

MASTER REVIEW REPORT [RESPONSE]

CASE NUMBER: C814-2014-0120

CASE MANAGER: Andy Moore

PHONE #: 512-974-7604

REVISION #: 00

UPDATE: 4

PROJECT NAME: Austin Oaks PUD

SUBMITTAL DATE: July 13, 2016

REPORT DUE DATE: August 4, 2016

FINAL REPORT DATE: August 16, 2016

REPORT LATE: 12 DAYS

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)

STAFF REVIEW:

- This report includes all comments received to date concerning your proposed planned unit development. The PUD will be scheduled for Commission when all requirements identified in this report have been addressed.
- PLEASE NOTE: 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 (referenced above) at the CITY OF AUSTIN, PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT, P.O. BOX 1088, AUSTIN, TX.

REPORT:

- The attached report identifies those requirements that must be addressed by an update to your application in order to obtain approval. This report may also contain recommendations for you to consider, which are not requirements.
- ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS MAY BE GENERATED AS A RESULT OF INFORMATION OR DESIGN CHANGES PROVIDED IN YOUR UPDATE.

Electric Review - Jenna R Neal - 512-322-6110

EL 1. FYI: Any relocation of existing electric facilities shall be at developer's expense.

Update 4: Informational. Comment cleared.

EL 2. FYI: Ron Solbach at ph. 512-504-7145 or Ronald.solbach@austinenergy.com is the initial Austin Energy contact for electric service design.

Update 4: Informational. Comment cleared.

EL 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.

This duct bank not only powers the building on Lot 6A but also the properties to the south across Executive Center Drive.

Update 4: Informational. Comment cleared.

New Comments (U3)

EL 4. Additional electric and telecommunications easement along and adjacent to Wood Hollow Dr, Executive Center Dr, Loop 1/ Mopac, Spicewood Springs Rd, and Hart Ln will be needed to bring power to the new development(s). The typical easements needed to bring a 3-phase main feeder along the road will need to be 15' wide.

Update 4: Informational – must be secured at plat or by separate instrument through site plan review process. Comment cleared.

EL 5. Only Utility Compatible trees may be planted within 10' of existing and / or proposed Austin Energy electric facilities.

*The City's Environmental Criteria Manual (ECM) 2.4.1.D and 2.4.2.C state, "In areas where utility lines are present or proposed **only trees from the Utility Compatible Shade Trees list** (see Appendix F https://www.municode.com/library/tx/austin/codes/environmental_criteria_manual)*

Update 4: Informational. Comment cleared.

AE Green Building Program – Sarah Talkington - 512-482-5393.

The PUD language pertaining to Green Building is not acceptable (Ordinance, Part 9, no.1). Please change the PUD agreement as follows:

Green Building Rating

1. A building in the Austin Oaks PUD that is served by Austin Energy must achieve a two-star rating under the City's Austin Energy Green Building program using the applicable rating version in effect at the time a rating application is submitted for the building.

RESPONSE: The Owner has agreed to achieve a two-star rating under the City's Austin Energy Green Building program.

- 2. A single family residential building in the Austin Oaks PUD that is not served by Austin Energy must achieve a two-star rating under the Austin Energy Green Building extended area rating network using the applicable rating version in effect at the time a rating application is submitted for the building.

RESPONSE: The proposed redevelopment does not contain any single family residential buildings.

Neighborhood Housing & Community Development – Regina Copic
512-974-3180

Continue working with NHCD to craft specific affordable housing requirements.

RESPONSE: The Owner has not changed the affordable housing language, with the exception of adding a provision to allow for 5% of the allocated affordable units to be rented to AISD employees, so long as their income does not exceed 120 percent of the median family income of the Austin metropolitan statistical area.

Fire Department Review – Cora Urgena - 512-974-0184

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

RESPONSE: Understood.

Parks & Recreation Dept. Planning – Marilyn Lamensdorf - 512-974-9372

UPDATE 4:

PR1. **Cleared.** Open Space acreage is now shown on Exhibit G.

PR2. **Cleared,** breakdown of acreage provided on two separate Parkland Dedication calculation sheet.

PR3: **Cleared,** if detention is eliminated on the east side of the North Creek acreage.

PR4: **Cleared.**

PR5: Add a Note to Exhibit G and/or to PUD Ordinance Exhibit D Phasing Plan that Applicant will construct a bridge and connecting trails on parcels 3 and 4 the costs for which are not

included in expenditures in Note 1 for Parcel 10. Also include that the Applicant will maintain the bridge and its associated trails. Please also include language that the bridge will be pre-engineered steel frame and at least 8-feet wide.

RESPONSE: Exhibit D to the Ordinance (Phasing Plan) has been revised to provide that the first permanent certificate of occupancy for Parcel 3 will not be issued until the pedestrian bridge with support piers is built and a specification for the bridge has been included on Exhibit H to the Ordinance (AO Creek Plan). The costs for redeveloping Parcel 10 into a Neighborhood Park are limited to Parcel 10, with the exception that a portion of the money may be used for historic markers for the Heritage Park on Parcel 8.

PR6: Discussions continue on a separate note on Exhibit G or in the PUD Ordinance related to expenditure on the Heritage Trail or Heritage Park for a historic marker.

RESPONSE: A note has been added to the Park Plan which indicates that the expenditure may include historic markers in the Heritage Park.

PR6: Please remove any trails from the Exhibits that will not be built by the Applicant.

RESPONSE: All trails have been removed with the exception of the concrete path to the pedestrian bridge from Parcels 4 and 3. It is the owner's understanding that PARD may develop nature trails within the AO Creek at a later date.

PR7: Discussions continue on PUD Ordinance Part 8 in relation to timing of dedication, approval of park plan and facilities included.

RESPONSE: The Ordinance, including the Phasing Plan, have been updated.

WPD Environmental Office Review – Andrea Bates - 512-974-2291

Update 4: Comment numbers have been corrected as needed.

Tier 1 & Tier 2 Compliance (superiority table)

EO 1. *Tier 1, #3, open space.* Please specify the amount of open space required based on land use, and state the exact amount of open space provided by the PUD. (Current language is “more than 10.92 acres.”)

Update 4: Comment cleared.

EO 2. *Tier 1, #8, minimum landscaping requirements.* Please specify how the project will exceed the minimum landscaping requirements of the Code, and clarify any references to the “Grow Green Program.” Grow Green is an educational program, not a specific set of requirements. Please note that using native and adapted plants from the Grow Green Guide and

providing an IPM for the PUD are not sufficient to exceed the minimum landscaping requirements as required by Tier 1.

Update 4: Using native and adapted plants for 50% of plant materials (excluding turf and land within dedicated parkland) and preparing an IPM plan for the PUD are not sufficient to exceed minimum landscaping requirements as required by Tier 1, especially given the requested code modifications. Please work with staff to develop a proposal to exceed the minimum landscaping requirements of the code.

RESPONSE: In connection with landscaping, in addition to the IPM plan, the owner will increase the requirements set forth in Section 2.4.1(D) of the Environmental Criteria Manual related to Street Yard Trees to provide the following:

- **75% of the street trees planted from the Preferred Plan List, rather than 60%;**
- **Planted street trees will be no less than 8 feet in initial height, rather than 6 feet;**
- **Planted street trees will be no less than 3 inch caliper measured at six inches above grade, rather than 1.5 inch caliper;**
- **No more than 30% of planted street trees will be from the same genus or species, rather than 50%.**

In addition, the owner will commit that at least 75% (rather than 50% as previously stated) of the total plant material planted, exclusive of turf and land within dedicated Parkland, shall be native to Central Texas or on the Grow Green Native and Adaptive Landscape Guide. This is an increase from Update 4, which provided for 50%.

EO 3. *Tier 2, #1, open space.* Please specify the amount of open space required based on proposed land uses, and state the exact amount of open space provided by the PUD. (Current language is “more than 10 acres.”) Parks and open space areas are not shown on the Land Use Plan, as stated in the Tier 2 table narrative. Please identify all park and open space areas on the Land Use Plan.

Update 4: Comment cleared. Exhibits G and L are sufficient in lieu of identifying park and open space areas on the Land Use Plan.

EO 4. *Tier 2, #1, open space.* For environmental superiority, the provided open space acreage must exceed the acreage of protected environmental features – including floodplain, CWQZ, and CEF buffers. Please calculate and provide the acreage of floodplain, CWQZ, and 150’ CEF buffers that are not currently developed. Include acreage totals for each of the three categories and a combined total that accounts for any overlap. Staff will then confirm whether the provided open space is larger than the floodplain/CWQZ/CEF area that would need to be protected anyway under §25-8-25.

Update 4: Comment cleared.

EO 5. *Tier 2, #2, environment.* Please revise the Tier 2 table to include all of the Environmental/Drainage criteria listed in the code (Chapter 25-2(B), Article 2, Division 5, §2.4). Each code criterion should be listed in a separate row, and the Compliance and Explanation columns should state whether and how the project is meeting that criterion (i.e., yes, no, or not

applicable; for yes, a description of the proposal). Proposed superiority items that do not fit under code criteria can be added under “Employs other creative or innovative measures to provide environmental protection.” Please ensure that the description in the Explanation column is specific enough to provide a review standard for future development applications.

Update 4: Please make the following revisions:

a. Add the following Tier 2 element and applicant’s response to the table: “Provides water quality treatment for currently untreated, developed off-site areas of at least 10 acres in size.”

RESPONSE: This element has been added to the chart; it does not apply to this property.

b. *Complies with current code:* Change “yes” to “not applicable.” The property does not have entitlements to follow old code provisions.

RESPONSE: The owner disagrees. The Tier 2 factor specifically requires compliance rather than "asserting entitlement to follow older code provisions by application of law or agreement." The owner is not asserting any such rights.

c. *Reduces impervious cover:* Add a statement that the maximum impervious cover otherwise allowed under the redevelopment exception is 66 percent.

RESPONSE: This statement has been added.

d. *Volumetric detention:* The PUD is not proposing volumetric detention. Change “yes” to “no,” and move the description of the proposed on-site detention to the last row under Environment/Drainage (“Employs other creative or innovative measures to provide environmental protection”). Per the Environmental Officer, staff also requests that the PUD participate in the RSMP for the remaining volume of detention that would be required based on undeveloped conditions. Maximizing on-site detention and participating in RSMP for the remainder would be a significant superiority item.

RESPONSE: Owner has agreed to lay back a portion of the West side of the unnamed creek bank on Parcels 4 and 5, which will create volumetric flood detention. The total amount of volumetric flood detention is unknown and depends on whether the firmly situated rock that lies beneath the surface deposits of soil, alluvium, rock fragments and fill can be readily removed without breaking the rock by blasting, air tool (hoe ram or jackhammer) or other destructive mechanical means. Regardless, owner has agreed to participate in the Regional Stormwater Management Program ("RSMP") and pay the calculated fee as if the entire 31.4 acres (minus the Neighborhood Park) were greenfield for a total of \$435,993.88. As noted by staff, the owner may deduct the costs associated with laying back a portion of the West side of the unnamed creek bank on Parcels 4 and 5 from the RSMP fee, which is the normal way to recalculate the amount to be paid into the RSMP. However, the owner has agreed not to further reduce the RSMP payment by recalculating the fee to account for the volumetric detention that the owner will be providing; thereby adding to the superiority of the RSMP approach. Because of this effort

to provide volumetric floodwater detention, the answer to this Tier 2 factor should remain a strong "Yes".

e. *Tree preservation*: Change “yes” to “yes as modified,” since the proposal does not meet all three criteria listed in the code.

RESPONSE: This item has been modified accordingly.

f. *Tree plantings*: Please discuss the feasibility of this proposal with staff.

RESPONSE: Given the difficulty of achieving this factor, the item has been modified to "No". However, if in the future, the supply for tree planting that use Central Texas seed stock native increases substantially, there might be a possibility that this item would be "Yes, as modified." However, given the number of trees on the site, as staff has noted, it would be very difficult (if not impossible in many cases) to achieve the increased standards that the City has suggested for soil volume. The owner is providing adequate soil volume for the trees without damaging the roots of nearby preserved trees. In the conditions on this site, the City's suggested soil volume would necessitate root ball intrusion among the preserved trees, thereby potentially harming the preserved trees' health.

g. *50% increase in setbacks*: Calculate the size of all existing and proposed setbacks, to confirm whether there will be a 50% increase in the CWQZ and each CEF buffer. When measuring existing and proposed setbacks, include undeveloped/restored area within the standard CWQZ and 150' buffer widths.

RESPONSE: Additional calculations have been made and a updated demonstrative exhibit with a chart has been prepared and submitted with this update. The demonstrative exhibit demonstrates that more than a 50% reduction in impervious cover has occurred within the CWQZ and the CEF. Although the purpose of the setback is to limit impervious cover, strictly speaking the reduction of the impervious cover is not literally increasing the setback. Instead, the owner is achieving the goal by reducing the impervious cover and, therefore, the item has been changed to "Yes, as modified".

h. *Clusters impervious cover*: Change “yes” to “no.” Credit for the expanded/restored CWQZ and CEF buffers is provided under several other Tier 2 elements.

RESPONSE: The owner disagrees. One purpose of the Design Charrette was to find a way to reduce impervious cover and create open space (in this case 41% more than required. In order to achieve the park space, Heritage Trail, and Creek area, the redevelopment was clustered in a manner that preserved adjacent existing trees and respected CEF and CWQZ setbacks.

i. *“This site current has no water quality treatment...”*: Delete this statement. Water quality treatment is required under the redevelopment exception, and impervious cover removal from the CWQZ is credited under a different Tier 2 element.

RESPONSE: The statement has been relocated.

j. *“The existing impervious cover located...”*: Delete this statement; impervious cover removal is credited under a different Tier 2 element.

RESPONSE: Ok.

k. *“The project shall provide for the preservation of the [CEFs]...”*: Delete this statement; this is a code requirement and restoration is credited under a different Tier 2 element.

RESPONSE: Ok.

l. *“The updated plan preserves more than 7,000 caliper inches...”*: Delete this statement; tree preservation is credited under a different Tier 2 element.

RESPONSE: This statement has been relocated within the Tier 2 portion of the table.

m. Please add letters or numbers to each Tier 2 Environment/Drainage element to make it easier to reference specific superiority elements.

RESPONSE: Letters have been added to these Environmental items in the Tier 2 portion of the table.

EO 6. *Tier 2, #2, environment.* As a general guideline, any statements that confirm the project will comply with code, rather than exceed code requirements, should be removed from the Tier 2 table. It is staff’s understanding that the applicant is electing to redevelop under §25-8-25 – Redevelopment Exception in Urban and Suburban Watersheds. Please use the requirements of §25-8-25 rather than the remainder of Chapter 25-8(A) to determine whether the PUD proposal is superior to current code. (Chapter 25-7 and Subchapter 25-8(B) are still applicable.)

Update 4: Comment cleared.

EO 7. *Tier 2, #2, environment.* Please provide the existing square footage of impervious cover within the CWQZ and 150’ CEF buffers, the square footage of impervious cover proposed to be removed, the square footage of any new non-compliant impervious cover or other development to be located in those areas, and the minimum distance of existing and proposed non-compliant development from the creek and CEF. This analysis should be performed separately for the CWQZ and each CEF setback on each parcel.

Update 4: Please update the exhibits to identify existing and proposed non-compliant development within the CWQZ (including areas that overlap CEF buffers). All of the existing impervious cover is non-compliant, but some of the proposed development may be allowed by code. For example, the pedestrian bridge would be allowed under 25-8-262. Part of the trail running parallel to the creek might comply with 25-8-261(B)(3), but other sections might be non-compliant because they are located within 25 feet of the centerline.

In addition to the exhibits, please prepare a table that includes the following for the CWQZ and each CEF buffer: square footage of existing non-compliant development; existing minimum distance from the feature; square footage of proposed non-compliant development; and proposed minimum distance from the feature. Please coordinate with PARD staff to determine if any other non-compliant park amenities (e.g., picnic table pads, etc.) will need to be located within the CWQZ or CEF buffers. If so, include that square footage in the calculation of proposed non-compliant development.

RESPONSE: An updated exhibit has been provided with this Update. Noteworthy, all of the trails, with the exception of the pedestrian connection and bridge that crosses the unnamed creek, have been removed per discussions with PARD. PARD will implement nature trails within the Creek Park at a later date after evaluating appropriate use and location. An allocation for impervious cover within the Creek Park has been provided, so PARD can determine at a later date what type of amenities (such as picnic tables) might be appropriate.

EO 8. *Tier 2, #2, environment.* Please provide additional information about the proposed restoration in the CWQZ and CEF buffers. Staff suggests the following draft language: The PUD shall restore the critical water quality zone and CEF buffer areas identified in Exhibit H, Creek Plan. A restoration plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval and implemented with each site plan for Parcels 2, 3, 4, and 5. The restoration plan shall include planting and seeding pursuant to Standard Specification 609S and must demonstrate that the following parameters of Appendix X “Scoring: Zone 2 – Critical Water Quality Zone” shall be raised to “Good (3)” or “Excellent (4)” condition: Gap Frequency, Soil Compaction, Structural Diversity, and Tree Demography.

Per the above language, Exhibit H should show all areas within the CWQZ and 150’ CEF setbacks where existing impervious cover will be removed and restoration will be performed.

Update 4: I understand the intent of the changes, but the proposed language is not acceptable. Staff suggests the following revised language, which would apply to CWQZ/floodplain and upland CEF buffer areas:

“The PUD shall restore the critical water quality zone and CEF buffer areas identified in Exhibit H, Creek Plan. A restoration plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval and implemented with each site plan for Parcels 2, 3, 4, and 5. The restoration plan shall include planting and seeding pursuant to Standard Specification 609S and must demonstrate that revegetation is adequate to achieve a score of “Good (3)” at maturity for the following parameters of Appendix X “Scoring: Zone 1 – Floodplain Health”: Gap Frequency, Soil Compaction, Structural Diversity, and Tree Demography. The identified Zone 1 parameters shall apply to all restored areas within the CWQZ and CEF buffers. The restoration plan may accommodate a trail or other permitted park improvements, if the location of the improvements has been identified at the time of site plan submittal.”

(Note that the parameters are the same as previously requested, but staff decided Zone 1 is a more appropriate reference.) Staff requests that all restoration areas identified in Exhibit

H meet the four identified parameters from Appendix X. Those parameters are appropriate restoration metrics for the CEF buffers/uplands as well as the CWQZ.

As discussed during recent meetings with staff and the Environmental Officer, please update the table to include the commitment to laying back and restoring the western creek bank. Include a drawing showing a conceptual cross section, the area of bank to be laid back, how the pedestrian bridge is to be incorporated, revegetation requirements, etc., as well as text in the Tier 2 table describing the plan with estimated detention volume. Also, include text describing alternative plans in case of subsurface geology preventing maximum lay back area.

RESPONSE: The Creek Plan exhibit has been updated to include the pedestrian path and bridge plan and elevation view and modified language for the restoration of the existing parking areas. For example, the PARD may not identify the location of the trails by the time that the redevelopment occurs on adjacent parcels, therefore, the end of the last sentence will not be included (" . . . if the location of the improvements has been identified at the time of site plan submittal."). Once the Creek Plan area is deeded to the City, PARD may decide to add nature trails and this language could be interpreted as limiting PARD's ability to do so after the City owns the property.

The revised language is as follows:

"Construction within the CWQZ and CEF buffer shall include the removal of existing surface parking lots and restoration of such areas. A restoration plan for each site plan for Parcels 2, 3, 4 and 5 shall be submitted to the City for review and approval if it complies with the following: (i) planting and seeding pursuant to Standard Specification 609S, and (ii) revegetation adequate to achieve a score of "Good (3)" at maturity for the following parameters of Environmental Criteria Manual Appendix X "Scoring: Zone 1 – Floodplain Health": Gap Frequency, Soil Compaction, Structural Diversity, and Tree Demography. The identified Zone 1 parameters shall apply to all restored areas within the CWQZ and CEF buffers. The restoration plan may, at the Owner's option, accommodate a trail or other permitted park improvements. Restoration of existing parking lot areas within the AO Creek Plan, and outside of the CWQZ or CEF buffer, may be planted and seeded pursuant to Standard Specification 609S."

The Tier table and ordinance has been updated to include laying back the Western bank of the unnamed creek. If the subsurface geology prevents maximum lay back, then the owner will pay a greater amount into the RSMP. The expectation is that potentially up to 43,000 cubic feet of detention will be provided as a result of the creek lay back plan.

EO 9. Tier 2, #2, environment. Please note that pedestrian paths and a pedestrian bridge may be allowed in the CWQZ pursuant to §25-8-25, but they do not contribute to environmental superiority. Please remove these references from the environment/drainage section of the superiority table.

Update 4: Comment cleared.

EO 10. *Tier 2, #2, environment.* To determine the proposed reduction in impervious cover, please specify the maximum impervious cover allowed by code for the current zoning districts (on both an aggregate and parcel-by-parcel basis, if applicable).

Update 4: Comment cleared.

EO 11. *Tier 2, #2, environment.* Please provide any known details about the proposed inundation area on Parcel 3 (e.g., that it will be located where impervious cover is removed; whether it will be within the CWQZ or CEF buffers; approximate location, size, depth, etc.). Staff understands that the inundation area will be designed at site plan, but any additional information that can be provided at this time would be useful to include. In order to evaluate the level of superiority provided by the detention area, please provide a comparison of the proposed volume to what the detention requirement would be if the PUD were currently undeveloped.

Update 4: Per recent discussions, update the superiority table and exhibits to remove the detention area on the east bank. Update any related drainage information.

RESPONSE: The 20,000 cubic feet of East bank detention has been removed from the ordinance, exhibits, and tier table, and replaced with participating in the Regional Stormwater Management Program ("RSMP") and paying the calculated fee *as if the entire 31.4 acres (minus the Neighborhood Park) were greenfield* for a total of \$435,993.88. As noted by staff, the owner may deduct the costs associated with laying back a portion of the West side of the unnamed creek bank on Parcels 4 and 5 from the RSMP fee, which is the normal way to recalculate the amount to be paid into the RSMP. However, the owner has agreed not to further reduce the RSMP payment by recalculating the fee to account for the volumetric detention that the owner will be providing; thereby adding to the superiority of the RSMP approach. The expectation is that potentially up to 43,000 cubic feet of detention will be provided as a result of the creek lay back plan.

EO 12. *Tier 2, #2, environment.* Please continue to work with staff to determine whether the proposed tree removal, protection, and mitigation meet code, require a code modification, and/or contribute to environmental superiority.

Update 4: Repeat comment.

RESPONSE: Please see responses to City Arborist Comments herein - CA#1 - #9.

Exhibit C, Land Use Plan

EO 13. As noted in EO 3, please identify park and open space areas on the land use plan.

Update 4: Comment cleared. Exhibits G and L are sufficient in lieu of identifying park and open space areas on the Land Use Plan.

EO 14. Please identify the standard 150' buffer for all CEFs.

Update 4: Please update the label on the inner buffer for the off-site Spicewood Springs; it looks like it should be 150', not 50'.

RESPONSE: This label has been updated on the ordinance exhibit.

EO 15. The CWQZ, 100-year floodplain, and CEF buffers are difficult to read on this plan. Please revise the symbology to better illustrate the environmental features on the land use plan. Can the Erosion Hazard Zone and Drainage Easements be removed to make the plan easier to read?

Update 4: Under 25-8-92(F), the boundaries of a CWQZ in an urban watershed coincide with the boundaries of the 100-year fully developed floodplain, with a minimum width of 50' and a maximum width of 400'. There are several places where the 100-year fully developed floodplain extends beyond the identified CWQZ. Please correct the CWQZ boundaries to follow the 100-year fully developed floodplain in areas where the floodplain width is between 50' and 400' from the creek centerline. (Maintain a minimum CWQZ width of 50' where the floodplain is narrower than 50' from centerline.)

RESPONSE: The CWQZ boundaries have been corrected.

Exhibit H, Creek Plan

EO 16. Please identify the standard 150' buffers for all CEFs.

Update 4: Comment cleared.

EO 17. As noted in EO [15], the boundaries on this exhibit are difficult to read. Please revise the symbology to better illustrate the environmental features and restoration areas, and remove any information that is not necessary for PUD review (e.g., EHZ, drainage easements, etc.).

Update 4: There are several places where the 100-year fully developed floodplain extends beyond the identified CWQZ. Please correct the CWQZ boundaries to follow the 100-year fully developed floodplain in areas where the floodplain width is between 50' and 400' from the creek centerline. (Maintain a minimum CWQZ width of 50' where the floodplain is narrower than 50' from centerline.)

RESPONSE: The CWQZ boundaries have been corrected.

EO 18. Please delete notes 1, 2, and 5, and delete or revise notes 3, 4, and 6 to reflect requested changes to the superiority table. All significant elements of the PUD proposal should be included in either the superiority table or a code modification table. Notes on the exhibit can repeat, reference, or add details to those proposals, but the exhibit notes should not be the only source of this information.

Update 4: Update the restoration language in Note 2 to match the staff suggestion above. Please add a note specifying that the proposed pedestrian bridge must span the erosion hazard zone with one set of support piers within the creek channel if necessary.

Note 2 and the restoration language suggested above only apply to areas within the CWQZ and CEF buffer. There are some areas where impervious cover will be removed that are outside of the CWQZ and CEF buffer. Staff suggests specifying that areas outside of the CWQZ and CEF buffer will be planted and seeded pursuant to Standard Specification 609S, but that those areas do not need to achieve a score of "Good" under the floodplain modification parameters.

RESPONSE: The note has been updated.

Exhibit J, Tree Plan

EO 19. This exhibit is hard to read. If the purpose is to designate every tree as either preserved or removed, it might be useful to incorporate color (e.g., green and red) into the plan, and add a detailed table with tree number, species, size, and proposal (preserved, removed, relocated).

Update 4: Comment cleared

Applicant's Draft Ordinance

EO 20. As a general guideline, all of the environmental and drainage information in the applicant's draft ordinance should be included in the superiority table, code modification table (if necessary), and/or exhibits. The applicant's draft ordinance should not be the sole source of information about specific PUD proposals.

Update 4: Comment cleared.

EO 21. Please create a code modification table that includes any proposed changes to existing code. It is difficult to identify and understand all of the proposed code modifications from reading the draft ordinance (e.g., Exhibit F contains code modifications but does not always specify current requirements). If the applicant is proposing to use the redevelopment exception, then the only proposed code modifications to Subchapter 25-8(A) should be to §25-8-25. Please delete the proposed code modifications to §25-8-281 and -372 in Part 12 items 1, 2, and 3.

Update 4: Repeat comment; please work with staff to clarify all proposed environmental code modifications, including the following:

- **Any standards that will be calculated over the entire PUD;**
- **Any current code requirements that the PUD will memorialize; and**
- **Any modifications to current standards.**

RESPONSE: A list has been provided with this Update.

EO 22. *Part 5, I, J.* Please revise the description of the Creek land use classification to clarify that it does not supersede or change the requirements for development within a CWQZ or CEF buffer established in §25-8-261, §25-8-281, and §25-8-282. Also, the reference to Parcel 1 may need to be removed; Exhibit H does not identify any Creek land use on Parcel 1.

Update 4: Comment cleared. Staff will evaluate any proposed code modifications to ensure that the Creek land use classification does not supersede the requirements for development within a CWQZ or CEF buffer.

EO 23. *Part 8, 2.* Please clarify that the Creek land use classification and Exhibit H do not supersede or change the requirements for development within a CWQZ or CEF buffer. Any modifications to Subchapter 25-8(A) should be to §25-8-25 and should be explicitly listed in a code modification table.

Update 4: Comment cleared. Staff will evaluate any proposed code modifications to ensure that the Creek land use classification does not supersede the requirements for development within a CWQZ or CEF buffer.

EO 24. *Part 8, 7.* Please clarify that the Creek land use classification and Exhibit H do not supersede or change the requirements for development within a CWQZ or CEF buffer. Any

modifications to Subchapter 25-8(A) should be to §25-8-25 and should be explicitly listed in a code modifications table.

Update 4: Comment cleared. Staff will evaluate any proposed code modifications to ensure that the Creek land use classification does not supersede the requirements for development within a CWQZ or CEF buffer.

EO 25. *Part 9, 2 and 3.* Please delete; these code modifications are not necessary if the PUD is electing to redevelop under §25-8-25.

Update 4: Please work with staff to clarify all proposed environmental code modifications, as requested above. Staff will review the proposed modifications once the request has been clarified.

RESPONSE: A list has been provided with this Update.

EO 26. *Part 9, 4.* Please continue to work with staff to determine whether the proposed tree removal, protection, and mitigation meet code, require a code modification, and/or contribute to environmental superiority.

Update 4: Repeat comment.

RESPONSE: Please see responses to City Arborist Comments herein - CA#1 - #9.

EO 27. *Part 9, 5.* Please delete or propose a specific code modification to §25-8-25.

Update 4: Please work with staff to clarify all proposed environmental code modifications, as requested above. Staff will review the proposed modifications once the request has been clarified. Staff does not agree with the statement that 25-8-25(B)(1) and (3) shall not apply to the PUD; the applicant may request a code modification to allow those requirements to be calculated across the entire PUD.

RESPONSE: A list has been provided with this Update.

EO 28. *Part 9, 6.* Please delete the first sentence; it is not necessary to restate code requirements.

Update 4: Please work with staff to clarify all proposed environmental code modifications, as requested above. Staff will review the proposed modifications once the request has been clarified.

RESPONSE: A list has been provided with this Update.

EO 29. *Exhibit D, D.* Please revise to clarify that the Creek “development” consists of the restoration and open space development allowed by code and specified in the superiority table and Exhibit H.

Update 4: Will the developer construct the trail and pedestrian bridge in addition to performing the restoration?

RESPONSE: Yes, prior to deeding the property to the City, as set forth on the AO Creek Plan, the owner will construct the pedestrian trail and bridge in addition to performing the restoration described in this update.

EO 30. *Exhibit F, 4.* Please delete; this code modification is not necessary if the PUD is electing to redevelop under §25-8-25.

Update 4: Please work with staff to clarify all proposed environmental code modifications, as requested above. Staff will review the proposed modifications once the request has been clarified.

RESPONSE: A list has been provided with this Update.

EO 31. *Exhibit F, 7.* Please delete; this code modification is not necessary if the PUD is electing to redevelop under §25-8-25.

Update 4: Comment cleared.

EO 32. *Exhibit F, 9.* Please delete; an ERI and Hydrogeologic Report will be required with each site plan.

Update 4: Comment cleared.

EO 33. *Exhibit F, 11.* This is a code modification to the landscaping requirements. Tier 1 requires PUDs to exceed landscaping requirements. Any code modifications to §25-2-1008(A) must be offset by additional landscaping superiority in order to meet the Tier 1 requirements.

Update 4: The proposed landscape superiority elements are not adequate to exceed landscaping requirements as required under Tier 1, especially given the requested code modifications.

RESPONSE: Please see response to EO2 above.

Exhibit G, AO Park Plan and Park Space

EO 34. The Parkland Dedication Summary table allocates 14,000 square feet of impervious cover for the Creek Park. Is this number intended to include the trail? If the trail is public it will not count towards the impervious cover limit; however, the square footage of noncompliant development does need to be calculated and incorporated into the PUD. Please clarify whether the 14,000 square feet includes the trail and if so, provide the estimated size of the trail. Any requested park development that would not comply with CWQZ or CEF buffer requirements should be subtracted from the proposed restoration area. See comment EO 7.

RESPONSE: Based on feedback from PARD, the parkland dedication summary table has been updated. Because nature trails do not count as impervious cover, the amount of impervious cover allowance for PARD within the Creek Park has been reduced to only 1,500 square feet. At the time PARD decides whether it needs to utilize any of this impervious cover, the City Environmental staff can coordinate with them, since the land will belong to the City.

WPD Drainage & Water Quality Engineering Review – Reem Zoun - 512-974-3354

1. Please provide a drainage report with relevant hydrologic and hydraulic analyses showing the proposed detention pond with a volume at least 20,000CF in addition to the existing detention pond on-site (Kroger Pond); the existing and proposed drainage plan for the site; and no adverse impact downstream for 2yr, 10yr, 25yr and 100 yr storm events.

RESPONSE: Owner has agreed to lay back a portion of the West side of the unnamed creek bank on Parcels 4 and 5, which will create volumetric flood detention. Please See full response at EO5, subparagraph d.

2. Please provide hydrologic analysis to show the required detention pond size for the Austin Oaks site treating the site as green field development and hydraulic analysis to show the impact of such detention volume downstream. Please document this in the drainage report.

RESPONSE: This has previously been provided with Update 4.

3. Consider providing additional detention volume at the water quality pond location.

RESPONSE: As previously noted, the water quality ponds are required to contain a substantial volume, in this case typically 1.1-1.3 inches of runoff which will have a substantial effect on the 2-year event. It will be impractical in this case to provide a meaningful amount of stacked detention in addition to the WQ volume. Moreover, the owner has now agreed to participate in the RSMP. Please see full response at EO5, subparagraph d.

4. Consider providing detention volume by sloping the banks outward from existing channel.

RESPONSE: Owner has agreed to lay back a portion of the West side of the unnamed creek bank on Parcels 4 and 5, which will create volumetric flood detention. Please see full response at EO5, subparagraph d.

Hydro Geologist Review - Sylvia R. Pope, P.G. - 512-974-3429

Please note: Update 3 is considered a new plan due to the change in design and applicant's consultants. Therefore, all comments should be considered new.

Update 4. Submitted 7/13/2016

HG 1. There are two geological Critical Environmental Features on Parcel 2 at the southeastern corner of Wood Hollow Drive and Executive Center Drive. These are a canyon rimrock and a seep that is within the canyon rimrock. Their locations are shown on the PUD plan sheets, Exhibits C, H and K. Critical Environmental Feature (CEF) buffers of 50 feet are shown for future reference within this redevelopment. An existing parking lot upslope of the CEFs will be removed within 50 feet of the CEFs. This action may be viewed favorably and contribute to an element of environmental benefit as part of the redevelopment under Chapter 25-8-25. However, additional specific restoration details need to be provided in order for staff to support the proposed restoration as a Tier 2 component.

U4. Applicant responded by saying that the restoration details have been included in the Ordinance. There is a note on Exhibit H that the CWQZ and CEF 50' buffers will be restored per a restoration plan submitted with the site plans for Parcels 2, 3, 4 and 5. The restoration plan shall include planting and seeding pursuant to Standard Specification 609S. This meets current Code and Criteria Manual requirements and may be counted as a Tier 1 component. *Comment cleared.*

HG 2. There is an offsite spring located to the north of Parcel 7 and north of Spicewood Springs Road. Exhibit K of the Land Use Plan shows a 300-foot radius buffer from the spring and the legend states that the area will be limited to 50% impervious cover. However, this pledged restriction is not repeated in the Tier 1 & Tier 2 compliance table. Please add specific restrictions to the Tier 1 & Tier 2 compliance table.

U4. Applicant responded that the Tier Table has been revised. Tier II, item 2. Environment/Drainage, Page 9 of the table states that the area will be limited to 50% impervious cover within 300 feet of the spring. Please provide a tally of the existing impervious cover within this area for comparison. *Comment pending.*

RESPONSE: By limiting the impervious cover within 300' of the springs, the proposed redevelopment will reduce impervious cover within the 300' POS Buffer by 18%. Currently, there is 1.12 acres of impervious cover in this area and by imposing the 50% limitation, the impervious cover cannot exceed .82 acres. The total area within 300 feet of the spring that is contained on the Property is 1.64 acres. We have not calculated the impervious cover on other portions of the 300' buffer, which includes several homes within the neighborhood across Spicewood Springs Road beyond the Subject Property.

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. Although not required under the Redevelopment Exception (LDC 25-8-25), the recommendation is that the PUD agreement should comply with the City of Austin's Void and Water Flow Mitigation Rule (LDC 25-8-281 (D), ECM 1.12.0 and COA Item No. 658S of the SSM). This is a standard provision for development over the recharge zone and would demonstrate a commitment to protection of groundwater resources.

- U4. The applicant responded that they will consider this at the time of site plan. The net effect will be compliance due to the requirement of LDC 25-8-25 (B)(5) that the redevelopment does not increase non-compliance with LDC 25-8-281. ***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 whether any underground parking structures or excavation greater than 8 feet is proposed on Parcels 7, 8, 9 and 10.
- U4. Applicant responded that this matter will be considered at the time of site plan. The owner expects some excavation greater than 8 feet below structures and will conduct appropriate geotechnical investigations at the time of design. This response reflects a desire to meet the minimum Code requirements. ***Comment cleared.***
- HG 5. A proposed pedestrian trail along the creek is alluded to within the documentation. Please provide additional specific alignment for Parcel 2 and how this will be incorporated into the standard protection for the CEFs. Please evaluate how the area of impervious cover removed and restored contrasts with the area restored within 150 feet of CEFs. Please incorporate proposed measures into the Tier 1 & Tier 2 Compliance table, especially on Item 6.
- U4. The applicant provided an exhibit comparing existing impervious cover within 150-feet of CEFs to the proposed land use within the 150-foot radius of the CEFs. Overall, impervious cover will reduce from approximately 1.98 acres to approximately 0.95 acres. The pedestrian trail is shown within the 150-foot radius of the CEFs but only as a tentative location. Future trail construction will be determined at a later time and will be constructed by PARD. ***Comment cleared.***
- HG 6. The Tier 1 & Tier 2 Compliance table lists in Item 2 of the Tier 2 section several elements of the project that warrant an “environmentally superior” rating. Please provide specific detail in the Land Use plans and Exhibits to the PUD to support that the project is superior in terms of Critical Environmental Feature protection and restoration.
- U4. Applicant responded that the Tier Table has been updated and the Ordinance revised. ***Comment pending.***

RESPONSE: Please see WPD Environmental Office Review comments and responses. An updated approach has been selected, whereby the West side of the unnamed creek bank on Parcels 4 and 5 will be laid back to provide volumetric flood detention and a restoration plan has been recommended following Appendix X of the Environmental Criteria Manual - both of these suggestions have been incorporated into the redevelopment plan.

HG 7. The PUD ordinance, Part 12, specifically excludes LDC sections 25-8-281(C)(1)(a) and 25-8-281(C)(2) of the Critical Environmental Feature provisions. Please strike numbers 2 and 3 from this section.

U4. Applicant responded that the Ordinance was revised. *Comment cleared.*

HG 8. Additional comments may be generated with future updates.

Wetlands Biologist Review - Andrew Clamann - 512-974-2694

The remaining comments (WB3 and 4) may be addressed by laying back the bank to adequately reduce storm velocities by restoring a more natural stream cross section and restore/revegetate a functional riparian zone as discussed on site July 13, 2016.

WB1. Comment cleared (wetland CEFs shown as described in ERI)

WB2. Comment Cleared. Applicant intends to pursue requesting using the redevelopment exemption, and has shown and labeled the full 150ft Standard CEF setback

WB5. Update 4. Comment Cleared. (Provision 7 of Exhibit F related to exemption to wetland protection) was deleted as requested.

WB3. Update 0. 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. 5/18/2015: 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.

Update 3. 5/11/2015: The notes provide in Exhibit H and language in the PUD does not convey the intent for restoration as discussed in previous meetings (see WB4). As requested in previous updates, please provide clear language to convey the intent for CEF setback restoration (see WB4).

Update 4 7/21/2016. Repeat Comment. To demonstrate superiority and demonstrate compliance with mitigation for disturbance within the 150 CEF setback, previous discussions with applicant have included restoration of bank slopes to a more natural creek cross section to reduce storm velocities and improve the riparian function of the creek. The notes in the Exhibits and language in the PUD does not convey the intent for restoration as discussed in previous meetings (see WB4) and as discussed on-site July 13, 2016. As requested in previous updates, please provide clear language to convey the intent for restoration activities of the creek bank (same as WB4).

RESPONSE: The Owner has agreed to lay back a portion of the West side of the unnamed creek bank on Parcels 4 and 5. Please see responses to WPD Environmental Office Review Comments, including EO8 which includes a restoration plan that will be utilized.

WB4. Update 0. 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. 5/18/2015: 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. (7/1/2016): The notes provide in Exhibit H and language in the PUD does not convey the intent for restoration as discussed in previous meetings (see Update 0,1,2). As requested in previous updates, and as discussed in previous meetings, please provide clear language to convey the intent for CEF setback restoration, as described above, to include restoring a wider cross section to the channel by laying back one or both of the banks and installing native revegetation. Revegetation is recommended to accomplish a score of “Good” in accordance with the Functional Assessment described in Zone 1 Appendix F.

If applicant intends to pursue requesting using the redevelopment exemption, then it will be imperative to provide superiority. An element of superiority may include the restoration of a wider cross section to the channel by laying back one or both of the banks and installing native revegetation. Revegetation is recommended to accomplish a score of “Good” in accordance with the Functional Assessment described in Zone 1 Appendix F.

Update 4 7/21/2016. Repeat Comment. (same comment as WB3) To demonstrate superiority and demonstrate compliance with mitigation for disturbance within the 150 CEF setback, previous discussions with applicant have included restoration of bank slopes to a more natural creek cross section to reduce storm velocities and improve the riparian function of the creek. The notes in the Exhibits and language in the PUD does not convey the intent for restoration as discussed in previous meetings (see WB4) and as discussed on-site July 13, 2016. As requested in previous updates, please provide clear language to convey the intent for restoration activities of the creek bank (same as WB3).

RESPONSE: The Owner has agreed to lay back a portion of the West side of the unnamed creek bank on Parcels 4 and 5. Please see responses to WPD Environmental Office Review Comments, including EO8 which includes a restoration plan that will be utilized.

NPZ Environmental Review - Atha Phillips - 512-974-6303

Update 4

Informal comments have been given to the Environmental Officer.

City Arborist Review - Keith Mars - 512-974-2755

CA #1: Staff does not support the proposed language in Part 9 statement 4. It is unlikely there is such refinement in conceptual site plans that the specific inches of trees to be removed is known. If submitted plans differ, and removal is greater, then the PUD would grant less mitigation than what is actually proposed on the site plan.

Update #1: Comment cleared. Statement has been removed from the proposed ordinance.

CA #2: Part 9 statement 4: Planting mitigation inches “to the extent feasible” shall be amended to “to the extent feasible as determined by staff”.

Update #1: Comment was addressed by applicant and modified in the proposed ordinance.

CA #3: Part 9 statement 4: Staff does not agree with the statement that mitigation can be transferred within the PUD as transferring requirements between site plans present tracking and owner/developer concurrence issues.

Update #1: Comment cleared. Statement has been removed from the proposed ordinance.

CA #4: Part 9 statement 4: Remove the statement regarding mitigation at \$200 inch. Mitigation payment, if allowed, will be subject to the rate at site plan submittal.

Update #1: Comment cleared. Statement has been removed from the proposed ordinance.

CA #5: Part 9 statement 4: Remove the statement regarding credits as this is not clear nor enforceable.

Update #1: Proposed ordinance language has been amended to reflect alternative mitigation per ECM Section 3.5.0.

CA #6: Part 9 statement 4: Staff does not agree with setting the tree survey date as 2013. Per the ECM surveys must be five years or more recent at the time of site plan submittal.

Update #1: Staff concurs with the timeline for the tree survey.

CA #7: Part 9 statement 4: Staff does not agree with the statement that, “no additional mitigation will be required and no other trees will be identified as protected or heritage trees”.

Update #1: Comment cleared. Statement has been removed from the proposed ordinance

CA #8: On the Tier 1 and Tier 2 document I do not see any documentation that supports the statement that more than 7,000 inches of trees less than 8” will be preserved.

Update #1: Comment partially addressed. Tier II is partially met.

Tier II

Protect all heritage - The table needs to state “met as modified”. Include the % of heritage proposed to be protected and removed.

Protect 75% of protected - Between protected and heritage trees, it appears greater than 75% are preserved. But, as discussed, were you able to identify the additional protected trees/inches to achieve 75% or greater of Protected Trees?

Protect 75% of all native inches - Please identify the size range on the “diameter inches of unprotected trees in undisturbed areas” tree sampling so we can modify this to state 75% of all native inches (insert inches) and greater.

RESPONSE: The Tier 2 table has been updated. It is correct that the redevelopment is preserving more than 75% of both the protected and heritage trees combined. In order to preserve 75% of the protected trees, an additional 132 caliper inches would have to be relocated at considerable cost. As part of this overall package, the owner has now agreed to participate in the RSMP, laying back the West side of the creek bank, and restore significant areas within the CWQZ and CEF buffers according to Appendix X; these additional requests from environmental staff are meaningful and expensive. Please see responses to WPD Environmental Office Review Comments herein. The smallest trees that were measured by Bartlett Tree company were 1 caliper inch.

In addition, Exhibit J (Tree Plan) has been updated to reflect that trees outside the subject Property were inadvertently included in Exhibit J and on the tree survey schedule (which has also been updated and resubmitted with this update). The owner does not have control over the trees that are not on the subject Property; these are trees in the right-of-way along Spicewood Springs Road and MoPac.

CA #9: Provide the tree survey including species and diameter and include the tree assessment.

Update #1: Comment cleared.

NPZ Drainage Engineering Review - Danielle Guevara - 512-974-3011

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.

DE1. Please provide a complete Tier 1 and Tier 2 table for review. Tier 1 should speak to how the project is meeting current code and asking for variances when it does not meet the

requirements of current code. Tier 2 should speak to how the project will go above and beyond current code.

UPDATE #1: Based on review of the Tier 1 and 2 table provided:

- You stated 'Yes' to volumetric detention. However you are not providing designed volumetric detention. Please change to 'No'
- You stated 'Yes' to no modifications to the existing floodplain; However the proposed pond is in the floodplain and if one of the banks is being asked to be pulled back. FYI – any modifications in a FEMA floodplain may require a LOMR.

RESPONSE: It is unclear to the owner as to the City's definition of volumetric detention as referenced here. The Owner has agreed to lay back a portion of the West side of the unnamed creek bank on Parcels 4 and 5, which will create a yet to be determined volume of flood detention. The total amount of flood detention is unknown and depends on whether the firmly situated rock that lies beneath the surface deposits of soil, alluvium, rock fragments and fill can be readily removed without breaking the rock by blasting, air tool (hoe ram or jackhammer) or other destructive mechanical means. Therefore, the response will remain "Yes." Because the owner has agreed to lay back a portion of the West side of the unnamed creek bank to create detention, the owner has eliminated the 20,000 cubic feet of detention on the East bank that would have been within the area dedicated as parkland on Parcel 3 and, therefore, no modification of the floodplain will occur as a result on Parcel 3. This creek enhancement to increase detention volume coupled with participation in RSMP also qualifies as creative/innovative measures to provide environmental protection.

DE2. Exhibit F – Please remove item #8. Any drainage studies required will be reviewed at the appropriate review process based on what is being proposed. Please also remove the statement regarding drainage studies from item #9.

UPDATE #1: The requirement for additional drainage studies will be determined at the site plan stage per parcel. Typically, the need for onsite detention is determined at the site plan stage per parcel. For this PUD, we request demonstrating you have proposed as much onsite detention as possible. We also request Regional Stormwater Management Participation with a fee calculated based on greenfield conditions. You would receive credit for the onsite detention provided. This is in-line with what is proposed with Code Next for redeveloped properties and is recommended by staff.

RESPONSE: Owner has agreed to participate in the Regional Stormwater Management Program ("RSMP") and pay the calculated fee as if the entire 31.4 acres (minus the Neighborhood Park) were greenfield for a total of \$435,993.88. As noted by staff, the owner may deduct the costs associated with laying back a portion of the West side of the unnamed creek bank on Parcels 4 and 5 from the RSMP fee, which is the normal way to recalculate the amount to be paid into the RSMP. However, the owner has agreed not to further reduce the RSMP payment by recalculating the fee to account for the volumetric detention that the owner will be providing; thereby adding to the superiority of the RSMP approach. The expectation is that potentially up to 43,000 cubic feet of detention will be

provided as a result of the creek lay back plan. The revised ordinance states that drainage studies may be done for a site development permit or building permit within the PUD Property.

DE3. Part 9 – please remove item #6. The requirement for detention will be reviewed at each parcel's site plan review. Factors in addition to impervious cover amount are reviewed when determining detention requirement.

UPDATE #1: Please see comment DE2 above.

DE4 – DE5 Cleared.

NPZ Water Quality Review - Danielle Guevara - 512-974-3011

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.

WQ1. Please provide a complete Tier 1 and Tier 2 table for review. Tier 1 should speak to how the project is meeting current code and asking for variances when it does not meet the requirements of current code. Tier 2 should speak to how the project will go above and beyond current code. Providing water quality controls and an IPM plan are listed as superior, however these are items required by Code/Criteria and would not be considered superior.

UPDATE #1: Based on review of the Tier 1 and 2 table provided:

- **Under the Tier 2 items, you still have included a statement regarding this project providing water quality treatment. Please remove this from the Tier 2 table as this would be a requirement per current code – it is not a Tier 2 item.**

RESPONSE: Please see similar WPD Environmental Office Review comments and responses. An updated Tier table has been submitted.

WQ2 Cleared.

WQ3. EHZ Analysis – Please provide an EHZ analysis that complies with the Drainage Criteria Manual, Appendix E. At a minimum, the channel geometry, side slope, incision factor, and 2-year WSE should be provided.

UPDATE #1: I suggest handling the EHZ analysis review at the site plan stage per parcel. Otherwise, the current analysis will need to be reviewed by our Streambank Restoration group of Watershed Protection since you are using an alternative method of analysis. Please let me know how you would like to proceed.

RESPONSE: The owner will submit an updated Erosion Hazard Zone Report using the City's approach to supplement the detailed report previously submitted.

WQ4 – WQ5 Cleared.

WQ6. Exhibit D – the IPM plan should be done at the site plan stage for each parcel as it should be specific to what is being proposed with that particular site plan.

UPDATE #1: Please remove this from the Tier 2 items in the table provided.

WQ7 Cleared.

NPZ Site Plan Review - Donna Galati - 512-974-2733

SP 1. –SP 3. Cleared.

SP 4. Ensure that there are no building locations or shapes on the land use plan.

Update #1: Comment can be cleared by PAZ and Law Dept.

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

No Comments.

NPZ Transportation Review - Bryan Golden - 512-974-3124

TIER I REQUIREMENTS (Division 5. Planned Unit Developments)

TR1. **Requirement #7:** If on-street parallel parking is provided, accessible parking should also be provided. Required spaces shall be considered cumulatively for the block face, per side, based on the number of provided on-street spaces (LDC 25-6-475)

U1: Comment cleared.

TR2. **Requirement #9:** Bike and Trails will review PUD and may provide additional recommendations. The “Heritage Trail” needs to be within a dedicated public easement to ensure access.

- Provide a mid-block pedestrian and bicycle pathway within a public easement between Parcel 8 and Parcel 7 connecting Executive Center Drive and Spicewood Springs (Min 8’ width). Specific location to be determined at time of site plan.

U1: Please revise Streetscape Plan, Note #2 to read “with specific location subject to owner discretion.”

RESPONSE: This revision has been made.

- 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 the results of these consults.

U1: Comment cleared.

- Additional comments pending final recommendations of the TIA.

U1: Comments pending.

TR3. On-street parking will be determined on a per project basis at site plan review. Propose a master parking tracking table to keep associated with the PUD, to be updated with each site plan.

U1: Comment cleared.

TR4. **Additional Requirements for Mixed-Use: Requirement #1.)** The proposed cross section of Wood Hollow Drive does not meet the minimum standard requirements of 25-2, Subchapter E. Planting zones should be 7’ minimum. Minimum requirements of Core Transit Corridor standards required for mixed-use projects within the Urban Roadway boundary (with trees 30’ on center where possible).

U1: Add a note that trees 30’ on center required, where feasible. Please note that an additional 2’ from the edge of the existing sidewalks is needed for maintenance. An easement, if necessary, may be established at the time of site plan or included as a note in these cross sections. Re: the west side of Wood Hollow, a note may be added: *Due to topography constraints, planting zone may be reduced to 6’ where necessary, otherwise 7’ required.

RESPONSE: A note concerning tree spacing has been added to the Streetscape Exhibit. The owner understands that a sidewalk easement may be necessary at the time of site plan. A note has been added concerning the width of the planting zone.

TR5. **Additional Requirements for Mixed-Use: Requirement #2** (Additional PUD Mixed Use requirements: This proposal is within the urban roadway boundary, therefore all sidewalks must comply with Core Transit Corridors: Sidewalks and Building Placement; Section 2.2.2, Subchapter E, Chapter 25-2 (2.2.2(B)) Due to existing site constraints, please explore alternatives for the required Core Transit Corridor standard for the southern edge of Spicewood Springs. Please note that sidewalks along Mopac will require TxDOT approval.

U1: Due to topographic and CEF constraints, AEC was considered. The provision of a public easement between Spicewood Springs and Executive Center Drive (on Parcel 7 or 8) satisfies this requirement. Comment cleared.

TR6. **Additional Requirements for Mixed-Use: Requirement #2.)** Internal and abutting (Hart and Spicewood Springs) roadways must meet Subchapter E, Core Transit Corridor requirements. To comply:

- Executive Center Drive – Min. 6’ sidewalks requirement. Must provide public access/sidewalk easement for “Heritage Trail” and street trees are required in the planting zone at no greater than 30’ on center, where possible.

U1: Note that a sidewalk easement may be required on the south side of Executive Center Drive.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

- Wood Hollow - Min. 6’ sidewalks requirement. Must provide public access/sidewalk easement where the sidewalk enters private property and street trees are required in the planting zone at no greater than 30’ on center, where possible.

U1: Add a note that trees 30’ on center required, where feasible.

Please note that an additional 2’ from the edge of the existing sidewalks is needed for maintenance. An easement, if necessary, may be established at the time of site plan or included as a note in these cross sections.

A Hart Lane streetscape plan is recommended. Please include a streetscape cross section or include a note on the Streetscape Plan that Hart Lane is subject to Subchapter E Core Transit Corridor standards.

RESPONSE: A note concerning tree spacing has been added to the Streetscape Exhibit. The owner understands that a sidewalk easement may be necessary at the time of site plan. A new streetscape cross section for Hart Lane has been added to reflect a planting zone and clear zone on Parcel 10; with the sidewalk winding behind the trees since strict compliance with Subchapter E would require the removal of trees. On Parcel 8, the steep topography and grade cut associated with Hart Lane does not permit the application of Subchapter E and, therefore, the sidewalk will have to remain to provide connectivity to Spicewood Springs Road.

TIER II REQUIREMENTS

TR7. **4.) Recommend inclusion of secure indoor bicycle parking for MF and Office developments at 10% of required parking.**

U1: Comment cleared.

- Include the “Heritage Trail” approximate location in the Land Use or Park exhibit or a new transportation exhibit. The cross section of Wood Hollow Drive does not meet the minimum standard requirements of 25-2, Subchapter E. Planting zones must be 7’ minimum; please revise. Recommend upgrading min. requirements to Core Transit Corridor standards for roadways.

U1: Add a note that trees 30’ on center required, where feasible. Please note that an additional 2’ from the edge of the existing sidewalks is needed for maintenance. An easement, if necessary, may be established at the time of site plan or included as a note in these cross sections.

RESPONSE: A note concerning tree spacing has been added to the Streetscape Exhibit. The owner understands that a sidewalk easement may be necessary at the time of site plan.

- Additional comment pending TIA final recommendations.

U1: Comment cleared (duplicate of TR 2).

DRAFT ORDINANCE COMMENTS **GENERAL PROVISIONS**

TR8. How will the shared parking be tracked? A reciprocal/off-site parking tracking table is recommended to be amended and tracked with the PUD.

U1: Comment cleared with proposed tracking table.

TR9. Remove “and valet” from the gated roadways/drives note (Exhibit E).

U1: Comment cleared.

TR10. Staff does not support Note #12. Off-street loading and delivery must be off-street. Recommend revising comment to note that off-street loading is permitted to use alternative sizing and number of spaces requirement; to be subject to approval by Staff at the time of site plan.

U1: Using the public right-of-way for maneuvering should be an administrative waiver (currently under the TCM), to be reviewed at the time of site plan. A blanket waiver for all public ROW maneuvering is not supported at the time. All other amendments are supported, however alternate sizing and number of spaces requirement may be permitted “by the Director” at the time of site plan. Please revise the language.

RESPONSE: These revisions to the Ordinance have been made.

TR11. Staff will support note #13 contingent upon it applying *only* to office, residential, and hotel. All other uses shall adhere to standard LDC, 25-6-477.

U1: Comment cleared.

Part 8:

TR12. Recommend combining with Part 11 for a collective “Transportation” section.

U1: Exhibit E: General Provision #2: Surface parking provision for retail conflicts with the structured parking requirement/provision (for retail) within the same note. “Visitor or customer parking” is too vague without limitation. How will surface parking be limited in general? A combined transportation section of draft ordinance is still recommended.

RESPONSE: The sentence states that parking will be provided in structured parking facilities, "provided, surface parking may be provided for" some of the uses and additional persons, such as visitors and customers. These are public streets for public use and public parking and, therefore, no further limitation would be appropriate.

TR13. Note #3: Pending TIA review and TR 4 and TR 22.

U1: Please add, “...and as required by the TIA.”

RESPONSE: This edit has been made to the draft ordinance.

TR14. Note #4: Revise note – “...determined in consultation *and subject to approval* by the Development Services Department...”

U1: Comment cleared.

TR15. Note #6/7: Add that these improvements are to be accessible and open to the public.

U1: Comment cleared.

Part 11:

TR16. Note #1: Revise “shared parking” to “cumulative” or “reciprocal.”

U1: Please include a reference to the provided tracking table under Note #3 (on-street parking). Note #1 comment is cleared.

EXHIBIT C: LAND USE PLAN

TR17. Note the proposed approximate location of the “Heritage Trail.”

U1: Please add the Heritage Trail (approx.) location to the Streetscape Exhibit.

RESPONSE: This has been added to the Streetscape Exhibit.

EXHIBIT I (STREETSCAPE PLAN)

TR18. Pedestrian “Heritage Trail”: Remove current note and add that this is to be within a dedicated public easement if it meanders out of the right-of-way.

U1: *Comment cleared.*

GENERAL ZONING

TR19. FYI - The Austin Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan calls for 140 feet of right-of-way for Spicewood Springs Road, however per the Austin Transportation Department, no additional right of way will be required at this time [LDC, Sec. 25-6-51 and 25-6-55].

U1: *Comment cleared. ATD has indicated that no additional right-of-way will be required at this time.*

TR20. 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]. Comments will be provided in a separate memo.

U1: *Comment cleared.*

TR21. Nadia Barrera, Urban Trails, Public Works Department and Nathan Wilkes, Bicycle Program, Austin Transportation Department may provide additional comments regarding bicycle and pedestrian connectivity per the Council Resolution No. 20130620-056.

U1: *Comments pending. Please email a pdf of the streetscape exhibits to the reviewer to coordinate review with other disciplines.*

RESPONSE: Updated Streetscape exhibits have been submitted with this update.

TR22. Additional comments pending TIA review. Results will be provided via separate memorandum.

TR23. 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 Drive	70'-80'	40'	Collector	Yes	No	Yes
Hart Lane	70'	40'	Collector	Yes	Yes	Yes

NEW COMMENT (EXHIBIT D)

TR24. Note B) #2 and B) #3 – remove these notes and replace with a reference to the phasing that will be established with the TIA final memo.

TR25. Note G) – How will the parking requirement for existing uses be tracked? Recommend adding an existing parking count by parcel to the proposed parking tracking table.

RESPONSE: This has been added and labeled as "Total Spaces #".

TR26. Additional comments may be provided when more complete information is obtained.

Austin Transportation Dept. TIA Review – Scott James 512-974- 2208

TIA still under review.

Public Works Bicycle Program Review – Nathan Wilkes 512-974-7016

Comments pending.

NPZ Austin Water Utility Review - Bradley Barron 512-972-0078

Monday, April 25, 2016

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.

P & ZD Zoning Review – Andrew Moore 512-974-7604

ORDINANCE DOCUMENT

1. Change the title of the ordinance to "Applicant's Draft Ordinance"
Comment cleared.

2. Remove the column numbering in the ordinance document.
Comment cleared.
3. In first paragraph of Ordinance,
 - Change “*PUD*” to Planned Unit Development;
 - Remove ”*PROJECT*” completely;
 - Remove “*COMBINING*” – PUD’s are not combining districts.**Comment cleared.**
4. PART 1 – change the department name from Development Services Department to Planning and Zoning Department.
Comment cleared.
5. PART 2 – Remove the last sentence of this paragraph that refers to grandfathering.
Still in discussion.
6. PART 5, no. 1, definitions for H and K - “*STREETSCAPE*” and “*CREEK*” should not be land use classifications. If the intent is to define these areas only, please remove the reference to a land use classification in the definition.
Still in discussion.
7. PART 7, no. 2 – this is a restatement of current code and is not necessary to state in the PUD ordinance.
Still in discussion.
8. PART 8, no. 4 –
 - Replace “*graphic representations and are not exact.*” with “for illustration purposes only. “
 - Change “*Environmental departments*” with “Watershed Protection Departments.”**Comment cleared.**
9. PART 10, no. 8 – please remove this item. Fee in lieu is no longer an option for affordable housing participation.
Comment cleared.
10. PART 11, no. 3 – this is a restatement of current code and is not necessary to state in the PUD ordinance.
Still in discussion.
11. PART 12 - For each code section to be modified, please be specific about what aspect is being modified and why the modification is needed.
Comment cleared.

12. PART 12 - add Compatibility (LDC 25-2-1062, 1063, 1065) to the list of code modifications and provide the detail requested in comment 11, above.
Comment cleared.
13. PART 12 - add Subchapter E (Design Standards and Mixed Use) and provide the detail requested in comment 11, above.
Comment cleared.
14. PART 12 – add Commercial Sign District Regulations (LDC 25-10-130 / 25-10) and provide detail requested in comment 11, above.
Comment cleared.
15. Label Exhibits C, G, H, I, J, K with the case number at the lower, right-hand corner of the diagram/plan.
Comment cleared.
16. Exhibit C – Provide your calculations for determining development bonuses pursuant to LDC 25-2, Division 5, Subpart B, Section 1.3.3 – Baseline for Determining Development Bonuses.
Comment cleared.
17. Exhibit C – LUP - Provide a legend.
Still in discussion.
18. Exhibit E - Review the proposed permitted use table with Staff.
Still in discussion.
19. Exhibit E - Provide an index defining “N” and “P”.
Comment cleared.
20. Exhibit F – add a column for the maximum number of floors associated with the MSL heights stated for each building type.
Comment cleared.
21. Exhibit F, no. 3 – this is a restatement of current code and is not necessary to state in the PUD ordinance.
Still in discussion.
22. Exhibit F, no. 4 – this is a restatement of current code and is not necessary to state in the PUD ordinance.
Still in discussion.
23. Exhibit F, no.16 - Add this to the list of code modifications in Part 12 of the ordinance and provide specifics about why the modification is being requested.
Comment cleared.

24. Exhibit G – add “Note 1” to Ordinance Part 8, no.1 in addition to keeping the note on the exhibit as well.

Comment cleared.

25. Has Capitol Metro been consulted in the possibility of partnering for transit improvements on-site?

Comment cleared.

<p>NPZ Comprehensive Planning Review – Kathleen Fox 512-974-7877</p>

REVISED REPORT FOR SUBMITTAL #3

Project: Austin Oaks PUD

C814-2014-0120

May 12, 2016

This zoning case is located on a 31.4 acre site located on the south side of Spicewood Springs Road, on both sides of Wood Hollow Drive, and adjacent to Mopac Expressway frontage road, which is to the east. The property is not located within the boundaries of a neighborhood planning area. The site contains an office complex and the developer is proposing a Planned Unit Development mixed use project, which would include commercial and residential elements including office buildings, a hotel, multi-family apartments (including affordable housing units), retail and restaurant uses, a 2 acre park, additional greenspace, and pedestrian walkways, a trail and bike lanes. The buildings on the site would range in height from one to seven stories tall. The tallest buildings would front the Mopac Expressway frontage road, while shorter buildings and the park would be located across the street single family houses, which are located to the west and north. Pedestrian-oriented uses are also proposed on the ground floor of the commercial buildings.

Imagine Austin

This project is located within the boundaries of ‘Neighborhood Center’, as identified on the Imagine Austin’s Growth Concept Map (the Map). The Map illustrates the desired manner to accommodate new residents, jobs, open space, and transportation infrastructure over the next 30 years, and is intended to promote a compact and connected city, infill and redevelopment. Neighborhood Centers are defined as, *“The smallest and least intense of the three mixed-use centers are neighborhood centers. As with the regional and town centers, neighborhood centers are walkable, bikable, and supported by transit. The greatest density of people and activities in neighborhood centers will likely be concentrated on several blocks or around one or two intersections. However, depending on localized conditions, different neighborhood centers can be very different places. If a neighborhood center is designated on an existing commercial area, such as a shopping center or mall, it could represent redevelopment or the addition of housing. A new neighborhood center may be focused on a dense, mixed-use core surrounded by a mix of housing. In other instances, new or redevelopment may occur incrementally and concentrate people and activities along several blocks or around one or two intersections. Neighborhood centers will be more locally focused than either a regional or a town center. Businesses and services—grocery and department stores, doctors and dentists, shops, branch libraries, dry cleaners, hair salons, schools, restaurants, and other small and local businesses—will generally*

serve the center and surrounding neighborhoods. Neighborhood centers range in size between approximately 5,000-10,000 people and 2,500-7,000 jobs.” (pgs. 105 – 106). The area along Mopac and Far West Boulevard is also located within the boundaries of a Neighborhood Center, although that area is larger in area than this proposed project area.

The following IACP policies are also relevant to this case:

- **LUT P1.** Align land use and transportation planning and decision-making to achieve a compact and connected city in line with the growth concept map.
- **LUT P3.** Promote development in compact centers, communities, or along corridors that are connected by roads and transit that are designed to encourage walking and bicycling, and reduce health care, housing and transportation costs.
- **LUT P7.** Encourage infill and redevelopment opportunities that place residential, work, and retail land uses in proximity to each other to maximize walking, bicycling, and transit opportunities.
- **HN P10.** Create complete neighborhoods across Austin that have a mix of housing types and land uses, affordable housing and transportation options, and access to schools, retail, employment, community services, and parks and recreation options.
- **HN P11.** Protect neighborhood character by directing growth to areas of change and ensuring context sensitive infill in such locations as designated redevelopment areas, corridors, and infill sites.

Analysis and Conclusion

The Imagine Austin Growth Concept Map identifies this area as a Neighborhood Center, which supports compact and connected mixed use and infill redevelopment. Reviewing the revised scope of this project, the height and density of submittal Number 3, which was formulated during a charrette process between the developer and neighborhood, appears to be scaled as Neighborhood Center based on the height and proposed density, which appears an appropriate scale along a major highway, as opposed to two previous submittals for this project, which once called for a 17 story building. This project also meets half of the eight Imagine Austin priority programs, which are key policies and actions, which are multiple building blocks grouped together to make it easier to implement the plan. This proposed mixed use project appears to support Priority Program Number 1, [Investing in a compact and connected Austin] by including residential, retail, office, park/recreational within a walkable center. The project also supports Priority Program Number 2 and 4 [#2 Sustainably manager our water resources, and #4 --Use green infrastructure to protect environmentally sensitive areas and integrate nature into the city], by preserving a large number of heritage trees, enhancing the watershed and adding stream restoration, reducing the existing impervious surface coverage, installing a new park and greenspace areas, and landscaping the site with native plants and trees. Finally, by adding affordable housing units (12 units), the project is supported by Priority Program Number 6, [Develop and maintain household affordability throughout Austin.]

Based on the scale of this project, which appears to for a Neighborhood Center (as defined above) located along a major highway; providing a true mixed and walkable project where people can live, work and play (per the Imagine Austin listed policies above); and supporting four of the eight priority programs to implement the policies and vision of Imagine Austin, this project appears to be supported by the plan.

RESPONSE: Thank you for your analysis and comments. In addition to the above-referenced priority programs, given the amount of parkland and open space that will be provided, it appears that the redevelopment plan also meets Priority Program Number 7 [Create a Healthy Austin Program].