

**SITE PLAN REVIEW SHEET
ENVIRONMENTAL VARIANCE REQUEST ONLY**

CASE: SP-2017-0176D

ZAP COMMISSION DATE: February 6, 2018
(Postponed to February 20th, 2018)

PROJECT NAME: 1704 & 1706 Channel Road

APPLICANT: Skylark Partners II LP

AGENT: Janis Smith Consulting, LLC
(Janis Smith)

ADDRESS OF SITE: 1704 & 1706 Channel Road

COUNTY: Travis

AREA: .65 acres

WATERSHED: Lake Austin

JURISDICTION: Full Purpose

EXISTING ZONING: LA

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

The applicant proposes to remove and replace an existing boat dock, add swim deck, along with shoreline modification.

DESCRIPTION OF VARIANCES:

The applicant requests the following: To allow cut above 4' within Lake Austin [25-8-341(A)]

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The findings of fact have not been met and staff does not recommend approval.

ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD ACTION:

January 17th, 2018: The Environmental Commission recommends support of the variance request to allow cut above 4' within Lake Austin with the following; Bring the floodplain rating from a "Poor" rating to an "Excellent" rating, remove the old submerged dock and posts, as well as one of the existing fishing piers, increase tree planting plan with at least a 5" trunk Pecan Tree as directed by the City Arborist, any increase to the fishing pier will require approval by the Environmental Commission, and all conditions will be added to the cover sheet of the permit set. Vote 8-0.

ZONING AND PLATTING COMMISSION ACTION:

N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STAFF: Atha Phillips
Atha.Phillips@austintexas.gov

PHONE: 974-6303

CASE MANAGER: Clarissa Davis
Clarissa.Davis@austintexas.gov

PHONE: 974-1423

**ITEM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION AGENDA**

COMMISSION MEETING DATE REQUESTED:	January 17, 2018
NAME & NUMBER OF PROJECT:	1704 and 1706 Channel Road SP-2017-0176D
NAME OF APPLICANT OR ORGANIZATION:	Janis Smith (512)914-3729
LOCATION:	1704 Channel Road, Austin, Texas
COUNCIL DISTRICT:	District # 10
PROJECT FILING DATE:	May 17, 2017
DSD/ENVIRONMENTAL STAFF:	Atha Phillips, Environmental Program Coordinator 512-974-6303, Atha.Phillips@austintexas.gov
WPD/ERM STAFF	Liz Johnston, Environmental Program Coordinator 512-974-2619, Liz.Johnston@austintexas.gov
WATERSHED:	Lake Austin
ORDINANCE:	Watershed Protection Ordinance
REQUEST:	Variance request is as follows: 1. To allow cut above 4' feet within Lake Austin. [25-8-341(A)]
STAFF DETERMINATION:	Staff does not recommend approval.
REASONS FOR DETERMINATION:	Findings of fact have not been met.



Development Services Department
Staff Recommendations Concerning Required Findings

Project: 1704 and 1706 Channel Road
Ordinance Standard: Watershed Protection Ordinance
Variance Request: To allow cut above 4' feet within Lake Austin. [25-8-341(A)]

Include an explanation with each applicable finding of fact.

A. Land Use Commission variance determinations from Chapter 25-8-41 of the City Code:

1. The requirement will deprive the applicant of a privilege available to owners of similarly situated property with approximately contemporaneous development subject to similar code requirements.

No, there is an existing cut in slip and other places along the shoreline that the boat dock could be located.

2. The variance:
 - a) Is not necessitated by the scale, layout, construction method, or other design decision made by the applicant, unless the design decision provides greater overall environmental protection than is achievable without the variance;

No, the development proposed is not based on a hardship but rather a preference for the boat dock location.

- b) Is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow a reasonable use of the property;

No, there is an existing cut in slip and other places along the shoreline that the boat dock could be located. It is unnecessary to deviate from code since other options exist.

- c) Does not create a significant probability of harmful environmental consequences.

Yes, the project is enhancing the floodplain but any disturbance could be deemed harmful.

3. Development with the variance will result in water quality that is at least equal to the water quality achievable without the variance.

Yes, there will be disturbance but it would be contained within a silt boom and the sediment would settle out eventually.

B. Additional Land Use Commission variance determinations for a requirement of Section 25-8-422 (Water Quality Transition Zone), Section 25-8-452 (Water Quality Transition Zone), Article 7, Division 1 (Critical Water Quality Zone Restrictions), or Section 25-8-652 (Development Impacting Lake Austin, Lady Bird Lake, and Lake Walter E. Long):

1. The criteria for granting a variance in Subsection (A) are met;

N/A

2. The requirement for which a variance is requested prevents a reasonable, economic use of the entire property;

N/A

3. The variance is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow a reasonable, economic use of the entire property.

N/A

Staff Recommendation: Not recommended for approval.

Environmental Reviewer: Altha Phillips Date: 1/11/2018

Environmental Officer: Chloe Date: 1/12/2018

November 7, 2017



ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION VARIANCE APPLICATION FORM

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Applicant Contact Information

Name of Applicant	<i>John and Amy Porter</i>
Street Address	<i>1704 Channel Road</i>
City State ZIP Code	<i>Austin, TX 78746</i>
Work Phone	<i>512-233-2388</i>
E-Mail Address	<i>john@affinipay.com</i>

Variance Case Information

Case Name	<i>1704 and 1706 Channel Road</i>
Case Number	<i>SP-2017-0176D</i>
Address or Location	<i>1704 and 1706 Channel Road</i>
Environmental Reviewer Name	<i>Atha Phillips</i>
Environmental Resource Management Reviewer Name	<i>Atha Phillips</i>
Applicable Ordinance	<i>LDC 25-8-341 Cut over 4 ft.</i>
Watershed Name	<i>Lake Austin</i>
Watershed Classification	<input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/> Suburban <input type="checkbox"/> Water Supply Suburban <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Supply Rural <input type="checkbox"/> Barton Springs Zone

November 7, 2017

Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Barton Springs Segment <input type="checkbox"/> Northern Edwards Segment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not in Edwards Aquifer Zones
Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Distance to Nearest Classified Waterway	<i>The project site is on the shore of Lake Austin</i>
Water and Waste Water service to be provided by	<i>Austin Water and On-Site Septic</i>
Request	The variance request is as follows (Cite code references: <i>LDC 25-2-341 C Cut over 4 ft.</i>

Impervious cover	Existing	Proposed
square footage:	_____	_____
acreage:	_____	_____
percentage:	_____	_____
Provide general description of the property (slope range, elevation range, summary of vegetation / trees, summary of the geology, CWQZ, WQTZ, CEFs, floodplain, heritage trees, any other notable or outstanding characteristics of the property)	<p><i>The project site consists of two separate legal lots, each containing a residence: 1704 and 1706 Channel Road. Together the tracts are 0.97 acres and are on the shorelines of Lake Austin and a man-made channel. The lots are essentially flat with a slope of about 1% toward the channel and about 2% toward the mainbody of the lake. The vegetation consists mainly of St. Augustine grass, and the trees are predominantly Pecan. Currently on 1706 there is an existing concrete bulkhead and one boat dock. 1704 is more complicated. In addition to the concrete bulkhead with extensive concrete slope paving, the following structures exist: one boat dock in a cut-in slip on the channel; wood piles that are irregularly spaced but span the length of the channel shoreline; and two fishing piers and the remains of a third failed fishing pier on the main body of the lake. There is a substantial amount of debris accumulated between the existing dock and the southwest corner of the lot. See Attachment 1, Site Photos. The Porters, who own the site, are seeking to renovate the property as a family home and hope to remediate the damage done by past owners. They wrote the commission a letter requesting this variance, and it's included as Attachment 2. Their plans include replacing the concrete bulkhead and slope paving in the channel with a limestone bulkhead and large-scale planting plan; expanding the channel cut-in slip boat dock; and rebuilding one fishing pier on the main body of the lake. They will remove one fishing pier and the remains of the failed fishing pier on the main body of the lake as well as the piles along the channel. See Attachment 3, Proposed Conditions. Attachment 4, Proposed Conditions Channel Rendering, shows proposed conditions on the channel in the area of the requested cut variance.</i></p>	

November 7, 2017

Clearly indicate in what way the proposed project does not comply with current Code (include maps and exhibits)	<i>Enlarging the cut-in slip will require cut more than 4 ft. Attachment 3, Proposed Conditions, shows the cross-sections detailing the cut across the proposed cut-in slip. In order for a boat dock to house a ski boat and boat lift, it's necessary to have 3.5 ft of depth to accommodate the draft of the ski boat and cradle of the boat lift. The slip will extend into what is now land which is about 4 ft higher than the water surface elevation; so the depth of the cut is the sum of the height difference between the land elevation and the water surface elevation plus 3.5 ft. for the boat draft.</i>
---	---

FINDINGS OF FACT

As required in LDC Section 25-8-41, in order to grant a variance the Land Use Commission must make the following findings of fact:

Include an explanation with each applicable finding of fact.

Project: 1704 and 1706 Channel Road

Ordinance:

A. Land Use Commission variance determinations from Chapter 25-8-41 of the City Code:

1. The requirement will deprive the applicant of a privilege or the safety of property given to owners of other similarly situated property with approximately contemporaneous development.

Yes/No [summary of justification for determination]

See Attachment 5

2. The variance:

- a) Is not based on a condition caused by the method chosen by the applicant to develop the property, unless the development method provides greater overall environmental protection than is achievable without the variance;

Yes/No [summary of basis for determination]

See Attachment 5

- b) Is the minimum change necessary to avoid the deprivation of a privilege given to other property owners and to allow a reasonable use of the property;

August 21, 2017

☒ Yes/No [summary of basis for determination]

See Attachment 5

- c) Does not create a significant probability of harmful environmental consequences; and

☒ Yes/No [summary of basis for determination]

See Attachment 5

3. Development with the variance will result in water quality that is at least equal to the water quality achievable without the variance.

☒ Yes/No [summary of basis for determination]

See Attachment 5

- B. Additional Land Use Commission variance determinations for a requirement of Section 25-8-422 (Water Quality Transition Zone), Section 25-8-452 (Water Quality Transition Zone), Section 25-8-482 (Water Quality Transition Zone), or Article 7, Division 1 (Critical Water Quality Zone Restrictions):

1. The criteria for granting a variance in Section A are met;

☒ Yes/No [summary of basis for determination]

See Attachment 5

2. The requirement for which a variance is requested prevents a reasonable, economic use of the entire property; and

☒ Yes/No [summary of basis for determination]

See Attachment 5

3. The variance is the minimum change necessary to allow a reasonable, economic use of the entire property.

☒ Yes/No [summary of basis for determination]

See Attachment 5

**Variance approval requires all above affirmative findings.

Exhibits for Commission Backup and/or Presentation

- Aerial photos of the site (backup and presentation)
- Site photos (backup and presentation)
- Aerial photos of the vicinity (backup and presentation)
- Context Map—A map illustrating the subject property in relation to developments in the vicinity to include nearby major streets and waterways (backup and presentation)
- Topographic Map - A topographic map is recommended if a significant grade change on the subject site exists or if there is a significant difference in grade in relation to adjacent properties. (backup and presentation)
- For cut/fill variances, a plan sheet showing areas and depth of cut/fill with topographic elevations. (backup and presentation)
- Site plan showing existing conditions if development exists currently on the property (presentation only)
- Proposed Site Plan- full size electronic or at least legible 11x17 showing proposed development, include tree survey if required as part of site or subdivision plan (backup and presentation)
- Environmental Map – A map that shows pertinent features including Floodplain, CWQZ, WQTZ, CEFs, Setbacks, Recharge Zone, etc. (backup and presentation)
- An Environmental Assessment pursuant to ECM 1.3.0 (if required by 25-8-121) (backup only)
- Applicant's variance request letter (backup only)

ATTACHMENT 1

SITE PHOTOS



ATTACHMENT 2

LETTER FROM THE OWNERS

John & Amy Porter
1704 Channel Rd
Austin, TX 78746
(512) 294-5484

November 7, 2017

Mr. Joe Pantalion
Director, Watershed Protection Department
City of Austin

Re: Environmental Variance Application for 1704 and 1706 Channel Road

Dear Mr. Pantalion,

My wife Amy and I own 1704 and 1706 Channel Road on the shores of Lake Austin. We are in the process of improving the property so that we can enjoy the lake with our kids and family friends. Currently, the shoreline is a solid mass of concrete with several dilapidated docks, fishing piers, and the remains of structures that have long since disappeared. We're lucky enough to have both channel and main body shoreline, and we intend to return the property to a healthy and thriving environment.

After much back and forth with our design and permitting professionals who consulted with City of Austin staff, we believe that we've come up with a plan that reverses much of the damage done decades ago by past owners. Our goal is to maximize preservation of our trees and declutter the Lake Austin shoreline. So keeping the boat dock on the canal is a priority. The existing boat dock is too small to accommodate modern boats, and I'm told that expanding the dock and cut-in slip requires a variance for Cut over 4 ft.

Amy and I request your approval of our application for a variance to LDC 25-8-341, Cut over 4 feet, so that we can construct a new boat dock in the same location as the existing dock. We will be good stewards of our Lake Austin property and its natural beauty.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,




John Porter




Amy Porter

ATTACHMENT 3
PROPOSED CONDITIONS

LEGEND



1704 CHANNEL ROAD CUT CALCULATIONS					
XSEC NO.	XSEC STA	CUT (SF)	AVG CUT (SF)	DISTANCE (FT)	VOLUME CU (CY)
SOUTH WALL PROP SLIP	0.0	0.0			
1	1.0	200.3			
2	7.8	229.7	215.0	6.8	54.1
3	14.9	215.7	222.7	7.1	58.6
4	17.1	92.2	154.0	2.2	12.6
5	25.5	75.2	83.7	8.4	26.0
6	28.0	224.8	150.0	3.5	19.4
			112.4	1.0	4.2
NORTH WALL PROP SLIP	30.0				
			TOTAL CUT (CY)		178.6



ATTACHMENT 4

PROPOSED CONDITIONS CHANNEL RENDERING



ATTACHMENT 5
FINDINGS OF FACT

- A. 1. The requirement will deprive the applicant of a privilege available to owners of similarly situated property with approximately contemporaneous development subject to similar code requirements.

YES. Defining contemporaneous construction as construction occurring since 2014, four applications for a variance to this section of code were presented to the Environmental Commission, and all four applications were approved.

2. The variance:

a. Is not necessitated by the scale, layout, construction method, or other design decision made by the applicant, unless the design decision provides greater overall environmental protection than is achievable without the variance;

YES. This design “provides greater overall environmental protection than is achievable without the variance”. It provides a rare opportunity for the COA to enlarge both the volume and surface area of Lake Austin by increasing the size of the cut-in slip. Doing so leads to an improved lake ecosystem while maximizing the storage capacity of the lake. The variance is required to enlarge the size of the cut-in slip and realize the benefits described above.

b. Is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow reasonable use of the property;

YES. After receiving the first set of comments in the update process and meeting with COA staff, the project design was changed to comply with a staff recommendation to incorporate the existing cut-in slip in the location of the proposed boat dock on the channel. According to staff, doing so will “avoid an environmental variance that might not meet the Findings of Fact.” The recommendation and subsequent design change requires one variance.

c. Does not create a significant probability of harmful environmental consequences.

YES. This project will benefit the functionality and environmental quality of Lake Austin by increasing the volume and surface area of the lake. Additionally, the extensive mitigation planting plan will raise the rating of the floodplain from “poor” to “excellent” which exceeds COA requirements. Raising the rating of the floodplain will enhance the infiltration of runoff, decrease erosion and the sediment load present in the runoff, and boost the filtration of stormwater before it enters the lake. The bulkhead design, featuring a lower bulkhead planted with wetland plants along the channel, will improve connectivity between the lake and the new wetland. The bulkhead will replace an existing vast expanse of concrete.

3. Development with the variance will result in water quality that is at least equal to the water quality achievable without the variance.

YES. This project will improve the water quality of the lake by increasing the surface area thus allowing for a more beneficial lake ecosystem, and the mitigation planting plan will further improve both the stormwater quality and quantity entering the lake.

B. 1. The criteria for granting a variance in Subsection (A) are met:

YES. Please see answers to A (1), (2), and (3).

2. The requirement for which a variance is requested prevents a reasonable, economic use of the entirety of the property;

YES. The existing dock in the cut-in slip on the channel is too small to accommodate modern boats. In order to realize a “reasonable, economic use of the entirety of the property”, a functioning boat dock is a necessity.

3. The variance is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow a reasonable, economic use of the entire property;

YES. This new boat dock incorporates the existing cut-in slip. Alternatively, a new dock could be constructed at another location and the cut-in slip could be filled so that the owners are allowed “a reasonable, economic use of the entirety of the property” (emphasis added). Filling in the cut-in slip to facilitate “use of the entirety of the property” would involve at least three variances (Fill in the Lake, Fill more than 4 ft., and Land Capture). City staff recommended against this route. The boat dock location is the location recommended by City staff, and it requires one variance for Cut over 4ft. This design is the minimum deviation from the Code.

Environmental Resource Inventory

For the City of Austin
Related to LDC 25-8-121, City Code 30-5-121, ECM 1.3.0 & 1.10.0

The ERI is required for projects that meet one or more of the criteria listed in LDC 25-8-121(A), City Code 30-5-121(A).

1. SITE/PROJECT NAME: _____
2. COUNTY APPRAISAL DISTRICT PROPERTY ID (#'s): _____
3. ADDRESS/LOCATION OF PROJECT: _____
4. WATERSHED: _____
5. THIS SITE IS WITHIN THE *(Check all that apply)*
 - Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone* *(See note below)* ☐ YES ☐ No
 - Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone* ☐ YES ☐ No
 - Edwards Aquifer 1500 ft Verification Zone* ☐ YES ☐ No
 - Barton Spring Zone* ☐ YES ☐ No

**(as defined by the City of Austin – LDC 25-8-2 or City Code 30-5-2)*

Note: If the property is over the Edwards Aquifer Recharge zone, the Hydrogeologic Report and karst surveys must be completed and signed by a Professional Geoscientist Licensed in the State of Texas.

6. DOES THIS PROJECT PROPOSE FLOODPLAIN MODIFICATION?.....☐ YES** ☐ NO
If yes, then check all that apply:
 - ☐ (1) The floodplain modifications proposed are necessary to protect the public health and safety;
 - ☐ (2) The floodplain modifications proposed would provide a significant, demonstrable environmental benefit, as determined by a **functional assessment** of floodplain health as prescribed by the Environmental Criteria Manual (ECM), or
 - ☐ (3) The floodplain modifications proposed are necessary for development allowed in the critical water **quality zone under LDC 25-8-261 or 25-8-262, City Code 30-5-261 or 30-5-262.**
 - ☐ (4) The floodplain modifications proposed are outside of the Critical Water Quality Zone in an area determined to be in poor or fair condition by a **functional assessment** of floodplain health.

**** If yes, then a functional assessment must be completed and attached to the ERI (see ECM 1.7 and Appendix X for forms and guidance) unless conditions 1 or 3 above apply.**

7. IF THE SITE IS WITHIN AN URBAN OR SUBURBAN WATERSHED, DOES THIS PROJECT PROPOSE A UTILITY LINE PARALLEL TO AND WITHIN THE CRITICAL WATER QUALITY ZONE? ☐ YES*** ☐ NO

*****If yes, then riparian restoration is required by LDC 25-8-261(E) or City Code 30-5-261(E) and a functional assessment must be completed and attached to the ERI (see ECM1.5 and Appendix X for forms and guidance).**

8. There is a total of _____ (#s) Critical Environmental Feature(s)(CEFs) on or within 150 feet of the project site. If CEF(s) are present, attach a detailed **DESCRIPTION** of the CEF(s), color **PHOTOGRAPHS**, the **CEF WORKSHEET** and provide **DESCRIPTIONS** of the proposed CEF buffer(s) and/or wetland mitigation. Provide the number of each type of CEFs on or within 150 feet of the site *(Please provide the number of CEFs)*:

_____ (#'s) Spring(s)/Seep(s) _____ (#'s) Point Recharge Feature(s) _____ (#'s) Bluff(s)
 _____ (#'s) Canyon Rimrock(s) _____ (#'s) Wetland(s)

Note: Standard buffers for CEFs are 150 feet, with a maximum of 300 feet for point recharge features. Except for wetlands, if the standard buffer is not provided, you must provide a written request for an administrative variance from LDC 25-8-281(C)(1) and provide written findings of fact to support your request. Request forms for administrative variances from requirements stated in LDC 25-8-281 are available from Watershed Protection Department.

9. The following site maps are attached at the end of this report (Check all that apply and provide):

All ERI reports must include:

- ☐ **Site Specific Geologic Map with 2-ft Topography** ATTACHMENT 1
- ☐ **Historic Aerial Photo of the Site** ATTACHMENT 2
- ☐ **Site Soil Map** ATTACHMENT 3
- ☐ **Critical Environmental Features and Well Location Map on current Aerial Photo with 2-ft Topography**

Only if present on site (Maps can be combined):

- ☐ **Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone with the 1500-ft Verification Zone**
(Only if site is over or within 1500 feet the recharge zone)
- ☐ **Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone**
- ☐ **Water Quality Transition Zone (WQTZ)**
- ☐ **Critical Water Quality Zone (CWQZ)** ATTACHMENT 1
- ☐ **City of Austin Fully Developed Floodplains for all water courses with up to 64-acres of drainage** ATTACHMENT 1

10. **HYDROGEOLOGIC REPORT** – Provide a description of site soils, topography, and site specific geology below (Attach additional sheets if needed):

Surface Soils on the project site is summarized in the table below and uses the SCS Hydrologic Soil Groups*. If there is more than one soil unit on the project site, show each soil unit on the site soils map.

Soil Series Unit Names, Infiltration Characteristics & Thickness		
Soil Series Unit Name & Subgroup**	Group*	Thickness (feet)

***Soil Hydrologic Groups Definitions (Abbreviated)**

- A. Soils having a high infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.
- B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.
- C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.
- D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.

**Subgroup Classification – See Classification of Soil Series Table in County Soil Survey.

Description of Site Topography and Drainage *(Attach additional sheets if needed):*

--

List surface geologic units below:

Geologic Units Exposed at Surface		
Group	Formation	Member

Brief description of site geology *(Attach additional sheets if needed):*

--

Wells – Identify all recorded and unrecorded wells on site (test holes, monitoring, water, oil, unplugged, capped and/or abandoned wells, etc.):

There are ____(#) wells present on the project site and the locations are shown and labeled

____(#'s)The wells are not in use and have been properly abandoned.

____(#'s)The wells are not in use and will be properly abandoned.

____(#'s)The wells are in use and comply with 16 TAC Chapter 76.

There are ____(#'s) wells that are off-site and within 150 feet of this site.

11. **THE VEGETATION REPORT** – Provide the information requested below:**Brief description of site plant communities** *(Attach additional sheets if needed):*

--

There is woodland community on site ☐ YES ☐ NO *(Check one).*

If yes, list the dominant species below:

Woodland species	
Common Name	Scientific Name

There is grassland/prairie/savanna on site..... ☐ YES ☐ NO *(Check one).*

If yes, list the dominant species below:

Grassland/prairie/savanna species	
Common Name	Scientific Name

There is hydrophytic vegetation on site ☐ YES ☐ NO *(Check one).*If yes, list the dominant species in table below *(next page):*

Hydrophytic plant species		
Common Name	Scientific Name	Wetland Indicator Status

A tree survey of all trees with a diameter of at least eight inches measured four and one-half feet above natural grade level has been completed on the site.

☐ YES ☐ NO (Check one).

12. WASTEWATER REPORT – Provide the information requested below.

Wastewater for the site will be treated by (Check of that Apply):

- ☐ On-site system(s)
☐ City of Austin Centralized sewage collection system
☐ Other Centralized collection system

Note: All sites that receive water or wastewater service from the Austin Water Utility must comply with City Code Chapter 15-12 and wells must be registered with the City of Austin

The site sewage collection system is designed and will be constructed to in accordance to all State, County and City standard specifications.

☐ YES ☐ NO (Check one).

Calculations of the size of the drainfield or wastewater irrigation area(s) are attached at the end of this report or shown on the site plan.

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Not Applicable (Check one).

Wastewater lines are proposed within the Critical Water Quality Zone?

☐ YES ☐ NO (Check one). If yes, then provide justification below:

Is the project site is over the Edwards Aquifer?

☐ YES ☐ NO (Check one).

If yes, then describe the wastewater disposal systems proposed for the site, its treatment level and effects on receiving watercourses or the Edwards Aquifer.

13. One (1) hard copy and one (1) electronic copy of the completed assessment have been provided.

Date(s) ERI Field Assessment was performed: _____
Date(s)

My signature certifies that to the best of my knowledge, the responses on this form accurately reflect all information requested.

Print Name

Telephone

Signature

Email Address


Name of Company

Date

For project sites within the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone, my signature and seal also certifies that I am a licensed Professional Geoscientist in the State of Texas as defined by ECM 1.12.3(A).

P.G.
Seal

ATTACHMENT 1
GEOLOGY WITH 2-FT CONTOURS



ATTACHMENT 2
HISTORIC AERIAL PHOTOS



Aerial Photo from 2009




Aerial Photo from 2011



ATTACHMENT 3

SITE SOIL MAP

Hydrologic Soil Group—Travis County, Texas



Hydrologic Soil Group

Hydrologic Soil Group— Summary by Map Unit — Travis County, Texas (TX453)				
Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
Lu	Gaddy soils and Urban land, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	A	7.8	88.5%
W	Water	D	1.0	11.5%
Totals for Area of Interest			8.8	100.0%

Description

Hydrologic soil groups are based on estimates of runoff potential. Soils are assigned to one of four groups according to the rate of water infiltration when the soils are not protected by vegetation, are thoroughly wet, and receive precipitation from long-duration storms.

The soils in the United States are assigned to four groups (A, B, C, and D) and three dual classes (A/D, B/D, and C/D). The groups are defined as follows:

Group A. Soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission.

Group B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission.

Group C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of soils having a layer that impedes the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture or fine texture. These soils have a slow rate of water transmission.

Group D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of clays that have a high shrink-swell potential, soils that have a high water table, soils that have a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and soils that are shallow over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very slow rate of water transmission.

If a soil is assigned to a dual hydrologic group (A/D, B/D, or C/D), the first letter is for drained areas and the second is for undrained areas. Only the soils that in their natural condition are in group D are assigned to dual classes.

**ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION MOTION 20180117 008a**

Date: January 17, 2018

Subject: 1704 and 1706 Channel Road, SP-2017-0176D Variance Request to allow cut above 4' within Lake Austin [25-8-341(A)]

Motion by: Hank Smith

Seconded by: Andrew Creel

RATIONALE:

WHEREAS, the applicant desires to remove a fishing pier on the main body of Lake Austin and expand an existing cut-in-slip to allow for an additional boat dock and jet ski dock; and

WHEREAS, the applicant does have options that would not require a variance; however, those options may not be as advantageous as the proposal to the overall lake environment.

THEREFORE, the Environmental Commission recommends support of the variance request to allow cut above 4' within Lake Austin with the following;

Staff Conditions:

Environmental Commission Conditions:

- Bring the floodplain rating from a "Poor" rating to an "Excellent" rating
- Remove the old submerged dock and posts, as well as one of the existing fishing piers
- Increase tree planting plan with at least a 5" trunk Pecan Tree as directed by the City Arborist
- Any increase to the fishing pier will require approval by the Environmental Commission
- All conditions will be added to the cover sheet of the permit set.

VOTE 8-0

For: B. Smith, Creel, Thompson, Istvan, Neely, Maceo, H. Smith Guerrero, and Gordon

Against: None

Abstain: Guerrero



Recuse: None

Absent: Perales and Coyne



Approved By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Peggy Maceo". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.


Peggy Maceo, Environmental Commission Vice Chair



Legend

-  Site Plan Case
-  Zoning

CASE#: SP-2017-0176D
ADDRESS: 1704 & 1706 Channel Road
CASE NAME: 1704 & 1706 Channel Road
MANAGER: Clarissa Davis



This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.

This product has been produced by the Planning and Development Review Department for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.

OPERATOR: Clarissa Davis