From: Eric Willis <ericw@nd-austin.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2020 2:35 PM
To: Brake, Alison
Cc: Hernandez, Amanda; Eric Willis
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: AC-20-03 La Cima Multifamily

Good afternoon Alison and Amanda,

Thank you for the feedback from the City review team regarding the La Cima Mulitfamily site.

We have responses/ comments below in BLUE.

We are always happy to provide additional information and answer any question the City review team may have.

Sincerely,

Eric Willis / La Cima

President,
Natural Development Austin, LLC
11612 FM 2244, BLDG. 1, STE. 140
Austin, Texas 78738

C 512-695-2875
O 512-402-1790

From: Brake, Alison <ABrake@sanmarcostx.gov>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2020 12:12 PM
To: Eric Willis <ericw@nd-austin.com>
Cc: Hernandez, Amanda <AHernandez@sanmarcostx.gov>
Subject: AC-20-03 La Cima Multifamily

Good afternoon Eric,

Staff has reviewed the alternative compliance to the block standards in Ordinance 2014-35 request and the following comments/concerns have been noted:

Public Services Department: It is important to see how the fire service hydrants will be located in the interior on private fire mains, as it will reduce the access to hydrants from public streets. This can be addressed during the site and building plan reviews.

We will address this in the site development and building design phase as has been suggested.

Fire Marshall's Office: The Fire Marshall stated that there were some concerns in relation to the fire code. However, those can be addressed during the site plan and building plan reviews. Please contact Kelly Kistner, Fire Marshall, should you have questions, 512.393.8481, KKistner@sanmarcostx.gov

We will address this in the site development and building design phase as has been suggested.

Police Department: Assistant Chief Winkenwerder stated that the problem PD always sees with a mix of multi-family and single family is noise and traffic complaints. He stated that PD should expect complaints from the homes that area to the west of the new multifamily area, specifically pool parties and noise complaints. Additionally, he stated that PD sees apartment complexes as a target for burglars due to the density of targets. Vehicle burglars count on large number of vehicles so that they can quickly steal multiple items and leave the area. Assistant Chief Winkenwerder stated that PD should expect an increase in these types of calls also once the complex and townhomes are finished. Staff clarified that Purpose Built Student Housing is prohibited in the Development Agreement to which Asst. Chief Winkenwerder replied that PD will monitor the area once it starts leasing to see if it becomes a major problem.

The police departments concern regarding noise and traffic are obviously a concern with college student-based housing projects in which people are coming and going at all hours.
I appreciate the communication with San Marcos PD by staff disclosing La Cima is a NON-Student oriented Multifamily Community and thus the concerns regarding noise and traffic are mitigated by the targeted demographics for this community.

Regarding complaints from homeowners to the west, please feel free to provide the PD with the Concept Plan showing Townhomes planned to be developed immediately to the west of the Multifamily Community. The Road between the Multifamily and the Townhomes, the Townhomes themselves and the 100ft power line easement before you get to the first homes in Phase 1 Section 1 should be a more than adequate buffer for any noise generated from the Multifamily Community. Regarding pool activity, the location and size of the pool within the Community and the targeted demographic should address any potential concerns regarding future complaints.

The police departments concern about apartment complexes as a "target" for burglars is exactly the concern we have with allowing pedestrian access which are open and not gated to public streets. We firmly believe gated access is the best way to deter such activity from occurring in the community. We also believe this is true with fencing around the Community instead of from edge of building to edge of building. The **non-student demographic** we are targeting will not want to live on the first floor with any windows, especially bedroom windows, next areas that are accessible by the public without restriction. Again, a potential burglary issue that can be minimized and deterred with fencing.

Planning Department: In addition to the block size requirement not being met, it appears that other requirements are not being met as well. I've outlined a list of these requirements below and have attached a visual representation of some of these instances:

1. Section 4.4.3.2(1)(b) Building Location
   – Section 4.4.3.2(1)(b)(i) Minimum Building Frontage – At least 50% of the frontage along streets shall consist of principal buildings, publicly accessible plazas, transit stops, or other functional open space focused on the corner of the block.
     ▪ The corner that Bldg. 5 is on is adjacent to a detention pond. Is this detention pond required in this location? Could this detention pond be moved behind Bldg. 5 so that the building is adjacent to the roadway? Could this detention pond be designed to be some kind of functional open space? If it can be redesigned, there's a possibility that Bldg. 5 would not have to be realigned.

       We have multiple detention ponds around the site to minimize the slopes and structures. There are some options to use slightly depressed areas for general park settings, but this would have to be worked out in the site plan development stage. The

detention pond at that corner is the best location to catch runoff since it is at the lower end of the site. Is there any options to area detention outside our legal lot perimeter?

2. Section 4.4.3.2(2)(c) Parking
    – Section 4.4.3.2(2)(c)(ii) Parking lots shall be located in the center and rear of the property rather than between buildings and streets.
        ▪ There appear to be instances around the site where the parking is in front of the building face; essentially anything between the red fence line and the street. You'll need to make sure that the parking is located behind the face of the building.

    The architect will adjust this on the revised site plan.

3. Section 4.4.3.2(2)(h) Fencing and Screening
    – Section 4.4.3.2(2)(h)(i) Perimeter fences around MF developments, if used, shall be at least 50% transparent. The location and height of fencing shall be subject to Section 6.1.3.3.
        ▪ The red line on the attached site plan helps better illustrate the appropriate perimeter fence location.

    The fencing in the Community will meet the 50% transparency requirement. The fence design needs to be 6' tall to address security concerns sited by the PD.

    This is in violation of supplemental development standards which sets the maximum height at 4', but a 4' fence is only good for dogs. We want to keep out unwanted people who prey on men, women and children and steal their stuff.

    The mark up on the concept plan showing the fence going from front building corners to the adjacent front building corner is a flawed concept. This will allow the thugs, burglars and thieves as mentioned in "Police Department" comments to enter and prey on our residents. I suggest we locate the perimeter fence half way between the property line and the building setback lines. On Centerpoint road this would be 32' from the property line and on Flint Ridge Road and the Townhomes Street, 20' back from the property line. Of course, we need flexibility to work this fence around the existing trees and detention ponds.

4. Section 4.4.3.2(2)(i) Pedestrian Access and Circulation
    – Section 4.4.3.2(2)(i)(i) One pedestrian entrance shall be provided connecting the multifamily site to the street for block faces up to 500 feet. 2 pedestrian entrances shall be provided for block faces longer than 500 feet. Pedestrian entrances shall connect sidewalks to the internal walkway network and shall be open and not gated.

    We have the required pedestrian entrances, but they are gated with keypads for security reasons. As we have already stated above and as pointed out by the police department in their concerns mentioned above.

        ▪ Pedestrian access is shown as gated, indicated by a purple circle. There are opportunities for additional connection points to sidewalks, indicated by a blue line.

    We don't have a problem having more connection points, but we need them to be gated with keypads.

– Section 4.4.3.2(2)(i)(iv) Crosswalks shall be distinguished from driving surfaces via painted striping or materials such as pavers, bricks, stamped concrete, etc.
  ▪ No crosswalks are indicated on the site plan. The yellow line on attached site plan helps illustrate more crosswalks throughout the parking areas.

We will have crosswalks with painted stripping and accessible by ADA standards connecting all buildings internally to other buildings.

5. Section 4.4.3.2(2)(m) Refuse and Recycling Dumpsters
  – Section 4.4.3.2(2)(m)(ii) Location – All MF developments shall provide both trash and recycling dumpsters located next to each other. Both shall be located within 500 feet of the entrance to each ground floor unit measured from the front entrance of the unit and along improved pedestrian paths.
    ▪ One valet trash compactor & recycle center shown on schematic site plan between Bldgs. 1 & 2.

We can put dumpsters throughout the site but that is exactly what we are trying to get away from. Unsightly dumpsters throughout site are ugly and generally have a smell associated with them.

It would be best, for this alternative compliance request, for you outline all the ways in which you are requesting to vary from Ordinance 2014-35. I recommend reviewing the entire ordinance once more before we proceed.

Thank you,

Alison Brake, CNU-A
Historic Preservation Officer & Planner | Planning & Development Services
630 E Hopkins, San Marcos, TX 78666
512.393.8232

Make Sure You Count In San Marcos!
Click here to respond to the US Census