

MASTER REVIEW REPORT

CASE NUMBER: C814-2014-0120

CASE MANAGER: Tori Haase

PHONE #: 512-974-7691

REVISION #: 00

UPDATE: 2

PROJECT NAME: Austin Oaks Planned Unit Development

LOCATION: Southwest Corner of Mo-Pac and Spicewood Springs Road (3409, 3420, 3429, 3445, 3520, 3636, 3701, 3721, 3724, and 3737 Executive Center Drive and 7601, 7718 and 7719 Wood Hollow Drive)

SUBMITTAL DATE: August 13, 2015

REPORT DUE DATE: September 8, 2015

FINAL REPORT DATE: October

27, 2015

REPORT LATE: 50 days

IMPORTANT INFORMATION:

- This report includes staff review comments received **to date** concerning your application. The PUD application will be forwarded for Environmental Board and Zoning and Platting Commission recommendations, and City Council action. At this time, staff has not made a recommendation regarding the entirety of the application; as such, the PUD application is considered not recommended for approval.
- Please note, if you have any questions/concerns about review comments, or you require additional information about items in this report, please contact the listed individual reviewer or case manager.
- The attached report identifies those requirements that must be addressed by an update to your PUD application in order to obtain a positive recommendation for approval. This report may also contain recommendations for you to consider, but are not required.
- Please note, additional requirements, recommendations, or comments may be generated as a result of information or design changes provided in subsequent updates.
- **UPDATE DEADLINE:** It is the responsibility of the applicant or his/her agent to update this PUD application. All updates must be submitted within 180 days from the date your application was filed [Sec. 25-5-113]. Otherwise, the application will automatically be denied.
- If due dates or expiration dates fall on a weekend or City of Austin holiday, the next City of Austin workday will be the deadline.

The following Staff should receive an UPDATE#3 Packet:

Development Services Department (DSD):

LUR Supervising Engineer – Andy Linseisen
Transportation Review – Bryan Golden, 512-974-3124
Heritage Tree Review – Keith Mars, 512-974-2755
Environmental Review – Atha Phillips 512-974-6303
Hydro-Geology Review – Sylvia Pope, 512-94-3429

Public Works Department (PWD):

Bicycle Program – Nathan Wilkes, 512-974-7016

Planning and Zoning Department (PZD):

Zoning Review & Case Manager – Victoria (Tori) Haase, 512-974-7691

Watershed Protection Department (WPD):

Wetland Biology – Andrew Clamann, 512-974-2694

Parks and Recreation Department (PAR):

PAR Planning – Marilyn Lamensdorf (Shashoua), 512-974-9372

Neighborhood Housing & Community Development (NHCD):

Javier Delgado, 512-974-3154

Austin Energy Electric – David Lambert

1. FYI: Any relocation of existing electric facilities shall be at developer's expense.
2. FYI: Ron Solbach at ph. 512-504-7145 or Ronald.solbach@austinenergy.com is the initial Austin Energy contact for electric service design.
3. FYI: Austin Energy's electric system maps show an underground electric duct bank that runs along the lot line between Lot 5, Koger Executive Center Unit 3 and Lot 6A, Resub of Lot 6, Koger Executive Center Unit 3.
4. This duct bank not only powers the building on Lot 6A but also the properties to the south across Executive Center Drive.

Austin Energy Green Building Program – Liana Kallivoka

1. Please have the developer contact us about the proposal.
UPDATE #1: Comment cleared.
2. The developer has proposed a 3 Star rating from Austin Energy Green Building to qualify for Tier 2 PUD status. Achieving a 3 Star rating on this project may be challenging.
UPDATE #1: Comment cleared.
3. Speculative buildings find it difficult to achieve the full range of points available in the AEGB rating system because many energy efficiency, water conservation and IEQ measures depend on the tenant finish-out package. All such points need to be incorporated in a Tenant Lease Agreement, and a protocol must be established for review and verification of tenant compliance. These tenant requirements may limit the ability of speculative buildings to achieve higher level ratings.
UPDATE #1: Comment cleared.
4. Austin Energy Green Building strongly recommends that the development team contact Liana Kallivoka, the Commercial Green Building Supervisor to discuss the opportunities and difficulties associated with pursuing a 3 Star rating on this site before committing the project to that level of sustainability.
UPDATE #1: Comment cleared.
5. The acceptable wording for the green building requirement is:
Development of the property shall comply with the requirements of the Austin Energy Green Building (AEGB) multifamily, single family or commercial rating system for a minimum two (three)-star rating. Certification from AEGB shall be based on the version of the rating system in effect at the time ratings applications are submitted for individual buildings.
UPDATE #1: Comment cleared.
6. Under Exhibit D-9, 7, Alternative Transportation the electric vehicle charging needs to be more explicit. Our preferred language is:
The project will provide 40 public dedicated spaces and charging infrastructure for electric vehicle charging within the project. A minimum of 25% of the charging infrastructure will be level 2 (240v) and participate in Austin Energy's Plug-In EVerywhere™ network. The remaining spaces can provide electric service via level 1 (120v) ruggedized outlets.
UPDATE #1: Comment cleared.

Austin Independent School District – Beth Wilson

An educational impact statement is required. Due to the lack of information provided, AISD staff cannot complete the impact statement at this time. Please provide additional information as to the residential component of this proposal.

UPDATE#1: See Attachment A. Comment cleared.

Neighborhood Housing & Community Development – Javier Delgado

10% of the residential units should serve households at 80% MFI or below. Long term affordability will be secured via a re-sale restrictive covenant giving the Austin Housing Finance Corp. first right of refusal.

UPDATE#1: Per Section 2.5.2.A, provide a summary of the prevailing MFI's in the Vicinity of the PUD. Please use the link to find MFI information:

http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml

UPDATE#2: Applicant must agree to the documents to be used for re-sale of ownership units.

PARD Planning – Marilyn Lamensdorf (Shashoua)

1. Demonstrate compliance with Tier 1 requirements for Open Space as required in Section 2.3.1.C Provide easy estimate breakout/comparison for open space, including breakouts for each PUD category, i.e. residential, commercial percentages and acreages. (Sheet 1)

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

UPDATE#2: - On LUP Sheet 1, add a column labeled Open Space Required and show the open space required for each Area No. (10% for residential, 20% for commercial)

2. Remove from open space acreage calculations any land encumbered or proposed to be encumbered by easements or rights-of-way or any other encumbrances that would restrict development. Water quality features must be designed as an amenity to be counted toward open space in accordance with 2.3.1 Tier One Requirements for PUDs:

All PUDs must:

C. provide a total amount of open space that equals or exceeds 10 percent of the residential tracts, 15 percent of the industrial tracts, and 20 percent of the nonresidential tracts within the PUD, except that:

- 1. a detention or filtration area is excluded from the calculation unless it is designed and maintained as an amenity; and*

2. the required percentage of open space may be reduced for urban property with characteristics that make open space infeasible if other community benefits are provided

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

UPDATE#2: Comment remains. Provide an Open Space/Parkland exhibit as a separate sheet. On this sheet provide a table with the following categories and acreages:

Parkland in the 25-year floodplain, CEF or CEF buffer (0% credit for parkland)
Parkland between the 25-100 year floodplain (50% credit for parkland)
Parkland outside the Floodplain (100% credit)
Open Space, not counting toward parkland credit

UPDATE#1: –NEW COMMENTS:

3. Add the 4.1-acre private park requirement to Sheet 2, PUD notes.

UPDATE#2: After the acreage above is calculated, development will receive 50% credit for recreation facilities open to the public. Please contact this reviewer once acreage for credit is calculated for additional notes related to remaining parkland dedication owed. (Marilyn.lamensdorf@austintexas.gov)

FYI: The parkland dedication fee of \$650/dwelling unit is required [25-1-601] and must be paid before any site plan or subdivision may be approved [25-1-605(B)].

Drainage Engineering Review - Benny Ho

RELEASE OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A VERIFICATION OF ALL DATA, INFORMATION, AND CALCULATIONS SUPPLIED BY THE APPLICANT. THE ENGINEER OF RECORD IS SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COMPLETENESS, ACCURACY, AND ADEQUACY OF HIS/HER SUBMITTAL, WHETHER OR NOT THE APPLICATION IS REVIEWED FOR CODE COMPLIANCE BY CITY ENGINEERS.

This site is located at 3429 Executive Center Drive in the Shoal Creek Watershed, which is classified as an Urban Watershed.

DE1. There is no outstanding drainage engineering related issue.

UPDATE #0: All drainage engineering comments are cleared.

Environmental Review - Atha Phillips

1. Please provide an Environmental Assessment to the Environmental Reviewer. This could create additional impediments to development. Additional comments from the COA ERM hydrogeologist and wetland staff may be generated once this information is received.

UPDATE#1: Currently, the applicant's ERI is missing some features that have been identified by staff. Specifically, a large wetland located just east of Wood Hollow Drive, please reference the City of Austin GIS or call staff for

clarification. Additionally, the ERI identifies wetlands that are not showing up on the Land Use Plan. Please update the Land Use Plan accordingly. Please provide an updated ERI with the next submittal.

UPDATE #2: Comment cleared; see hydro-geologist comments.

2. Please show all the critical environmental features (CEFs) such as wetlands, rimrocks and springs, and their associated buffer setback on the land use plan.

UPDATE#1: Please show the standard buffers for all wetlands identified in the ERI and others identified by staff. If a buffer reduction is requested, please identify the request and update the Summary of Environmental Superiority and reference EV 14.

UPDATE #2: The rimrock buffer should be 150' and the reduction request is not stated within the Tier 1 or Tier 2 tables. Please acknowledge the request for a reduction.

3. Please also indicate the COA fully developed 100 yr. floodplain on the land use plan. Please provide an exhibit including a development plan with accompanying drainage area map for the areas draining to the tributaries in this section. This should include all current code the waterway setbacks and those proposed per the proposed PUD regulations for waterways with acreage of 64 acres and greater. These setbacks are based on the COA fully developed 100yr floodplain and those limits should also be indicated.

UPDATE#1: Please include the entire Floodplain within either a park or open space designation.

UPDATE #2: Comment cleared.

4. Any environmental variances to current code should be requested as exceptions within the proposed PUD. Please list those exceptions and provide explanations for the overall superiority of the PUD in relations to these exceptions. Additional comments may be generated.

UPDATE#1: In the comment response, the applicant stated that no Environmental Variances were being sought but showed a modified CEF buffer of 25' instead of the standard 150' buffer outlined in code on the Land Use Plan. Please adjust the buffer to 150' or request a variance. Please show the correct and the proposed buffers on the next submittal.

UPDATE #2: The rimrock buffer should be 150' and the reduction request is not stated within the Tier 1 or Tier 2 tables. Please acknowledge the request for a reduction required by code.

5. Please provide a side-by-side analysis of how the proposed PUD compares to current code, including how this affects developable acreage. Also, indicate how the PUD plans to provide overall environmental superiority over current code.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

6. This comment is pending approval of the ERI and CEF issues with the ERM section. Additional comments from ERM will need to be addressed.
UPDATE#1: Comment pending correction of ERI.
UPDATE#2: Comment pending correction of ERI.
7. Please further clarify and explain how this PUD will provide superior environmental advantages over conventional zoning.
UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.
8. Remove Note #15 from the PUD NOTES located on Sheet 2.
UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.
9. Please reconcile notes found in Tier II Requirement #2 and PUD NOTES on Sheet 2 #14, so that the language is consistent.
UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.
10. In Note 9 of the PUD notes. Please clarify this note by stating how much you plan to exceed the requirements.
UPDATE#1: Please identify if cut and fill variances will be required.
UPDATE #2: Comment cleared.
11. Please go through the land development code 25-2 and 25-8 and speak to each item listed. We must know specifically what items you are trying to modify and which items you plan to be superior.
UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.
12. A general proposed development exhibit that calls out open space areas and addresses tree protection would also be helpful.
UPDATE#1: Please provide a tree plan that shows trees proposed to be removed and saved.
UPDATE #2: Tier 2 requirements superiority is 75%, please update to meet these standards. It has also been called to our attention that the survey may not be correct in the measurement of trees. Please confirm, we will be on-site to perform spot checking to ensure that all trees all being accurately being accounted for in the tree survey.

UPDATE#1: –NEW COMMENTS:
13. Please specify how the garages will be constructed. Due to the geological nature of the site, staff would ask that no more than 4' of cut within 300' of the Spicewood Springs POS and no more than 8' beyond the 300' buffer.
UPDATE#2: Comment cleared.

UPDATE#2: –NEW COMMENTS:
14. **The superiority table is very long, partially because PUD notes are repeated between Tier 1 and Tier 2 and within different sections of Tier 2. We recommend removing all repeated information to make the superiority table more clear. Tier 1 should not contain any PUD notes that address Tier 2 elements, and a PUD note should only be listed once in Tier 2. Any repetition in the “Superiority” column narrative should also be removed or minimized.**

15. Any narrative or PUD note that confirms the project will comply with code, rather than exceed code requirements, should be removed from Tier 2.
16. The requirements listed in the “Tier II Requirement” column under “2. Environment” do not match current code (see Section 2.4 – Tier Two Requirements, Environment/Drainage). Please update the superiority table to reflect current Tier Two criteria.
17. As currently laid out, it is challenging to match the proposed PUD Note to the Tier Two criteria from the code. Please separate the Environment section of the table into separate rows for each Tier Two criterion. Each criterion the PUD is addressing should have its own narrative in the Superiority column and the relevant note in the PUD Note column. If the PUD is not addressing some of the criteria in the code, the Superiority and PUD Note columns should be left blank. If a criterion is truly not applicable to the site (rather than the proposal choosing not to pursue it), you can put N/A in the table.
18. As a general guideline, the proposed PUD notes should be specific enough to provide a review standard for future development applications. For example, note 28 is not specific enough because it does not quantify the minimum percentage of the required water quality volume that will be treated with green controls for each subsequent development application.

Comments on Specific PUD Notes

19. 23 - The table states that 6 acres of open space is required and a minimum of 12 acres of parks and open space is provided. For environmental superiority, the provided open space amount must exceed the acreage of environmental features that must be protected – including floodplain, CWQZ, and CEF buffers. Please calculate and provide the required acreage of floodplain, CWQZ, and CEF buffers (acreage totals for each of the three categories and a combined total that accounts for any overlap). We will then confirm whether the provided open space is larger than the floodplain/CWQZ/CEFs that must be protected anyway.
20. 24, 27, 28, 34 – All four of these notes have to do with water quality treatment, but they don’t provide enough detail to provide a review standard for future development applications. There are three water quality related criteria in the code’s Tier 2 requirements:
Provides water quality controls superior to those otherwise required by code;
Uses green water quality controls as described in the Environmental Criteria Manual to treat at least 50 percent of the water quality volume required by code; and
Provides water quality treatment for currently untreated, developed off-site areas of at least 10 acres in size.
In general, “superior” controls must treat a greater volume than required by code, and “green water quality controls” are defined as those listed in ECM Section 1.6.7. Please rewrite the notes to clarify if and how the PUD will meet those requirements. For example, note 24 says the project shall exceed onsite water quality treatment – how? Will all controls be sized to treat X% additional water quality volume? How and where will the project achieve additional TSS removal? (We recommend achieving 25% additional removal by treating 25% additional volume.) What percent of the water quality volume will be treated by the green controls listed in ECM Section 1.6.7? Are you proposing green controls in addition to rainwater harvesting?

21. We need to get Benny involved with this discussion.
 35 – Many of the items listed for tree removal and mitigation are not superiority elements. There are two Tier 2 requirements related to tree protection and planting: Preserves all heritage trees; preserves 75% of the caliper inches associated with native protected size trees; and preserves 75% of all of the native caliper inches; and Tree plantings use Central Texas seed stock native and with adequate soil volume. Subsection “a” would actually be a code modification; staff currently requires a tree survey that is less than five years old at the time of development application. Subsections “b” and “c” do not reach the protection threshold required for superiority; they might meet code, but should not be included in the superiority table. Please confirm with the Environmental and Heritage Tree reviewers whether subsections “d” through “g” exceed code requirements; if not, remove them from the superiority table. Subsection “h” can be considered superior, but it should be located under “Employs other creative or innovative measures to provide environmental protection.”
22. 29, 36, and 38 – Please provide more detail about the planned invasive species removal, impervious cover removal, and riparian restoration. Please work with the Wetland Biology reviewer to develop a restoration plan.
23. 33 – Please delete; CEF protection is code compliance, not a superiority element.
24. The PUD notes do not speak to the riparian restoration, what does that look like, there are guidelines in the ECM. This is an item they are using to be “superior”.

Code Modification Table

25. Please prepare a table of requested code modifications, either instead of or in addition to the summary on Sheet 2. The table should include the existing code and the proposed language, so it is very clear what is being modified.
26. If possible, please describe or refer to a graphic that illustrates the modified CEF boundary for the rim rock (to clarify which portion of the buffer is decreased to 25 feet).

Hydro Geology Review – Sylvia R. Pope, P.G.

- HG 1. There are two Critical Environmental Features on Tract 5 at the corner of Wood Hollow Drive and Executive Center Drive. These are a canyon rimrock and a wetland. Their locations need to be included in the Environmental Resource Inventory and shown on the PUD plan sheets. Critical Environmental Feature (CEF) buffers for these were approved with the Austin Oaks Restaurant site plan number SP-2013-0058CT but are subject to re-evaluation with redevelopment. Specifically, a larger upslope buffer for the canyon rimrock CEF will demonstrate environmental superiority of this PUD. The larger buffer will impact an area that currently is a parking lot.
UPDATE #2: The canyon rimrock and the wetland are now shown in the ERI and on Sheet 1 of the PUD. A seep has also been identified on the canyon rimrock face. The PUD application is proposing an upslope buffer of 25 feet width for the canyon rimrock CEF. There are many cases where a 50-foot width CEF buffer has

been approved upslope of canyon rimrock. The 25-foot width will provide approximately 10 feet more buffer area than currently exists due to an existing parking lot. The pavement will be removed to increase the upslope buffer to 25 feet and the area will be restored per future site plan submittals. The proposed buffer is stated as Note 5 of the Modifications to Code table on Sheet 2 of the Land Use Plan.

Spicewood Springs is located offsite to the north of Area A but is shown in the ERI as a water well. Please label this water well as "Spicewood Springs" in the ERI report and associated map attachments.

A water well is shown in the middle of the Woodhollow detention pond. Please have Horizon Environmental Services, Inc. contact me to explain the specific location and construction of this water well or if they downloaded this information from a database. *Comment pending.*

HG 2. The remainder of the PUD area needs to be examined for the presence of Critical Environmental Features. The re-development of this office complex presents an opportunity to increase environmental protection of features that may have been covered/alterd or have minimal surface buffer area. In particular, there is a historic spring location in this general area that may have been disturbed during the construction of the office complex. If the applicant has records of the spring from the earlier development, please submit those with the next update.

UPDATE #2: A site visit didn't reveal additional CEFs and records search of the building plans for the existing buildings didn't indicate a spring location. *Comment cleared.*

HG 3. Portions of the PUD are within the Recharge Zone of the Northern Edwards Aquifer and portions close to the eastern perimeter are outside, per surface exposure of geologic units. The PUD agreement should include the standard provisions for development over the recharge zone, such as installing liners in stormwater control structures.

UPDATE #2: The PUD proposes using Low Impact Development techniques such as bio-swales and rain gardens. These structures may not require low permeability liners and this issue will be addressed at the site plan phase. *Comment cleared.*

HG 4. Please note that construction of underground parking structures has the potential to intercept shallow groundwater. Due to the proximity of Spicewood Springs, disturbance to groundwater flow paths may have an impact to the Jollyville Plateau Salamander habitat at Spicewood Springs. Please describe how this situation has been evaluated and proposed measures to ensure protection of the salamander habitat.

UPDATE #2: Per the applicant's response to EV13, no excavation greater than 4 feet will be allowed within 300 feet of Spicewood Springs POS. Also, construction excavation outside of the 300-foot zone will be inspected by a Texas Professional Geoscientist. Note 51 of the Land Use Plan states these conditions. *Comment cleared.*

HG 5. Additional comments may be generated with future updates.

New comments with UPDATE# 2:

HG 6. Note 33 of Sheet 2 of the Land Use Plan states that Critical Environmental Features will be preserved but doesn't contain the list of the standard restricted activities within CEF buffers. Please list the standard restrictions then add the

statement, “unless authorized by Watershed Protection Department staff for restoration.” The restrictions are: maintain existing drainage and native vegetation to the maximum extent practicable, construction is prohibited and wastewater disposal or irrigation is prohibited.

Fire Department Review - Cora Urgena

1. Fire department access roads, fire hydrant spacing and the required fire flow must comply with IFC and will be verified when the site plans for construction are submitted.

UPDATE#0: APPROVED WITH COMMENTS

Flood Plain Review - David Marquez

No comments

Heritage Tree Review - Keith Mars

1. It does not appear a proposed PUD requirement is an exemption or modification of the Heritage Tree Ordinance. However, the tier compliance letter states that the design will preserve a very high percentage of protected and heritage trees. We should identify during the PUD process if heritage tree variances will be requested.

UPDATE#1: It appears administrative variances will be necessary. And it appears granting of these administrative variances is being requested as part of the PUD. Is that correct? Review of the preservation/mitigation rates and an assessment of the heritage trees proposed for removal are currently under review. I suggest establishing a meeting with appropriate staff to discuss overall environmental superiority. I don't understand the “tree numbers ___ and ___ must be replaced in either Area A or Area G”.

UPDATE#2: Exact variance language is still being discussed between the applicant and staff.

2. Please provide a tree survey. If possible, please provide a conceptual preservation/removal table to determine the extent of trees to be preserved.

UPDATE#1: An assessment of the heritage trees proposed for removal is currently under review.

UPDATE #2: Comment merged with HT1. Comment cleared.

Site Plan Review – Rosemary Avila

1. Please clarify #7 on Tier 1 requirements. Civic space will not exceed 1,500 sq ft. Is that going to be adequate?

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

2. Please label the base zoning or sita data table for each area.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

3. Are you planning on complying with Subchapter E?

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

4. Label the open space, prove that there will be 20% as stated in the Tier 1 requirements.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

5. Please clarify if you are requesting for AEC for the whole site or not.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

6. Provide compatibility cross-section along Hart Lane and Spicewood Springs Rd to prove compatibility.

UPDATE#1: Please indicate if any landscaping is going to be provided in lieu of compatibility.

UPDATE#2: Comment cleared

7. Please provide a more specific site development chart that shows more of a breakdown.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

8. FYI- Cocktail Lounges require a Conditional Use Permit.

UPDATE#1: Please explain if the amount of square footage will have a limitation for cocktail lounge use.

UPDATE#2: Comment cleared.

Transportation Review - Bryan Golden

TIER 1 REQUIREMENTS (Division 5. Planned Unit Developments)

1. Requirement #2: PUD Note #1- Remove part "D" of note. On-street parking will be determined on a per project basis at site plan review. Please add note that parking structures will have minimal visual presence from neighborhood property owners and public ROW, through use of architectural elements and screening.

UPDATE#1: Please note on-street parking and surface parking are separate. On-street parking will be subject to approval from Austin Transportation Department. Surface parking and loading shall be limited and determined at the time of site plan and shall not exist along public ROW frontage.

UPDATE#2: Comment cleared.

2. Requirement#2: PUD Note #19- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities and road cross section will be reviewed by Austin Transportation Department. Associated comments may follow. Pedestrian connection (mid block) from Executive Center Drive through "Area A" to Spicewood Springs Road is recommended.

UPDATE#1: Note that 7' min clear zones and 8' min planting zones are required on all streets and where ROW cannot accommodate both, sidewalk shall extend into property with sidewalk easement.

- Provide a pedestrian/bicycle easement at midblock of "Area A" from Executive Center Drive to Spicewood Springs Road with crosswalk improvements to Ceberry Drive.

UPDATE#2: Comment cleared.

3. Requirement #9: Mitigate adverse cumulative transportation impacts with sidewalks, trails, and roadways (2.3.1). Bike and Trails will review PUD and may provide additional recommendations. Please consult with Capital Metro regarding the need for additional mass transit (bus) stop(s) and Austin Transportation Department regarding any requirements of the "High Capacity Transit Stop"; provide results of consults.

UPDATE#1: Please update Note #46 to read "a publicly accessible hiking trail, in a dedicated public easement, throughout the project."

- Provide a pedestrian/bicycle easement at midblock of "Area A" from Executive Center Drive to Spicewood Springs Road with crosswalk improvements to Ceberry Drive.

UPDATE#2: Comment cleared.

4. Requirement #10: PUD Note #11 - Gated roadways are prohibited (2.3.1) Please add driveways equipped with controlled access gates must provide a minimum of 40 feet of storage space measured from the gate to the street property line. Additional storage space may be required if a TIA or traffic study warrants. If the entry drive is from an arterial street, the applicant may also be required to provide a means for a vehicle to turnaround and exit the driveway without backing into the street, in case the gate is closed and access is denied [TCM, 9.5.0 #2; 9.3.0 #3; TCM, 5.1.0].

UPDATE#1: Revise the #9 note accordingly: "Gated roadways within the PUD are prohibited. Additionally, private resident or commercial parking area may be secured by a gate only with 40' or more of vehicle storage space between the gate and the street property line. Gated driveways are not permitted on arterial roads."

UPDATE#2: Comment cleared.

5. Compliance with Chapter 25-2, Subchapter E will be required (2.3.2(A)).
UPDATE#1: Add to note #10 "...and along southern edge of Spicewood Springs Road unless topographic conditions prohibit."

UPDATE#2: Constraints noted. Add to note #10 "...and along southern edge of Spicewood Springs Road in areas B and C unless topographic conditions preclude."

6. Requirement #2 (Additional PUD Mixed Use requirements): PUD Note #12- This proposal is within the urban roadway boundary, therefore all sidewalks must comply with CoreTransit Corridors: Sidewalks and Building Placement; Section 2.2.2, Subchapter E, Chapter 25-2 (2.3.2(B)) Add southern edge of Spicewood Springs to note where Subchapter E comments will be required and note that sidewalks along Mopac will require TxDOT approval.

UPDATE#1: Add to note #10 "...and along southern edge of Spicewood Springs Road unless topographic conditions prohibit. Pedestrian hiking trail will be provided along Mopac frontage road, and sidewalks along Mopac will require TxDOT approval."

UPDATE#2: Constraints noted. Add to note #10 "...and along southern edge of Spicewood Springs Road in areas B and C unless topographic conditions preclude."

TIER 2 REQUIREMENTS (Division 5. Planned Unit Developments)

7. Requirement #7: PUD Note #19,24 – Please specify how above-code level bicycle parking will be met
 UPDATE#1: 318 minimum or 10% minimum of Appendix A?
UPDATE#2: Comment cleared.
8. Requirement #9: PUD Note #9- Must comply with requirement. Alternative configurations may be considered.
 UPDATE#1: Add a note to the PUD showing how this requirement is to be addressed.
UPDATE#2: This refers to the #9 requirement of Tier II (parking structure frontage). Area B and Wood Hollow should be added to the note (#49).
9. Requirement #12: PUD Note #22- Provide for accessibility for persons with disabilities to a degree exceeding applicable legal requirements. Accessible dwelling units apply to Affordable/Smart Housing requirements only. Specify transportation based accessibility.
 UPDATE#1: Recommend: All buildings shall have ADA accessible routes from public ROW and 2% accessible units for residential developments. Any public amenity must provide accessible parking and all developments shall adhere to LDC 25-6-475; CABO/ANSI parking requirements.
UPDATE#2: Comment cleared.

ZONING

10. The Austin Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan calls for 140 feet of right-of-way for Spicewood Springs Road. If the requested zoning is granted for this site, then 70 feet of right-of-way from the existing centerline should be dedicated for Spicewood Springs according to the Transportation Plan. [LDC, Sec. 25-6-51 and 25-6-55].
11. Additional right-of-way may be required at the time of subdivision and/or site plan.
12. A traffic impact analysis is required and has been received. Additional right-of-way, participation in roadway improvements, or limitations on development intensity may be recommended based on review of the TIA. [LDC, Sec. 25-6-142].

***** TIA comments will be provided in a separate memo ***.**

13. Existing Street Characteristics:

Name	ROW	Pavement	Classification	Sidewalks	Bike Route	Capital Metro
Loop 1/ Mopac	400'	380'	Freeway	Yes	No	Yes
Spicewood Springs	118'-140'	82'	Arterial	Yes	No	No
Executive Center Drive	70'	30'	Collector	Yes	No	No
Wood Hollow	70'-80'	40'	Collector	Yes	No	Yes

Drive						
Hart Lane	70'	40'	Collector	Yes	Yes	Yes

PDRD Water Quality Review - Benny Ho

RELEASE OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A VERIFICATION OF ALL DATA, INFORMATION, AND CALCULATIONS SUPPLIED BY THE APPLICANT. THE ENGINEER OF RECORD IS SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COMPLETENESS, ACCURACY, AND ADEQUACY OF HIS/HER SUBMITTAL, WHETHER OR NOT THE APPLICATION IS REVIEWED FOR CODE COMPLIANCE BY CITY ENGINEERS.

This site is located at 3429 Executive Center Drive in the Shoal Creek Watershed, which is classified as an Urban Watershed.

WQ1 FYI., Redevelopment impervious cover exceeding 8,000 sf requires water quality control meeting the current water quality standard. It is therefore not considered to be superiority.

UPDATE#0: All water quality comments are cleared.

PDRD Austin Water Utility Review - Bradley Barron

FYI: The landowner intends to serve the site with City of Austin water and wastewater utilities. The landowner, at own expense, will be responsible for providing any water and wastewater utility improvements, offsite main extensions, water or wastewater easements, utility relocations and/or abandonments required by the proposed land uses. It is recommended that Service Extension Requests be submitted to the Austin Water Utility at the early stages of project planning. Water and wastewater utility plans must be reviewed and approved by the Austin Water Utility in compliance with Texas Commission of Environmental rules and regulations, the City's Utility Criteria Manual and suitability for operation and maintenance. All water and wastewater construction must be inspected by the City of Austin. The landowner must pay the City inspection fees with the utility construction. The landowner must pay the tap and impact fee once the landowner makes an application for a City of Austin water and wastewater utility tap permit.

Typical water system operating pressures in the area are above 65 psi. Pressure reducing valves reducing the pressure to 65 psi (552 kPa) or less to water outlets in buildings shall be installed in accordance with the plumbing code.

All AWU infrastructure and appurtenances must meet all TCEQ separation criteria. Additionally AWU must have adequate accessibility to safely construct, maintain, and repair all public infrastructure. Rules & guidelines include:

1. A minimum separation distance of 5 feet from all other utilities (measured outside of pipe to outside of pipe) and AWU infrastructure;
2. A minimum separation distance of 5 feet from trees and must have root barrier systems installed when within 7.5 feet;

3. Water meters and cleanouts must be located in the right-of-way or public water and wastewater easements;
4. Easements AWU infrastructure shall be a minimum of 15 feet wide, or twice the depth of the main, measured from finished grade to pipe flow line, whichever is greater.
5. A minimum separation of 7.5 feet from center line of pipe to any obstruction is required for straddling line with a backhoe;
6. AWU infrastructure shall not be located under water quality or detention structures and should be separated horizontally to allow for maintenance without damaging structures or the AWU infrastructure.
7. The planning and design of circular Intersections or other geometric street features and their amenities shall include consideration for access, maintenance, protection, testing, cleaning, and operations of the AWU infrastructure as prescribed in the Utility Criteria Manual (UCM)
8. Building setbacks must provide ample space for the installation of private plumbing items such as sewer connections, customer shut off valves, pressure reducing valves, and back flow prevention devices in the instance where auxiliary water sources are provided

Public Works – Bicycle Program: Nathan Wilkes

1. Bicycle lanes on Hart Lane are complete. Bicycle Lanes on Wood Hollow will be complete this year.
UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.
2. Request: Showers on site for tenants and employees per South Shore PUD From South Shore: "A building containing one or more GR uses, including cocktail lounge, totaling 5,000 square feet or more shall include shower facilities for bicycle riders. Such a building containing 20,000 square feet or more of GR uses including cocktail lounges, shall provide one facility for each gender. Otherwise, the building shall provide one unisex facility. The facilities shall be separately accessible from commercial / retail toilet facilities and include an area for changing clothes and storing personal items. The facilities may be located outside of the building in a common area accessible to all buildings subject to this requirement."
UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.
3. Request: Secure Bicycle Parking per South Shore PUD (bicycle parking rooms in buildings for occupants, tenants and employees in addition to short term bicycle parking for the general public). From South Shore: "For every ten vehicle parking spaces in the PUD, the owner shall provide one bicycle parking space. At least half the total spaces shall be either (a) Class I racks / parking spaces as defined in the City Transportation Criteria Manual or (b) spaces in a locked bicycle storage room with a means to secure individual bicycles within the room. Review and approval of bicycle parking placement by the City of Austin Bicycle Program or any successor program is required prior to site plan approval."
UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

4. Request: SUP along MoPac along site frontage. If additional superiority was desired limits could extend to the south connecting Far West to Spicewood Springs Road. This would create a tie in to the work that the Mopac Improvement Project is doing to improve the trail crossing at Far West to the east across the railroad tracks.

UPDATE#1: Comment understood.

5. Request: Bicycle Lanes with 8' parking and 6' bicycle lanes and 10' travel lanes on Wood Hollow and Executive Center Drive internal to site. Current proposed cross section from developer uses substandard lane widths.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

UPDATE#1: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

6. Request: Widen Anderson Lane from Mopac to Shoal Creek by 2feet on each side of the median divided roadway in order to provide 6' bicycle lanes in each direction.

UPDATE#2: Repeat Comment

Watershed Protection: Wetland Biology – Andrew Clamann

1. Please show all Wetland CEFs and label them “Wetland CEF” (FYI: The previous figures that I had seen did not include the wetland CEFs located in the upstream reach).

UPDATE#1: Currently, only one wetland CEF is shown in PUD figures, however applicant’s Environmental Report indicates additional wetland CEFs within the channel south of Executive Center Drive. Please ensure that all wetland CEFs are shown in the figures.

UPDATE#2: Comment cleared.

2. Please show a contiguous 50ft CEF setback from centerline on both sides of creek.
UPDATE#1: Currently, the only CEF setbacks shown in figures are the CEF setbacks associated with the Rimrock, however there should be CEF setbacks shown associated with wetland CEFs. PUD figures should show all CEF setbacks, including all wetland CEF setbacks. Instead of the Standard 150ft CEF setback from wetland CEFs, the applicant may apply a 50ft CEF setback from the centerline of the channels. This can be approved as an administratively modified CEF setback and reduction to setback area in conjunction with mitigation (see next comment) pursuant to ECM 1.10 (formerly ECM 1.3.0).

UPDATE#2: 8/19/2015: The setback is labeled “50’ Creek Centerline Setback” rather than “Wetland CEF Setback”. Additionally, the setback is not contiguous, ends prematurely on the North end, and is not clearly visible. This ambiguity is not acceptable. This reviewer recommends a meeting with applicant to ensure an appropriate and acceptable revision to Update 3.

3. Please include language in the PUD that unambiguously states preservation of the CEFs, short term impacts to the CEF setback for restoration, and longer preservation of the CEF setbacks in a natural condition (full growth).

UPDATE#1: Repeat comment

UPDATE#2: 8/19/2015: The Note provided (note 33) is ambiguous and does not appear to convey the intent recommended in the original comment above. This reviewer recommends a meeting with applicant to ensure an appropriate and acceptable revision to Update 3.

4. Please include language, plan view figures and details in the PUD that unambiguously indicate the riparian buffer restoration activities which will occur within the CEF

setback. This should include removal of all impervious cover and restoration of the channel, banks, floodplain benches and riparian corridor to a more natural stream morphology and native plantings. Stream morphology of upstream reach can be used as a template for downstream reach. Proposed restoration shall be approved by ERM prior to PUD approval. Please provide restoration plan to this reviewer.

UPDATE#1: In order to mitigate for the reduction to the total area of the Standard CEF Setback for wetland CEFs, applicant must demonstrate compliance with mitigation guidance in ECM 1.10 (formerly ECM 1.3.0). This reviewer recommends enhancement of one bank of the channel north of Executive Center Drive. Currently the historic bank armoring of the channel north of Executive Center Drive has created a narrow cross section which creates increased velocity during storm events that scours in-channel habitat. Restoring a wider cross section to the channel may restore the creek (similar to cross section to the south of Executive Center Drive). Widening the cross section of the channel and restoration of one of the banks north of Executive Center Drive may be considered "enhancement" which shall mitigate for the reduction to the standard CEF setback for wetlands.

UPDATE#2: 8/19/2015: The Note provided (note 52) is ambiguous and does not appear to clearly convey the intent recommended in the two comments above. This reviewer recommends a meeting with applicant to ensure an appropriate and acceptable revision to Update 3.

Planning & Zoning Review - Victoria Haase

Tier 1 Requirement/Superiority Table:

1. (Item #2) Upon completion of the tree survey and coordination with the City Arborist, please specify the exact number of trees (protected and heritage) that will be preserved. What is the plan for mitigation?
UPDATE#1: An exact number was not given. How many Protected trees and how many Heritage trees will be preserved?
UPDATE#2: Comment cleared.
2. (Item #2) Please elaborate or define “innovated design and high quality construction”
UPDATE#1: Comment understood/Cleared.
3. (Item #2) Given that the parking garages would be multiple stories with multiple stories of office above, how will their visual presence be minimized architecturally (given they will be too tall to screen)?
UPDATE#1: Comment understood/Cleared.
4. (Item#5) What is the source of your data that this redevelopment will provide 3500 permanent jobs?
UPDATE #1: Comment cleared.
5. (Item#6) Specify the reduction in impervious cover levels –in terms of to what’s there today, and what could be if the project were developed under a GR/MU scenario. Elsewhere it is indicated the site will be at 65% IC, but what’s the reduction?
UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.
6. (Item#7) What has the response been from these COA departments? If not interested, have you also approached PARD or other City departments about satellite office space? Is this space also included in the civic square feet?
UPDATE#1: Is this space also included in the civic square feet calculation?
UPDATE #2: Comment cleared.

Tier 1 Requirement/Superiority Table – Mixed Use Development:

7. (Item#2) Sidewalk is also proposed along the east side of Hart Lane (note 12). If you are not proposing construction of a sidewalk along Mo-Pac, are there other connectivity options or enhancements proposed between the proposed PUD and the surrounding neighborhoods?
UPDATE#1: Comment understood/Cleared.
8. (Item#3) Should this be re-phrased as multiple story or multi-story office building? What’s the difference between a mixed-use building and the commercial buildings? As staff understands the proposal, there are essentially four possible building types: office, office with retail/civic uses; office with retail/civic uses and/or residential uses, and residential only.
UPDATE#1: Comment understood/Cleared.

Tier 2 Compliance/Superiority Table:

9. (Item#1) Please provide the square feet. Provide calculations showing how this number was derived. If the exact number is unknown, provide a minimum.
UPDATE #1: Comment cleared.
10. (Item#2) Please provide calculations.
UPDATE #1: Comment cleared.
11. (Item#4) Provide documentation that the Art in Public Places Program is amendable to your proposal. What is meant by “providing the art directory”?
UPDATE #1: Please provide a letter or documentation of your communication with the Art in Public Places Program about how you plan to incorporate art into this project. The documentation should include comments from the Art in Public Places Program.
UPDATE #2: Comment cleared.
12. (Item#7) Will spots for EV charging also be provided to residents? Presumably, “the public” includes both visitors and employees of office spaces. What amount of bicycle parking is required and will be provided? See also the bicycle reviewer’s comments for shower facilities and other requests.
UPDATE#1: Comment understood and is being addressed in the Public Works Bicycle Program Comments.
13. (Item#9) Areas A, D, and E have frontage on MoPac, but these buildings also have frontage to Executive Center Drive, Wood Hollow or Spicewood Springs. Will the sides that face these streets have pedestrian oriented uses?
UPDATE#1: Comment understood.
14. (Item#10) The site development regulations for maximum height, maximum floor area ratio, and maximum building coverage in a PUD with residential uses may not exceed the baseline except with compliance to Section 2.5.2 (a report approved by NCHD and commitment for on-site affordable housing or donation in lieu of), as development bonuses.
 - 1) If the residential component remains, has such a report been filed with the NCHD?
 - 2) Do you have alternative proposals if the residential component is reduced or removed?**UPDATE#1: Comment understood and is being addressed in the NHCD Comments.**

Land Use Plan Comments

15. (Sheet 1) The LUP depicts “minimum” open zones distributed throughout the site. Please approximate the size of these areas.
UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.
16. (Sheet 1) The superiority chart and the LUP notes refer to tracts as “area”. For the sake of consistency, please change “Proposed Parcel Boundary” to area; alternately, change reference from area to parcel, or everything to “tract.”
UPDATE#1: (Sheet 2) Change the terminology from “lots” to “Areas” in comment #1.
UPDATE #2: Comment cleared.
17. (Sheet 2- #1) Surface parking for visitors – is this associated with the townhomes or also for office and retail patrons?

UPDATE#1: Where will visitors to the residential uses park?

UPDATE #2: Comment cleared.

18. (Sheet 2- #3) Please provide the square feet. Provide calculations showing how this number was derived.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

19. (Sheet 2- #6) Is the meeting room space (Note 18) included in this amount? What other civic uses are contemplated? Is the 100,000 square feet of these three uses consistent with the TIA numbers?

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

20. (Sheet 2- #13) Since this property is not in the WO, please list the pedestrian-oriented uses. Also, why is there no such use proposed on Area G?

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

21. (Sheet 2- #15) This seems to need rewording. See also environmental reviewer's note #8.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

22. (Sheet 2- #16) Trees are not depicted on the LUP. Will there be an exhibit or another sheet added?

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

23. (Sheet 2- #25) Please refer to lots as areas or parcels (for consistency). Please indicate the Site Development Standards in the table supersede base district requirements for all tracts.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

24. (Sheet 2- Site Development Standards Table) If the impervious cover is limited to 65%, explain how the building coverage can be higher.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

25. (Sheet 2) What is the rationale behind inclusion/specification of minimum lot size and frontage? Related, are these values appropriate given a potential townhouse-style development?

UPDATE#1: Please incorporate the items from the Site Development Standards Table and related notes (*) below the table on LUP, Sheet 2, to the table on LUP, Sheet 1. The table on LUP Sheet 2 is not necessary.

UPDATE #2: Comment cleared.

26. (Sheet 3) Please provide a table that identifies locations of new and existing sidewalks/bike lanes (in addition to what is listed in the legend)

UPDATE#1: a table was provided in the responses to the Master Comment Report, however there was no table added to LUP Sheet 3. Please add the table to LUP Sheet 3.

UPDATE #2: Comment cleared.

27. (Sheet 3) Please identify heavy dashed line and solid line in legend (parcel/area/tract boundary and edge of pavement)

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

28. There are existing sidewalks, along Wood Hollow (both sides), Executive Center (north side), and along the MoPac Service Road that appear to be identified as new. Is this just a graphic error, or are the existing sidewalks being replaced with standard Core Transit Corridor sidewalks according as per the typical proposed cross-section? This might be clarified in the table requested in #26 above.

UPDATE#1: Comment cleared.

GENERAL QUESTIONS:

29. Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan - There has been much discussion about whether the proposal is a Neighborhood Center as envisioned in the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan, and whether this location is such. Please elaborate on what makes the proposal a neighborhood center and at this location.

UPDATE#1: Repeat comment. Please provide, in writing, the verbal explanation given to Staff regarding this subject.

UPDATE #2: Comment cleared, document provided.

30. Environmental Superiority - The proposal for redevelopment indicates superiority by bringing the site into compliance with current environmental regulations, especially as relates to water quality. Please explain to what degree the proposal is different than redevelopment of the site under a GR-MU or similar scenario.

UPDATE#1: Comments understood.

Related, staff has fielded numerous requests for an accounting of what could be done with existing zoning entitlements. Staff recognizes that there are any number of scenarios (uses by space per use) that could be developed. Any use, or mix of uses, will have different parking requirements, and different traffic generating implications. At the same time, this is not a vacant greenfield; trees, compatibility requirements, other environmental features, traffic constraints, if any, and a developer's creativity and innovation would all come into play. Nonetheless, the question is forwarded: do you have an estimate of what could be developed, in terms of square feet and parking requirements, for a typical development under the existing zoning?

UPDATE#1: Comments understood.

31. Height - The proposed height along Mo-Pac is several times that allowed under conventional GR or GO zoning. Outside the downtown area, and some examples along Barton Springs Road south of downtown, heights are generally determined by a base zoning district, such as office along Loop 360 or Southwest Parkway, or even elsewhere along Mo-Pac. There are two exceptions along Mo-Pac, the Domain (LI-PDA), which is capped at 150 feet, and commercial highway services (CH) zoning that is permissible along and north of US 183, which tops out at 120 feet. The Domain was envisioned as another "downtown" at the time of its adoption, whereas CH is seen as single major mixed use development of a service nature that includes any combination of office, retail, commercial, and residential uses.

UPDATE #1: Staff continues to discuss this item.

UPDATE #2: Staff continues to discuss this item.

a. Please explain how the proposed heights were derived. Staff understands that an increase in open space/pervious cover is correlated to a smaller building footprint and thus height. Please explain how the proposed reduction in impervious cover translates into or equates to increase in building height. Is there a logic or justification that relates these in some proportion?

UPDATE#1: This item is in ongoing discussion by Staff.

b. Among the zoning principles staff must consider is 1) granting of the zoning should not in any way set an undesirable precedent for other properties in the neighborhood or within other areas of the city and 2) zoning should satisfy a public need and not constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual owner; the request should not result in spot zoning.

UPDATE#1: Comment understood.

c. By its nature, a PUD is unique and customized zoning. But two questions among staff as it relates to these principles are if the PUD is recommended and adopted, does this height set a precedent (negative, neutral, or positive) for other intersections along Mo-Pac? The concern goes to whether buildings that exceed current zoning districts are appropriate at these intersections. (Traffic at such intersections is also a concern, but presumably if part of the transportation/TIA review). Second, the community benefits proposed to meet superiority criteria aside, please explain the public need satisfied with this PUD application.

UPDATE#1: Please elaborate how you feel that a public need is satisfied with the proposed development.

UPDATE #2: Comment Cleared.

32. Increase in FAR - As depicted, it appears some areas will have a higher or lower FAR than allowed under the proposed PUD versus current zoning (on a per tract basis). In total, however, the FAR of 1.12 represents an increase of just over 55% across the entire site. Staff understands a reduced impervious cover leads to greater height if the FAR is held constant. How does a reduction in impervious cover also translate into a request for additional FAR?

UPDATE#1: Is the increase in FAR for a portion of the proposed development, as per your responses submitted in UPDATE1, a result of compromise between achieving less impervious cover but without requesting additional height to the original request?

UPDATE #2: Comment Cleared.

33. Bonus Development - Is residential only located in Areas A and G? Or will there be residential in other areas? Regardless of the underlying baseline, there is a difference between a bonus area of 20' versus an expanded bonus area. The requested difference in FAR and height (current zoning versus proposed) are 128% and 50%, and 87% and 50% for Areas A & G, respectively. Similarly, the biggest difference (between current and proposed) in FAR is for Area D (150%), as is the height (275%). Please elaborate and discuss how participating in affordable housing options for residential portions, if any, or other proposed community/neighborhood benefits are superior for the entire project (and not just for any residential components). Staff recognizes the residential portion may be reduced or removed, so please discuss alternate scenarios and community benefits (i.e., superiority) as necessary.

UPDATE #1: What is the status of any agreements reached with NHCD regarding affordable housing? PLEASE NOTE, this item is still being discussed among Staff.

UPDATE#2: Comment Cleared - see Neighborhood Housing and Community Development comments on page 4.

34. Benefits Summary - Based on previous experience, it appears Council prefers a listing or summary of all the public benefits, which may be slightly different than superiority items. In other words, what are the tangible and obvious public benefits that make this project superior to entitlements under existing (or even higher district) zoning for the community of Austin? To the extent you can provide a benefits summary, please do so.
UPDATE#1: Please provide a list of public benefits that summarizes the superiority tables in a concise way.
UPDATE#2: Comment Cleared

UPDATE#1: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

35. LUP (Sheet 1) – Please provide building coverage numbers.
UPDATE#2: Provide existing building coverage numbers.
36. LUP (Sheet 1) – Please list the F.A.R. ratios in a standard format.
UPDATE#2: Comment Cleared
37. Add *TCAD* to “Existing Parcel Boundary” in the Legend.
UPDATE#2: Comment Cleared
38. LUP (All Sheets) – Please add the zoning case number to the bottom right corner.
UPDATE#2: Comment Cleared
39. LUP (All Sheets) – Please change the department name to “Planning and Zoning Department”
UPDATE#2: Comment Cleared
40. Please provide conceptual/visual context as an exhibit.
UPDATE#2: Please provide conceptual/visual context as an exhibit.
41. LUP (All Sheets) – Please make the street name font larger.
UPDATE#2: Comment Cleared
42. Are any of the buildings proposed for a mixture of both residential and non-residential uses, within one structure, in other words, a vertical mix of uses.
UPDATE#2: Comment Understood, cleared.
43. Which area will host the Civic Space?
UPDATE#2: Comment Understood, cleared.
44. Is the 1,500 sq. ft. of space that is being offered to Austin Fire Department included in the 10,000 sq. ft of space that is being proposed for retail, civic, or pedestrian oriented uses?
UPDATE#2: Comment Understood, cleared.
45. Are there any Civic uses proposed other than the rent-free space being offered to the AFD?
UPDATE#2: Comment Understood, cleared.

46. I do not see that a variance to compatibility setbacks is being requested. Will you be requesting a variance to compatibility setbacks? If so, please include this variance to the "MODIFICATIONS TO CODE" text box on LUP-Sheet 2.

UPDATE#2: REPEAT COMMENT

CASE MANAGER – Tori Haase – (512) 974-7691

A PRELIMINARY STAFF RECOMMENDATION CANNOT BE ISSUED AT THIS TIME BASED ON THE INFORMATION PROVIDED. A STAFF RECOMMENDATION WILL NOT BE ISSUED UNTIL THE ASSOCIATED TIA HAS BEEN APPROVED.

A formal update is required. Please submit **10** copies of updated materials to INTAKE for distribution to the 10 Staff that provided review comments *requiring a response*. Please provide all required documentation to the individual reviewer who requested it. PLEASE CLEARLY LABEL ALL PACKETS WITH THE REVIEWER'S NAME.

Please provide **2 additional copies** of the update materials and response letters to the Zoning Review/Case Manager. Please Note: You must make an appointment with the Intake Staff (974-2689) to submit the update. PLEASE BRING ALL COPIES OF THIS REPORT WITH YOU UPON SUBMITTAL TO INTAKE.

***** Additional comments may be generated as requested information is provided *****

PLEASE NOTE: Release of this application does not constitute a verification of all data, information and calculations supplied by the applicant. The engineer of record is solely responsible for the completeness, accuracy and adequacy of his/her submittal, whether or not city engineers review the application for code compliance.

Reviewers

Austin Energy (AE):

Electric Review – David Lambert, 512-322-6109

Green Building Program – Liana Kallivoka, 512-482-5406

Development Services Department (DSD):

LUR Supervising Engineer – Andy Linseisen

Drainage Engineering Review – Benny Ho, 512-974-3402

Site Plan Review – Rosemary Avila, 512-974-2784

Transportation Review – Bryan Golden, 512-974-3124

Water Quality Review – Benny Ho, 512-974-3402

Flood Plain Review – David Marquez, 512-974-3389

Heritage Tree Review – Keith Mars, 512-974-2755

City Arborist – Michael Embesi, 512-974-1876

Environmental Review – Atha Phillips 512-974-6303

Public Works Department (PWD):

Bicycle Program – Nathan Wilkes, 512-974-7016

Planning and Zoning Department (PZD):

Comprehensive Planning Review – Kathleen Fox, 512-974-7877

Zoning Review & Case Manager – Victoria Haase, 512-974-7691

Watershed Protection Department (WPD):

Environmental Officer – Chuck Lesniak, 512-974-2699

Wetland Biology – Andrew Clamann, 512-974-2694

Parks and Recreation Department (PARD):

PARD Planning – Marilyn Lamensdorf (Shashoua), 512-974-9372

Neighborhood Housing & Community Development (NHCD): Javier Delgado, 512-974-3154

Austin Water Utility: Bradley Barron, 512-972-0077

Austin Fire Department (AFD): Cora Urgena, 512-974-0184

Austin Independent School District: Beth Wilson, 512-414-9841

Legal Review – No comments at this time

Mapping Review – No comments at this time