



IMAGINEAUSTON
Our Plan for the Future. In Action Today.

Land Development Code Advisory Group Meeting #22 Minutes

August 18, 2014 at 4:00 pm
One Texas Center, 3rd Floor, Room 325
505 Barton Springs Rd, Austin, Texas 78701

Members in attendance: Stephen Delgado, Melissa Neslund, Jeff Jack, Will Herring, Dave Sullivan, Jim Duncan, Chris Bradford, Stephen Oliver, Mandy De Mayo, Beverly Silas, Brian Reis.

Members Absent: none

Meeting Objective: Update on PDRD Workflow project, presentation on information given to neighborhood associations, and preparation for upcoming community event. The Advisory Group may vote on a resolution on any agenda item.

1. Approval of Minutes: By consensus the Advisory Group approved the minutes of the meeting July 21, 2014.
2. Update on PDRD Workflow and organizational assessment project: Melissa Martinez of PDR provided an update on the PDRD Workflow and organizational assessment project. Zucker Systems has begun what will be a nine month project, and is in the process of conducting staff interviews with stakeholder meetings as the next step. They are currently focusing on near-term recommendations, facilities, current workflow and staffing. Zucker Systems has offered to meet with the code advisory group during their next visit, at a time to be determined.
3. Review draft Code Diagnosis: Modifications to the resolution adopted at the July 21 advisory group meeting were discussed. With no objections from any advisory group members, the revised document (attached) was determined ready to submit to the consultant team as the code advisory group's comments on the Diagnosis document.
4. Presentation on information to neighborhood associations: Jeff Jack presented a critique of the CodeNEXT process (attached). Topics discussed by the advisory group (as interpreted by staff) included the perpetuation of mistrust, availability of missing middle housing, increasing existence of suburban poverty, as well as staying on schedule with

the project and not letting fear prevail in regards to questions that cannot be answered yet.

5. Review approach for the community event on Approach Alternatives & Annotated Outlines: Diane Miller presented an overview of the next educational CodeNEXT community event to be held on September 4 for the Approach Alternatives & Annotated Outlines document. Discussion included the role of code advisory group members at the event as well as outreach duties preceding the event.
6. Standing Items:
 - a. Discuss structure and organization of Advisory Group.
 - i. Joint working group with Planning Commission on updating neighborhood plans: Working group of three code advisory group members (Jeff Jack, Steven Oliver, and Will Herring) was formed to attend Planning Commission Neighborhood Plan Subcommittee meeting at 6:00pm on Wednesday, August 20 2014.
 - b. Discuss work product type and goals for Advisory Group (Milestone document): An updated copy of the 2014 Activities Update was distributed (attached). Steve Oliver requested a one month extension to refine the document.
 - c. Update from members on their outreach activities: Jeff Jack to Unitarian Universalist and Bouldin Creek Neighborhood; Dave Sullivan to Sierra Club; Mandy De Mayo to Leadership Austin; staff with ANC CodeNEXT committee members and Austin Institute of Architects.
 - d. Report from Working Group on Envision Tomorrow: None.
 - e. Agenda items to consider for next meeting (September 22): Upcoming meetings include September 4 community event; September 22 regular meeting; October 6 dedicated to public comment; October 20 regular meeting. The September 22 meeting will include a briefing from Opticos on the Code Approach Alternatives report, which will be distributed to advisory group members in early September. It was recommended that members submit questions to staff in advance so that the consultants can address them at the meeting.
7. Public Comment: Public comments included: use of Austin Eco Network to engage and inform the community; neighborhood members are watching the code advisory group and the process closely; concern about RECA statements on the CodeNEXT process; request that the code advisory group not be swayed by politics but use their expertise to achieve the best code possible; attention to the fact that the decisions that the advisory group makes affect many people; infrastructure data should be requested; missing middle used to be a larger part of the Austin housing market than it is today; request for more of this process to be accessible online instead of in-person meetings; request to maintain and strengthen specific ordinances; ensure that corridor plans are compatible with Imagine Austin; concern that developer interests are overrepresented on the code advisory group; infrastructure needs should be assessed on a cumulative

basis; ensure that the scope of CodeNEXT includes a green and sustainable approach and that Opticos is equipped with the right team to do that; preservation of heritage trees is critical; necessary to look at the impact on people currently living on the land.

8. CodeNEXT Team response to public comment: Reinforced concept that CodeNEXT is a tool to implement plans and not a plan in itself; the growth concept map in Imagine Austin aligns with existing neighborhood plans; any neighborhood plan changes need to go through City Council; there has been no statement from city staff that neighborhood plans nor any specific ordinances are being eliminated. Advisory group members also reinforced that they do not write the code, that their role is to advise on the progress of the project along the way as well as help in outreach efforts.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55pm.



CodeNEXT Advisory Group Resolution

The CodeNEXT Advisory Group gratefully acknowledges the feedback on the Code Diagnosis Report dated May 2014, specifically input received from

- [American Institute of Architects \(AIA Austin\)](#)
- [American Society of Landscape Architects \(ASLA Austin\)](#)
- [Austin Board of REALTORS \(ABoR\)](#)
- [Austin Neighborhoods Council \(ANC\)](#)
- [AURA](#)
- [Allan W. Shearer, Ph.D., ASLA](#)
- [Congress for the New Urbanism \(CNU-CTX\)](#)
- [HousingWorks](#)
- [Residential Design and Compatibility Commission \(RDCC\)](#)
- [Real Estate Council of Austin \(RECA\)](#)
- [Texas Appleseed](#)

Furthermore we acknowledge the feedback from individuals submitted through the

- [CodeNEXT: Online survey](#)
- [CodeNEXT: SpeakUpAustin, the city's community engagement portal](#)

Based on our own review of the Code Diagnosis and the comments submitted by stakeholders, the CodeNEXT Advisory Group (CAG) offers the following resolution:

Whereas the staff and consultant have met all obligation in terms of community outreach, and
Whereas the Code Diagnosis is a thorough and balanced description of major issues and opportunities in the CodeNEXT process,

Therefore the CAG recommends acceptance of the report, with the following two conditions:

1. The consultant team should consider and address the community input responding to the Code Diagnosis Report;
2. The consultant team should consider the topics in the list below for added detail in the Code Diagnosis Report as to how CodeNEXT may affect each:
 - a. Compatibility standards;
 - b. Technical criteria manuals that accompany the Land Development Code;
 - c. Economic analyses (see last paragraph on p. 207 of the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan, adopted June 15, 2012);
 - d. The Subdivision Ordinance rewrite;
 - e. Sustainable management of water resources;
 - f. Green infrastructure;
 - g. The treatment of small area plans;
 - h. Regarding “Austin-flavored” regulations (e.g., Capitol Views, Save Our Springs, Heritage Trees) – List specific elements of existing LDC encapsulating Austin values that will translate to the new code with little or no change.

- i. Detail what in our existing code influences new land development to pay for itself as opposed to having costs shared city-wide (e.g., water/wastewater, road capacity.)

Adopted by the CAG 7 – 1 (Jack) with Silas, Reis, DeMayo absent, July 21, 2014

Adopted by the CAG by consensus with all members present, August 18, 2014

Dave Sullivan, chair

Brian Reis, vice-chair

1. Austin Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan Interim Update 2008

- * Attempt by staff to “update” the plan by inclusion of staff supported actions not adopted by the City Council

2. Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan (IACP)

- * RFP for consultants weighted toward consultants that supported “smart growth” and new urbanists principles favoring adding more density to urban core neighborhoods.
- * Process was seen by many as being slanted toward a preconceived outcome due to manipulations of the community involvement process:
 - * Ignoring the results of the only statistically valid survey
 - * Unclear use of the “in a box” exercise outcomes
 - * Questionable “Chip” exercise map results allotted to into 4 pre-determined scenarios
 - * Slanted “indicators” used in four (A, B, C, D) scenarios survey
 - * South Congress Case Study outcome incomplete economic analysis focused entirely on ROI, more like “Enron” accounting.
- * Lack of clear definitions for “Sustainability” and “household affordability”
- * Difficulty in getting into IACP that the plan has to work for the existing population as well as those moving to Austin.
- * Focus on the “creative class” as the next economic engine without respect for the exiting working class of our community.
- * Development of the priority programs wherein both “compact and connected” and the re-write of the Land development Code were inserted without community support.
- * Planning Commission suggested action items included in PC recommendation to City Council on adopting the IACP not implemented
- * Eleventh Hour inclusion of add language to IACP concerning neighborhood plans and economic analysis, page 207 of IACP.
- * Preferred Growth Concept Map created as a result of
 - * Flawed chip exercises and subsequent skewed survey instrument
 - * Based on concept of adding density along transit corridors and at “centers”
 - * No information on infrastructure capacity or impact on existing zoning
 - * No means to discourage the utilization of existing zoning not consistent with map
 - * No economic analysis of the impact on cost to support growth concept.
- * Zoning Capacity Analysis was difficult to obtain and was not utilized to determine just how much additional zoning capacity was needed to accommodate projected growth.

3. Code Next, the rewrite of the Land Development Code

- * Establishment of the LDC Community Advisory Group with the provision that four of the 11 members would be appointed by the City Manager.
- * Requested of LDC CAG members to be fully in support of the IACP from the outset?
- * RFP again slanted to finding a consultant who supports “form based code” and new urban principles and “compact and connected”
 - * Request to have a clear scope of work to distinguish between substantive code issues and what are administration, management and city process problems was ignored
 - * Inadequate funding initially budgeted, not sufficient to cover scope of work needed to fully address issue left unresolved by the IACP.
- * Selected Consultant’s team heavily invested in supporters of the IACP process, either consultants or previous IACP CATF members.
- * Community engagement process
 - * Listening to the Community Report
 - * Over two hundred pages of comments (many ambiguous) distilled by staff and consultant into summary that supported their position.
 - * Limited opportunity for community to correct summary
 - * Community Character Manual
 - * Unclear how this input is being used to shape code diagnostic
 - * Neighborhood plans “priorities” again distilled by staff and consultants by counting of the number of items noted in plans without understanding any of plan’s actual priorities
 - * Limited opportunity for neighborhood associations or neighborhood plan contact teams to review the Code Next teams categorization of the neighborhood plans.
- * Schedule for establishing Code Alternatives set to be voted on by current City Council prior to November 2014 elections (since changed to allow new Council to review recommendation early in 2015.)
- * Initial Code Talks schedule established as a means to address unresolved issue coming AFTER the code diagnostic and recommendation on code alternatives.
- * Continued emphasis on “Compact and Connected” as #1 priority without evaluation of other IACP priorities.
- * Revelation that Opticos would not be dealing with the administrative, management and process issue of the existing LDC.
- * RFP for a separate consultant to deal with the administrative, management and process issue came out with out any CAG review almost a year into the process?

- * Code Diagnostic
 - * Mainly focused on the negatives of the code without acknowledging the positive aspects of the code.
 - * Ineffective base zoning
 - * Competing layers of regulations
 - * Complicated opt-in, opt-out process
 - * Lack of Household affordability and choice
 - * Auto Centric Code
 - * LDC not always in line with IACP
 - * Lack of usability and clarity
 - * Ineffective Digital Code
 - * Code changes adversely affect Department organization
 - * Incomplete and Complicated Administration and Procedures
 - * The enumerated short comings noted are consistent with the push of a more “compact and connected” planning approach without any consideration of the other IACP priorities
 - * Does not address how new base districts would be amended by community considerations or zoning negotiations.
 - * Possible basis for more “administrative” actions or by right zoning eliminating community input and oversight of neighborhood plans.
- * Other City initiated efforts related to the LDC re-write
 - * The push by this lame duck council for code changes before Code Next is done
 - * Airport Boulevard corridor plan pushing form based coding
 - * East Riverside Plan that supersedes the adopted neighborhood plans
 - * Micro apartment units in MF zoning on core transit corridors
 - * Accessory Dwelling Units with roll back of zoning site development provisions
 - * Bundling Project Connect with IACP and the code rewrite
 - * The South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan rejected by the community
 - * Elimination of Downtown Parking requirements
 - * Parking reductions for providing bike racks on commercial properties
 - * Parking meters on City Parkland and neighborhood parking districts
 - * Changes to the Neighborhood Planning process and the numerous Neighborhood Plan amendments
 - * Water resource planning Report 2014
 - * Affordable Housing initiatives focused mainly on increasing the supply of housing and not addressing any aspect of the demand side of the economic situation.
- * Data request on the relationship of “compact and connected “ (code for density) with the affordability of a community, none provided. Graph of the relationship of density with cost burdened households has been discounted as a “correlation” and not a “causation” but not other data provided.

* Envision Tomorrow Tool

- * Provides a long list of analytic outcomes or indicators but does not provide any means to evaluate other IACP priorities such as economic sustainability for our existing residents.
- * Process used by this tool relies on “normative data” from a variety of situations which may or may not reflect the on the ground situation in Austin Texas.
- * Actual real time data is available to be used such as sewer capacity, but is not being considered in the modeling process.
- * Process relies on a much finer grained analysis of our current zoning capacity but uses building types currently in place to establish metric for total build out capacity.
- * One run has been completed but is now being “adjusted” with a number of variables being used to “fine tune” the capacity numbers? The Envision Tomorrow working group has requested that several areas be looked at in detail such as South Congress, North Burnet and 78702.
- * Can the envision tomorrow tool indicated just how much up-zoning will be needed to provide the market with enough opportunity to build more housing to bring the price point down and to stop sprawl?

* Existing Neighborhood plans relationship to Code Next

- * Page 207 of the IACP is clear

- * “The existing neighborhood plans and area plans were crafted within the context of this (current) code and decisions were reached based upon the assumptions of the continued utilizations of its provisions. This includes elements of the Land development Code that are not specifically addressed in neighborhood or area plans but on which decisions were based (e.g. compatibility standards). The vision of the comprehensive plan can be achieved by retaining these protections and the approaches taken in the neighborhood and area plans.

- * “Any suggested rewrite of the City Code (LDC) while striving to achieve the broad goals of the comprehensive plan, must recognize, respect, and reflect these carefully crafted compromises, balances, and the assumptions upon which the existing neighborhood and area plans were based and depend.”

- * “Continued protection and preservation of existing neighborhoods and the natural environment must be considered top priorities of comprehensive revisions to the City Code (LDC). The consequences and impact of additional density and infill in existing neighborhoods must be carefully identified and analyzed to avoid endangering the existing character of neighborhoods and exacerbating community health and safety issues, such as flooding.”

- * So if the IACP is to be the basis of the new code why was the first “code talk” on “Compatibility”?
- * And why is there continuing work being done by Opticos sub consultants, the McCann, Adams studio on possible changes to current compatibility standards?
- * Why has the LDC CAG requested to Planning Commission to address this issue rather than deal with it as part of their responsibility?
- * How does the insertion of the “missing middle Housing”, which does not appear in the IACP at all, impact the retention of our neighborhood plan

* We often hear from the development community and the growth lobby that neighborhoods are “Nimby” and never accept any changes. What data supports this? It has been requested during the IACP that an analysis of the zoning in each neighborhood planning area be compared between what was allowed prior to the plan adoption and what is now allowed due to zoning changes approved as part of the neighborhood planning process. This data should be easy to acquire due to the work on the zoning capacity analysis done during IACP and would provide factual data on what added density neighborhoods have already accepted.

* Likewise we also hear from the growth lobby how neighborhood opposition is so bad that it is hard to get zoning changes through the city. So why not do an analysis of the number of zoning change requests that have been filed by the city over say the last 5 to 10 years versus how many have been denied. If my experience on the PC is any indication that probably 95% of zoning changes get approved on a regular basis. But lets run the numbers so we have factual data on just how hard it is to get a zoning change. This could be done on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis as well.

* Economic Analysis required of IACP

* Page 207 is also clear on this

* “Impacts on sustainability and livability by increased infill and density of units, including associated infrastructure costs and impacts on affordability should be identified prior to adoption of a new city code (LDC). Modifications to the City Code (LDC) and building code should be measured with regard to the ability to preserve neighborhood character, consistency with adopted neighborhood and area plans, impact on affordability, and the ability of existing families to continue to reside in their homes.”

* If the Envision Tomorrow Tool can not provide this required analysis, so when and how will it be provided?

* The request to do a simple standard projection of the various economic strata from historical data for the projected increase in population assumed in IACP has been ignored by the consultants and staff. While the 2014 Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis does show how the affordable housing gap has grown since 2009, it does not forecast what the economic diversity may be in the planning horizon of IACP.

* A similar request to map our current land values as a means to determine the likely placement of more affordable units due to land costs has also been ignored.

* There is a simple link between increasing zoning capacity, “up zoning” and the obligation of the city to provide infrastructure. Even with the recent increase in utility tap fees the total cost of providing infrastructure due to increased zoning capacity has not been analyzed with regard to the preferred growth concept map.

* With any suggested increase in zoning entitlements comes an increase in land value and eventual cost. It has been suggested that speculative up zoning drives up the cost of land and thereby is inflationary which has a negative impact on the cost of living. Has there been any consideration of how to prevent the unintended consequence on land values due to an up zoning that may occur with the adoption of the new LDC?

- * Actual mapping of new zoning district not until late 2016
- * Code Next CAG only established until November 2015?
- * Now can you determine the economic impact of the proposed zoning changes as required by page 207 if the mapping of where these new zoning districts and the related density they will allow has not been done BEFORE the code is adopted by the city?
- * What will be the process for determining where the new zoning districts will be applied and will this process denote any proposed zoning district applications will impact neighborhood or small area plans?
- * It has also been requested that a map be created that projects Austin's eventual annexation until we become land locked by other jurisdictions. This would then give a better understanding of the extent the new LDC would have to cover to be effective. This has not been done either.
- * How will Zilker Neighborhood be impacted by Code Next and the "missing middle housing"
 - * In 2001 the Zilker neighborhood we had 577.6 acres of which 345.7 acres is single family, 40.8 acres multifamily, (386.5 ac. Residential) 156.1 acres commercial, 3.8 acres office and 30 ac. Misc. (189.99 ac. Non-residential).
 - * Of the SF-3 Zoning we had 340.1 Ac. In 2004, with the following distribution

Lots > 4,000 sf. 406,	Lots 4,000 to 5750 sf. 122	Lots 5,750 to 7,000 sf 390
Lots over 7,000 sf. 894.		
 - * Many of the lots over 7,000 sf are either duplexes or have build secondary units as allowed under SF-3.
 - * These SF-3 lots over 7,000 sf are not concentrated in one area nor are they contiguous. So how would a new zoning district coming from the Code Next process be applied to recognizes these locations as part of the mix of the "missing middle housing"?
 - * Would it be suggested that these scattered SF-3 lots over 7,000 sf be "unified" by aggregating them into a geographic contiguous district that would necessitate inclusion of other non 7,000 sf lots?
 - * Would the residential lots between 5,750 sf and 7,000 sf be recommended for secondary units as was the case with staff recommendation for the SACNPA?
 - * Would lots over 7,500 sf be recommended by staff to allow the re-sub to three 2,500 sf cottage lots? And would lots over 7,000 sf be recommended by staff to allow two homes at 3,500 sf.
- * How much must neighborhoods "change", how far to we have to go toward Houston or New York, what is the density that developers , staff and the consultant really want in our neighborhoods? Be honest, tell the truth and quit hiding behind "compact and connected"

CodeNEXT Land Development Code Advisory Group (CAG)

2014 Activities Update

Composition:

The CAG is comprised of eleven (11) members including Chris Bradford, Mandy De Mayo, Stephen Delgado, Jim Duncan, Will Herring, Jeff Jack, Melissa Neslund, Stephen Oliver, Brian Reis (Vice-Chair), Beverly Silas, Dave Sullivan (Chair).

Structure:

The CAG has regular monthly meetings, most often at 4pm on the 3rd Monday of the month at City Hall. Meetings were initially led by City Staff but transitioned being led by Chair Sullivan. Attendance has been high and consistent from all 11 members. The roles of chair and vice-chair were approved by the CAG members after nearly one year of meetings. The presence of community members and stakeholders has been high, consistent and increasing as well. Typically there are 10-20 community members and stakeholders present.

Activities and Responsibilities:

- 1) to review staff and consultant briefings on the work product (i.e. Community Character presentations);
- 2) to discuss outreach efforts by staff and fellow members;
- 3) to discuss consultant scope of work as related to working group expectations and those expectations raised in discussions with various stakeholders;
- 4) to listen and respond to community feedback during each meeting;
- 5) to provide feedback and recommendations on upcoming CodeNEXT schedule of product and meeting format (i.e. CodeTALKs);
- 6) to discuss ongoing problem areas within our current land development code to better educate ourselves in how to be ambassadors to all the various stakeholders;
- 7) to raise concerns regarding other parallel code revision and planning efforts (i.e. subdivision rewrite) and discuss how other efforts and processes will be best integrated into the CodeNEXT effort.

Work Product Review

- 1) Listening to the Community Report is the summary and documentation of the first 6 months of outreach and listening efforts conducted by City of Austin staff, the CodeNEXT consultant, the CAG and invested stakeholders and community members. It was made available to illustrate the many steps and mediums of the initial listening phase of CodeNEXT. The report serves as a guide for the documentation of feedback, interviews, questions and additional resources received and provided during this phase from community members, neighborhood residents, City Staff, and professional organizations.

CAG involvement: The CAG reviewed the work product with staff, represented stakeholders and the consultant during our monthly meetings as well as participated directly in the Listening Sessions documented in the report. The CAG recognized that this lengthy initial phase helped provide significant additional information that can be used in the context of understanding community needs and concerns surrounding the Code Rewrite. Austin's listening phase has been identified as uniquely more in depth than Code Rewrite efforts in other peer cities. However, the CAG also recognizes that the conclusion of this phase should not be viewed as the end of significant "listening efforts".

- 2) Community Character Manual is intended to combine key information and catalogue neighborhoods and the places that make Austin unique. The manual will document the form, character, design, and unique places that make up a neighborhood. This process is a combined effort led by the CodeNEXT consultant team as well as neighborhood residents, property owners, renters, employees, etc. who live, work and play in the area. This manual is intended to be expanded-upon over time and serve as a foundation for policy decisions and planning. It does not replace neighborhood plans or the efforts that went into the formation. It serves as an aiding document that brings together elements from across the city. It looks at what is on the ground in Austin in a way in a manner previously directed by Imagine Austin.

CAG involvement: The CAG has had an opportunity to review the manual and supported its development.

- 3) Code Diagnosis

CAG Feedback – Moving Forward

The significance of the CodeNEXT effort cannot be understated. The Working Group understands how critical it is to align the goals of Imagine Austin with a supportive Land Development Code. Key steps have already been recognized by the CAG and have been set in motion.

1. The CAG has witnessed the key relationship between a simplified and effective LDC and the "operating system" of city departments and the plan review process. Repeated consistently throughout our meetings has been a desire to best align the plan review process and departmental structure within the CodeNEXT product. The City of Austin has now hired a consultant to specifically address this relationship between code and administration of the code to which the CAG fully supports.
2. Continued Communication and expansion on difficult and/or sensitive areas within the code prior to later Draft approaches is necessary to build a foundation of understanding of how the code currently works. Often Code can be simultaneously successful and failing in helping our community realize the goals of Imagine Austin. This duality can be confusing to even seasoned professionals working daily with the LDC. The CAG strongly encouraged beginning CodeTALKs as early as possible so as to directly address difficult development issues early in the rewrite process. In June, the first CodeTALK was held centered on the topic of "Compatibility". The event, held over two sessions, was strongly attended.
 - a. The CAG feels the momentum of holding CodeTALKs should be aggressively maintained throughout the second year of the rewrite
 - b. Identifying follow up meetings on each topic is critically important so that there may be opportunities for progress on each issue.

In addition the following areas have been identified by the CAG to be addressed during the upcoming phases of work.

3. Clarity in the Neighborhood Planning process – CAG members have identified significant and growing confusion in the current and future Neighborhood Planning efforts related to CodeNEXT and the implementation of Imagine Austin. A wide range of stakeholders representing Neighborhood associations as well as those involved with design and development have pointed to a lack of clarity in the relationship of upcoming CodeNEXT mapping

(2017), current formulation of new Neighborhood Plans, and the future update of small area plans. This confusion often takes significant time and energy in CAG meetings though not directly related to current CAG agenda items. However, addressing these concerns about "What will happen next?" is key to the CAG being able to best provide input to City of Austin staff and the Consultant on current and future Code work products. The CAG has reached out to City of Austin and Planning Commission to support additional efforts to address Neighborhood Planning confusion.

4. Utilization of Envision Tomorrow – the CAG established a working group to track and provide input into the development of the zoning capacity modeling software being utilized by the Consultant team. It is important to understand and appropriately define expectations for the work product. The software has been targeted as key opportunity for understanding area specific issues related to zoning, affordability, infrastructure costs, and patterns of population growth. The software can be used to test assumptions when considering a range of zoning and LDC implications. When the new land development code is approved by council, the CAG will then assist in implementing the new zoning categories by remapping the city. The CAG views the envision tomorrow program as essential to this remapping effort. The CAG would support having goals and checkpoints throughout the code re-write process that involve the Envision Tomorrow program.

Observations and Consistent themes from Outreach Efforts

Staff and the Working Group have been working diligently to share the CodeNext process and educational components with a wide range of stakeholders and community groups. Some groups are very receptive to changes to the Code while others are skeptical as to the success of this endeavor. More outreach is consistently on our agenda and in the works.

This report specifically highlights the following items for additional consideration:

1. Ongoing fears by some stakeholders, specifically Austin Neighborhood Council, that the process is moving too fast to be properly vetted by the community as a whole.
2. Consistently the CAG hears from stakeholders wanting answers to Code Rewrite questions that will be answered during later phases of the rewrite effort. Because the initial listening session was robust and long in duration and the Draft Code is still several steps away, there is a natural impatience for wanting concerns to be immediately addressed related to specific areas of the code.
3. The presentation of the LDC rewrite during CAG meetings and Community Outreach events has been significantly weighed towards Imagine Austin principle of "Compact and Connected", though Imagine Austin identifies 6 other core principles.
4. The CAG hears many concerns related to fears of the unknown which is to be expected during such an extensive review of how our current LDC impacts our city policies, goals and the built environment.
5. The need for additional housing types (the missing middle) to be allowed and more easily built near and around our existing neighborhoods has been voiced consistently.

Recommendations to City Staff, Planning Commission and City Council

The CAG suggests the following set of actions to positively address opportunities and obstacles of successful progress through the LDC Code Rewrite process:

1. Develop a "Decision Tree" of what is known and unknown in future scenarios of updates to existing Neighborhood Plans and the formation of New Plans. Though the structure and representation of City Council will change during both the early Code adoption as well as later during the mapping phase of the lengthy Code

Rewrite process, it is critical to resolve as much of the confusion surrounding the future of neighborhood plans, their updates, the remapping efforts of CodeNEXT. It will be critical to consider the required resources to necessary to engage the community for each scope of work. Neighborhood Planning and CodeNEXT are different but parallel efforts in the context of Imagine Austin.

2. Provide a more balanced effort to address other Imagine Austin priority programs in CodeNEXT:
 - a. Sustainably manage our water resources
 - b. Continue to grow Austin's economy
 - c. Use green infrastructure
 - d. Grow and invest in Austin's creative economy
 - e. Develop and maintain household affordability
 - f. Creative a Healthy Austin Program

The emphasis on Compact and Connected without due mention of other priority programs leads some to the conclusions that CodeNEXT is only for the implementation of "Compact and Connected".

DRAFT