



PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION 20170912-E-01

Date: September 12, 2017

Subject: CodeNEXT

Motioned By: Commissioner Shieh

Seconded By: Chair Oliver

Recommendation

See attachment

Vote : 11-0

For: Chair Oliver, Vice-Chair Kazi and Commissioners Anderson, McGraw, Schissler, Seeger, Shieh, Thompson, Vela, White and Zaragoza

Against:

Abstain:

Absent: Commissioners De Hoyos Hart and Nuckols off the dais.

Attest: Andrew D. Rivera

_____  _____

Mayor Steve Adler
Mayor Pro Tem Kathie Tovo
City of Austin Council Members
City of Austin Staff and CodeNEXT Consultants

PLANNING COMMISSION CODENEXT DRAFT 1.0 MAPPING COMMENTS

The Planning Commission's review of the Draft 1 of the Zoning Map was extensive through the following efforts:

1. A designated Working Group was established to study map conditions, potential underlying motivations and mapping strategies. A key focus of study was related to identifying connections of the Draft 1 map to goals of CodeNEXT identified in Imagine Austin, existing city policies as well as other factors identified through our Commission activities.
2. A review was initiated of the previous Code Diagnosis, Prescription Papers, and other CodeNEXT presentations to understand how the map related to these earlier influential CodeNEXT documents and conversations with the community, CAG, the Planning Commission and City Council. It is noted that our individual and collective Commissioner expectations of the anticipated Draft 1.0 "mapping direction" were shaped by these connecting and directive elements from previous CodeNEXT efforts.
3. Individual research was ongoing throughout the review period by Commissioners with stakeholder groups, staff, community outreach presentations of the CodeNEXT map.
4. A wide range of other influencing factors over the last 5 months also supported Planning Commission understanding of the Draft 1.0 map.

The Draft 1.0 map review has taken on an on-going dynamic. It has been difficult to arrive at an official Planning Commission report or feedback document related to our collective opinions or directives in moving forward between the Draft 1.0 map and the forthcoming Draft 2.0 map. It is agreed upon by Planning Commission members that for many shared (and some differing) reasons, our original mapping expectations were not met. This has been expressed to staff and consultant during meetings throughout the review period, especially in the months of June and July. Subsequent to this unmet expectation, our requests of staff and the consultant to provide indications and examples of Draft 2.0 mapping direction have been largely unanswered or received with very high level or open-ended presentations. Finally, we recognize that a major new update, via a Draft 2.0 map, is soon to be released.

It has been stressed to the Planning Commission by City Staff and its consultants that the Draft 2.0 map will be more reflective of the wide range of comments they have collected since April. This would include Planning Commission feedback during our CodeNEXT meetings. With this in mind, and with the 2nd map arriving for review in the next few days, we believe it is most helpful to present the following expectations of the ultimate Planning Commission recommended Map (as part of Draft 3.0). Previous efforts and observations of the Mapping Working Group will continue to serve as a guide in our individual and collective reviews until that time.

1. Overarching goals (whether from Imagine Austin Comp Plan, supporting plans or any subsequent CodeNEXT documents) should be clearly communicated to the public as what the intent of each Map iteration is. These goals should be easily understood, when and where maps indicate updates that may differ from current zoning. Examples should be provided that can help guide the public in better understanding these types of alignments of zoning with adopted goals, policies, or areas where recommended new policies should be considered as part of the CodeNEXT adoption process.

2. The Planning Commission strongly encourages the presentation of a range of mapping options that illustrate various methods or strategies to reaching goals of CodeNEXT and Imagine Austin. In doing so, our recommendations can be based upon a “framework” of decisions or outcomes, i.e. if “x” goal is desired, “y” zoning tool can be increasingly utilized, rather than “z” zoning tool. Without such comparisons, making informed decisions becomes more difficult to make.
3. The mapping of zoning classifications should include the list of criteria used to arrive at specific or intended outcomes. Case study examples should be presented at a micro scale (perhaps multiple block) so that the impact of the desired strategies for the update can be illustrated and reviewed. Hopefully then, these examples of zoning updates can be better understood at a macro scale.
4. Changes from the original Draft 1.0 with respect to corrections, new code naming classifications, or for any other reason, should be tracked and be easily accessible for public review.
5. Where possible, the map and its supporting zoning strategies, should clearly show how it will be updated in the future thru necessary follow up planning steps. We understand the future adopted CodeNEXT map will be unable to address all planning related issues necessary to support Imagine Austin or other goals raised during the Code Diagnosis or Prescription Papers. However, we must be able to provide the anticipated content and timeline of needed updates to align current and future expectations with an understandable and achievable city planning process. In doing so, we can better categorize what we should be attempting to resolve now vs. items that we can manageably table to upcoming planning efforts. Essentially, we should all see, understand, and agree upon the scope and resources needed to “plan to plan”.

The Planning Commission looks forward to reviewing the 2nd Draft of the Zoning Map. We are hopeful that our input to City Staff and its consultants during many public meetings since the Draft 1.0 release will yield a Draft 2.0 Map that is significantly more aligned with the mapping directions indicated previously indicated in the CodeNEXT process and are supported by the Nodes and Corridors growth vision identified in Imagine Austin.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen Oliver". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being more prominent.

Stephen Oliver, AIA
City of Austin Planning Commission | Chair