

Question 1. Scope of Code Revision. To what extent should the Land Development Code be revised?	1	QA
Answer: Adopt a new Land Development Code, consisting of a new Land Development Code (text) and Zoning Map, to take effect concurrently	1	QA
The new code should prioritize all types of homes for all kinds of people in all parts of town (our Strategic Housing Blueprint goals) and a development pattern that supports 50/50 Transportation Mode share by 2039 (our Austin Strategic Mobility Plan).	1	G
The code revision process should use the staff-recommended Draft 3 (text and map) as a baseline, with revisions made to implement policy direction provided below and in response to Questions 2-5.	1	Z,ZM
Staff should also review recommendations previously made by boards and commissions on Draft 3 and incorporate those with which staff agrees (all or in part), using a process such as that used for the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan.	1	G
The Manager should work to deliver a new code that is simplified, can be applied consistently, and furthers the goals of the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan.	1	G
The manager should have a revised Land Development Code (text) and Zoning Map ready for Council action on First Reading in October of this year (after Planning Commission issues their report on the text and map as part of the required process).	1	S
3. Communication. The Manager should establish and communicate clearly the public input process for Council's adoption of the revised Land Development Code, including timelines and opportunities for public input. Include a transparent and educational public process under which stakeholders are informed on how their input has been received and is being evaluated.	2	COMM
4. Code Text. The revised Land Development Code should be sufficiently clear and unambiguous that administrative criteria manuals are not relied upon to establish policy, except in circumstances where Council has directed that particular requirements be established administratively.	2	G
a. The revised Code text and map should result in reduced allowable city-wide impervious cover, improved city-wide water quality, and reduced overall flood risk.	2	NZ
b. The new land development code should not weaken current City of Austin floodplain regulations, drainage criteria, and water quality regulations and criteria. Methods to measure and options to reduce allowable impervious cover in each watershed relative to current code, and methods to measure and options to improve water quality in each watershed, should be developed for the new code and the following goals incorporated: i. Reductions in impervious cover city-wide should either decrease allowable impervious cover for, or make no change to, each individual watershed (relative to current code). ii. Improvements in water quality city-wide should result in improvements in water quality for each individual watershed.	2	NZ
c. The Atlas 14 floodplain regulations should be approved and incorporated with the most current rainfall data as soon as possible.	2	NZ
d. The Manager will report on how revisions to the land development code will likely affect existing environmental regulations, understanding that the goal of the council is to preserve, or increase, our current level of environmental protections and sustainability with respect to flooding, water quality and usage, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions.	2	NZ

e. Staff to provide options for timelines and methods for implementation of the new code and map and to achieve additional housing capacity and affordable housing goals beyond those contained in the new code and map.	3	H
f. Creative Spaces. Propose options to preserve creative space, including but not limited to zoning categories specific to cultural spaces and incentives to create dedicated, below market rate creative spaces in developments along corridors and in centers.	3	O
g. Age Friendly Policies. Propose options for provisions in the LDC to carry out the land use recommendations from the Age Friendly Action Plan, including supports for multigenerational housing, visitability, and other provisions. Additionally, there should be provisions that enable day cares and senior living centers in all parts of the City, at a scale commensurate with its surroundings.	3	O
i. The new LDC should focus on the size and scale of the built environment and regulate uses through context-sensitive policies that are clearly identified in the code and apply equitably throughout the City instead of through by-lot zoning regulations. Use restrictions should continue and be improved through a framework that identifies a range of incompatible uses among zoning categories, such as to avoid adult entertainment, hazardous industrial, or other activities that aren't supportive to surrounding residential or civic uses. Simple, clear requirements of conditions should be established, such as distance requirements and hours of operation.	3	Z
ii. Propose options for prohibiting uses along corridors that displace potential housing opportunities, such as self-storage facilities or other uses that do not contribute to overall policy goals.	3	ZM
i. Transportation and VMT. Developments should be able to use a predetermined set of transportation demand management tools such as building additional bike lanes or sidewalks, providing bike storage, public transit stops and other mechanisms.	3	T
j. The new LDC should provide for the following as it relates to shaping the City's sustainable water future by preventing flooding, protecting water quality, and promoting water conservation:	3	NZ
i. Developments should retain more water on-site and encourage beneficial reuse.	4	NZ
ii. Require developments where total of new and redeveloped impervious cover is 5,000 sq. ft. and greater to treat water quality. Through the land development code process, this provision should be tested, and staff should potentially create separate requirements for missing middle housing if such separate requirements are needed to achieve the goals of producing more small and missing middle housing types, while improving water quality in the city and the region overall.	4	NZ
iii. Expand the use of Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) controls to treat residential subdivisions including roads.	4	NZ
iv. Provide options to significantly reform and/or remove exemptions to impervious cover limits in the redevelopment exceptions throughout the water quality section for all watersheds. Provide such options with the goal of actually achieving the most meaningful reductions in impervious cover locally and regionally, while balancing near-term and longer-term needs to reduce impervious cover and improve water quality.	4	NZ
v. Coordinate with Water Forward to Reduce Water Demand.	4	NZ

5. Zoning Map. The revised zoning map should limit the Former Title 25 (F25) zoning classification to unique zoning districts (e.g., NCCDs and PDAs) for which no similar district exists under the revised Land Development Code. Specialized zoning districts that exist today and are of a type contained in the new Code, such as Planned Unit Developments and regulating plans, should be carried over and not be classified as F25.	4	ZM
a. Existing NCCDs should be preserved and carried forward in the new code and map, however, Code and Zoning Map changes related to ADUs, Parking, Preservation Bonuses, Affordability Bonuses, lot size, and Transition Area mapping (consistent with Council direction provided below and in response to Questions 2-5) should be applied to those NCCDs. Unique zoning districts (e.g., NCCDs) should be reevaluated in the current context of Austin’s housing and transportation needs in addition to analyzing the extent to which NCCDs provide missing middle housing.	4	SAP
b. COs that are generally incorporated into the new code are not to be carried forward; other, unique COs are carried forward and are subject to change with any future rezoning.	4	Z
c. Determinations about mapping should also be informed by appropriate analyses available to staff, including but not limited to the “Zoning Capacity and Redevelopment Analysis” completed by city staff and the Fregonese study.	5	Z
6. Additional. To ensure that the Land Development Codes and permitting process are streamlined to the greatest extent possible upon adoption of any revision to the Land Development Code, the regulatory requirements adopted as part of Water Forward, Austin’s 100-year integrated water resource plan, that are related to the Land Development Code and are able to be accelerated and implemented this year should be codified and implemented as part of this comprehensive land development code revision process. Staff should report back at least on the following areas if not able to accelerate and implement this year, especially as concerns large buildings over 250,000 square feet: water benchmarking, dual plumbing, landscape transformation, and alternative water.	5	NZ
Question 2. Housing Capacity. To what extent should the Land Development Code provide for additional housing capacity in order to achieve the 135,000 additional housing units recommended by the Strategic Housing Blueprint?	5	QA
Answer: Provide greater housing capacity than Draft 3, through enhanced measures to allow construction of additional residential units.	5	QA
a. The new code and map should allow for housing capacity equivalent to at least three times the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint (ASHB) goal of 135,000 new housing units, as well as for ASHB goals of 60,000 affordable housing units, preservation of 10,000 affordable housing units, production of sufficient numbers	5	H
of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) units each year sufficient to address needs and 30% Missing Middle Housing, and be achieved in a manner consistent with direction provided throughout this document.	6	H
b. In general, within activity centers, along activity corridors, along the transit priority network, and in transition areas, additional entitlements beyond current zoning should only be provided:	6	H
i. to increase the supply of missing middle housing, which shall include an affordable housing bonus program where economically viable or,	6	H
ii. through a density bonus that requires some measure of affordable housing.	6	H

c. The granting of new entitlements in areas currently or susceptible to gentrification should be limited so as to reduce displacement and disincentivize the redevelopment of multi-family residential development, unless substantial increases in long-term affordable housing will be otherwise achieved. Existing market rate affordable multifamily shall not be mapped to be upzoned.	6	ZM
d. In general, housing affordability should be the primary policy driver of code and mapping revisions and the Manager should explore:	6	H
d. In general, housing affordability should be the primary policy driver of code and mapping revisions and the Manager should explore: i. options to allow some level of administrative variances for some building form regulations (setbacks, height, building cover, etc.) to help maximize the shared community values of housing, tree preservation, parks, and mitigating flood risk; and	6	G
d. In general, housing affordability should be the primary policy driver of code and mapping revisions and the Manager should explore: ii. the feasibility of how regulations can overlap (e.g., how a drainage field can also safely serve as open space).	6	G
e. The City Manager shall provide estimates for the potential impacts of the new map on transit ridership as well as affordable housing goals.	6	D
f. Code and map revisions should maximize potential for employment and residential units within Downtown, in accordance with the Downtown Austin Plan and the guidance in this document, with affordable housing benefits included and calibrated.	6	H,Z,ZM
Code and map revisions should maximize potential for employment and residential units within Regional Centers, in accordance with the guidance in this document, with affordable housing benefits included and calibrated.	6	H,Z,ZM
g. Generally, revisions to the Zoning map should not result in a downzoning of an existing use.	7	ZM
h. The new LDC provisions should: i. Improve the City's fiscal health by (1) facilitating fiscally sound infrastructure investment for both public and private interests; and (2) applying the code in strategic locations that maximize public infrastructure investment and minimize long term obligations.	7	G
h. The new LDC provisions should: ii. Continue including and enhance a site plan process that assesses the infrastructure needs of developments, including the cumulative impact of development, and facilitate the installation of new infrastructure funded in whole or in part by new development.	7	G
h. The new LDC provisions should: iii. To the greatest extent possible, include code restrictions that provide properties zoned for multi-family will develop with multi-family and not single-family structures. At the same time, however, make allowances for existing single-family structures that become non-conforming to be maintained, remodeled, and potentially expanded, so long as they are not demolished or substantially rebuilt. Staff should provide options for minimum unit yield based on the zone.	7	Z,ZM
2. Code Text. Code revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include:a. Options for reducing minimum lot size and width to achieve the goals elsewhere in this document, including preservation goals, while also considering public safety concerns.	7	Z

2. Code Text. Code revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include:b. For parcels within activity centers and on activity corridors, application of non-zoning regulations should be prioritized in a manner that allows for greater potential housing unit yields than would otherwise be achieved without prioritization.	7	NZ
2. Code Text. Code revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include:c. Non-zoning regulations should provide flexibility to allow for higher unit yields for parcels within activity centers and activity corridors. The code should create alternative equivalent means to ensure the balance of needs, while protecting environment and sustainability (landscaping, parkland and tree preservation), public safety, transportation, utility and right of way needs. Review non-zoning regulations related to Austin Energy and Austin Water (other than regular fees) that can significantly impact the cost of development. Review and suggest changes to non-zoning regulations that may encourage demolition rather than the redevelopment of existing structures.	7	NZ
i. The application of non-zoning regulations to smaller, remaining downtown sites should allow for greater potential for employment and residential units than Draft 3, with affordable housing benefits included and calibrated in accordance with the Downtown Austin Plan and the direction of this document.	8	NZ
d. Should the testing and modeling of the draft code demonstrate that any non-zoning regulations significantly constrain housing capacity within activity centers and on activity corridors, staff should provide council with options for best achieving the goals of non-zoning regulations while minimizing impact on achieving our housing capacity goals.	8	NZ
e. A city-led testing process to assess the impact of revised regulations that includes participation by outside design and technical professionals, including architects, landscape architects, and engineers, in addition to city staff and the substantial involvement of the public. The initial testing should examine how the proposed zoning and non-zoning code provisions perform when applied to various types and scales of development and staff should complete this testing prior to review by boards and commissions. Staff should provide accurate and careful testing and modeling of corridor and transition area regulations so that Council and community discussions can focus on achieving policy results and include proposed non-zoning regulations.	8	D
f. Measures to dis-incentivize the demolition and replacement of an existing housing unit(s) with a single, larger housing unit.	8	Z
g. Identifying and implementing opportunities throughout the code to encourage preservation of existing housing, especially market affordable housing.	8	Z
h. Residential uses should be allowed in commercial zoning categories. Draft 3 mapping included affordability requirements for commercial properties where residential uses are not permitted and these requirements should be maintained in the new draft. [Note: Clarify what this means.]	8	Z,ZM

i. Preservation incentives should be expanded City-wide, so that an additional unit, beyond what would otherwise be allowed, is allowed with the preservation of an existing structure. Remodeling or adding units should be very simple, so it is much easier to preserve an existing home than to tear down and replace it with another larger structure. Provide options to revise McMansion ordinance that provide for ability to add a room or limited remodel but constrain ability to demolish existing home and replace with another larger single family home. If an existing affordable home is preserved, the balance of the lot's entitlements can be used to add more dwelling units.	9	Z
3. Zoning Map. Map revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include broader use of zones that allow for affordable housing density bonuses than in Draft 3.	9	ZM
a. 75% of new housing capacity should be within ½ mile of transit priority networks as identified by the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan and Imagine Austin activity centers and corridors. Staff should update the growth maps for Imagine Austin including both corridors and centers.	9	ZM
b. All parts of town should be expected to contribute to reaching our ASHB and Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) housing and mode shift goals as well.	9	ZM
c. Additional direction to staff to develop specific, context-sensitive criteria for areas where the distance between corridors is less than ½ mile.	9	ZM
Question 3. Missing Middle Housing Types. To what extent should the Land Development Code encourage more “missing-middle” housing types, such as duplexes, multiplexes, townhomes, cottage courts, and accessory dwelling units?	9	QA
Answer: Provide for a greater range of housing types than Draft 3.	10	QA
1. Code Text. Code revisions to increase the supply of missing middle housing should include: a. Allowing accessory dwelling units (ADUs), both external and internal/attached, to be permitted and more easily developed in all residential zones;	10	Z
1. Code Text. Code revisions to increase the supply of missing middle housing should include:b. Where appropriate, allowing new housing types to qualify as ADUs, including existing homes being preserved, mobile and manufactured homes, tiny homes on wheels, Airstream-style trailers, modular homes, and 3D-printed homes; and	10	Z
1. Code Text. Code revisions to increase the supply of missing middle housing should include:c. Reduced site development standards as appropriate for missing middle housing options such as duplexes, multiplexes, townhomes, cooperatives and cottage courts in order to facilitate development of additional units. Council will need to determine the appropriate criteria to achieve more affordable housing while protecting environment and sustainability, public safety, transportation, utility and right of way needs.	10	Z
2. Zoning Map. The goal of providing additional missing middle housing should inform the mapping of missing middle zones, consistent with the direction provided throughout this document. a. Map new Missing Middle housing in transition areas adjacent to activity centers, activity corridors, or the transit priority network. i. Generally, the transition area should be two (2) to (5) lots deep beyond the corridor lot. ii. The depth and scale of any transition area should be set considering context-sensitive factors and planning principles such as those set out in the direction for Question 4.	10	ZM

Question 4. Compatibility Standards. To what extent should the City’s “compatibility standards” (i.e., rules limiting development near residential properties) be modified to provide additional opportunities for development?	10	QA
Answer: Reduce the impact of compatibility standards on development to a greater degree than Draft 3.	11	QA
1. Objective. The code revision should reduce the impact of compatibility standards on development within activity centers and activity corridors to a greater extent than Draft 3.	11	C
2. Code Text. Maintain Draft 3’s no-build and vegetative buffers between residential and commercial uses, as well as other compatibility triggers and standards for properties adjacent to a Residential House-Scale zone. The only exception should be that the highest density Residential House-Scale zones should not trigger compatibility onto the lowest density Residential Multifamily zones in order to create smooth transitions. The revision should provide options for the following:	11	C
i. Standards related to noise, uses, utility screening, side buffers, trash, loading and pick-up zones as well as shielded lighting.	11	C
ii. Standards related to Green Infrastructure, tree preservation, as well as increasing tree canopy along corridors and centers to enhance walkability and curb heat island effect.	11	NZ
3. Zoning Map. Compatibility standards and initial mapping should work together in a way that maximizes housing capacity on parcels fronting activity corridors, the Transit Priority Network, and within activity centers, consistent with applicable base zoning regulations and with any Affordable Housing Bonus otherwise available. Employment and other uses to create “complete communities” along transit and Imagine Austin corridors and centers should also be allowed in a way that is context-sensitive. In addition, regulations should still allow “village center” type low-density mixed-use and commercial use in neighborhoods to create “complete communities”.	11	ZM
a. In general, consider revisions that minimize the impact of compatibility standards on properties facing transportation corridors, particularly in relation to shallow lots.	12	C
b. The revised zoning maps should reduce the impact of compatibility standards on development for parcels along all activity corridors and within activity centers. In redefining compatibility standards, the code revision should: i. Define the maximum height allowed by-right plus affordable housing bonus, along activity corridors and in activity centers, and then establish regulations that create a step-down effect in the transition zones.	12	C
c. The revised zoning map should include a transition zone that will eliminate the impact of compatibility for parcels along all activity corridors and within activity centers.	12	C,ZM
i. Lot(s) adjacent to parcels fronting an activity corridor will not trigger compatibility and will be in scale with any adjacent residential house-scale zones.	12	C,ZM
ii Mapping of lots within a transition area should be responsive to existing situations, including instances where market affordable missing middle housing is adjacent or proximate to a property fronting a corridor, and specific context sensitive general criteria provided by Council.	12	ZM

d. The LDC Revisions should map properties for missing middle housing in transition areas that meet some or all of the following criteria. Entitlements and length of transition areas should be relatively more or less intense for areas that meet more or fewer of the criteria listed below, respectively: i. Located on Transit Priority Network, or Imagine Austin Centers or Corridors, ii. Located within the Urban Core as defined by the Residential Design and Compatibility Standards Area (McMansion Ordinance), iii. Has a well-connected street grid, iv. Located in a high opportunity area as defined in the Enterprise Opportunity360 Index	12	ZM
e. The depth and scale of transition zones should be reduced so that the transition zone(s) do not overlap with the majority of the existing single-family neighborhood area.	12	ZM
f. The length and level of entitlement in transition zones should be substantially reduced in “Vulnerable” areas identified in the UT Gentrification Study, regardless of the number of criteria met above.	13	ZM
g. Lot(s) adjacent to parcels fronting an activity corridor will be mapped with a zone that does not trigger compatibility and that could provide a step-down in scale from the zone of the parcel fronting an activity corridor. For a shallow lot on a corridor, consideration will be given to maintaining the zoning of the corridor-fronting lot to the adjoining rear lot, if appropriate.	13	C,ZM
h. Transition areas should step down to residential house scale as quickly as possible, while providing for a graceful transition in scale from the zone of the parcel fronting an activity corridor.	13	ZM
i. Four units within a house scale should be the least intense zone within a transition area, subject to staff’s consideration of what is appropriate.	13	ZM
j. Staff will provide a projection of how much missing middle housing capacity the mapping of transition areas consistent with these guidelines will provide, and how effectively the map enables us to achieve ASHB and ASMP goals.	13	D
k. The City Manager shall also use the following conditions as appropriate when mapping transition areas: i. Orientation of blocks relative to corridors, ii. Residential blocks sided by main street or mixed use type zoned lots, iii. Bound by other zones, use, or environmental features (including topography), iv. Drainage and flooding considerations, v. Whether it is most appropriate to split zone or not split zone a lot.	13	ZM
l. The City Manager shall provide to Council an analysis of the affordable housing and housing capacity yield when presenting the proposed mapping and potential for redevelopment using the Envision Tomorrow tool.	13	D
m. If the transition area is not on an Imagine Austin corridor, but is on a residential transit priority network street, the street facing lot should generally begin with missing middle zoning, rather than corridor zoning.	13	ZM
n. Staff will consider mapping missing middle areas in high opportunity areas not impacted by environmental concerns in order to help achieve goals related to housing throughout the city	13	ZM
Question 5. Parking Requirements. To what extent should the City’s minimum parking requirements be modified to provide additional opportunities for development and/or encourage transit options consistent with the Imagine Austin comprehensive plan?	14	QA
Answer: Reduce the impact of minimum parking requirements on development to a greater than Draft 3.	14	QA

1. Objective. The code revision should seek to reduce the impact of minimum parking requirements on development to a greater degree than Draft 3.	14	T
2. Code Text.	14	T
a. Minimum parking requirements should be generally eliminated in areas that are within the ¼ mile of activity centers, activity corridors, and transit priority network, except that some parking requirements may be maintained for areas where elimination of parking requirements would be particularly disruptive (conditions to be proposed by staff).	14	T
b. The City's visitability ordinance should be retained and expanded to ground floor missing middle housing in the new code and staff shall provide options for how it is expanded.	14	Z
ADA-compliant parking should be required for commercial and multifamily developments, even if no minimum parking is otherwise required to ensure adequate number of dedicated parking spaces exist to safeguard those with permanent disabilities, temporary illness or injury are afforded a place to park near where they live, shop, or visit others.	14	T
Off-site or on-street parking may challenge safety and accessibility and should be carefully considered before being used as a means to provide for this parking. This is of critical importance with an aging population and generational housing.	14	T
c. Code revisions should provide that parking structures are able to evolve over time as transportation patterns change, including design standards for structured parking that will facilitate eventual conversion to residential or commercial uses.	15	T
d. The Manager should:i. Explore options for adopting parking maximums or minimum unit-yield in areas necessary to ensure sufficient transit-supportive development (e.g., TODs);	15	T
d. The Manager should:ii. Determine if parking in certain areas should be counted against FAR;	15	T
d. The Manager should:iii. Explore the feasibility of decoupling parking from leases; and	15	T
d. The Manager should:iv. Explore options for utilizing public parking and ROW to provide more ADA-compliant parking across the City.	15	T
Addition 1. Planning	15	SAP
1. Objective. The Manager should as soon as possible develop a proposed district level (e.g., ERC, North Burnet/Gateway Neighborhood Plan) planning process for Imagine Austin Activity Centers and Corridors susceptible to change, and include specific objectives for each plan related to achieving the goals of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan, Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint, and other Council policy priorities, such as: a. housing capacity to reach the city's 10-year goals and beyond, b. affordable housing, especially in high opportunity areas, c. anti-displacement and anti-gentrification measures where relevant, d. shared parking, e. regional storm water and water quality planning,f. parkland accessibility, g. utility infrastructure, h. walkability and connectivity, i. increasing opportunities for missing middle housing, and j. policy priorities associated with complete communities.	15	SAP
2. Code Text. The City Manager shall draft language for Council approval to codify the district level planning process and the criteria for selecting planning areas in the Land Development Code as follows:	16	SAP

<p>a. Selection of Planning Areas: Identify geographic areas along corridors throughout the city where district level planning will have maximum public benefit, paying particular attention to corridors (including streets and arterials) identified in the ASMP, Project Connect, and where construction, planning, and land acquisition with done dollars will be applied and can be leveraged.</p>	16	SAP
<p>b. Planning Process Criteria: Determine when district-level planning for an area is needed to align with our adopted city goals and plans, including Imagine Austin, ASHB, ASMP, Age Friendly Austin Action Plan, the upcoming Parks Master Plan, and other relevant plans. Criteria should include, but not be limited to, the following information sources: i. Planned transportation investments, including corridors with transportation bonds and public transit investments;ii. Affordable housing investments;iii. Significant number or scale of private development; iv. Market force indicators expressing need and opportunity to leverage an area’s potential or significant public investment via facilities or other infrastructure; v. Areas of vulnerability identified using the mapping tool from the UT Gentrification & Displacement Study, “Uprooted”; and vi. Include consideration for inhibiting displacement, preserving cultural and historic assets, promoting multi-generational housing, and support neighborhood schools, particularly schools with under –enrollment or in areas of rapid displacement.</p>	16	SAP
<p>c. Planning Process Types: i. Areas facing gentrification and/or displacement should have planning processes that focus on equity, community and economic development, and anti-displacement measures; ii. Higher opportunity areas should have planning processes that focus on reaching housing capacity goals and furthering fair housing/integration.</p>	16	SAP
<p>3. Timeline. Multiple planning efforts for Activity Centers and Activity Corridors should occur concurrently, with a goal of completing those most susceptible to change within 5 years.</p>	17	SAP
<p>4. Resources. The Council recognizes that additional resources will be required to achieve this scale of planning in this time frame, and the use of consultants should be considered to allow for multiple district-level plans to be developed in order to meet this timeline. The City Manager should ensure that planning processes have robust community engagement that incorporates door-to-door outreach, multi-language access, community organizing, and popular education regarding planning, zoning, equity, gentrification, displacement, and affordable housing.</p>	17	SAP
<p>5. Community engagement. The City Manager should review the 2016 Neighborhood Plan Audit and incorporate recommendations into any new planning processes. Planning should include robust engagement of adjacent stakeholders, but also include participation from across our city, as all parts of Austin have an interest in each part of Austin contributing equitably to our goals being met. Community engagement should specifically focus on elevating the voices of populations that have historically been underrepresented in planning processes (as was done with the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan), including: renters, lower-income residents, youth, seniors, people of color, and people with disabilities. Staff should develop and track participation metrics for each planning area and target participation to be representative of the diversity of the planning area and the City as a whole.</p>	17	SAP
<p>6. Triggers for Plan Updates. The planning horizon for each plan should align with Imagine Austin and be assessed and updated approximately every 5 years. Staff should explore mechanisms to trigger when a Small Area Plan is updated, such as demographic changes or infrastructure improvements, and return to Council with recommendations.</p>	17	SAP

Addition 2. Affordable Housing	17	H
1. Objective: The Land Development Code should support the city's 10-year Affordable Housing Goals and align resources and ensure a unified strategic direction to achieve a shared vision of housing affordability for all Austinites in all parts of the city. The City	17	H
Manager should identify and propose for Council approval amendments to the Land Development Code that will (1) further the housing goals established in the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint (ASHB) and (2) implement recommendations for achieving these goals included in the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint (ASHB) and the ASHB Implementation Plan (if adopted by Council).	18	H
• At least 75% of new housing units should be within ½ mile of Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors (see the Figure 10 map showing Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors).	18	H,ZM
• Preserve 10,000 affordable housing units over 10 years.	18	H
• Produce Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in sufficient numbers to meet the need.	18	H
• At least 25% of new income-restricted affordable housing should be in high opportunity areas.	18	H,ZM
• At least 30% of new housing should be a range of housing types from small-lot single-family to eight-plexes to help address Austin's need for multi-generational housing.	18	H,ZM
2. Code Text: Code revisions for Council approval should include provisions to achieve the following ASHB "Key Actions" that are related to the Land Development Code in addition to those already included in response to City Managers question 1 to 5 (* indicating strategies with highest potential impact):	18	H
a. Prevent Households from Being Priced Out of Austin	18	H
• Allow Homeowners to Rent a Portion of Their House as a Separate Housing Unit	18	H
• Increase the Supply of Multi-Bedroom Housing for Families with Children	18	H
• Prevent Displacement of Low-and Moderate-Income Homeowners	18	H
• Preserve and Create Ownership Options for Households at 80% to 120% MFI	18	H
b. Foster Equitable, Integrated and Diverse Communities	18	H
• *Implement the City of Austin's Fair Housing Action Plan and Bolster Enforcement of Existing Fair Housing Requirements	18	H
• Implement Tenant Relocation Assistance Program	18	H
• Protect Renters from Discrimination Based on Source of Income	18	H
• Add Flexibility to Occupancy Limits	19	H,Z
• Support Community Goal for At Least 25% of New Income-Restricted Affordable Housing to be in Moderate-to-High Opportunity Areas	19	H,ZM
c. Invest In Housing for Those Most in Need • Incentive Programs, • Expand the Supply of Housing for People with Disabilities	19	H
d. Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin	19	H
• *Implement Consistent Density Bonus Programs for Centers and Corridors	19	H
• *Streamline City Codes and Permitting Processes	19	H

• Better Utilize Land for Affordable Housing	19	H
• Revise S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program	19	H
• Implement Density Bonus Program for Missing Middle Housing	19	H,Z
• Allow the Development of Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots	19	H,Z
• Create Pre-Approved Standard Plans for Infill Development	19	H,Z
• Relax Regulations on More Affordable Housing Products	19	H,Z
• Relax Regulations on Housing Cooperatives (Co-Ops)	19	H,Z
• Utilize Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) to Provide a Range of Affordability	19	H,Z
• Increase Housing Diversity in New Subdivisions	19	H,ZM
• Consider Building and Fire Code Modifications to Allow Six Stories of Wood Frame Construction	19	G
e. Help Austinites Reduce their Household Costs • *Minimize the Displacement of Core Transit Riders, • *Link Housing Choices with Transportation Choices, • *Comprehensive Parking Reform	19	T
3. Zoning Map. Propose options for mapping the provisions above dependent on geographic locations (such as high opportunity areas, centers, corridors, and transit) to achieve affordable housing goals over the next ten years.	19	H,ZM

<u>ANSWERS TO CITY MANAGER QUESTIONS</u>		
Question 1. Scope of Code Revision. To what extent should the Land Development Code be revised?	QA	1
Answer: Adopt a new Land Development Code, consisting of a new Land Development Code (text) and Zoning Map, to take effect concurrently	QA	1
Question 2. Housing Capacity. To what extent should the Land Development Code provide for additional housing capacity in order to achieve the 135,000 additional housing units recommended by the Strategic Housing Blueprint?	QA	5
Answer: Provide greater housing capacity than Draft 3, through enhanced measures to allow construction of additional residential units.	QA	5
Question 3. Missing Middle Housing Types. To what extent should the Land Development Code encourage more “missing-middle” housing types, such as duplexes, multiplexes, townhomes, cottage courts, and accessory dwelling units?	QA	9
Answer: Provide for a greater range of housing types than Draft 3.	QA	10
Question 4. Compatibility Standards. To what extent should the City’s “compatibility standards” (i.e., rules limiting development near residential properties) be modified to provide additional opportunities for development?	QA	10
Answer: Reduce the impact of compatibility standards on development to a greater degree than Draft 3.	QA	11
Question 5. Parking Requirements. To what extent should the City’s minimum parking requirements be modified to provide additional opportunities for development and/or encourage transit options consistent with the Imagine Austin comprehensive plan?	QA	14
Answer: Reduce the impact of minimum parking requirements on development to a greater than Draft 3.	QA	14
<u>ZONING CODE TEXT</u>		
i. The new LDC should focus on the size and scale of the built environment and regulate uses through context-sensitive policies that are clearly identified in the code and apply equitably throughout the City instead of through by-lot zoning regulations. Use restrictions should continue and be improved through a framework that identifies a range of incompatible uses among zoning categories, such as to avoid adult entertainment, hazardous industrial, or other activities that aren’t supportive to surrounding residential or civic uses. Simple, clear requirements of conditions should be established, such as distance requirements and hours of operation.	Z	3
b. COs that are generally incorporated into the new code are not to be carried forward; other, unique COs are carried forward and are subject to change with any future rezoning.	Z	4
c. Determinations about mapping should also be informed by appropriate analyses available to staff, including but not limited to the “Zoning Capacity and Redevelopment Analysis” completed by city staff and the Fregonese study.	Z	5
2. Code Text. Code revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include:a. Options for reducing minimum lot size and width to achieve the goals elsewhere in this document, including preservation goals, while also considering public safety concerns.	Z	7
f. Measures to dis-incentivize the demolition and replacement of an existing housing unit(s) with a single, larger housing unit.	Z	8

g. Identifying and implementing opportunities throughout the code to encourage preservation of existing housing, especially market affordable housing.	Z	8
i. Preservation incentives should be expanded City-wide, so that an additional unit, beyond what would otherwise be allowed, is allowed with the preservation of an existing structure. Remodeling or adding units should be very simple, so it is much easier to preserve an existing home than to tear down and replace it with another larger structure. Provide options to revise McMansion ordinance that provide for ability to add a room or limited remodel but constrain ability to demolish existing home and replace with another larger single family home. If an existing affordable home is preserved, the balance of the lot's entitlements can be used to add more dwelling units.	Z	9
1. Code Text. Code revisions to increase the supply of missing middle housing should include: a. Allowing accessory dwelling units (ADUs), both external and internal/attached, to be permitted and more easily developed in all residential zones;	Z	10
1. Code Text. Code revisions to increase the supply of missing middle housing should include:b. Where appropriate, allowing new housing types to qualify as ADUs, including existing homes being preserved, mobile and manufactured homes, tiny homes on wheels, Airstream-style trailers, modular homes, and 3D-printed homes; and	Z	10
1. Code Text. Code revisions to increase the supply of missing middle housing should include:c. Reduced site development standards as appropriate for missing middle housing options such as duplexes, multiplexes, townhomes, cooperatives and cottage courts in order to facilitate development of additional units. Council will need to determine the appropriate criteria to achieve more affordable housing while protecting environment and sustainability, public safety, transportation, utility and right of way needs.	Z	10
b. The City's visitability ordinance should be retained and expanded to ground floor missing middle housing in the new code and staff shall provide options for how it is expanded.	Z	14
The code revision process should use the staff-recommended Draft 3 (text and map) as a baseline, with revisions made to implement policy direction provided below and in response to Questions 2-5.	Z,ZM	1
h. The new LDC provisions should: iii. To the greatest extent possible, include code restrictions that provide properties zoned for multi-family will develop with multi-family and not single-family structures. At the same time, however, make allowances for existing single-family structures that become non-conforming to be maintained, remodeled, and potentially expanded, so long as they are not demolished or substantially rebuilt. Staff should provide options for minimum unit yield based on the zone.	Z,ZM	7
h. Residential uses should be allowed in commercial zoning categories. Draft 3 mapping included affordability requirements for commercial properties where residential uses are not permitted and these requirements should be maintained in the new draft. [Note: Clarify what this means.]	Z,ZM	8
ZONE MAPPING		
ii. Propose options for prohibiting uses along corridors that displace potential housing opportunities, such as self-storage facilities or other uses that do not contribute to overall policy goals.	ZM	3

5. Zoning Map. The revised zoning map should limit the Former Title 25 (F25) zoning classification to unique zoning districts (e.g., NCCDs and PDAs) for which no similar district exists under the revised Land Development Code. Specialized zoning districts that exist today and are of a type contained in the new Code, such as Planned Unit Developments and regulating plans, should be carried over and not be classified as F25.	ZM	4
c. The granting of new entitlements in areas currently or susceptible to gentrification should be limited so as to reduce displacement and disincentivize the redevelopment of multi-family residential development, unless substantial increases in long-term affordable housing will be otherwise achieved. Existing market rate affordable multifamily shall not be mapped to be upzoned.	ZM	6
g. Generally, revisions to the Zoning map should not result in a downzoning of an existing use.	ZM	7
3. Zoning Map. Map revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include broader use of zones that allow for affordable housing density bonuses than in Draft 3.	ZM	9
a. 75% of new housing capacity should be within ½ mile of transit priority networks as identified by the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan and Imagine Austin activity centers and corridors. Staff should update the growth maps for Imagine Austin including both corridors and centers.	ZM	9
b. All parts of town should be expected to contribute to reaching our ASHB and Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) housing and mode shift goals as well.	ZM	9
c. Additional direction to staff to develop specific, context-sensitive criteria for areas where the distance between corridors is less than ½ mile.	ZM	9
2. Zoning Map. The goal of providing additional missing middle housing should inform the mapping of missing middle zones, consistent with the direction provided throughout this document. a. Map new Missing Middle housing in transition areas adjacent to activity centers, activity corridors, or the transit priority network. i. Generally, the transition area should be two (2) to (5) lots deep beyond the corridor lot. ii. The depth and scale of any transition area should be set considering context-sensitive factors and planning principles such as those set out in the direction for Question 4.	ZM	10
3. Zoning Map. Compatibility standards and initial mapping should work together in a way that maximizes housing capacity on parcels fronting activity corridors, the Transit Priority Network, and within activity centers, consistent with applicable base zoning regulations and with any Affordable Housing Bonus otherwise available. Employment and other uses to create “complete communities” along transit and Imagine Austin corridors and centers should also be allowed in a way that is context-sensitive. In addition, regulations should still allow “village center” type low-density mixed-use and commercial use in neighborhoods to create “complete communities”.	ZM	11
ii Mapping of lots within a transition area should be responsive to existing situations, including instances where market affordable missing middle housing is adjacent or proximate to a property fronting a corridor, and specific context sensitive general criteria provided by Council.	ZM	12

d. The LDC Revisions should map properties for missing middle housing in transition areas that meet some or all of the following criteria. Entitlements and length of transition areas should be relatively more or less intense for areas that meet more or fewer of the criteria listed below, respectively: i. Located on Transit Priority Network, or Imagine Austin Centers or Corridors, ii. Located within the Urban Core as defined by the Residential Design and Compatibility Standards Area (McMansion Ordinance), iii. Has a well-connected street grid, iv. Located in a high opportunity area as defined in the Enterprise Opportunity360 Index	ZM	12
e. The depth and scale of transition zones should be reduced so that the transition zone(s) do not overlap with the majority of the existing single-family neighborhood area.	ZM	12
f. The length and level of entitlement in transition zones should be substantially reduced in “Vulnerable” areas identified in the UT Gentrification Study, regardless of the number of criteria met above.	ZM	13
h. Transition areas should step down to residential house scale as quickly as possible, while providing for a graceful transition in scale from the zone of the parcel fronting an activity corridor.	ZM	13
i. Four units within a house scale should be the least intense zone within a transition area, subject to staff’s consideration of what is appropriate.	ZM	13
k. The City Manager shall also use the following conditions as appropriate when mapping transition areas: i. Orientation of blocks relative to corridors, ii. Residential blocks sided by main street or mixed use type zoned lots, iii. Bound by other zones, use, or environmental features (including topography), iv. Drainage and flooding considerations, v. Whether it is most appropriate to split zone or not split zone a lot.	ZM	13
m. If the transition area is not on an Imagine Austin corridor, but is on a residential transit priority network street, the street facing lot should generally begin with missing middle zoning, rather than corridor zoning.	ZM	13
n. Staff will consider mapping missing middle areas in high opportunity areas not impacted by environmental concerns in order to help achieve goals related to housing throughout the city	ZM	13
<u>COMPATIBILITY</u>		
1. Objective. The code revision should reduce the impact of compatibility standards on development within activity centers and activity corridors to a greater extent than Draft 3.	C	11
2. Code Text. Maintain Draft 3’s no-build and vegetative buffers between residential and commercial uses, as well as other compatibility triggers and standards for properties adjacent to a Residential House-Scale zone. The only exception should be that the highest density Residential House-Scale zones should not trigger compatibility onto the lowest density Residential Multifamily zones in order to create smooth transitions. The revision should provide options for the following:	C	11
i. Standards related to noise, uses, utility screening, side buffers, trash, loading and pick-up zones as well as shielded lighting.	C	11
a. In general, consider revisions that minimize the impact of compatibility standards on properties facing transportation corridors, particularly in relation to shallow lots.	C	12

b. The revised zoning maps should reduce the impact of compatibility standards on development for parcels along all activity corridors and within activity centers. In redefining compatibility standards, the code revision should: i. Define the maximum height allowed by-right plus affordable housing bonus, along activity corridors and in activity centers, and then establish regulations that create a step-down effect in the transition zones.	C	12
c. The revised zoning map should include a transition zone that will eliminate the impact of compatibility for parcels along all activity corridors and within activity centers.	C,ZM	12
i. Lot(s) adjacent to parcels fronting an activity corridor will not trigger compatibility and will be in scale with any adjacent residential house-scale zones.	C,ZM	12
g. Lot(s) adjacent to parcels fronting an activity corridor will be mapped with a zone that does not trigger compatibility and that could provide a step-down in scale from the zone of the parcel fronting an activity corridor. For a shallow lot on a corridor, consideration will be given to maintaining the zoning of the corridor-fronting lot to the adjoining rear lot, if appropriate.	C,ZM	13
COMMUNICATION/PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT		
3. Communication. The Manager should establish and communicate clearly the public input process for Council’s adoption of the revised Land Development Code, including timelines and opportunities for public input. Include a transparent and educational public process under which stakeholders are informed on how their input has been received and is being evaluated.	COMM	2
CITY MANAGER DELIVERABLES		
e. The City Manager shall provide estimates for the potential impacts of the new map on transit ridership as well as affordable housing goals.	D	6
e. A city-led testing process to assess the impact of revised regulations that includes participation by outside design and technical professionals, including architects, landscape architects, and engineers, in addition to city staff and the substantial involvement of the public. The initial testing should examine how the proposed zoning and non-zoning code provisions perform when applied to various types and scales of development and staff should complete this testing prior to review by boards and commissions. Staff should provide accurate and careful testing and modeling of corridor and transition area regulations so that Council and community discussions can focus on achieving policy results and include proposed non-zoning regulations.	D	8
j. Staff will provide a projection of how much missing middle housing capacity the mapping of transition areas consistent with these guidelines will provide, and how effectively the map enables us to achieve ASHB and ASMP goals.	D	13
l. The City Manager shall provide to Council an analysis of the affordable housing and housing capacity yield when presenting the proposed mapping and potential for redevelopment using the Envision Tomorrow tool.	D	13
HOUSING		
e. Staff to provide options for timelines and methods for implementation of the new code and map and to achieve additional housing capacity and affordable housing goals beyond those contained in the new code and map.	H	3

a. The new code and map should allow for housing capacity equivalent to at least three times the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint (ASHB) goal of 135,000 new housing units, as well as for ASHB goals of 60,000 affordable housing units, preservation of 10,000 affordable housing units, production of sufficient numbers	H	5
of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) units each year sufficient to address needs and 30% Missing Middle Housing, and be achieved in a manner consistent with direction provided throughout this document.	H	6
b. In general, within activity centers, along activity corridors, along the transit priority network, and in transition areas, additional entitlements beyond current zoning should only be provided:	H	6
i. to increase the supply of missing middle housing, which shall include an affordable housing bonus program where economically viable or,	H	6
ii. through a density bonus that requires some measure of affordable housing.	H	6
d. In general, housing affordability should be the primary policy driver of code and mapping revisions and the Manager should explore:	H	6
Addition 2. Affordable Housing	H	17
1. Objective: The Land Development Code should support the city's 10-year Affordable Housing Goals and align resources and ensure a unified strategic direction to achieve a shared vision of housing affordability for all Austinites in all parts of the city. The City	H	17
Manager should identify and propose for Council approval amendments to the Land Development Code that will (1) further the housing goals established in the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint (ASHB) and (2) implement recommendations for achieving these goals included in the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint (ASHB) and the ASHB Implementation Plan (if adopted by Council).	H	18
• Preserve 10,000 affordable housing units over 10 years.	H	18
• Produce Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in sufficient numbers to meet the need.	H	18
2. Code Text: Code revisions for Council approval should include provisions to achieve the following ASHB "Key Actions" that are related to the Land Development Code in addition to those already included in response to City Managers question 1 to 5 (* indicating strategies with highest potential impact):	H	18
a. Prevent Households from Being Priced Out of Austin	H	18
• Allow Homeowners to Rent a Portion of Their House as a Separate Housing Unit	H	18
• Increase the Supply of Multi-Bedroom Housing for Families with Children	H	18
• Prevent Displacement of Low-and Moderate-Income Homeowners	H	18
• Preserve and Create Ownership Options for Households at 80% to 120% MFI	H	18
b. Foster Equitable, Integrated and Diverse Communities	H	18
• *Implement the City of Austin's Fair Housing Action Plan and Bolster Enforcement of Existing Fair Housing Requirements	H	18
• Implement Tenant Relocation Assistance Program	H	18
• Protect Renters from Discrimination Based on Source of Income	H	18

c. Invest In Housing for Those Most in Need • Incentive Programs, • Expand the Supply of Housing for People with Disabilities	H	19
d. Create New and Affordable Housing Choices for All Austinites in All Parts of Austin	H	19
• *Implement Consistent Density Bonus Programs for Centers and Corridors	H	19
• *Streamline City Codes and Permitting Processes	H	19
• Better Utilize Land for Affordable Housing	H	19
• Revise S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program	H	19
• Add Flexibility to Occupancy Limits	H,Z	19
• Implement Density Bonus Program for Missing Middle Housing	H,Z	19
• Allow the Development of Smaller Houses on Smaller Lots	H,Z	19
• Create Pre-Approved Standard Plans for Infill Development	H,Z	19
• Relax Regulations on More Affordable Housing Products	H,Z	19
• Relax Regulations on Housing Cooperatives (Co-Ops)	H,Z	19
• Utilize Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) to Provide a Range of Affordability	H,Z	19
f. Code and map revisions should maximize potential for employment and residential units within Downtown, in accordance with the Downtown Austin Plan and the guidance in this document, with affordable housing benefits included and calibrated.	H,Z,ZM	6
Code and map revisions should maximize potential for employment and residential units within Regional Centers, in accordance with the guidance in this document, with affordable housing benefits included and calibrated.	H,Z,ZM	6
• At least 75% of new housing units should be within ½ mile of Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors (see the Figure 10 map showing Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors).	H,ZM	18
• At least 25% of new income-restricted affordable housing should be in high opportunity areas.	H,ZM	18
• At least 30% of new housing should be a range of housing types from small-lot single-family to eight-plexes to help address Austin’s need for multi-generational housing.	H,ZM	18
• Support Community Goal for At Least 25% of New Income-Restricted Affordable Housing to be in Moderate-to-High Opportunity Areas	H,ZM	19
• Increase Housing Diversity in New Subdivisions	H,ZM	19
3. Zoning Map. Propose options for mapping the provisions above dependent on geographic locations (such as high opportunity areas, centers, corridors, and transit) to achieve affordable housing goals over the next ten years.	H,ZM	19
<u>NON-ZONING RELATED CODE</u>		
a. The revised Code text and map should result in reduced allowable city-wide impervious cover, improved city-wide water quality, and reduced overall flood risk.	NZ	2

b. The new land development code should not weaken current City of Austin floodplain regulations, drainage criteria, and water quality regulations and criteria. Methods to measure and options to reduce allowable impervious cover in each watershed relative to current code, and methods to measure and options to improve water quality in each watershed, should be developed for the new code and the following goals incorporated: i. Reductions in impervious cover city-wide should either decrease allowable impervious cover for, or make no change to, each individual watershed (relative to current code). ii. Improvements in water quality city-wide should result in improvements in water quality for each individual watershed.	NZ	2
c. The Atlas 14 floodplain regulations should be approved and incorporated with the most current rainfall data as soon as possible.	NZ	2
d. The Manager will report on how revisions to the land development code will likely affect existing environmental regulations, understanding that the goal of the council is to preserve, or increase, our current level of environmental protections and sustainability with respect to flooding, water quality and usage, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions.	NZ	2
j. The new LDC should provide for the following as it relates to shaping the City's sustainable water future by preventing flooding, protecting water quality, and promoting water conservation:	NZ	3
i. Developments should retain more water on-site and encourage beneficial reuse.	NZ	4
ii. Require developments where total of new and redeveloped impervious cover is 5,000 sq. ft. and greater to treat water quality. Through the land development code process, this provision should be tested, and staff should potentially create separate requirements for missing middle housing if such separate requirements are needed to achieve the goals of producing more small and missing middle housing types, while improving water quality in the city and the region overall.	NZ	4
iii. Expand the use of Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) controls to treat residential subdivisions including roads.	NZ	4
iv. Provide options to significantly reform and/or remove exemptions to impervious cover limits in the redevelopment exceptions throughout the water quality section for all watersheds. Provide such options with the goal of actually achieving the most meaningful reductions in impervious cover locally and regionally, while balancing near-term and longer-term needs to reduce impervious cover and improve water quality.	NZ	4
v. Coordinate with Water Forward to Reduce Water Demand.	NZ	4
6. Additional. To ensure that the Land Development Codes and permitting process are streamlined to the greatest extent possible upon adoption of any revision to the Land Development Code, the regulatory requirements adopted as part of Water Forward, Austin's 100-year integrated water resource plan, that are related to the Land Development Code and are able to be accelerated and implemented this year should be codified and implemented as part of this comprehensive land development code revision process. Staff should report back at least on the following areas if not able to accelerate and implement this year, especially as concerns large buildings over 250,000 square feet: water benchmarking, dual plumbing, landscape transformation, and alternative water.	NZ	5
2. Code Text. Code revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include: b. For parcels within activity centers and on activity corridors, application of non-zoning regulations should be prioritized in a manner that allows for greater potential housing unit yields than would otherwise be achieved without prioritization.	NZ	7

<p>2. Code Text. Code revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include:</p> <p>c. Non-zoning regulations should provide flexibility to allow for higher unit yields for parcels within activity centers and activity corridors. The code should create alternative equivalent means to ensure the balance of needs, while protecting environment and sustainability (landscaping, parkland and tree preservation), public safety, transportation, utility and right of way needs. Review non-zoning regulations related to Austin Energy and Austin Water (other than regular fees) that can significantly impact the cost of development. Review and suggest changes to non-zoning regulations that may encourage demolition rather than the redevelopment of existing structures.</p>	<p>NZ</p>	<p>7</p>
<p>i. The application of non-zoning regulations to smaller, remaining downtown sites should allow for greater potential for employment and residential units than Draft 3, with affordable housing benefits included and calibrated in accordance with the Downtown Austin Plan and the direction of this document.</p>	<p>NZ</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>d. Should the testing and modeling of the draft code demonstrate that any non-zoning regulations significantly constrain housing capacity within activity centers and on activity corridors, staff should provide council with options for best achieving the goals of non-zoning regulations while minimizing impact on achieving our housing capacity goals.</p>	<p>NZ</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>ii. Standards related to Green Infrastructure, tree preservation, as well as increasing tree canopy along corridors and centers to enhance walkability and curb heat island effect.</p>	<p>NZ</p>	<p>11</p>
<p><u>SCHEDULE</u></p>		
<p>The manager should have a revised Land Development Code (text) and Zoning Map ready for Council action on First Reading in October of this year (after Planning Commission issues their report on the text and map as part of the required process).</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><u>SMALL AREA PLANNING</u></p>		
<p>a. Existing NCCDs should be preserved and carried forward in the new code and map, however, Code and Zoning Map changes related to ADUs, Parking, Preservation Bonuses, Affordability Bonuses, lot size, and Transition Area mapping (consistent with Council direction provided below and in response to Questions 2-5) should be applied to those NCCDs. Unique zoning districts (e.g., NCCDs) should be reevaluated in the current context of Austin’s housing and transportation needs in addition to analyzing the extent to which NCCDs provide missing middle housing.</p>	<p>SAP</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Addition 1. Planning</p>		
<p>1. Objective. The Manager should as soon as possible develop a proposed district level (e.g., ERC, North Burnet/Gateway Neighborhood Plan) planning process for Imagine Austin Activity Centers and Corridors susceptible to change, and include specific objectives for each plan related to achieving the goals of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan, Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint, and other Council policy priorities, such as: a. housing capacity to reach the city’s 10-year goals and beyond, b. affordable housing, especially in high opportunity areas, c. anti-displacement and anti-gentrification measures where relevant, d. shared parking, e. regional storm water and water quality planning, f. parkland accessibility, g. utility infrastructure, h. walkability and connectivity, i. increasing opportunities for missing middle housing, and j. policy priorities associated with complete communities.</p>	<p>SAP</p>	<p>15</p>

2. Code Text. The City Manager shall draft language for Council approval to codify the district level planning process and the criteria for selecting planning areas in the Land Development Code as follows:	SAP	16
a. Selection of Planning Areas: Identify geographic areas along corridors throughout the city where district level planning will have maximum public benefit, paying particular attention to corridors (including streets and arterials) identified in the ASMP, Project Connect, and where construction, planning, and land acquisition with done dollars will be applied and can be leveraged.	SAP	16
b. Planning Process Criteria: Determine when district-level planning for an area is needed to align with our adopted city goals and plans, including Imagine Austin, ASHB, ASMP, Age Friendly Austin Action Plan, the upcoming Parks Master Plan, and other relevant plans. Criteria should include, but not be limited to, the following information sources: i. Planned transportation investments, including corridors with transportation bonds and public transit investments;ii. Affordable housing investments;iii. Significant number or scale of private development; iv. Market force indicators expressing need and opportunity to leverage an area’s potential or significant public investment via facilities or other infrastructure; v. Areas of vulnerability identified using the mapping tool from the UT Gentrification & Displacement Study, “Uprooted”; and vi. Include consideration for inhibiting displacement, preserving cultural and historic assets, promoting multi-generational housing, and support neighborhood schools, particularly schools with under –enrollment or in areas of rapid displacement.	SAP	16
c. Planning Process Types: i. Areas facing gentrification and/or displacement should have planning processes that focus on equity, community and economic development, and anti-displacement measures; ii. Higher opportunity areas should have planning processes that focus on reaching housing capacity goals and furthering fair housing/integration.	SAP	16
3. Timeline. Multiple planning efforts for Activity Centers and Activity Corridors should occur concurrently, with a goal of completing those most susceptible to change within 5 years.	SAP	17
4. Resources. The Council recognizes that additional resources will be required to achieve this scale of planning in this time frame, and the use of consultants should be considered to allow for multiple district-level plans to be developed in order to meet this timeline. The City Manager should ensure that planning processes have robust community engagement that incorporates door-to-door outreach, multi-language access, community organizing, and popular education regarding planning, zoning, equity, gentrification, displacement, and affordable housing.	SAP	17
5. Community engagement. The City Manager should review the 2016 Neighborhood Plan Audit and incorporate recommendations into any new planning processes. Planning should include robust engagement of adjacent stakeholders, but also include participation from across our city, as all parts of Austin have an interest in each part of Austin contributing equitably to our goals being met. Community engagement should specifically focus on elevating the voices of populations that have historically been underrepresented in planning processes (as was done with the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan), including: renters, lower-income residents, youth, seniors, people of color, and people with disabilities. Staff should develop and track participation metrics for each planning area and target participation to be representative of the diversity of the planning area and the City as a whole.	SAP	17

6. Triggers for Plan Updates. The planning horizon for each plan should align with Imagine Austin and be assessed and updated approximately every 5 years. Staff should explore mechanisms to trigger when a Small Area Plan is updated, such as demographic changes or infrastructure improvements, and return to Council with recommendations.	SAP	17
TRANSPORATION/PARKING		
i. Transportation and VMT. Developments should be able to use a predetermined set of transportation demand management tools such as building additional bike lanes or sidewalks, providing bike storage, public transit stops and other mechanisms.	T	3
1. Objective. The code revision should seek to reduce the impact of minimum parking requirements on development to a greater degree than Draft 3.	T	14
2. Code Text.	T	14
a. Minimum parking requirements should be generally eliminated in areas that are within the ¼ mile of activity centers, activity corridors, and transit priority network, except that some parking requirements may be maintained for areas where elimination of parking requirements would be particularly disruptive (conditions to be proposed by staff).	T	14
ADA-compliant parking should be required for commercial and multifamily developments, even if no minimum parking is otherwise required to ensure adequate number of dedicated parking spaces exist to safeguard those with permanent disabilities, temporary illness or injury are afforded a place to park near where they live, shop, or visit others.	T	14
Off-site or on-street parking may challenge safety and accessibility and should be carefully considered before being used as a means to provide for this parking. This is of critical importance with an aging population and generational housing.	T	14
c. Code revisions should provide that parking structures are able to evolve over time as transportation patterns change, including design standards for structured parking that will facilitate eventual conversion to residential or commercial uses.	T	15
d. The Manager should:i. Explore options for adopting parking maximums or minimum unit-yield in areas necessary to ensure sufficient transit-supportive development (e.g., TODs);	T	15
d. The Manager should:ii. Determine if parking in certain areas should be counted against FAR;	T	15
d. The Manager should:iii. Explore the feasibility of decoupling parking from leases; and	T	15
d. The Manager should:iv. Explore options for utilizing public parking and ROW to provide more ADA-compliant parking across the City.	T	15
e. Help Austinites Reduce their Household Costs• *Minimize the Displacement of Core Transit Riders, • *Link Housing Choices with Transportation Choices, • *Comprehensive Parking Reform	T	19
GENERAL		
The new code should prioritize all types of homes for all kinds of people in all parts of town (our Strategic Housing Blueprint goals) and a development pattern that supports 50/50 Transportation Mode share by 2039 (our Austin Strategic Mobility Plan).	G	1
Staff should also review recommendations previously made by boards and commissions on Draft 3 and incorporate those with which staff agrees (all or in part), using a process such as that used for the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan.	G	1
The Manager should work to deliver a new code that is simplified, can be applied consistently, and furthers the goals of the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan.	G	1

4. Code Text. The revised Land Development Code should be sufficiently clear and unambiguous that administrative criteria manuals are not relied upon to establish policy, except in circumstances where Council has directed that particular requirements be established administratively.	G	2
f. Creative Spaces. Propose options to preserve creative space, including but not limited to zoning categories specific to cultural spaces and incentives to create dedicated, below market rate creative spaces in developments along corridors and in centers.	G	3
g. Age Friendly Policies. Propose options for provisions in the LDC to carry out the land use recommendations from the Age Friendly Action Plan, including supports for multigenerational housing, visitability, and other provisions. Additionally, there should be provisions that enable day cares and senior living centers in all parts of the City, at a scale commensurate with its surroundings.	G	3
d. In general, housing affordability should be the primary policy driver of code and mapping revisions and the Manager should explore: i. options to allow some level of administrative variances for some building form regulations (setbacks, height, building cover, etc.) to help maximize the shared community values of housing, tree preservation, parks, and mitigating flood risk; and	G	6
d. In general, housing affordability should be the primary policy driver of code and mapping revisions and the Manager should explore: ii. the feasibility of how regulations can overlap (e.g., how a drainage field can also safely serve as open space).	G	6
h. The new LDC provisions should: i. Improve the City's fiscal health by (1) facilitating fiscally sound infrastructure investment for both public and private interests; and (2) applying the code in strategic locations that maximize public infrastructure investment and minimize long term obligations.	G	7
h. The new LDC provisions should: ii. Continue including and enhance a site plan process that assesses the infrastructure needs of developments, including the cumulative impact of development, and facilitate the installation of new infrastructure funded in whole or in part by new development.	G	7
• Consider Building and Fire Code Modifications to Allow Six Stories of Wood Frame Construction	G	19