

Frequently Asked Questions

Last updated April 11th, 2024

1. Is preference given to 50% Workforce.? AMI - 50%, 60%...?
 - A. Yes. The goal is to provide as many affordable units with the greatest range/depth of affordability to the workforce as possible.
2. What is the preferred financing mechanism for this project for the City of Bee Cave?
 - A. The COBC will consider any structure, there is not a favoured approach at this time.
3. Any tax abatements that COBC is providing as part of the AMI measures, or should we underwrite as a market rate deal with 50% of the units under AMI provisions provided?
 - A. The COBC will consider tax abatements.
4. What zoning categories are available? What are the minimum and maximum units per acre we should assume?
 - A. <https://ecode360.com/40279649> This is a link to the zoning chapter. I'd guess either R-4, R-5 or MU-C are the most appropriate. The densities are found in the Dimensional Standards table in 3.4.1. Density bonus options are described in 3.4.4.E
 - B. Increased densities, increasing the number of "affordable" units will be considered.
5. Sale of Land or GL preferred?
 - A. There is not a preference at this point.
6. What does 'big house' mean? Does it mean the city wants less density?
 - A. We want something other than a garden style design, something that fits local environment.
7. What is median pay in Bee Cave of teachers, first responders etc. to input in numbers that city estimates?
 - A. See RFP.
8. 15 units / AC available with IC in terms of density?
 - A. See earlier answer for code specific response. COBC will consider more.
9. Are there reimbursables for public work? Utilities? ROW?
 - A. Per 10, the COBC will be building roads. Because the COBC does not provide utilities directly, a direct rebate is not possible.
10. Are the conceptualized roads baked?
 - A. These streets are part of the throughfare plan and will need to remain.

11. Anything we should know with respect to impact fees (prevailing market rate)?
 - A. The city does not have any impact fees, WTCPUA does.

12. Is the City of Bee Cave guaranteeing the LUEs and capacity for such a project? (We see water is there with a 12" line but want to confirm wastewater).
 - A. Assume LUE's and water are accessible, although the COBC does not have LUE's reserved for this site per se.

13. Any unique off-sites required by developer? Or put another way, is city stubbing the utilities to the property? Where is line coming from?
 - A. Assume utilities will be brought to the property line. Location TBD. Potentially, there will be ingress, egress, curb work, depending on design.

14. On road bisecting site, is that required? Two points of access off Bee Cave Parkway and 71?
 - A. This road is part of the throughfare plan, city is funding and constructing.

15. Do you have active survey, CAD file so we can lay out site plan? Tree survey? Normal Tree ordinances and mitigation apply to this tract?
 - A. CAD file has been uploaded to Deal Room. No tree survey. Normal tree ordinances and mitigation will apply.

16. Are there particular units you want to see in the AMI units? Or is it preferred they are spread across various unit types?
 - A. The COBC will give preference to developers providing the largest number of workforce units and greatest range/depth of affordability.

17. What should buyers assume for timing of rezoning process once under contract?
 - A. Assume the appropriate zoning will be in place immediately. Please describe any needed variances in your response.

18. Workforce housing a must? What % needs to be affordable?
 - A. Yes, see RFP

19. Can we utilize the existing detention that is shown for water quality and modify it larger to increase? The RFP mentions that we will need upgrades but want to make sure that we can use/expand what is there.
 - A. There is currently on-site detention and an off-site regional water quality pond. During future planning, a developer will need to determine capacity and the ultimate need.

20. Are there particularly units you want to see in the AMI units, or do you prefer, as is typical, to spread them across various unit types?
 - A. Proportional, with families in mind.

21. What should we assume for the timing of the rezoning process once under contract? This will help us analyze when our construction date will be.
- A. See above.
22. In the RFP, under III. Project Requirements 4) it states that the max IC is 55%, However, on the Developable Areas Map (attached) it shows in the legend on the bottom right that Area A is allotted 58.5% IC, Area B is allotted 50% IC and Area C is allotted 60% IC. Could you please advise on which scenario is accurate?
- A. All parcels combined may not exceed 55% and may be allocated across all three as reasonably determined.
23. Can unused IC be transferred from one Area to another Area, provided the total IC limit for all three Areas combined is not exceeded?
- A. Yes, can be averaged as reasonably determined.
24. Is Bee Cave looking for capital “A” Affordable Housing product (vouchers, LIHTC) or are they looking for nonsubsidized product like Micro Units and potentially Co-Living?
- A. The COBC is focused on maximizing the number of workforce housing, spread across different unit sizes.
25. Who are the local housing authorities, if any, in Bee Cave that will serve as PFC sponsors? Is the City of Bee Cave agreeable to utilizing a PFC structure through local housing authorities to achieve tax abatement in return for the depth of affordability they are seeking?
- A. The COBC will consider tax abatements and sponsoring entities to achieve them. The goal is to have the PFC in place by the time this development advances, if a PFC is to be utilized the preference will be to utilize the PFC being created by COBC.
26. Is a partnership with Hill Country Indoor possible?
- A. We have not created a partnership, would certainly make sense for both HCI and this ultimate developer.
27. Possible for a discount on impact fees?
- A. Not with the WTCPUA.
28. Is the pond considered a wet land?
- A. Not to our knowledge.
29. Is there enough water capacity to the site for this development?
- A. See above.

30. Is there a required parking ratio?
 - A. Please follow industry standard, please submit any variances desired.
31. Can the second road be deleted?
 - A. Not any shown in the throughfare plan.
32. Can the private ROW be converted to public?
 - A. If referring to the existing portion of Skaggs drive, which is currently private, it is on the Throughfare Plan to be converted to public ROW, but there is no known timeline.
33. Are there any karst features?
 - A. We are not aware of any.
34. What is perspective on garden style development?
 - A. Least desirable, the development should align with the existing surroundings.
35. With the city embarking on a PFC, any issue with Travis County being the Housing Authority.
 - A. The goal is to have the PFC in place by the time this development advances, if a PFC is to be utilized the preference will be to utilize the PFC being created by COBC.
36. Pitch and Putt – an affordable pitch and putt not to be a deal killer or take away from the number of affordable units. The COBC may reserve the ability to work with the selected respondent on the feasibility of a pitch and putt, along with other amenities.

Questions received 3/22/2024

37. Are there Geotech inspections reports for the fill area or a Geotech report of the site available?
 - A. No
38. Can we get a CAD file of the survey?
 - A. We are working to obtain.
39. Can we get a PDF or CAD file of the Developable Areas and Encumbrances exhibits in the RFP document?
 - A. The items we have are being placed in the deal room.
40. Are there any compatibility restraints along Bee Cave Pkwy? Setbacks or height restrictions?
 - A. Setback will be per code. Exceeding height will require a special request, expect sensitivity on the Ladera side of the property.
41. Is there a copy of the TIA available or any required offsite improvements/fees?

- A. There is no TIA. Assume code for any fees the city does not directly control.
42. The dam above the pond will need to be raised/reconstructed. Will this be the City's responsibility when they construct Skaggs Dr. or the developer's responsibility?
- The City is responsible for the public infrastructure including the Tordera and Skaggs Drive extension. The Skaggs drive extension would include construction across the dam so, in effect, that would raise the top elevation of the dam to a certain degree because the top the new roadway surface may be at a slightly higher elevation than the current natural ground across the top of dam. If additional volume in the detention pond that the dam is creating due to the increased impervious cover associated with the project, there should be grading opportunities in and around the existing pond to gain additional volume without having to increase the height the dam (which is effectively an emergency overflow weir). In the case the detention pond needs to be modified (i.e. re-graded to gain volume), that would fall on the developer. And if for some reason the top of dam does need to be raised because they can't gain enough additional volume by just re-grading the pond itself, that should fall on the developer as well.

Questions from the Q & A on March 26th, 2024

43. Impervious Cover
- Should not exceed 55% - distribution is variable. TO NOTE: Rainwater harvesting and/or IC transfer is expected to bridge the gap between 55% and 40%.**
 - History: purchased from Skaggs Family, deal restrictions based off purchase
44. Utility Arrangements with PUA
- Assuming no issues, no fee arrangements, no rebates available for non city utilities
45. Confirming 55% is of 22 acres?
- Yes, averaged across the entire site.
46. Does the city value deep affordability of 60 % vs 80% MFI units
- 80% AMI is really at current market rent
 - The city is looking for a deeper rent skewing and understands that probably a component of financing, of course.
47. Confirm Skaggs and Tordero Roads are funded by city and both required
- Yes and Yes
 - Should be viewed as primary/ only point of access for site
48. Bonus density for affordable on existing
- 5 dwelling units per acre on top of base density of 20
 - Other density bumps related to parking but the main one comes from affordability
 - The city expects density to be challenged in order to provide a significant number of workforce units.

49. Is the city OK with us using a condominium structure to define units as market or affordable? Noticed that potential ownership options is a bonus in RFP. This would still be multifamily, but condominium structure allows map of units across the AMI and market rate units to customize unit mixed site plans.
 - a. if there's an intent to do eventual tenant ownership, there should be within your proposal and outline of what that ownership process will look like and how it would take place. Providing a path to ownership will likely to viewed favourably.
50. Is the city okay with condo structure for define and assign affordable housing
 - a. See above
51. Ground lease payments should be above the line, below the line is soft (cash flow availability)
 - a. Please show above the line, but not hard payment, subject to proposal being made.
52. Is there a dam management in place – will it be duty of developer
 - a. See above
53. Is 55% inclusive or exclusive to Right of Way dedications
 - a. See above
54. Are there any development or impact fees?
 - a. See above
55. COBC willing to fund any Affordable Housing units below 60% MFI
 - a. The city is a nonparticipating jurisdiction
 - b. City is providing land and roads
56. Is city willing to forgo any site permit or parkland costs
 - a. See above
57. Is there COBC preference between mixed income dev. availability vs all affordable
 - a. We anticipate there will be some level of mixed income, but relying on the market to dictate.
58. Example of Big House Design
 - a. See above
59. FAQ – what kind of units do you want to see?
 - a. See above
60. FAQ – CAD file
 - a. See above
61. Minimum SF per unit?
 - a. See above
62. Property Management
 - a. CITY WILL NOT BE INVOLVED
63. Families in mind – requesting 3 bedroom units?
 - a. See above
64. Are construction plans available in deal room
 - a. Unclear on question
65. Visual/ Aesthetic needs
 - a. See above

66. The provided developable area map shows a 1.01 drainage easement doc. no. 2009036808. This easement does not show up on the encumbrance map and does not show up on the survey which was done in 2016. Can we assume the easement has been vacated or can be vacated and is not an encumbrance on our land planning?
- a. The City will work with the developer on any easements not showing on the current survey. Understand, there will be a need for a future alta survey.
67. In order to fully understand the existing utilities relevant to the Bee Cave Workforce site, can you provide size and location information for water, wastewater and electricity?
- a. See above.

Questions received 4/2/2024

68. Will flood plain be required to analyze and map? Are there existing flood studies or existing pond calculations? RFP appears to show stream buffer.....is this just approximate or defined by your ECM? FEMA doesn't show any mapping.
- A. The expectation is a drainage analysis will be performed for the project using ATLAS 14 data. The water quality buffer zone is set at 85' from the 2-year floodplain elevation. The current buffer area shown is based on a study that is over 10 years old. This will need to be analysis using current the drainage criteria manual.
69. Will The City allow mechanical separators for WQ similar to what TCEQ allows for this site?
- a. The City's Environmental Criteria Manual outlines the approved water quality facilities. This document allows the City Engineer to approve alternative facilities; however, it must be demonstrated with supported data what the removal rates for total suspended solids, total phosphorus, and oil & data are and the final design must remove at least 90% of these pollutants
70. Is there a sanitary sewer for this site available? The GIS I can find doesn't show sewers in this area, but it is surely there.
- a. It is anticipated that additional wastewater facilities (lines/manholes) will be required to serve the site.
71. Does City have any unique required annual operating expenses or fees that must be paid annually?
- a. Typically, an annual operating permit is required for water quality facilities based on the number of basins and the size of the drainage basin(s) ranging from \$250 to \$1,500 per facility
72. The front lot along Bee Cave Parkway is leveled, when was this done? By who? What fill and standards were used?

- a. This area was the staging and storage area during the construction of the Skaggs water quality pond and other miscellaneous grading. Final compaction standards cannot be confirmed at this time. A geotechnical analysis is recommended to determine the suitability on this fill area as is.
73. From FAQ dated 3/22, question #22 indicates an attached developable area map that indicates impervious cover distributions per developable area. Do you happen to have this map? We understand that the percent impervious can be distributed amongst the area, we just wanted to get a copy of that document if it exists.
- a. All docs in our possession are in the Deal Room.
74. With respect to water quality, can green type facilities be used such as pervious pavers, rainwater harvesting, vegetative filter strips, porous paving, etc.
- a. Staff recommends prospective firms familiarize themselves with the City's Unified Development Code (Article 7 for this inquiry) and Environmental Criteria Manual (ECM). THE ECM lists the approved water quality facilities and Article 7 discusses rainwater harvesting and pervious pavers as it relates to impervious cover. Pervious pavement types are allowed for pedestrian paths only with a 50% impervious cover credit. Rainwater harvesting is utilized for the 5% IC credit and must be used for a "green" purpose such as landscape watering and/or gray water applications.
75. In the Comprehensive Plan, it lists the two public streets with this project as 'Type C Major Collector'. We did not see this particular label in the Street Cross Section PDF under the Design Manual. Can you provide the street section required?
- a. Per the Throughfare Plan.

Questions received 4/3/2024

76. Can we reroute Tordera Road?
- a. See above
77. Can we get access to the western boundary road for fire access?
- a. Up for further investigation.
78. Can the City of Bee Cave commit to how many months for an SDP? What does expediency mean?
- a. The city cannot commit to a specific time frame.
79. After submitting the application for permits, is it expected to have permits in hand in 6 months?
- a. The city cannot commit to a specific time frame.
80. Who makes the final decision on awarding the project?

- a. There is a review committee assigned, who will make a recommendation to council and Mayor. Council and mayor make the final decision and may want to be involved prior, to be determined.
81. Regarding the draining easement on the northside, can we relocate the easement?
- a. See question 66.
82. Is there any additional value being placed on developers headquartered in Travis County?
- a. The City wants the best in class throughout the team, process and execution.
83. Is there any additional value being prescribed to developers currently developing in the City of Bee Cave?
- a. See question 82.
84. What is the Council preferability for a 1 or 2 story product that fits with the surrounding community over a 4 or 5 story product for density?
- a. We are looking for best in class design, development and end user experience.
85. Is there greater detail on the attributes of the compliance plan requirements?
- a. Respondent is expected to develop and appropriate compliance plan.
86. Is there greater detail on the attributes of the marketing plan requirements?
- a. Same as 85.
87. The Code I'm looking at, UDC 7.3, references a maximum Impervious Cover of 40% for new projects. It seems there are some mechanisms for increasing that by 5-10%. Please confirm the 55% level and how it is achieved?
- a. See above.
88. We will be platting this tract and dedicating public ROWs. Is the impervious cover within the ROWs accounted for in the 55% of NSA impervious cover limitation?
- a. 40% additional IC out of the ROW area but only that ROW area which resides outside of the water quality buffer zone. But ALL proposed impervious cover associated with the parcel development and the public infrastructure (roads and sidewalks) must be treated in a water quality facility.
 - b. Regarding approach, determine the net site area (NSA) for the entire tract. Then determine how much of that area NSA was ROW. Then determine what the total IC allowance is. So for example: If the NSA is 10 acres and the ROW is 1 acre of that I would assume 9 acres could get 55% and 1 acre could get 40%.
89. Will the existing water quality/detention feature be categorized as a Critical Environmental Feature (CEF) thus creating a separate buffer zone of 150'?

- a. It is not the City's expectation that the existing ponds will require a buffer larger than the 85' WQBZ. If an environmental resource inventory were to categorized these facilities as CEFs, further discussions would be made on what effect that has on buffer size.

- 90. The Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) sheet mentions in question #15 that there is a CAD file uploaded to the Deal Room; however, I do not see one there. Do you know the name of the CAD file that was uploaded and/or if you could reply all to this email with the CAD file attachment? I am only seeing pdfs and kmz files in the deal room as of right now.
 - a. See above.

- 91. The provided developable area map (attached to the email) shows a 1.01 drainage easement doc. no. 2009036808. This easement does not show up on the encumbrance map and does not show up on the survey which was done in 2016. Can we assume the easement has been vacated or can be vacated and is not an encumbrance on our land planning?
 - a. See above.

- 92. What is the city's ideal configuration of residential and mixed-use components?
 - a. See above.

- 93. Is the city going to be funding and constructing the water and any other utility lines that need to be located beneath the Skaggs/Tordera pavement or is the city just going to build/fund the roads themselves and not the utilities beneath them?
 - a. See above.

- 94. Is there a target start date and completion date for the Project?
 - a. As soon as possible.

- 95. Has the city begun the process of engaging with the community regarding the project (to get ahead of potential NIMBY issues)?
 - a. We look forward to working in a collaborative manner.

- 96. Is the city willing to play a leadership role in engaging with the community and supporting the project once the developer has been selected?
 - a. We look forward to working in a collaborative manner.

- 97. Is Bee Cave maintaining a waitlist of potential tenants (i.e. Bee Cave first responders, teachers, hospitality workers)? Are they planning to create a waitlist?
 - a. We look forward to respondents proposals.

- 98. Will the selected developer be provided direct access/marketing to the targeted groups (LTISD faculty/staff, first responders, local businesses)?
 - a. We look forward to working in a collaborative manner.

99. Has the city considered other target groups beyond those mentioned (i.e. medical and hospital workers)?
- We look forward to respondents proposals.
100. Is there any Census/profile data related to the target groups (LTISD, first responders) like employee count, income levels, current zip code?
- We are relying on census data to determine income levels.
101. Is it intended that any infrastructure built by the developer will be deeded by the Developer to the City of Bee Cave upon completion and the City will maintain the infrastructure?
- Depends on the structure.
102. Will a Qualified Respondent be able to meet with Fire Marshal regarding access lanes prior to submittal? Would standpipes work?
- It is expected respondents will utilize typically due diligence process.
103. If we did standalone retail, how would the city handle in terms of being on city-owned land under a ground lease structure?
- We look forward to respondents proposals.
104. Does the intermittent creek count as 100% pervious coverage?
- Net Site Area
 - (100 percent of land with gradient of 15 percent or less) + (40 percent of land with a gradient from 15 percent to 25 percent) + 20 percent of land with gradient between 25 percent and 35 percent). Applies to uplands zones only. Areas designated for wastewater irrigation, impermeable liners, Water Quality Buffer Zones and Critical Environmental Features are to be excluded from Net Site Area.
 - The creek falls within the water quality buffer zone which is deducted from the gross area. The allowed impervious cover acreage is 55% of the Net Site Area (gross site area minus buffer areas). The creek has no other bearing on the impervious cover allowance.
105. Do the buffer zones count as 100% pervious coverage?
- Net Site Area
 - (100 percent of land with gradient of 15 percent or less) + (40 percent of land with a gradient from 15 percent to 25 percent) + 20 percent of land with gradient between 25 percent and 35 percent). Applies to uplands zones only. Areas designated for wastewater irrigation, impermeable liners, Water Quality Buffer Zones and Critical Environmental Features are to be excluded from Net Site Area.
106. Will the city be responsible for enlarging retention ponds if required due to road extensions?
- See above

107. What is the timeline for the proposed future signals at Tordera Road/Bee Caves Parkway and Skaggs/Hwy 71?
 - a. Anticipating for the light to be operational when the development opens.

108. What is the intended timeline for start and completion of the extension of Skaggs Road and Tordera Road on the site? Would the city entertain the developer completing this work as part of the development under a funding/reimbursement structure?
 - a. We are open to collaboration.

109. Can the city elaborate on their desire to create paths to home ownership? Preferred structures?
 - a. See above.

110. Does the city have a preferred tax-exempt bond issuer? Credit Enhancer? Trustee?
 - a. Not at this time.

111. Has the city had any preliminary conversations with the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA) regarding the project? Have they had preliminary conversations with others? HACA? Travis County? Does HACA have jurisdiction to work outside of the city of Austin?
 - a. Not at this time.

112. Is the city aware of bond issuers who have previously financed projects in Bee Cave? Can we have a list please?
 - a. Not at this time.

113. Given the city's intent to create a public facility corporation (PFC), have they given thought to their preferred structure?
 - a. We look forward to respondents creative proposals.

114. Do they intend to maintain ownership and enter a long-term ground lease with the developer/operating entity?
 - a. See above.

115. Do they have requirements around ground lease rent?
 - a. See above.

116. Will they act as the General Partner of the operating entity?
 - a. See above.

117. Do they have any specifics around their desired equity and economic interests, fee sharing, etc.?
 - a. See above.

118. In connection with the PFC, do they intend to form a 501(c)(3) and apply for a sales tax exemption? If so, can we assume in our projections that a 501c3 will be established?
- a. The Bee Cave Development Corp has a 501(c)(3) in place.
119. Can the city recommend any local social service agencies that might be well suited to provide tenant services?
- a. Not at this time.
120. Product Type: Given that you have mentioned typical garden is your least desirable product type, can you please opine on your most desirable product type and design intentions? Single-family rentals alone will not allow for the depth of affordable units desired.
- a. See above.
121. Affordability: Within the 50%-70% Affordability Thresholds, does City of Bee Cave have a preference within how this is allocated? Is the preference to additionally distribute equally by bedroom type?
- a. See above.
122. TIA: Will the future stoplights be funded by COBC?
- a. Yes
123. Offsite Improvements: How far did the utilities get pulled from the BackYard development? May you please provide any information regarding the distance for offsite improvements or potential costs to carry for pulling utilities to the site?
- a. It is the City's understanding based on the Hill Country Indoor Phase 1 construction plans that waterlines exist along the Bee Cave Pkwy frontage and along the existing Skaggs roadway. Wastewater was installed along the existing Skaggs Drive under the eastern side of the pavement with a stubout to the northernmost lot. It is anticipated that water and sewer lines will need to be extended to SH 71; however, this shall be confirmed, along with availability of service based on proposed demand, with the PUA.
124. Will a title commitment be provided since a title survey / exceptions list is not available?
- a. No
125. Does the previous recorded Impervious Cover Acknowledgements associated with the adjacent properties, affect the allowable IC, or can we assume 55% Net Site Area is the allowable regardless of those documents?
- a. Assume 55% for purposes of a proposal response.

126. The existing water quality pond was accepted under older code and processes, which accepted the pond as meeting the removal rates. Please confirm if the pond design is grandfathered and that we can still assume it can treat the amount of impervious cover it was originally sized/ designed for (with excess IC being treated by new proposed ponds, to be designed to current code).
- a. See above.
127. Per Document #2016071604, Confirmation of Impervious Cover Credit, an additional 52,655.328 sf of Impervious Cover credit (due to Bee Cave Pkwy ROW dedication to the City) is available. Can that be added to the 55% impervious cover?
- a. Please use 55% IC as your calculation for purposes of proposal response.
128. Will site be subject to Atlas 14 precipitation / methodology?
- a. Yes
129. Is City providing WQ and Detention for Skaggs Drive with the roadway project since a portion of that road is downstream of the existing WQ pond? If not, can WQ Pond be located in 75' landscape buffer along Hwy 71 since that pond would be to primarily treat the road?
- a. Ponds are not allowed within the buffer.
130. Deed records note an unnamed road abutting the site along the west property line was dedicated as a public road. Is there a plan regarding the future use of this road?
- a. See above.
131. Is City installing 12" WL extension along Skaggs Drive with the construction of Skaggs Drive? The dam has limited width available outside of pavement for this and other utilities.
- a. Undetermined.

Questions received 4/4/2024

132. Predevelopment schedule: If zoning efforts are required, will the new zoning classification need to be finalized prior to kicking off the site plan permit process?
- a. Yes
133. Will a TIA be required by the City?
- a. Yes
134. Has the city expressed a desire to protect existing on-site trees?
- a. That would be preferred, has not been determined.
135. What kind of perpetual access easement needs to be maintained to the neighboring family? Gate access at 71?

- a. We anticipate there will be some level of cross access, to be determined.
136. In regard to the proposed road over the existing dam to Hwy 71. Is it the applicant's responsibility to design, engineer, and build this connection to 71 within this proposal?
- a. See above.
137. Is it the applicant's responsibility to coordinate with TXDOT for the access road? Or has this already been approved?
- a. See above.
138. How many LUE's are allotted for the property? Is there a reservation of LUE's with the WTCPUA for the increased density of workforce housing? If not, what are the estimated impact fees?
- a. To be determined, assume the appropriate number will be available.
139. Is the city open to alternative methods of water treatment? Terraced rain gardens, injection wells etc...
- a. City code allows alternative water quality treatment facilities as approved by the City Engineer; however, they must include pollutant removal data proving the design will meet the City's 90% pollutant removal criteria.
140. There is a drainage easement shown on the LGA site plan that is roughly 1.2 acres on an otherwise developable area. Is the city amenable to vacating that easement so long as drainage solutions are engineered to accommodate any existing and proposed drainage impacts.
- a. To be determined.
141. Is the city amenable to allowing significant cut fill variances seeing that there is existing fill from roadway construction spoils and significant topography on site. This will help us increase density.
- a. Cut/fill for ponds, buildings, and roads are excluded. Any other areas exceeding 8' of cut or fill requires Planning & Zoning Commission approval.
142. Is there a maximum density that the city would like to impose in terms of units per acre or FAR. R-5 = 13du/ac TCMU = 24du/ac
- a. See above.
143. Will Bee Cave Allow Tandem Parking in front of enclosed garages?
- a. To be determined.
144. With R-5 Zoning having a 13 unit per acre density cap with allowable additional 7 units per acre with at least 51% of the units being offered at 80% ami, we are

assuming a maximum density of 450 units on the subject site. Does this meet COBC expectations and requirements?

- a. To be determined.
145. Will a 20% parking reduction be granted with the submission of an adequate parking study?
- A. Section 3.4.2B.1(viii) In addition to the requirements of this subsection 3.4.2B.1, the Planning Director may approve up a twenty percent (20%) reduction if the following criteria are met:
 - B. The applicant submits a study or evaluation from a qualified parking consultant that demonstrates the reduction will not increase congestion;
 - C. The use does not create ancillary parking demand from services such as pick up/drop off, curbside, or other factors that increase the amount of vehicle turnover during operational hours; and
 - D. The use does not share parking with other uses (see subsection 3.4.2C).
146. Is the city Amenable to waiving covered parking requirements or at least reducing the covered parking percentage from 75%
- A. This percentage may be reduced or waived by the Director for projects receiving a density bonus per section 3.4.4E.4. (UDC Section of Code 3.4.4B.3)
147. If a public private partnership (Housing Finance Corporation or Public Facility Corporation or other) will the City of Bee Cave be disclosing terms of such an agreement, or is that to be proposed by the applicant?
- a. To be determined, looking for respondents to propose structure.

Please submit all questions to the Advisory Contacts below.

Advisory Contacts

Joe Dowdle

Managing Director

512.593.4901

Joe.Dowdle@jll.com

Will Douglas

Senior Managing

Director

512.940.1976

Will.Douglas@jll.com

Parker McCollum

Associate

512.532.1971

Parker.McCollum@jll.com

George Carameros

Analyst

512.368.7140

George.Carameros@jll.com