AUSTIN LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE

Environmental Commission October 4th, 2017

SHAPING THE AUSTIN WE IMAGINE







Overview

- Introduction
- Comments on Public Review Draft
- Draft 2 Improvements
- Natural + Resilient Section Improvements





INTRODUCTION



IMAGINE AUSTIN COMPREHENSIVE PLAN



The imagine Austin **Comprehensive Plan was** adopted by Austin City **Council in June 2012**

Imagine Austin lays out our citizens' vision for a complete community that responds to the pressures and opportunities of our growing modern city.



Core Principles for Action

connected city

Grow as a compact,



Provide paths to

prosperity for all

Develop as an affordable and healthy community



Sustainably manage water, energy and other environmental resources



Endorse innovation and creativity throughout the city

CODE

4-OCT-17

UPDATING AUSTIN'S LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE



In 2013, the City engaged the help of both national and local experts to work with elected officials, staff, appointed representatives, and the community at large on how best to align our land use standards and regulations with the goals of Imagine Austin.

Process To Date 2013 - 2014 2014 - 2015 2014 2015 2016 2017 **Draft Code** Listening Community Alternative Code Code to the Character Diagnosis Approaches **Prescriptions** Manual to the Code Community

Past reports and documentation of the CodeNEXT process can be reviewed at **austintexas.gov/CodeNEXT**



CODE

5

CODE DIAGNOSIS SUMMARY

Top 10 Issues





Complicated "Opt-in, Opt-out" System

Ineffective Base

Zoning Districts

Competing Layers

of Regulations



Lack of Household Affordability and Choice



Auto-Centric Code



Not Always In Line with Imagine Austin



Lack of Usability and Clarity



Ineffective Digital Code



Code Changes Adversely Affect Department Organization



Incomplete and Complicated Administration and Procedures





LIMITATIONS OF CONVENTIONAL ZONING

ENVIRONMENTAL | 7 COMMISSION

The conventional, use-based approach to zoning has been shown to be ineffective for regulating diverse, urban, mixed-use environments.

These three parcels have "CS – Commercial Services" as their base zone.

















LIMITATIONS OF CONVENTIONAL ZONING

Over the years, supplemental layers of regulations have been added to address incompatibilities and issues of the day, resulting in complexity and reduced usability.



8

Other SF-3 Combinations

SF-3 SF-3-CO SF-3-CO-H-NP SF-3-CO-NCCD-NP SF-3-H SF-3-H-CO-NP SF-3-H-HD-NCCD-NP SF-3-H-HD-NP SF-3-H-NP SF-3-HD SF-3-HD SF-3-HD SF-3-HD-NCCD-NP SF-3-HD-NP SF-3-NCCD-NP SF-3-NP

CODE

LIMITATIONS OF CONVENTIONAL ZONING

Existing Base Zoning Districts

RESIDENTIAL

- Lake Austin Residence District LA Rural Residence District RR Single Family - Large Lot SF-1
- Single Family Regular Lot SF-2
- SF-3 Family Residence
- SF-4A Single Family Small Lot
- SF-4B Single Family Condominium
- Urban Family Residence SF-5
- Townhouse and Condominium SF-6
- MF-1 Multifamily - Limited Density
- Multifamily Low Density MF-2
- Multifamily Medium Density MF-3
- Multifamily Moderate Density MF-4
- Multifamily High Density MF-5
- MF-6 Multifamily - Highest Density
- Mobile Home Residence MH

COMMERCIAL

- Neighborhood Office NO
- Limited Office LO
- General Office GO Commercial Recreation
- CR LR
- Neighborhood Commercial GR
- Community Commercial Lake Commercial L
 - Central Business District
- CBD DMU Downtown Mixed Use
- W/LO Warehouse/Limited Office
- CS Commercial Services
- Commercial Liquor Sales CS-1
- CH Commercial Highway

INDUSTRIAL

- Industrial Park IP
- LI Limited Industrial Service
- Major Industrial MI
- R&D Research and Development

- **Combining and Overlay Districts**
- Central Urban Redevelopment (CURE)
- Conditional Overlay
- □ Historic Landmarks
- Historic Area
- Neighborhood Conservation
- Capitol Dominance
- □ Capitol View Corridor Overlay
- Congress Avenue
- East Sixth / Pecan Street
- Downtown Parks
- Downtown Creeks
- Convention Center
- Planned Development Area
- Criminal Justice Center Overlay
- □ Barton Springs Zoning District Overlay
- U Waterfront Overlay
- University Neighborhood Overlay
- Neighborhood Plan
- Mixed Use
- Vertical Mixed Use

Special Purpose Zoning Districts

- **Development Research** DR
- AV Aviation Services
- AG Agricultural District
- Ρ Public
- Planned Unit Development PUD
- ΤN Traditional Neighborhood
- TOD Transit Oriented Development
- NBG North Burnet/Gateway
- East Riverside Corridor ERC

Combinations Found in the Existing Code



CODE 4 - O C T - 1 7

COMMENTS ON PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT (DRAFT 1)





EVENTS AND MEETINGS:



HELD ON THEMES



STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

CODE NEXT 4-0 CT-17

HELD FOR ONE-ON-ONE MEETINGS





ON CODE TEXT AND MAP





comments on the text from 3,410 users through the CiviComment portal



submitted position papers







What we heard during the Public Review Draft, a desire for: "More Consistency" "More Flexibility" "Single Spectrum"





DRAFT 2 IMPROVEMENTS



MAPPING CHANGES

- New and unified spectrum of zones
- Conservation Lands (CL) introduced on Balcones Canyonlands Conservation Program (BCCP) lands and certain water quality protection properties and Park (PR) applied to City Parkland (work continues)
- Former Title 25 (F25) applied to properties that are bound to Title 25, such as NCCDs, specific COs, PDAs, TOD, NBG, and ERC





ENVIRONMENTAL

COMMISSION

15

2015 City Council Direction "Hybrid" Code

{DRAFT 1}

Transect Non-Transect

T3NELDRT3NLMDR

{DRAFT 2}

ENVIRONMENTAL

COMMISSION

16

Residential House-Scale

Zone Group	R1	R2	R3
Zone Districts	R1A R1B R1C	R2A R2B R2C	R3A R3B R3C R3D



Arrange Zones Along a Single Spectrum

Draft 1 Improved upon the Existing LDC by reorganizing standards and providing additional tools by creating two zoning tools in a hybrid code.

Concerns with Draft 1: Separating zones into distinct categories—Transect and Non-Transect—divided the City.

Draft 2 creates a **Single spectrum of zones** that can respond to specific on-the-ground conditions found throughout Austin.







STRUCTURE

ZONE Districts are organized in to Categories and Groups

CATEGORIES are overall themes such as house-scaled residential or mixed-use

GROUPS are zones that share common intensities of development.

Zones are organized into Theme Categories

 Groups of Zones, Based on Intensity

 (less intense < ----> more intense)

 Sistricts





CODEANEXT

ENVIRONMENTAL

COMMISSION

Category: Residential House-Scale

Groups: Residential 1, Residential 2, Residential 3

Zones:

Residential 1A, Residential 1B, Residential 1C ...

Residential House-Scale

Zone Group	R1	R2	R3
Zone Districts	R1A R1B R1C	R2A R2B R2C	R3A R3B R3C R3D



4-0 CT-17

SINGLE CONSISTENT SPECTRUM

ENVIRONMENTAL | 20 COMMISSION



VARIATIONS ON STANDARDS

- Lot Size
- Form Controls (McMansion)
- Setbacks
- Land Uses





NEW ORGANIZATION

Categories:

Zone Districts are organized into theme categories

Residential House-Scale

Residential Multi-Unit

Mixed-Use

Main Street

Regional Center

Commercial & Industrial

Other





ENVIRONMENTAL

COMMISSION

21

RESIDENTIAL HOUSE-SCALE

Zone Group	RR	LA	R1	R2	R3	R4
Zone Districts	RR	LA	R1A R1B R1C	R2A, R2B, R2C, R2D, R2E	R3A, R3B, R3C, R3D	R4A R4B R4C
Number of Units	One Unit Typical	One Unit Typical	One Unit Typical	Up to Two Units Typical	Up to Three Units Typical	Up to Four Units Typical
Height feet	35	30	35 (32 R1C)	35 (32 R2A / R2C)	35 (32 R3C / R3D)	35
Front Setback	40	40	25	25 (15 for R2D / R2E)	25 (15 for R3D)	25 (15 for R4B / R4C)
Building Cover	20%	varies	40% (35% R1A)	40% (55% for R2D / R2E)	40%	40%
Impervious Cover	25%	varies	45% (40% R1A)	45% (65% for R2D / R2E)	45%	45%

RESIDENTIAL MULTI-UNIT

Zone Group	RM1	RM2	RM3	RM4	RM5	MH
Zone Districts	RM1A RM1B RM1C	RM2A	RM3A	RM4A	RM5A	МН
Height feet	35 (45 RM1B)	40 (55 RM2B)	60	75	90	25
Front Setback feet	25 (10 RM1B)	25 (10 RM2B)	25	5	25	25
Building Cover	50%	50%	60%	80%	70%	20%
Impervious Cover	60%	60%	70%	90%	80%	25%

MIXED-USE

Zone Group	MU1	MU2	MU3	MU4	MU5	
Zone Districts	MU1A MU1B MU1C MU1D	MU2A MU2B	MU3A	MU4A MU4B	MU5A	
Height feet	32 / 45	35 / 45	60	60	80	
Front Setback feet	25	20 / 15	10	10	30	
Building Cover	40%	40%	75%	90% (95% MU4B)	70%	
Impervious Cover	60%	60%	90%	95%	75%	CODE NEXT 19-SEP-17

MAIN STREET, REGIONAL CENTER DRAFT 2 ROLL OUT | 25

Zone Group	MS1	MS2	MS3	CC Commercial Center	UC Urban Center	DC Downtown Core
Zone Districts	MS1A MS1B	MS2A MS2B MS2C	MS3A MS3B MS3C	СС	UC	DC
Height feet	35	45	75	Varies, 120 max.	Varies, No Limit	Varies, No Limit
Front Setback feet	5	5	5	10	5	0
Building Cover	70%	70%	90%	95%	95%	100%
Impervious Cover	80%	80%	95%	95%	100%	100%

COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL

Zone Group	CR Commercial Recreation	COM Commercial Warehouse	IF Industrial Flex	IG Industrial General	Industrial Heavy	R&D Research & Development
Zone Districts	CR	CW	IF	IG	ІН	R&D
Height feet	40	25	60	60	120	90
Front Setback feet	50	25	10	25	0	25
Building Cover	25%	25%	75%	50%	75%	40%
Impervious Cover	60%	70%	80%	80%	80%	50%

OTHER ZONES

ENVIRONMENTAL | 27 COMMISSION

Zone Group	P Public	Aviation Service	AG Agriculture	DR Development Reserve	PR Park	CL Conservation Land	PUD Planned Unit Development	F25 Former Title 25
Zone Districts	Ρ	AV	AG	DR	PR	CL	PUD	F25





ZONE NAMES AND MAP CHANGES

1

DRAFT 2

ENVIRONMENTAL

COMMISSION







ZONE NAMES AND MAP CHANGES

ENVIRONMENTAL | 29 COMMISSION

Existing Title 25

DRAFT 1

DRAFT 2







DRAFT 2





CONSISTENCY:

Impervious Cover and Building Cover

Draft 1 built upon the Existing LDC and strengthened water quality and flood mitigation regulations.

Concerns with Draft 1: Concern over how the former two zoning tools related and if the new districts increased impervious cover.

Draft 2 provides a single spectrum that allows for easier comparison of impervious cover and building cover limits.





IMPERVIOUS COVER & BUILDING COVER

NO10 11

ENVIRONMENTAL | 33 COMMISSION



IMPERVIOUS COVER & BUILDING COVER

ENVIRONMENTAL 34 COMMISSION



CODENEXT PRIORITY: NATURAL + RESILIENT



PROMOTE WATER STEWARDSHIP/ ENCOURAGE FLOOD MITIGATION

• Takes pressure off of water supply lakes through use of green stormwater

infrastructure to create sites more resilient to drought

- Rainwater harvesting tanks receive **impervious cover exemption** to encourage water conservation
- Complements watershed and tree regulations by **prioritizing landscape**

requirements for stormwater filtration and tree preservation

• Provides enhanced flood mitigation by requiring redeveloping sites to



contribute their fair share to downstream solutions



4 - O C T - 1 7

ENVIRONMENTAL

COMMISSION

36
EMPHASIZE TREE PROTECTION

• Urban Forestry **refined its organization** to reduce wordiness & increase

readability

- Added references to right-of-way tree regulations
- Identified activities eligible for fee waivers
- Clarified that **Keystone Tree preservation** is **incentive-based** for single-family

development

• Further **refinements to due process language**, such as timelines for acting on

applications





4-OCT-17

INCREASE OPEN SPACES & PARKS

- **Open Space** is **defined** in CodeNEXT
- Open Space percentages are increased for larger sites from 10% to 15% of site area
- Parkland dedication, as adopted in 2016, remains unchanged in CodeNEXT
- CodeNEXT provides **guidelines** for **each type** of open space
- Revised land uses for recreation make it easier to locate small recreation types

into more areas of the City

New zones provide development standards for parks and preserved lands



CODE

4 - O C T - 1 7

ENHANCE NATURE IN THE CITY

- Improves commercial sites by **expanding landscape & tree planting standards**
- Provides **enhanced ecosystem functions** to urban environments
- CodeNEXT unifies the street visually to provide greater safety for pedestrians and other vulnerable commuters
- Improves all commercial sites with **expanded landscape treatments**





4 - O C T - 1 7

Key CodeNEXT Watershed Analysis & Proposals

Environmental Commission, October 4, 2017

Overview of Presentation

- Balancing Austin's priorities
- Impervious cover analysis
- Maintain existing watershed protections
- Flood Mitigation for Redevelopment
- Green Infrastructure / Beneficial Use of Stormwater
- Next Steps for Draft 3



Impervious Cover Analysis

Purpose of Impervious Cover Analysis

- Compare existing vs. current max. entitlements vs. proposed CodeNEXT max. entitlements
 - 100-year floodplain and drainage infrastructure implications
- Understand areas of change



Impervious Cover Analysis Results (Draft 2)

Area	Area Within City Limits	Existing Impervious	Allowed Maximum Impervious Cover (%)		Difference b/n Current
	(acres)	Cover (%)	Current LDC	Proposed LDC	and Proposed Entitlements
Total	208,668	27%	45.7%	45.2%	-0.57%
Urban Watersheds	38,115	51%	64.3%	63.3%	-0.95%
Likely to Develop/ Redevelop	20,245	8%	51.7%	51.6%	-0.05%
Local Flood Problem Areas	7,297	49%	57.3%	57.0%	-0.31%

Note: This analysis does <u>not</u> account for steep slopes, critical environmental feature setbacks, and protected trees. These protections potentially lower the total amount of impervious cover for any given parcel.

CodeNEXT Proposal

Maintain Existing Watershed Protections

- CodeNEXT proposes to preserve existing watershed regulations, including:
 - Floodplain protections
 - Drainage standards
 - Stream & lake buffers
 - Watershed impervious cover limits
 - Critical Environmental Features
 - Steep slope protections
 - Cut and fill limits
 - Erosion & sedimentation controls
 - Structural stormwater controls
 - Tree protections



History of Environmental & Drainage Regulations



Existing Watershed Regulations

CodeNEXT proposes to preserve existing watershed regulations, including:



2013 Watershed Protection Ordinance extended protection to 400 miles of headwaters buffers, increasing protection of eastern Blackland Prairie creeks by 90%



Watershed Regulations: Flood Mitigation

FloodPro



Watershed Regulations: Flood Mitigation



Count of structures in the current 100-year floodplain by decade

Watershed Regulations: Flood Mitigation



Count of structures in the current 100-year floodplain by decade

Watershed Challenges: Flood Mitigation

290



0 2 4 6 8 NORTH

Watershed Challenges: Flood Mitigation

- Older sites built before drainage regulations were introduced in 1974 lack detention facilities and are often highly impervious
- Runoff from these sites can contribute to downstream flooding and erosion
- Redevelopment in Austin's central core has put even greater pressure on existing infrastructure, which is often aging and undersized



Watershed Challenges: Flood Mitigation

- Current code requires commercial & multifamily projects and residential subdivisions demonstrate no <u>additional</u> adverse flooding
- Redevelopment projects that do not increase impervious cover or change drainage patterns are generally not required to provide flood mitigation
- As Austin grows and redevelops, key opportunities for improvement are being missed in areas that already experience flooding





CodeNEXT Proposal: Flood Mitigation for Redevelopment

- Redevelopment to contribute its fair share to address existing drainage issues by accounting for existing impervious cover
- Tools for mitigating flood impacts & reducing peak flows include:
 - Detention
 - Conveyance
 - Regional Stormwater Management Program (RSMP)



Subsurface Detention



Parking Lot Detention



Conveyance Upgrades



Regional Solutions



Original Site

Maria's Taco Express & Mobile Home Park 2.9 acres



Original Site

Localized Flood complaint points



Maria's Taco Express & Walgreens



Water quality controls (required by current code)



Added flood detention vault under parking lot





Upgraded drainage infrastructure



Original Site

Sunnymeade Apartments 3.96 acres



Original Site

Localized Flood complaint points



City improvements with Longbow Ln CIP project



Original Site No detention required



Added flood detention chambers





Green Infrastructure/ Beneficial Use of Stormwater

latershed Challenges and the Need for Water Stewardship



Current requirements for stormwater controls do not significantly address goals of enhancing creek baseflow, sustaining on-site vegetation, and reducing potable water consumption.

CodeNEXT Proposal: Green Infrastructure & Beneficial Use of Stormwater

- Infiltrate to mitigate the impacts of impervious cover
 - Improve stream baseflow
 - Pollutant removal
 - Reduce creek scour and erosion
 - Improve aquatic habitat
 - Enhance recreational values
- Conserve potable water indoors and outdoors
- Green stormwater infrastructure for resiliency




Next Steps

THE M

H

9

0

Flood Mitigation for Residential Infill and "Missing Middle" Housing

- Seeking to balance affordability goals with avoidance of drainage problems
- Analyses in progress to assess extent and severity of potential impacts
- Opportunity to lessen review burden for missing middle housing
- Assessing potential impacts on City resources & permitting process



Additional Analyses and Next Steps

- Impervious cover watershed analysis (updated)
- Modeling for estimating creek flood and localized flood impacts:
 - Redevelopment proposal
 - Residential infill
- Missing Middle: drainage & environmental considerations
- Continue work (e.g., capital projects) for existing drainage concerns
- Balance community priorities

Contact Information

Matt Hollon

Watershed Protection Department City of Austin

(512) 974-2212

matt.hollon@austintexas.gov







Full Purpose Jurisdiction

Difference from Current Impervious Cover Max



Parcels with the largest increases in max IC is largely attributable to rezoning from I-RR to a zone in alignment with its current land use

This map has been produced by the Watershed Protection Department for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.



Watershed	Watershed Area Within City Limits (acres)	Existing Impervious Cover (%)	Allowed Maximum Impervious Cover (%) Current LDC Proposed LDC		Difference between Current and Proposed Entitlements
Total	214,775	25%	49.6%	49.8%	0.25%
Urban Watersheds	38,594	48%	64.4%	64.1%	-0.35%

Note: This analysis does <u>not</u> account for environmental protections that may be located on a parcel, including stream buffers, steep slopes, Critical Environmental Feature setbacks, and protected trees. These protections potentially lower the total amount of impervious cover for any given parcel.

Existing Zoning	Percent of City	Existing IC	Current Max IC	Proposed Max IC	Pct Unbuilt IC
Single-Family	33%	20%	34%	35%	18%
Public	12%	6%	24%	24%	8%
Commercial/Multifamily	29%	32%	67%	66%	40%
PUDs	13%	7%	67%	67%	32%
No Zoning	14%	55%	59%	59%	1%
Grand Total	100%	25%	49.6%	49.8%	100%

- Commercial, Multifamily, and PUD zoning categories represent over 70% of unbuilt impervious cover (IC) entitlements.
- Under the new proposal, these properties would have to prove no adverse impact relative to undeveloped conditions.



Difference from current impervious cover maximum



Floodplains and Buffers



Difference from current impervious cover maximum



Water Features Floodplains and Buffers Imagine Austin Corridors



Difference from current impervious cover maximum





dditional Water Quality Changes

Additional water quality proposals include:

- Decompaction of soils after construction
- Revised creek crossing requirements for streets
- Limited payment-in-lieu option for small, infill subdivisions in Suburban Watersheds
- Improved code organization



Watershed	Watershed Area Within City Limits (acres)	Existing Impervious Cover (%)	Allowed Maximum Impervious Cover (%) Current LDC Proposed LDC		Difference between Current and Proposed Entitlements
Total	214,775	25%	49.6%	49.8%	0.25%
Urban Watersheds	38,594	48%	64.4%	64.1%	-0.35%

Note: This analysis does <u>not</u> account for environmental protections that may be located on a parcel, including stream buffers, steep slopes, Critical Environmental Feature setbacks, and protected trees. These protections potentially lower the total amount of impervious cover for any given parcel.

Existing Zoning	Percent of City	Existing IC	Current Max IC	Proposed Max IC	Pct Unbuilt IC Increase
Single-Family	33%	20%	34%	35%	18%
Public	12%	6%	24%	24%	8%
Commercial/Multifamily	29%	32%	67%	66%	40%
PUDs	13%	7%	67%	67%	32%
No Zoning	14%	55%	59%	59%	1%
Grand Total	100%	25%	49.6%	49.8%	100%

- Commercial, Multifamily, and PUD zoning categories represent over 70% of unbuilt impervious cover entitlements.
- Under the new proposal, these properties would have to prove no adverse impact relative to undeveloped conditions.