

CodeNEXT Working Group

2014 Feedback and Advisory Update – DRAFT 1.0

Summary of Regular Tasks

1. Review staff and consultant briefings on the work products such as the Code Diagnosis
2. Discuss outreach efforts by staff and fellow CAG members
3. Discuss consultant scope of work in relation to CAG and community expectations
4. Hear community feedback during our meetings

1.0 STATUS

Summary of Regular Tasks

6. Provide provide feedback on CodeNEXT schedule, product and structure
7. Discuss problem areas within our current LDC to better educate ourselves in being ambassadors to stakeholders
8. Raise concerns regarding potential hurdles and obstacles in the CodeNEXT

1.0 STATUS

Summary of Regular Tasks

6. Provide provide feedback on CodeNEXT schedule, product and structure
7. Discuss problem areas within our current LDC to better educate ourselves in being ambassadors to stakeholders
8. Raise concerns regarding potential hurdles and obstacles in the CodeNEXT

1.0 STATUS

ACIEVEMENTS

1. INCREASED UNDERSTANDING OF LDC TO BECOME A MORE KNOWLEDGEABLE WORKING GROUP
2. DEVELOPED WORKING GROUPS TO ADDRESS MORE DETAILED AREAS OF THE CONSULTANT'S SCOPE
3. PRESENTED TO CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE, PLANNING COMMISSION, AND ???

Critical Elements Identified

1. Key Relationship between a simplified and effective LDC and the “operating system” of City Departments and the Plan Review Process.

- *Clarification of the scope of the Contract*
- *Schedule of “operating system” realignment*
- *What is best practice and what do we need?*

2.0 OPPORTUNITIES AND CONCERNS

Critical Elements Identified

2. Understanding of the two major portions of work in the code rewrite, the zoning and technical components vs. the mapping of the code.

- *Zoning theory vs. practical application*
- *Fears of what is on the table on what isn't and where it's on the table and where it isn't*

2.0 OPPORTUNITIES AND CONCERNS

Critical Elements Identified

2. Understanding of the two major portions of work in the code rewrite, the zoning and technical components vs. the mapping of the code.
 - *Neighborhood plan updates as a part of Imagine Austin is related to CodeNEXT but is also not the same thing. Our comprehensive plan and its components are to be updated every 5 years.*
 - *The impact of 10-1 Council*

2.0 OPPORTUNITIES AND CONCERNS

Consistent Themes

1. Confusion of some graphics
2. How is the information gathered being used
3. Mix of positive and negative reactions at each step/deliverable
4. Mix of opinion on how much the code should be modified/updated

3.0 Observations and Themes from Outreach Efforts

Consistent Themes

5. Nearly all stakeholders ask for major improvements in the development review process
6. Many are concerned about the leadership transition within the City at providing guidance throughout the long CodeNEXT process

3.0 Observations and Themes from Outreach Efforts

Consistent Themes

7. Nearly all stakeholders are concerned about the code's impact on affordability, mobility, environmental protections, density, infrastructure improvement, open space and preservation with varied viewpoints.

3.0 Observations and Themes from Outreach Efforts

1. Identify necessary steps to best transition the development review process and departmental structure to be in alignment with the CodeNEXT product.
2. Instruct staff and the consultant team to explore options for integrating components of the later Mapping phase earlier into the process so stakeholders have a preview of what happens later. Talk openly about options.

4.0 Recommendations to Council