: Section G – to ensure seamless treatment of transplanted trees, a single point of contact should be responsible for overseeing the maintenance contract. Who will be the point of contact with the certified arborist and/or IPM representative?

## 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.**

**Up#2 –It appears the project still needs to obtain approval from Urban Forestry Board, EV Board, Waterfront Planning Advisory Board, and Planning Commission, as shown in the Board spreadsheet.**

**Please provide a copy of the response provided to the Design Commission from Zach on the requested recommendations.**

**Up#3 – Comment cleared. The site plan is scheduled for WPAB November 8<sup>th</sup>.**

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**

**Up#2 – Pending**

**Up#3 – Pending**

**SP 3-5. Clear**

**SP 6-7. Clear**

**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.**

**Up#2 – CLEAR**

**Under the CS zoning FAR column, its shown as 1.62:1, however I've calculated the FAR at .50:1, please explain. Up#2 - CLEAR**

**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. Up#2 - CLEAR**

**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. UP#2 - CLEAR**

**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%. UP#2 - CLEAR**

**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 does not match.**

**Up#2 – Building coverage should include all covered walkways. Conditioned space would be considered Gross floor area. Please update all calculations to reflect these definitions.**

**Up# 3 – Comment clear**

**SP 9-11. 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, it's assumed this number is the recording information for the deed.**

**Up#2 – Repeat comment.**



**Up#3 – Comment Cleared**

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.

**Up#2 – It's understood that a Land Status Determination is required because this site will not be used by the City of Austin.**

**Up#3 – Comment cleared, it was determined by COA legal that this project did not require a platting or a land status determination, since its owned by the City of Austin and the theatre is partially run by Bond funds under an operating agreement with the City.**

**SP 13-16. Clear**

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.**

**Up#2 – Pending review and approval by staff and COA legal.**

**Up#3 – Pending**

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**

**Up#2 – Pending**

**Up#3 - Pending**

**SP 19. Clear**

**Subchapter E, Commercial Design Standards**

**SP 20. Clear**

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.**

**Up#2 – Pending**

**Up#3 - Pending**

**SP 22. Clear**

SP 23-24. **Clear**

SP 25-26. **Clear**

### **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.**

**Up#2 – Pending**

**Up#3 – pending, scheduled for WPAB November 8, 2010.**

SP 28. **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.**

**Up#2 – Pending**

**Up#3- Pending**

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.**

**Up# 2- Pending**

**Up#3 - Pending**

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.**

**Up#2 – The Theatre use may be requested as a permitted pedestrian use to the Planning Commission. Pending.**

**Up# 3 – Comment cleared, PC approval is not required for the theatre use. It was determined by staff that a theatre is a permitted use within the P, Public zoning district. The Pedestrian oriented uses are additional uses to the permitted zoning district uses.**

SP 32. Clear

SP 33. **Clear**

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.**

**Up#2 – The use for the ZPACC building is listed as office on the site plan and art workshop within the site data table. Please clarify. Art Workshop is listed as a pedestrian oriented use within the waterfront overlay.**

**Up#3 – Comment Cleared**

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.**

**Up#2 – Pending, see SP 31.**

SP 36. **Clear**

**NEW COMMENT:**

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

**Up#2 – Comment will be cleared once a copy of the shared parking agreement is provided to this reviewer.**

**Up#3 – Additional comment are pending review of the parking agreement, signed by Susan Benz and Sara Hensley, which was recently emailed. The agreement will be reviewed by Shandrian Jarvis, please contact her with any questions.**

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

11-04-2010: Rejected.

Previous comments not addressed:

“Since the plan calls for closing the right hand SB traffic lane of Lamar Blvd. at Riverside, prior to traffic entering and driving in that lane, the lane block signs and the arrow board aren’t needed. The transition should not be designed as a wedge but as a radius as shown on the returned plans. Finally, the detail does not properly represent the intersection geometry and lane assignments. Plan should be revised to correct differences”.

The right hand, SB lane closure on Lamar has been removed from the plan and proper intersection geometry is not represented.

## Transportation Review - Shandrian Jarvis - 974-2628

### 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.

**U3: Comment not cleared**

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.

**U2: Comment cleared.**

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.

**U2: Comment cleared.**

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

**U2: Comment cleared.**

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  $\geq 3$  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.

**U2: Comment cleared.**

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 3: 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.

**U2: Comment cleared.**

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

**U3: Comment cleared.**

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.

**U2: Comment cleared.**

<b>Austin Water Utility Review - Howard Neil Kepple - 972-0077</b>
--

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 10<sup>th</sup> St., 4<sup>th</sup> floor.

# Water Quality Review - Ron Czajkowski - 974-6307

WQ 1 to WQ 5. CLEARED

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.

Update 2: Show a section detail for the rock flow spreader/hedgerow for Ponds A and B (including VFS). Modify plantings to account for any changes due to other comments herein.

Update 3: Sheet L1.32 - Replace Canada Germander in the Pond A and B base areas with filtration pond vegetation from ECM Table 1-16 (Canada Germander is listed as sedimentation pond vegetation only).

WQ 7 to WQ 9. CLEARED

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.

Update 2: The maximum head on the orifice is from splitter elevation (450.85) to orifice (approximately 446.3), or 4.55 ft. The final head on the orifice is from the top of sand bed elevation (449.0) to the orifice, or 2.7 ft. Please review/correct.

Update 3: Check the calculations again. The required orifice diameter corresponding to an area of 0.002 sq ft is 0.6 inches. A 1-inch diameter orifice as specified will empty the pond in approximately one-third the minimum required time of 48 hours.

WQ 11 to WQ 17. CLEARED

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.

Updates 1 and 2: Comment to be cleared upon submittal and approval of RC.

Update 3: Comment to be cleared upon submittal of recorded copy of IPM 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.

Updates 1, 2, and 3: Comment to be cleared upon submittal and approval of UDA.

WQ 20 and WQ 21. CLEARED

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.

Update 2: Note the following:

- (1) Provide additional spot elevations in the parking lot and label all high points to verify the drainage areas to rain gardens D, E, and F.
- (2) The acceptability of Chinquapin Oaks as vegetation in the rain gardens will be determined after consultation with Environmental Resource Management.

Update 3: Label high point lines on Sheet C1.09 corresponding to the north limit of the drainage area to Rain Garden D and the boundary line between the drainage areas to Rain Gardens E and F. Label top of curb at representative locations for Rain Garden F on Sheet C1.18 (also, it appears that TC of 453.5 indicated at southwest end of rain garden should actually be TP). Correct the water quality volume (2375 ft<sup>3</sup>) used in the infiltration area calculations on Sheet C1.18 (actual calculated infiltration areas, however, appear to be correct).

WQ 23 and WQ 24. CLEARED

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.

Update 2: As presently designed, the level spreader will not evenly distribute the flows to the VFS since it is not level. The level spreader and VFS are lower at the east end where flow from the storm sewer enters the spreader area with flowline at el. 454.5. The majority of the spreader appears intended to distribute flow to the VFS at elevation 455.65, but flows will tend to concentrate at the low end of the spreader near the storm sewer headwall. Since building flows (approximately 80% of the total) enter the spreader area at a higher elevation (455.65), it appears feasible to design two level spreader and corresponding VFS sections (one for flows from the storm sewer and one for flows from the building) at different levels. Alternatively, consideration could be given to replacing the storm sewer with a channel to facilitate a single spreader design.

Update 3: Sheet C1.15 - The roof drain pipe flowline needs to be higher than el. 454.5 to maintain a slope towards the el. 454.5 contour in the pond. Should the elevation be 454.75 to be consistent with Sheet C1.09? Also, the indicated number of pipes should be 6.

WQ 26. CLEARED