

Description	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
			Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>CHAPTER 25-1 GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>				
1. <i>Impervious Cover Measurement</i> (§25-1-23)	Current code regulates impervious cover in two places: §25-1-23 for zoning limits and §25-8-63 for watershed limits. The requirements are largely consistent, but some elements are included in one section but not the other.	Move code provisions from §25-1-23 to §25-8-63 for clarity and ensure compatability. Refer to §25-8-63 in §25-1-23 as a reference.	Clarity. Consistency.	None.
2. <i>Application for Adjustment</i> (§25-1-251, 252)	Current code provides limited adjustment option to resolve potential takings issues in Barton Springs Zone. But option not available in other watersheds.	Extend limited adjustment citywide. Allows Council, in the case of a conflicting law, to adjust application of 25-8, Subchapter A, for a specific property. Requires that such modification provide maximum water quality protection.	Offers means of resolving takings grievances in addition to existing variance system.	None.
<b>CHAPTER 25-2 ZONING</b>				
3. <i>PUD Tier 2 Watershed Elements</i> (§25-2 Subch.B. Art.2. Div.5. §2.4)	Current code for Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) presents various watershed-related elements that, if proposed by a prospective PUD project, demonstrate "superiority" to standard compliance. But some elements are outdated.	Bring watershed protection elements in alignment with other WPO provisions, e.g., use of innovative controls, volumetric detention, mitigation of offsite runoff, & superior stream buffers; delete outdated provisions.	Provide consistency in what is considered "superior" watershed protection to the PUD rules, a key "lead by example" type of land use tool used by Council.	None. But will need to clarify that this effort will be limited to watershed elements (i.e., does not address the entirety of PUD superiority elements).
4. <i>PUD Tier 2: Grandfathering</i>	Credit for compliance with current code instead of asserting grandfathered rights.	Changes existing version to clarify that project forgoes grandfathering rights rather than just comply with code.	Compliance with current code is not "superior" unless it involves forgoing of grandfathered rights.	None. All Tier 2 options are or are not selected at the discretion of the applicant.
5. <i>PUD Tier 2: Superior Water Quality Controls</i>	Credit for providing water quality controls superior to those otherwise required by code.	Provision unchanged from existing code.	Offers a way to propose water quality controls not included in the Environmental Criteria Manual; encourages innovation.	See above.

Description	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
			Advantages	Disadvantages
6. <i>PUD Tier 2: Innovative Water Quality Controls</i>	Credit for providing green stormwater quality controls to treat at least 50% of the required water quality volume.	Modifies previous version that credited larger water quality capture volumes and pollutant removal. Updates previous name of "innovative" to current "green stormwater" water quality controls.	Current practice focuses on green infrastructure water quality controls. These are required to be properly sized for capture volume; they also offer superior pollutant removal. Providing more capture volume is not especially helpful unless the volume treats an untreated off-site area (which is the subject of another option; see below).	See above.
7. <i>PUD Tier 2: Treatment of Off-Site Development</i>	Credit for providing water quality treatment for currently untreated, developed off-site areas of at least 10 acres in size.	Modifies credit to align with current Environmental Criteria Manual policy regarding cost participation with projects offering to treat additional, off-site runoff. Corrects accidental error to require the drainage come from developed areas.	Ensures a meaningful area of land will be treated with controls; existing version could be a very small area for a very small PUD.	See above.
8. <i>PUD Tier 2: Impervious Cover Reductions</i>	Credit for reduction of impervious cover by 5% below the code maximum either on or off-site.	Retains this credit except removes a (seldom-used) provision to reduce single-family residential density by 5%.	Reduction of single-family density is not a current goal. (The Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan calls for "compact & connected" to counter urban sprawl.) Achieving the same or higher density on a reduced footprint of disturbance is preferred, hence the continued credit given to 5% impervious cover reduction.	See above.
9. <i>PUD Tier 2: 32-Acre Stream Buffers</i>	Credit for providing minimum 50-foot setback for 50+ percent of waterways with 32 or more acres of drainage.	Changes existing version that calls for 5-acre drainage area buffers--a laudable goal but likely not to be used.	Increases likelihood that projects will choose to have 32-acre buffers, which are superior to standard 64-acre buffers.	See above.
10. <i>PUD Tier 2: Volumetric Flood Detention</i>	Credit for providing volumetric flood detention as described in the Drainage Criteria Manual.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Volumetric flood detention can offer superior protection and warrants recognition.	See above.

Description	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
			Advantages	Disadvantages
11. <i>PUD Tier 2: Off-Site Drainage Upgrades</i>	Credit for upgrading inadequate off-site drainage infrastructure, such as storm drains and culverts.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Existing drainage infrastructure may be undersized and/or in poor condition; upgrades should be encouraged and warrant recognition as superior.	See above.
12. <i>PUD Tier 2: Floodplain Left Unmodified</i>	Credit for designs with no modifications to existing 100-year floodplains.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Modifications to floodplains are discouraged but still allowed; projects electing to leave them undisturbed should be recognized as superior.	See above.
13. <i>PUD Tier 2: Natural Channel Design Techniques</i>	Credit for use of natural channel design techniques.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Natural channel design techniques provide multiple public and environmental benefits as compared with conventional solutions and should be encouraged and recognized as superior.	See above.
14. <i>PUD Tier 2: Riparian Vegetation Restoration</i>	Credit for restoration of riparian vegetation in existing, degraded Critical Water Quality Zone areas.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Restoration of riparian vegetation is a major component of the WPO, providing multiple public and environmental benefits; efforts to actively reestablish this vegetation should be encouraged and recognized as superior.	See above.
15. <i>PUD Tier 2: Removal of Critical Zone Impervious Cover</i>	Credit for removal of existing impervious cover from the Critical Water Quality Zone.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Historic development often was placed too close to waterways in the Critical Water Quality Zone. Designs that remove impervious cover and restore soils and vegetation should be encouraged and recognized as superior.	See above.
16. <i>PUD Tier 2: Superior Tree Preservation</i>	Credit if: preserve all heritage trees; preserve 75% of the caliper inches associated with native protected size trees; and preserve 75% of all of the native caliper inches.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Need a clear plan to demonstrate superior preservation of existing trees.	See above.

Description	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
			Advantages	Disadvantages
17. <i>PUD Tier 2: Central Texas Trees &amp; Soil</i>	Credit if tree plantings use Central Texas native seed stock and adequate soil volume.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Need an option that recognizes the benefits and superiority of providing native seed stock and plants or providing adequate soil volume.	See above.
18. <i>PUD Tier 2: Increased Stream and CEF Buffers</i>	Credit if provide 50% or more increase in the minimum waterway <u>and/or</u> critical environmental feature setbacks required by code.	Modifies previous version that asked for both larger stream and CEF buffers; new proposal will give credit for either or both.	Increases likelihood that projects will choose to increase buffer protections for streams and CEFs.	See above.
19. <i>PUD Tier 2: Clustering/ Minimized Site Disturbance</i>	Credit if cluster impervious cover and disturbed areas to preserve the most environmentally sensitive areas of the site.	No change.	Retain provision to acknowledge superiority of clustering development to minimize site disturbance and impacts during and after construction.	See above.
20. <i>PUD Tier 2: Porous Pavement for Parking &amp; Drive Surfaces</i>	Provides porous pavement for at least 20 percent or more of all paved areas for non-pedestrian use in non-aquifer recharge areas.	Changes existing version that calls for 50% of all pavement to be porous--a laudable goal but likely not to be used.	The existing porous pavement option calls for 50% of all pavement, which is a threshold too high to encourage frequent use. A 20% or greater threshold will encourage more use of this provision and the benefits of this superior design approach.	See above.
21. <i>PUD Tier 2: Porous Pavement for Pedestrian Surfaces</i>	Credit if provide porous pavement for 50% or more of all paved areas for pedestrian use (e.g., sidewalks, plazas, etc.).	Add new Tier 2 option.	Porous pavement can help infiltrate water and reduce impacts from paved areas; it requires more expense and care and its use should be encouraged and recognized as superior.	See above.
22. <i>PUD Tier 2: Rainwater Harvesting for Landscape Irrigation</i>	Provides rainwater harvesting for landscaping irrigation to serve not less than 50% of the landscaped area.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Encourage water conservation and re-use of rainwater.	See above.

Description	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
			Advantages	Disadvantages
23. <i>PUD Tier 2: Increased Stormwater Management in Landscaping</i>	Directs stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces to a landscaped area at least equal to the total required landscape area.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Integration of stormwater management with landscaping benefits water quality and conservation; efforts to exceed baseline requirements should be encouraged and recognized as superior.	See above.
24. <i>PUD Tier 2: Other Creative Protective Measures</i>	Employs other creative or innovative measures to provide environmental protection.	Clarifies that credit be given for measures that "provide environmental protection."	Clarity.	See above.
25. <i>PUD Tier 2: Community Gardens &amp; Urban Farms</i>	Provides community gardens or urban farms. (Added to existing list of other community or public amenities.)	Add new Tier 2 option.	Provide environmental, health & community benefits of urban agriculture.	See above.
26. <i>PUD Tier 2: Public Trails &amp; Greenways</i>	Provides publicly accessible multi-use trail and greenway along creek or waterway.	Add new Tier 2 option.	Emphasis of the benefits of healthy riparian buffers is a major component of the WPO; efforts to integrate public trails should be encouraged and recognized as superior.	See above.
27. <i>Commercial Landscaping Code Conflicts (§25-2-982)</i>	Current code states that Commercial Landscaping Requirements do not override transportation requirements but does not speak to drainage or environment requirements.	Clarify that commercial landscaping provisions do not trump drainage or environmental requirements.	Acknowledges that 2010 changes to the Commercial Landscape Code are not meant to exempt developments from drainage & environmental requirements.	None: few conflicts are expected between Commercial Landscaping & drainage/environment requirements.
28. <i>Compatibility Standard &amp; Innovative WQ Controls (§25-2 Subch.C. Art. 10. Div. 1&amp;2 §25-2-1052, 1062 &amp; 1063)</i>	Zoning compatibility standards provide for setbacks between potentially conflicting land uses; currently unclear whether rain gardens would qualify as a "structure."	Allow rain gardens in compatibility setbacks.	Encourage the use of innovative WQ controls; give more flexibility to placement of controls; reduce project costs (combine landscaping & WQ controls)	If not maintained well could become nuisance for adjacent residential properties (note: would be concern of any landscape).

Description	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
			Advantages	Disadvantages
29. <i>Compatibility Standard &amp; Recreation/ Trails</i> (§25-2 Subch.C. Art.10. Div.2 § 25-2-1067)	Compatibility standards do not clearly define what qualifies as "passive recreation."	Clarify which features qualify as passive recreation, e.g., trails.	Facilitates low-impact neighborhood connectivity.	Potential compatibility issues need to be resolved prior to approval of passive recreation options.
30. <i>Site Development Standards</i> (§25-2 Subch.E. Art.2. §2.3.1.B.5)	Existing Commercial Design Standard code allows impervious cover limits to be exceeded by 5% if the difference is for porous concrete sidewalks. Proposed provisions eliminate the need for this added complexity.	Delete this section; no longer needed since sidewalks made of porous pavement are no longer to be counted against impervious cover limits [see §25-8-63(C)(8)].	Clarity. Consistency. Simplicity.	None.

Description	Current Status/Concern	Proposed Improvement	Anticipated Impacts	
			Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>CHAPTER 25-4 SUBDIVISION</b>				
31. <i>Easements and Alleys</i> (§ 25-4-132)	Current code recognizes the need to design easements for public utilities & drainageways to minimize construction cost but does not mention minimization of future maintenance costs.	Add minimization of future maintenance costs to the criteria for the determination of easement width and location.	Ensure that easements for public utilities and drainageways are designed with long-term maintenance in mind.	Potential increase is land required for easements; but is to avoid future public cost.
<b>Chapter 25-8 Subchapter B: Tree and Natural Area Protection; Endangered Species</b>				
32. <i>Shoreline Modification Review</i> (§25-8-652)	Requirements exist for Parks Board review in 25-7-63 as well; not in correct location.	Move language from 25-7-63 into 25-8-652.	Clarity	None.
33. <i>Birds &amp; Plants; Cave Species</i> (§25-8-693 & 694)	Reference to "habitat survey" no longer is applicable. Outdated references to recharge zone maps.	Delete "habitat survey" and refer to "Notice" (see below). Refer to definition of recharge zone in 25-8, Subchapter A.	Consistency.	None.
34. <i>Habitat Survey</i> (§25-8-695) <i>[Deleted]</i>	Requirement for a habitat survey no longer applicable under state law. (Applicants process this with the US Fish & Wildlife Service, not the City of Austin.)	Delete section.	Consistency. Conformity with State law.	None.
35. <i>Salamander Species</i> § 25-8-695	Need equivalent salamander section.	Add salamander species section.	Consistency.	None.
36. <i>Notice in Areas with Endangered Species</i> (§25-8-696) <i>[New]</i>	Requirement that the department director notify a number of entities (Council, Land Use Commission, Environmental Board & Travis County Commissioners Court) of applications for subdivision or site plans is not useful and does not relate to present practice.	Delete requirement to notify Council, Land Use Commission, Environmental Board & Travis County Commissioners Court.	Reduction of unnecessary paperwork.	None.