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

CASE NUMBER: SPC-2010-0061C

REVISION #: 00 UPDATE: U4

CASE MANAGER: Nikki Hoelter PHONE #: 974-2863

PROJECT NAME: New Theatre @ Zach Scott

LOCATION: 202 S LAMAR BLVD

SUBMITTAL DATE: December 17, 2010
REPORT DUE DATE: January 3, 2011
FINAL REPORT DATE: January 6, 2011

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 27, 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 4 copies of the plans and 5 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

Drainage Construction: Ron Czajkowski

Site Plan: Nikki Hoelter

Transportation: Shandrian Jarvis

Austin Water Utility: Howard Neil Kepple

Water Quality: Ron Czajkowski



Drainage Construction Review - Ron Czajkowski - 974-6307

DC 1 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.

Update 4: The area corresponding to drainage area P4 has been revised. Note the following:

- (1) The contour labeled el. 456 on Sheet C1.08 should be el. 457.
- (2) Drainage in P4 appears to be to the west. There are no inlets or pipes in the western portion of the area to capture all flows in P4. Please revise the drainage pattern to assure drainage to the three indicated inlets, or add additional inlets and pipe at the western limits of area P4..
- (3) There appear to be errors in the revised calculated areas of areas A and C (Sheet C1.14). Area C appears to be approximately 0.2 acres and area A appears to be approximately 1.0 acre.

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.

Update 4: Show where the discharge line is to tie to the city storm sewer system. Contact Andy Halm regarding a license agreement for any non-standard discharge line in R.O.W. or city easements.

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.

Update 4: There is still non-standard construction in the R.O.W. Contact Andy Halm regarding a license agreement.

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

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)

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

Update 4: Awaiting written confirmation from WPD agreeing to the Interdepartmental Agreement between PARD and WPD.

PA 13 - 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 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

Update 3: Need to see the tree preservation and protection plan for the pre-construction care, during construction care, and post construction care for this tree included in the plans the same way that the specifics were listed for tree 583.

PA 26 - 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 in 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			
564	15	\$1,138.88	#	Species	DBH	Reason
565	9	\$1,277.30	561	Chinaberry	14, 15, 18	invasive
578	4, 6	\$1,166.78	562	Mulberry	9, 16	invasive
684	4,4,3,3	\$1,517.76	563	Chinaberry	11, 12, 13	invasive
685	3,3,3	\$281.23	570	Maple, Bigtooth	8	dead
686	3,3,3	\$187.49	575	Maple, Bigtooth	7	dead
687	3,3,3,3,2,2,2	\$1,403.93	581	Plum, Mexican	5, 5, 5, 7	dead
692	11	\$2,067.06				poor
697	6, 6	\$1,938.94	584	Elm, American	39	condition
698	4	\$268.07	585	Chinese tallow	19	invasive
899	12	\$4,339.65	690	Mulberry	19	invasive
			694	Redbud	4, 4, 6, 6, 6	dead
903	4,2,2	\$585.76	788	Oak, Spanish	6	dead
ĺ		*	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

Update 3: The appraised

values listed previously for trees proposed for removal has been evaluated alongside the number of inches of trees proposed for replanting in the landscape plan. The excess of inches planted has been applied against the total of inches removed and there will not be a payment required for tree mitigation. All landscape trees must be maintained and irrigated for a minimum of 2 years after installation. Specifications for care of landscape plants must be approved by the Urban Forestry program, so please forward Emily a copy.

The Following Comments are from Rey Hernandez. If there are any questions regarding the following comments, you may contact him at reynaldo.hernandez@ci.austin.tx.us or 512.974.9464

PA 35 - 40: cleared

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...?

Update 2: Identify on plan 'AIPP' Benches. Indicate on plan and provide AIPP Project Manager Contact information.

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. **Update 2:** Not addressed. Sara Hensley is the PARD Director and not directly working on PARD Signage locations or standards. Indicate existing sign location on all pertinent plans and add note regarding retention, protection and or removal of all sign elements. If you have been given direction as to the removal or relocation of the sign indicate so on plans.

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. **Update 3:** Typically match lines are used to illustrate continuation of plan views when the total information can not be displayed on one sheet. The Lamar Blvd. streetscape on sheet L1.30 illustrates six (6) tree well planters. There is no planting sheet that covers these planters. Sheet L1.36 only dimensions out three (3) of the six (6) planters. Where is the planting plan for these planters? Sheet L1.32 is not complete because it cuts off the planting beyond the trees and does not illustrate the lease line or the edge of payment including Lamar Blvd.

PA 44: cleared

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 or 512.974.9548

PA 45 - 47: cleared

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.

Update 1: inserted wording should read "ISA certified arborist" not "ISO certified arborist"

PA 49: cleared

Site Plan Review - Nikki Hoelter - 974-2863

SP 1. Clear

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

Up#4 - Scheduled for PC January 25, 2011.

SP 3-5. Clear

SP 6-7. Clear

SP 8. Clear

SP 9-11. Clear

SP 12. Clear

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

Up#4 - Pending approval of the joint access easement and drainage easement.

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

Up#4 - 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

Up#4 -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 <u>shall</u> 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.

Up#4 – Comment cleared, WPAB recommended approval of the site plan and 2 variances.

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

Up#4 -Pending, scheduled for PC January 25, 2011.

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

Up#4 - Pending, scheduled for PC January 25, 2011.

SP 31. Clear

SP 32.Clear

SP 33.Clear

SP 34. Clear

SP 35.Clear

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.

Up#4 – Comment cleared

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

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 ≥ 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 4: 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.

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 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).

Update 4: The plantings have changed from the previous submittal. Note the following:

- (1) Provide a reference for the allotment of 20 points for Wax Myrtles in Pond C.
- (2) The calculations for the required and provided plants for the Pond C filtration basin appear to be in error.
- (3) Check the number of provided plants for Pond A. The total appears to be 385 plants.
- (4) The total required tall plants for the Pond B filtration basin is 66 plants (not 132).

WQ 7 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.

Updates 3 and 4: 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.

Update 4: Comment to be cleared upon approval and recording of UDA. WQ 20 to WQ 26. CLEARED