





**Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council**

Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner										General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions							
		Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISSLER	SEEGER	SHIEH									THOMPSON	WHITE	SHAW				
12 Original Motion	Recommend approval of Article 23-3E (Affordable Housing Bonus Program), but with direction for staff to develop revisions that will address the following concerns:  1. Establish as additional items of intent for the program to: a. meet the annual affordable housing goals set forth by city council; b. generally permit sites to utilize affordable bonus entitlements; and c. maximize affordable units in high-opportunity areas, whether built on-site or financed via fee-in-lieu. 2. Reinstate expedited review for SMART Housing and expand it to the Affordable Housing Bonus Program at all stages for projects that participate in the program per the original requirements of 2000. 3. Explore a Super Density Bonus for large-scale affordable projects that offer over 50% of units as affordable 4. Establish a Density Bonus pilot program with a revision and review window of 18-months with an annual re-evaluation period to ensure the program is properly calibrated, and staff and consultants to continue to hold workshops with stakeholders, including affordable housing advocates, builders, affordable housing builders, construction companies, developers, and community advocates to continue to work out the bonus program. 5. Staff to use White Exhibit 1 Pages 20-25 (Edits to the SMART program) and White Exhibit 1 Pages 45-48 (SIMPLICITY & HOUSING BLUEPRINT GOALS - yellow from Housing Coalition) as a directive to prioritize those changes as they review this Article	Passed	10	0	1													White Exhibit 1 Pages 20-25 (Edits to the SMART program) and White Exhibit 1 Pages 45-48 (SIMPLICITY & HOUSING BLUEPRINT GOALS)  Kenny Exhibit 3 - Affordable Housing Bonus Program	Affordable Housing	NHCD: Generally not opposed, but opposed to the following elements: 1 a) Remove goals - not appropriate for Code  5) Staff do not recommend requiring density bonus projects to comply with S.M.A.R.T. Housing requirements unless it can be evidenced that typical density bonus projects would be S.M.A.R.T. Housing compliant and that this would not deter participation in density bonus programs.  DSD: Review turnaround times for SMART Housing projects are currently in a policy document and have been in effect since the program's inception. Staff adheres to these review times to the extent possible; however, turnaround times are impacted by application volume and available resources. DSD does not recommend reincorporating review times into the land development code. Review times are administrative and were removed from Title 25 and moved into the criteria manuals to be adopted via the rules process. Adopting review times by rule preserves the public stakeholder engagement component and provides staff with the flexibility to make adjustments based on the previously identified factors without having to initiate a code amendment.									
13 Original Motion	Upon Council's review of Article 23-3E, Council consider sending that division back to the Planning Commission for additional feedback	Passed	9	2	0														absent	Off dais	General to Article	23-3E		None	Affordable Housing	PAZ: Oppose. Process for adopting code should be consistent.	N/A		
14 Original Motion	Recommend approval of Chapter 23-4 with amendments previously approved	Passed	7	2	2															absent	Off dais	General to Article	23-4			Policy	PAZ: Do not oppose	N/A	
15 Original Motion	Strike "that are intended to promote compatible land patterns" and add "that address the social and environmental values described in 23-1A-1020."	-	-	-	-																	Specific to Section	23-4A-1010			Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose	20.2	
16 Original Motion	Reference back to the Comprehensive Plan (23-1A-1020) as recommended by staff	Passed	12	1	0																	Specific	23-4A-2020(H)			Policy		20.4	
16 Original Motion	List NCCDs and NP as Overlay Zones in Section 23-4A-2020(H)	Failed	5	8	0																								
17 Original Motion	Eliminate the Downtown Plan overlay until Small area plan can be completed with funding assistance provided by DAA.	-	-	-	-																								
17 Substitute Motion	Increase the base entitlements in DC per DAA recommendation, including: - Increase driveway width maximum to 30' to allow for 3 lanes of traffic flow - Frontage Requirements: Create exception for <1/2 block sites. Either significantly reduce the % gross frontage requirement or change requirement to "net" frontage or only require one block face of the site to comply. Or remove requirement in DC base zone and allow for a district planning process to dictate which streets and which uses are appropriate. And reduce requirements for many building support spaces (AE vault, fire pump, etc.) that must be located directly on ROW. The definition of active commercial uses (Commercial Group A in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone) needs to be clarified or refined to allow for ground level office or multi-family lobbies. Additionally, revise the requirement that prohibits stairs/ramps in required setbacks to allow them in required setbacks. - (intent) Recalibrate the Downtown Density Program to maximize the yield of affordable housing units in a way that does not impede taking up of the bonus, particularly related to small lots - FAR and height for the PID area, not including Judge's Hill, be increased to unlimited for the Density Bonus Program	Passed	12	0	1																	Specific to Section	23-4D-6080			Additional Development Standards	NHCD: Do not support increased base FAR. Generally, for bonus programs any increase in base entitlements will decrease the attractiveness of bonus entitlements, and could lead to decreased participation in the bonus program or decreased numbers of affordable units. Increases in bonus entitlements without any increases in base entitlements can increase participation in bonus programs.  Austin Energy: If intent is reduce frontage requirement because a certain amount will be taken up by necessary infrastructure, staff agrees.  ATD: Driveway widths and standards are within the TCM and should not be within Code (see previous ATD comments on various drafts). "Support spaces" requirements are dictated by various utility agencies, many of which are protected by franchise agreements and by environmental laws at the State level - these requirements can change periodically and should not be specifically called out within Code (should be within the UCM).  PWD: Driveway standards are in the Transportation Criteria Manual. Need to verify which building support spaces (AE vault, fire pump, etc.) are regulated by national, state & local standards and must go through the proper channels in order to be changed. The stairs/ramps are not allowed in required setbacks so that the City can meet ADA requirements within the ROW.	20.5	23.205 23.225
18 Original Motion	Change DC zone FAR max to 12:1.		7	6	0																	Specific to Section	23-4D-6080			FAR/ Height	PAZ: Do not oppose. Does not carry forward existing 8:1 FAR for CBD. Additional FAR by-right may impact the AHBP.  NHCD: Do not support increased base FAR. Generally, for bonus programs any increase in base entitlements will decrease the attractiveness of bonus entitlements, and could lead to decreased participation in the bonus program or decreased numbers of affordable units. Increases in bonus entitlements without any increases in base entitlements can increase participation in bonus programs.	23.223	



**Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council**

Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions		
		Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW
29 Original Motion	Remove Section 23-4C-1030 Common Open Space, eliminating the Common Open Space requirement	Passed	7	6	0														Open Space	PAZ: Zones that currently have "only" common open space requirements should have common open space replaced with personal open space.  DSD: For those projects that have no other open space requirement, common open space has provided a benefit not otherwise found since it was expanded in the 2013 amendments to Subchapter E (Design Standards). Concur with PAZ.  PARD: The combination of this item and #27 mean that no common open space is required on projects less than 8 acres in size.  WPD: Oppose. Will reduce the enhanced natural function provided by larger, contiguous pervious areas. The Green Infrastructure Working Group supported the creation of contiguous areas of pervious cover that also enhance connectivity between sites and serve as desirable public and private open spaces.	22.11	22.7 22.8 22.9 22.10 22.12 22.13 22.14 22.15 22.16 22.29			
30 Original Motion	Replace language in Section 23-4C-1040(B)(3) with: An application for a site plan or subdivision is not required to provide Civic open space when the site is: i) less than two acres, ii) located within one-quarter mile of a safe pedestrian travel distance of an existing and developed dedicated parkland that is at least one acre, measured from the boundary of the site to the nearest public entrance of the park, and iii) not located in a Park Deficient Area as determined by the Parks and Recreation Department.	Failed	1	12	0																				
30 Substitute Motion	Replace language in Section 23-4C-1040(B)(3) with: An application for a site plan or subdivision is not required to provide Civic open space when the site is: i) less than four acres, ii) located within one-quarter mile of a safe pedestrian travel distance of an existing and developed dedicated parkland that is at least one acre, measured from the boundary of the site to the nearest public entrance of the park, and	Failed	4	8	1														Specific	23-4C-1040(B)(3)		Open Space		22.17	22.21
31 Original Motion	Replace language in Section 23-4C-1040(B)(4) with: An applicant shall locate each residential lot within: (a) one-quarter mile of a safe pedestrian travel distance from existing or proposed civic open space if the development is located within the urban core; and (b) a half mile of a safe pedestrian travel distance from existing or proposed civic open space if the development is located outside of the urban core Add a definition of "safe pedestrian travel"	Passed	11	0	2														Specific to Section	23-4C-1040(B)(4)		Open Space	PAZ: Oppose. Redundant with existing civic open space access requirements.	22.18	
32 Original Motion	Strike Section 23-4C-1040 and all of Section 23-4C-2	Failed	5	8	0														Specific	23-4C-1040 and all of 23-4C-2		Open Space		22.20	
33 Original Motion	Revise the purpose statement in Section 23-4C-2010 to: This division sets the requirements for a wide range of civic open space types that are appropriate for the City. Civic Open Space aligns with Imagine Austin Priority "Use green infrastructure to protect environmentally sensitive areas and integrate nature into the city" and will ensure adequate open spaces are incorporated into comprehensive plan developments creating complete communities.	Failed	3	10	0														Specific	23-4C-2010		Open Space		22.26	
34 Original Motion	Strike Section 23-4C-2050(D)	Passed	7	6	0														Specific to Section	23-4C-2050(D)		Open Space	Staff response pending	22.31	22.32
35 Original Motion	Strike Section 23-4C-2050(E)	-	-	-	-																				
35 Substitute Motion	Where appropriate for the nature of the Civic Open Space, the design shall make shade an integral feature for people utilizing the civic space.	Passed	8	4	1														Specific to Section	23-4C-2050(E)		Open Space	WPD: Oppose. The integration of shade into open space, especially through tree plantings, helps reduce urban heat island impacts and integrates nature into the city.	22.33	
36 Original Motion	100% reduction in parking for properties located within a TOD	Passed	9	3	0					Absent															
36 Amendment to Original Motion	Add the following language from current code on CBD/DMU Parking: Except for a use occupying a designated historic landmark or an existing building in a designated historic district, off-street motor vehicle parking for persons with disabilities must be provided for a use that occupies 6,000 square feet or more of floor space under the requirements of this paragraph. (a) The following requirements apply if no parking is provided for a use, other than parking for persons with disabilities: (i) the minimum number of accessible parking spaces is calculated by taking 20 percent of the parking required for the use under Appendix A ( Tables of Off -Street Parking and Loading Requirements ) and using that result to determine the number of accessible spaces required under the Building Code. The accessible spaces may be provided on - or off-site, within 250 feet of the use. (ii) The director may waive or reduce the number of accessible spaces required under Paragraph (2)(a)(i) if the applicant pays a fee in-lieu to be used by the city to construct and maintain accessible parking in the vicinity of the use.	Passed	10	1	1														General to Code			Parking	PAZ: Do not oppose. staff would need to amend each TOD plan to change the parking reduction from 40% max to 100% max. Not an item that can be addressed with D3.  ATD: ATD is in favor of requiring adequate ADA parking spaces, however off-site and/or fees in lieu will need to be addressed within the TCM.	22.34	
37 Original Motion	100% reduction of parking for properties located within UNO	Passed	7	4	1					Absent									Specific to Section	23-4D-9130		Parking	PAZ: Do not oppose	22.34	
38 Original Motion	List "Live Music Venue" as a separate use that is permitted in all the same use tables with the same permission standards as "Performance Venue/ Theater," but without the requirements for alcohol sales. Define in Definitions	Passed	13	0	0														Specific to Article	23-4D		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Oppose. This would allow live music venues to function as a bar and would be permitted in districts where Performance Venue/Theater is allowed (more permissive than a bar).	23.1	
39 Original Motion	Whatever the compatibility trigger is, setbacks and setbacks both start at the triggering property's lot line (regardless of an alley)	Divided	-	-	-																				23.2
39 Divided Original Motion 1	Whatever the compatibility trigger is, setbacks start at the triggering property's lot line	Passed	13	0	0																	Compatibility/ Transition Zones			23.20 23.145
39 Divided Original Motion 2	Whatever the compatibility trigger is, setbacks start at the triggering property's lot line (regardless of an alley)	Passed	13	0	0														Specific to Article	23-4D		Compatibility/ Transition Zones	PAZ: Do not oppose	23.2	23.170 23.193



**Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council**

Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions	
		Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE
48 Original Motion	Passed	7	5	1														Specific to Section	23-4E-6170(C) 23-13A-2		Terms and Definitions	PAZ: Opposed. Would prefer units to remain attached as defined by "attached" in D3. DSD: Opposed. Recommend keeping the units attached to avoid potential conflict with application of ADU provisions.	23.21	
49 Original Motion	Failed	6	7	0														General to Article	23-4D	Kenny Exhibit 1 - Page 29 of 29	FAR/ Height		23.24	
50 Original Motion Amendment to Original Motion	Passed	8	3	2														Specific to Article	23-4D		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Do not oppose. DSD: Do not oppose.	23.28	23.274
51 Original Motion	Failed	4	9	0														Specific to Section	23-4B-1030		Policy	PAZ: Opposed. This would create a new precedent of having two separate appeal bodies and a two-step appeal process.	23.30	
52 Original Motion	Passed	11	2	0														Specific to Article	23-4D		Terms/ Definitions	PAZ: Do not oppose.	23.33	
53 Original Motion	Passed	12	1	0														Specific to Article	23-4D		Policy	PAZ: Do not oppose. - only makes sense for R zones that have FAR limit	A-23.33.1	23.77 57.3
54 Original Motion	Divided	-	-	-																				
54 Divided Original Motion 1	Failed	6	6	1																				
54 Divided Original Motion with Amendments 1 and 2	Failed	4	8	1																				
54 Divided Original Motion with Amendment 1 only	Failed	4	8	1																				
54 Amendment to Divided Original Motion 1	Passed	12	1	0																				
54 Amendment to Divided Original Motion 2	Passed	8	4	1																				
54 Divided Original Motion 2	Failed	-	-	-														Specific to Article	23-4D	White Exhibit 1 - Page 35 of 48, Items A and B	Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use		23.35	
55 Original Motion	Divided	-	-	-																				
55 Divided Original Motion 1	Passed	7	6	0																		PAZ: Opposed. Creating more zones with slightly different min. lot sizes and lot widths will cause confusion and add complexity.		
55 Divided Original Motion 2	Failed	2	9	2																				
55 Substitute Motion	Failed	3	8	2														Specific to Article	23-4D	White Exhibit 1 - Page 35 of 48, Item B	Lot Size/ Intensity	DSD: Opposed. Concur with PAZ.	23.37	23.35
56 Original Motion	Failed	6	7	0														Specific to Section	23-4D-2010		Language Revisions		23.38	23.159 23.160 23.185 23.191 23.207
57 Original Motion	Passed	10	3	0														Specific to Section	Table 23-4D-2030(B) Table 23-4D-2150(A) Table 23-4D-2160(A) Table 23-4D-2170(A) Table 23-4D-2180(A)		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Opposed; a use cannot be exclusively CUP	23.43	
58 Original Motion	Divided	-	-	-															23-4D-2100 23-4D-2110 23-4D-2120					
58 Divided Original Motion 1	Failed	6	N/A	N/A																				
58 Divided Original Motion 2	Failed	2	8	3														Specific to Section	23-4D-2150 23-4D-2160		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use		23.44	23.76 23.81
59 Original Motion	Passed	12	1	0														Specific to Article	23-4D		Language Revisions	PAZ: STR use is already shown in the use tables. Specifics on timeframes is not appropriate in the use tables (it can already be found in specific to use).	23.46	
60 Original Motion	-	-	-	-																				
60 Substitute Motion	Passed	9	4	0														Specific to Article	23-4D-2130 23-4D-2140		Allowed Use/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Opposed. This is virtually identical to R2D and R2E already in D3. DSD: Opposed. Concur with PAZ. WPD: Agree with PAZ/DSD.	23.47	

**Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council**

Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions			
		Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW	
61 Original Motion	In all R Zones, set the required lot size for an ADU to the minimum lot size for a single-family use. Retain all affordability requirements	Passed	11	1	1														Specific to Article	23-4D			Lot Size/ Intensity	PAZ: Opposed. There are some zones where an ADU is allowed at a smaller min lot size than a single-family (eg when combined with single-family attached)  NHCD: NHCD recommends a fee-in-lieu, rather than on-site income-restricted affordable ADUs.  NHCD supports ADUs in general. With regard to ADUs and the Affordable Housing Bonus Program, the Department's position is that property owners opting into the program through ADU development pay a fee-in-lieu into the Housing Trust Fund, rather than income-restrict the ADU on their sites. We take this position for many reasons, including the higher per-unit cost associated with monitoring these units and potential issues related to how tenants are selected. City Council has expressed interest in creating a waitlist for affordable housing units that may include priorities for people with housing barriers (including criminal backgrounds, poor credit, or who are exiting homelessness). Employing this waitlist approach for ADUs may cause potential bonus program applicants to decide not to utilize the program at all. Other cities are grappling with how to enforce affordability in ADUs as well – Portland, OR decided not to require ADUs to be affordable after difficulties with their proposal were identified.	23.62	23.64 23.66 23.80
62 Original Motion	Add a new zone to the Residential zones which has the same development standards as R1C, but does not permit an ADU	Failed	2	11	0													Specific to Article	23-4D			New Zone		23.70		
63 Original Motion	In the Parking Tables in all zones, add clarifying notes to the term "Other Allowed Uses" that reference back to the Permitted Use Tables	Passed	12	0	1													Specific to Article	23-4D			Parking	PAZ: Do not oppose.	23.72		
64 Original Motion	Add a "Small Lot Single-Family Use" as a permitted use in R3 zones, R4 zones, RM1A, and RM1B to allow small houses on small lots without requiring them to be attached min. lot size: 2500 sf. max lot size: 4999sf min. lot width: 25' Building Size (max) for all Small Lot uses: the greater of .4 FAR or 1500 sf Building Placement add Small Lot Setbacks: Front 15', Side St. 10', Side 3.5' or 0 when adjacent to Small Lot Uses, Rear 10'. Building Form (1) Building Articulation New Construction add "Building Articulation is not required for Small Lot uses." Impervious Cover add *(2) Small Lot Impervious Cover 65% max, 55% building cover max	Failed	3	7	2																					
64 Substitute Motion 1	Rescind the related motion for a "Small Lot Single-Family Use" in the R2D and R2E	Failed	3	7	2																					
64 Substitute Motion 2	Make one new zone (staff to determine which zoning base [R, RM, etc.]) for the Small Lot Single-Family Use with the following development standards: min. lot size: 2500 sf. max lot size: 4999sf min. lot width: 25' Building Size (max) for all Small Lot uses: the greater of .4 FAR or 1500 sf Building Placement add Small Lot Setbacks: Front 15', Side St. 10', Side 3.5' or 0 when adjacent to Small Lot Uses, Rear 10'. Building Form (1) Building Articulation New Construction add "Building Articulation is not required for Small Lot uses." Impervious Cover add *(2) Small Lot Impervious Cover 65% max, 55% building cover max  Staff to prepare a new zone that only permits the single use.	Passed	7	6	0													Specific to Article	23-4D			New Zone	PAZ: Opposed. This is virtually identical to R2D and R2E already in D3.  DSD: Opposed. Concur with PAZ.  WPD: Agree with PAZ/DSD.	23.78	23.114	
65 Original Motion	Add/ amend the below definitions and place in correct location of the Code: Attached: When used with reference to two or more buildings units, means having one or more common walls or being joined by a roof, covered porch or covered passageway measured 20 feet in depth, perpendicular to the front property line. Detached: Fully separated from any other building, or joined to another building by structural members not constituting an enclosed or covered space Staff to analyze intent of above language and recommend a definition that encompasses the intent of a clear definable difference	Passed	8	4	0																			PAZ: Opposed regarding the 20' measurement and definition of detached (both are unnecessary).		
65 Amendment to Original Motion 1	Add the covered porch or covered passageway back to the definition of attached	Passed	9	2	1													Specific to Section	23-13A-1030	White Item 1 - Page 41 of 48		Terms/ Definitions	DSD: Opposed. 20' measurement is arbitrary and adds to impervious cover. The definition of "detached" should not allow attachment. Please define "units".	23.82		
65 Amendment to Original Motion 2	Strike the 20 feet in depth language	Withdrawn	-	-	-																					
66 Original Motion	Add language to applicable zones regarding sideyard setbacks exemptions for Small Lot Single Family Attached, Single Family Attached, and Townhouse	Passed	11	0	1													Specific to Article	23-4D			Setbacks	DSD: Opposed. Adding language regarding setbacks for these uses would create conflicts with the definitions of these uses. PAZ: Concur with DSD.	23.87		
67 Original Motion	Add a bonus of "+150sf for each three bedroom unit within 500' of public school." for Single-Family and Duplex uses in R2-R4 zones where McMansion applies	Passed	8	1	3																					
67 Amendment to Original Motion	Remove the word "public"	Failed	5	8	0													Specific to Article	23-4D			FAR/ Height	DSD: Opposed. Proposal increases complexity and will extend review times. PAZ: Concur with DSD.	23.89		
68 Original Motion	Add a bonus of +0.1 FAR for every unit above Single Family Use in all R3 zones	Failed	3	9	0																					
68 Amendment to Original Motion 1	Apply bonus only outside 1/4 mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor; all votes regarding FAR would remain intact	Failed	2	10	0																					
68 Amendment to Original Motion 2	Apply the bonus of 0.1, but with a maximum of 0.3 bonus FAR per lot	Failed	4	8	0													Specific to Section	23-4D-2150 23-4D-2160 23-4D-2170 23-4D-2180			FAR/ Height		23.90	23.117	







**Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council**

Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions				
		Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW		
88 Original Motion Substitute Motion	Failed Failed	6 5	4 7	2 0																Specific to Section	23-4D-8080		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use		23.247		
89 Original Motion Divided Original Motion 1 Divided Original Motion 2 Substitute to Divided Original Motion 2 Amendment to Divided Original Motion 2	Divided Passed - Passed Passed	- 12 - 7 7	- 0 - 5 5	- 0 - 0 0																Specific to Section	23-4D-8110		Landscaping	WPD: Do not oppose. The landscaping requirement reflects current code for Tier 1. The green stormwater option is no longer necessary since CodeNEXT is proposing making GSI a standard requirement. DSD: Concur with WPD response.	23.250 23.251 23.252	23.250 23.251	23.252
90 Original Motion	Failed	4	4	4																General to Code			Policy		23.266		
91 Original Motion	Passed	11	1	0																Specific to Section	23-4D-9130		Policy	PAZ: Do not oppose. This is outside of the scope of CodeNEXT	23.269		
92 Original Motion	Passed	12	0	1																Specific to Article	23-4D		Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose.	-		
93 Original Motion	Passed	11	0	0																Specific to Article	23-4D		Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose. DSD: Do not oppose.	A-24.5.1		
94 Original Motion Amendment to Original Motion 1 Amendment to Original Motion 2 Substitute Motion	Passed Passed Passed Failed	9 8 11 3	3 4 1 8	0 0 0 1																General to Code			Parking	Staff response pending.	24.8	23.49 23.50 23.52 23.53 23.54 23.55 23.56 23.57 23.58 23.59 23.60 23.61 23.127 23.148 23.149 23.165 23.190 23.192 23.234 24.9 24.11 24.12 24.13 24.14 14.15 24.16 24.18	
95 Original Motion	Passed	9	2	1																General to Code			Parking	PAZ: Outside the scope of CodeNEXT. ATD: ATD suggests reviewing AISD parking requirements to include school-specific TDM policies for staff, parents, and students to include Vision Zero goals and to enhance pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to/from school sites during the site plan phase.	24.23		



**Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council**

Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions			
		Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW	
102 Original Motion	Passed	8	3	0															Specific to Article	23-6		Policy	<p>Not Opposed.</p> <p><b>DSD:</b> Site Plans are the tool that the City uses to demonstrate a project's compliance with all applicable regulations across multiple departments and disciplines, reviewing the building and development in context with the site work. All interconnected disciplines evaluate a proposed development in context and ensure a conflict free construction. The scope of review matches the scope of the regulations; therefore, regulations would need to be reduced for these projects in order for the required review (and review mechanism) to be condensed. Additional policy direction is required in order to determine which regulatory areas the City would be willing to relax to incentivize this project type.</p> <p><b>WPD:</b> Open to working on this process with staff and policymakers. However, the Environmental Officer does not think 2 months is a reasonable timeframe for full environmental and drainage review.</p> <p><b>Austin Energy:</b> The length of a site plan review is often determined by the applicant's original effort put into the design and subsequent efforts to address comments or not</p>	N/A		
103 Original Motion	Failed	5	5	1																		Policy		44.4	44.5	
104 Original Motion	Passed	11	0	0															Specific to Article	23-11		Policy	<p><b>PAZ:</b> Not recommended for criteria manuals. Existing rules process allows public process for stakeholders of criteria manuals.</p> <p><b>DSD:</b> Do not recommend. The Technical Criteria Manuals are administrative. The process for amending them includes a public stakeholder process.</p> <p><b>WPD:</b> Need clarification of intent. 23-11 is the Technical Code (e.g., Building Code) and not the same as the Technical Criteria Manuals (e.g., Environmental Criteria Manual). The code establishes an administrative process for the adoption of rules and technical criteria.</p> <p><b>Austin Energy:</b> Are technical criteria merely to be "discussed" at PC and Council or debated? Technical criteria should be based on sound engineering rather than political judgements</p> <p><b>PWD:</b> There is an established Rules Posting Process to update Criteria Manuals. All notices are posted on the City's website: <a href="http://www.austintexas.gov/department/rule-postings-and-technical-criteria-manuals">http://www.austintexas.gov/department/rule-postings-and-technical-criteria-manuals</a>. Please contact the Rules Posting Manager to see if there are distribution lists for rules posting notices that individuals or groups can be added to.</p>	N/A		
105 Original Motion	Passed	8	3	1															Specific to Article	23-4D		Allowed Use/ Specific to Use	<b>DSD:</b> Opposed. Adds additional review complexity, potential conflicts with the building code, and will increase review times.	A-57.22.1	A-57.22.2	
106 Original Motion	Passed	8	5	0																			<b>PAZ:</b> Opposed. FAR needs to be consistent and coordinated with other proposals.			
Amendment to Original Motion 1	Failed	5	7	1															Specific to Section	Article 23-13A-1030	See White Exhibit 1 - Page 36 of 48	Terms and Definitions	<b>DSD:</b> Opposed. Concur with PAZ.	<b>NHCD:</b> Generally, for bonus programs any increase in base entitlements will decrease the attractiveness of bonus entitlements, and could lead to decreased participation in the bonus program or a decreased number of affordable units.	57.4	



**Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council**

	Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions								
			Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW						
111	Original Motion	Divided	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-											
	Divided Original Motion 1	Passed	9	4	0																											
	Divided Original Motion 2	Passed	8	5	0																											
	Amendment 1 to Divided Original Motion 1 AND 2	Passed	10	3	0																											
	Amendment 2 to Divided Original Motion 1 AND 2	Passed	9	2	2																											
	Divided Original Motion 3	Passed	9	4	0																											
	Amendment 1 to Divided Original Motion 3	Passed	10	3	0																											
Substitute Motion to Divided Original Motion 3	Failed	4	8	1																												
112	Original Motion	Passed	11	1	1																											
113	Original Motion	Passed	13	0	0																											

