


MESA ENGINEERING

ENVIRONMENTALLY CONSCIOUS CIVIL ENGINEERING

8103 Kirkham Drive
Austin, Texas 78736
(512) 799-7998
Fax: (512) 288-1454



Date: September 13, 2009
To: West Park PUD Neighbors
From: Bruce Melton, P.E., Oak Hill, Texas
Re: Implications for Development Buildout, West Park PUD

West Park PUD Application Comments
August 13, 2009
Bruce Melton PE

Overall: This application looks about the same to me as the land owner has been proposing: 38,600 trips per day, almost double the existing 40,000 trips per day on 290 at this location in 2007 as per TxDOT traffic counts. One thing to note is there are numerous contradictions in this proposal. The most damaging to the neighborhoods adjacent is whether or not the applicant intends on persisting with their request of 5 athletic fields. The document states variously, 5 and or 1 athletic field in different places.

History

1993: Original Zoning approved: 209 residential lots - comparable to adjacent uses

2000: Original PUD special considerations approved - 70,000 sf retail, 966 residential

Current PUD proposal: additional special consideration for approximately 900,000 sf retail / commercial (likely exceed 1 million feet with vertical uses) and 480 residential, doubling existing traffic on 290.

1. The applicant repeatedly says that this project is the town center (page 9 and 10). It is very undesirable that this parcel be the town Center. Whether or not the applicant wishes this to become the town center, it will exacerbate the current blight at the "Y". If this project is approved, the "Y" will sink even further into abandonment and disrepair. This current state of blight is caused by excess retail space availability in the area. Within five minutes of the "Y" there are four major retail developments with well over 4 million square feet of space.

The old "Y" facilities are not capable of standing up to the current pressure, much less what it will be with another million square feet in the area. The blight will get worse if these additional special exceptions, on top of the special exceptions ranted in 2000, are approved.

2. #7 and #8, page 10 are for the creation of a fund to acquire environmentally sensitive tracts for some undisclosed reason. This is suspicious. There is no justification for this mitigation fund and the proposal is extremely vague and very poorly worded.

3. Their water quality treatment regime will not meet SOS requirements as described and in fact be far from meeting SOS requirements. A previous analysis that I performed shows that it would be physically impossible to meet SOS requirements with 38%+ impervious cover.

4. The applicant claims there are no critical environmental features on the site. This is incorrect. There is a series of ledgerocks, that the City does indeed classify as "critical environmental features" in the northeastern portion of the property. They are not planning much development in this area, but the setbacks are 200 feet. This could impact their plans, and it represents a significant error in the application.

5. Twenty variances are being requested.
 - 1 & 2. Cut / fill greater than 4 feet (big one)
 3. Waive net site area requirement and calculate impervious cover based on gross site area. This is highly unusual. This means that the 38.5% requested impervious cover is conservative. The actual site impervious cover is likely greater by at least four or five percent. They do not provide slope information from which I can derive net site area and they have not , as per the reviewing engineer at the City, provided a standard slope map, as required by city criteria, so that these calculations can be confirmed.
 4. This CEF (critical environmental feature) waiver directly contradicts a statement early in the application that says there are no CEFs on the property.
 5. They ask for a waiver to modify the Water Quality Transition Zone, based on a waiver to allow gross site impervious cover to be used for IC calcs instead of Net Site area. (this is a double variance - it is like a triple word bonus square in scrabble... Add another several percentage points of impervious cover).
 6. The statement about this creek channel being modified, as far as I understand is not accurate. This channel is in its natural state.
 - 7, 8 more variances for construction on steep slopes otherwise prohibited.
 9. This is the SOS variance for greater than 25% IC.
 10. **IMPORTANT:** This variance is very poorly written, but it appears that they are proposing offsite mitigation for not meeting SOS requirements for pollution capture on site. If this is so, the mitigation property is critical. Allowing pollution form this site to enter the aquifer may or may not be equal to the mitigation proposed, dependent upon the proposed area's impervious cover ratio, land use and proximity to recharge features. This site's runoff will enter the aquifer within ½ , mile of being discharged from the site. The discharge will flow the entire way to the aquifer recharge zone in confined channels or stormwsewer pipes. Very little natural treatment of the runoff will occur in these channels, from additional traffic loading equal to or greater than the current traffic load on 290W today.
 11. This is the variance to be allowed to NOT tie into existing streets - but they do not mention Calbram or Landsman, only Scenic Brook. (Bad form – the specific streets should have been described.)
 12. no problem
 13. They want to use the SOS non-impervious cover area as parkland dedication... (in light of new parkland dedication rules that are significantly more restrictive than the previous rules (meaning that the City is now much more adamant about obtaining parkland for the general population) this is a really bad variance.
 - 14-19, comment later.
 20. **MOST IMPORTANT COMMENT:** The applicant wants to disregard the adjacent roadway IC calculation requirement. This means that their impervious cover calculations are another several percentage points conservative.

Summary of conservative calculations and variance used to determine PUD Allowable impervious cover:

Stated Impervious Cover Variance:	38.5%
Conservative allowance for Net Site vs. Gross Site:	5%
Conservative allowance for Water Quality Transition Zone	3%
Conservative allowance for Adjacent Roadway contribution:	3%
Total PUD Impervious Cover	51.5%

Additional Comments:

I will review the revised TIA at a later date.

There are several other contradictions in the doc that I have not mentioned.