



PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD
September 26, 2022 – 6:00 PM
City Hall Chambers, Room 1001
301 W. Second Street, Austin, Texas 78701

Questions and Answers Report

PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD MEMBERS:

Laura Cottam Sajbel (D-9), Chair
Sarah Faust (D-5), Vice-Chair
Nina Rinaldi (D-1)
Anna Di Carlo (D-2)

Patrick Moore (D-3)
Kathryn Flowers (D-4)
Lisa Hugman (D-6)
Nancy Barnard (D-7)

Kim Taylor (D-8)
Dawn Lewis (D-10)
Richard DePalma (Mayor)

Item 3: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding a recommendation to City Council on the Brodie Oaks Planned Unit Development application and whether it is superior with respect to parkland dedication.

Vice Chair Faust

- 1) *Is this development in a park deficient area?*

The development area is currently partially deficient per the PARD Park Deficient Areas Map.

- 2) *Please describe what restrooms that do not require entering a commercial business will be available to users of the public parks. It is not clear from the presentation that restrooms will be available.*

Park restrooms are a planned amenity for the trail overlook park. Exact designs of the park to be finalized at the time of development

- 3) *Please describe precisely the access to the Barton Creek greenbelt that will be available directly from the development.*

There will be a trailhead in the dedicated parkland included as part of the Brodie Oaks development, located adjacent to the existing Barton Creek Greenbelt. A future sustainable, low impact pedestrian and biking trail would connect the proposed redevelopment project to the overall Barton Creek Greenbelt. The trail is to be developed in partnership with PARD, the Hill Country Conservancy, the Austin Parks Foundation, Save Barton Creek Association, and the applicant. There will also be an additional trail along the access road between the existing parkland and Loop 360, providing further access to the park entrance located in the existing commercial center (see #4).

- 4) *It is my understanding that the steep trail from the existing development adjacent to 360 will remain. Can this be shielded from the road by vegetative plantings or otherwise to make it safer and more enjoyable?*

A tree zone is included in the cross section, Park Street A.

- 5) *Overall the application does not demonstrate how the applicant plans to address the significant increase in use to the Barton Creek greenbelt that the development will create. It seems quite likely that the hotel and apartments will feature the greenbelt in its marketing and encourage active use of it. It is unusual that we have a development adjacent to such an ecologically fragile yet overused and under-resourced natural area of parkland as this situation. What are the plans to address trash, dogs, and the other issues we see in this exact area of the greenbelt?*

The restoration of the existing shopping center to its original landscape, as well as improving slopes and drainage for the area, will further protect the existing Greenbelt. The future parks will be designed to include trash receptacles and other trail appurtenances to minimize litter and waste. A separate dog park is planned for the neighborhood park. The future trail will provide better connectivity into the Greenbelt while minimizing any erosion or ecological impact (see #3).

- 6) *Is the applicant proposing any support for interpretive exhibits within the parks and the development regarding the Barton Creek greenbelt and Airmen's Cave. The proposals regarding parks do not indicate a strong intent to increase the community's level of knowledge regarding Barton Creek, its ecological significance and fragility, nor the existence of a unique and significant cave running directly under the development.*

Interpretive signage is one of the planned amenities.

- 7) *Please describe in very specific terms how the parkland dedication includes or does not include any water quality treatment areas, either for rain garden, irrigable area, pond, or otherwise. No credit should be given for parkland for land used for water quality treatment. See Comment 91 and 92 of the PUD application.*

The applicant is allowed a maximum of 6.5 acres of parkland to be used toward stormwater management. A maximum of 2.5 acres may be put toward reirrigation, which must be designed to allow for recreational facilities to receive 50 percent credit. Underground ponds may receive greater credit for allowing full recreational opportunities on the surface. Acreage amount and credit to be finalized at time of site development. Any stormwater infrastructure will need to be designed to allow for recreational use.

- 8) *On Comment 98 of the PUD application, the resolution of the comment seems to state that the 50 parking spaces required to access the parks can be mixed within the various parking for the development. This seems problematic in that in order for families that do not live in the development to access the neighborhood park, the parking cannot be part of a separate shopping or hotel or apartment structure located elsewhere in the development. Further, there is no reference as to what the charge for parking will be. Please provide a response as to how far the parking may be located from the neighborhood park and how any fees for using the parking spaces that are required will be determined.*

Parking for this development is contemplated as one large district, with the reserved parking for parks being the exemption. Parking is intended to provide affordable access to the Greenbelt for those outside the development, and as an addition to the alternative transportation options contemplated (bicycle, public transit). PARD has not proposed any fee for the reserved parking spaces. Exact

location of the parking to be finalized at the time of site development. See Phasing Plan: “The requested 50 parking spaces will be developed at this time as temporary surface lots located outside of the parkland or as structured parking within buildings in Phase I. All parking will be in structured garages by full build-out.” PARD proposes that the spaces be located close to the parkland.

- 9) *Please see attached in reference to my question on stormwater treatment being in parks and explain how the reviewer's comments have been addressed; also how was the not less than 10% grade requirement addressed?*

Slopes over ten percent grade have been minimized to 1.4 acres or less. Acreage of any stormwater infrastructure has been capped (see response #4), and must be designed to accommodate recreation and amenities.

- 10) *Is it accurate that the applicant will not provide a restroom for the neighborhood park?*

A restroom is only contemplated for the overlook trailhead park. As of today, applicant also proposes a planned restroom in the neighborhood park.

- 11) *Please explain whether this application comes under the newly adopted parkland development requirements for commercial/office, and if not, how the proposal compares were it subject to those requirements.*

As written, the PUD would not be exempt from the commercial parkland dedication requirements, which come into effect January 1, 2023. That said, PARD review staff recommend exempting the PUD from these requirements for a certain period, 1 year or more, as the review for the development has been ongoing for two years.

Proposed commercial uses and associated parkland:

- 1,260,000 square feet of office: 3.42 acres of parkland owed, equal to ~\$1.2 million fee in-lieu, ~\$116k in development fee.
- (estimated) 80,000 square feet of hotel: 0.14 acres of parkland owed*, equal to ~\$51k fee in-lieu, ~\$5k in development fee.
- 140,000 square feet of retail and restaurant: 0.34 acres of parkland owed, equal to ~\$124k fee in-lieu, ~\$11k in development fee.

Parkland amount derived from superiority requirement of 10.4 acres per 1,000 people

* in addition the existing requirements associated with hotel rooms per the residential requirements

Commercial requirements would not yield any additional onsite parkland dedication, only additional fees.