

## DRAFT TRANSITION WORKING GROUP PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Intent	Vote	Notes	Justification
Map transition zones based on city staff process which is a deviation from council limit on 2-5 lots beyond corridor lot but with following changes for mapping transition area zones.	5-0-0	Refer to Draft Land Code Revision Staff Report pages 10-14.	Staff changes from council 5/2 direction will maintain equi-distant transition zones along corridors.
Only restrict transition zones depths and zone types per staff process in vulnerable areas categorized as classified as Gentrification Neighborhood levels of Susceptible, Early Type 1, and , Dynamic.	5-0-0	Staff reduced transition zones in all “Vulnerable” categories and did not consider level of gentrification. Staff mapping procedure provided that, “... regardless of other applicable criteria, staff has not proposed mapping transition areas deeper than a two lot parallel distance from a corridor in any area identified as “vulnerable” based on the University of Texas “Uprooted Austin” study, which analyzed residential displacement and gentrification in Austin. Additionally, only the least intensive residential house-scale zone [(R4)] was applied.”	Reference Affordability Working Group recommendation.
When mapping of transition areas leaves only 1-2 lots of residential (R2) zoning between transition area and other higher density zones (non-transition zone), these remaining residential lots should be lots should be mapped with transition area zones.	5-0-0	James will provide references where there are pockets of residential (R2) zones among other higher density zones. Provide examples.	In many of these cases, most of the R2 scale neighborhood has already been re-zoned. Application of council direction to avoid mapping transition areas in a majority of the single family neighborhoods should not apply. Leaving these "pockets" of R2 zones is incompatible with the surrounding increased density.

## DRAFT TRANSITION WORKING GROUP PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Intent	Vote	Notes	Justification
<p>Additional zones should be included as transition zones in order to adhere to criteria established by Council. Include an R zone that is lower intensity than R4 and provides a gradual increase between R2 zones and R4 zones and an RM zone that allows for a more gradual transition from higher MU and MS zones fronting corridors to the RM1 zones. Mapping of these zones will depend on context of the IA corridor and/or TPN.</p>	5-0-0	<p>Draft LDC does not provide many choices for lower density zone except R3. Residential Working Group will provide recommendations for this residential step-down transition area zone. RM2 provides for a 60' height with density bonus and could be considered for the higher level zone. These zones will not trigger compatibility with the corridor facing lots. The other advantage of the larger zone is that it may actually be large enough to yield on-site affordable units where R4 and RM1 will not based on staff 10/8 presentation. RM2 would have to be modified as it triggers compatibility with R3 or more restrictive zones.</p>	<p>Excerpts from Council Direction: <i>1) 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, 2) 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, 3) 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.</i></p>
<p>For added housing capacity, consider increasing depth and zone density beyond draft zoning maps based on city staff's mapping process when context of IA corridor and/or TPN supports increased density such as 1) intersection of two IA corridors, 2) along IA corridors with predominance of high density MU and/or MS zones, and 3) where high capacity bus service benefits from greater residential density (i.e.; rail, 801, 803, future high capacity service lines)</p>	5-0-0	Provide examples.	<p>This is proposing zoning beyond council's direction, but is supported by ASMP and ASHB for prioritizing density with high capacity transit.</p>
<p>Missing middle % goal (30%) was not achieved. Propose amendments to increase missing middle in transition areas and other areas.</p>	5-0-0		<p>Require additional missing middle to achieve ASHP goals and Council Directives.</p>
<p>Map transition areas near schools.</p>	5-0-0	<p>Must ensure public safety such as infrastructure for safety of pedestrians (sidewalks, cross walks, traffic calming, etc.) In opportunity areas?</p>	<p>Not addressed by council.</p>
<p>Map transition areas near dedicated parkland.</p>	5-0-0	<p>Must ensure public safety such as infrastructure for safety of pedestrians (sidewalks, cross walks, traffic calming, etc.) In opportunity areas?</p>	<p>Not addressed by council.</p>
<p>Allow RM1 development including affordability bonus units (up to 11 units) to be included in Limited Site Plan Review Process if impervious cover 50% or</p>	5-0-0		

## DRAFT TRANSITION WORKING GROUP PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Intent	Vote	Notes	Justification
<p>Allow RM1 development including affordability bonus units (up to 11 units) to be included in Limited Site Plan Review Process if impervious cover 60% or less.</p>	<p>5-0-0</p>	<p>Current Limited Site Plan requirements cover 3-8 (9?) units at 50% or less impervious cover. This was based on Watershed analysis increasing impervious cover in transition areas to 50% or 60% will not increase risks of creek flooding and localized flooding.</p>	<p>Current Limited Site Plan requirements cover 3-8 (9?) units at 50% or less impervious cover. This was based on Watershed analysis increasing impervious cover in transition areas to 50% or 60% will not increase risks of creek flooding and localized flooding.</p>
<p>Do not require transition area zones to construct on-site storm water controls/RSMP.</p>	<p>5-0-0</p>	<p>Agree with staff position for Limited Site Plan for 3-8 units. Discuss whether should apply to development &gt; 8 units or 60% impervious cover.</p>	
<p>Allow some flexibility in zone requirements (height, setbacks, etc.) to achieve number of units allowed by zone.</p>	<p>5-0-0</p>	<p>Maintain public safety.</p>	<p>Council Direction: 1) Code revisions to increase the supply of missing middle housing should include: 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. 2) 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: i. to increase the supply of missing middle housing, which shall include an affordable housing bonus program where economically viable or, ii. through a density bonus that requires some measure of affordable housing.</p>
<p>No mapping of transition area zones in Atlas-14 100-YR Floodplain (current 500-YR)</p>	<p>5-0-0</p>		<p>Aligns with council direction.</p>

## DRAFT TRANSITION WORKING GROUP PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Intent	Vote	Notes	Justification
Market rate affordable multi-family units in transition areas should not be mapped with transition area zones.	5-0-0	Staff used Co-Star data to identify MF at 80% MFI or below.	Adheres to council directives. Staff Report: "Using available data on average rents, staff identified market rate affordable multi-family development throughout the City and proposed zoning classifications that are comparable to current entitlements. Due to limitations on available data, this analysis focused primarily on properties with five or more units, although some smaller scale development is also included."
Segments along corridors and TPN were not mapped with transition area zones. If these segments are similar in context to other lots, then they should be mapped consistently.	5-0-0		
R4 and RM1 development within transition areas that are provided entitlements for affordable housing which result in 2 or fewer affordable units, the developer should provide in-lieu-of payment instead of providing on-site affordable units.	4-1-0		Based on staff presentation, it takes a minimum of 6 bonus to yield 1 affordable unit. Staff stated that 1-2 on-site affordable unit developments are not preferable to manage and this is probably the max. affordable housing yield for transition area zones (R4 and RM1), 4+4 and 6+4.
Current or future high capacity Cap Metro service that are not IA corridors or on the TPN should be mapped as transition areas consistent with mapping of IA corridors and TPN.	4-0-1	Based on recently proposed projects by Cap Metro. Suggested by Commissioner Thompson	ASMP and ASHB references for transit supported density.
Where vulnerable areas border high opportunity areas along an IA corridor or TPN, the transition area should be mapped the same on both sides. The decision to map one side or the other more or less shall depend on other context-sensitive criteria for that specific corridor or TPN.	4-1-0	Provide examples.	The study classifies various neighborhoods which borders to include corridors and TPN roads, but these do not accurately represent exact points at which neighborhoods actually change from high opportunity to vulnerable. This would not follow council's direction, but is a recommendation based on practical mapping of zones.
Do not limit mapping of transition areas in vulnerable areas that are along IA and TPN corridors that have been allocated bond funding for transit improvements. These corridors require transit supportive densities.	3-1-1	<a href="#">2016 Corridor Bond Projects</a>	In conflict with council direction for limiting transition area zoning in vulnerable areas. Supported by ASMP policies for transit supported densities along IA corridors and TPN.

## DRAFT TRANSITION WORKING GROUP PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Intent	Vote	Notes	Justification
<p>For TPN and IA Corridors that are fronted by a majority of residential zones R2 and less, in addition to council direction on context-sensitive mapping criteria, reduce depth and density of zones within transition areas based on unique conditions of the TPN and IA corridor segment. Consider the following context-related criteria for reducing transition areas.</p> <p>1) the number of continuous residential blocks, 2) vicinity of transit centers/stops, 3) capacity of roadway to handle increased density, 4) the bus route triggering the TPN designation was established to reach a designation beyond the residential area, 5) orientation of lots on TPN or corridor, 5) proximity to other IA corridors, IA centers and TPN streets, 6) features of TPN or corridor make it difficult to support needs of residents (electric, water, trash services, parking, etc.) 7) TPN/corridor will not support multi-modal transportation options due to lack of sidewalks and room in streets for bike lanes, 7) wildfire risks, 8) vicinity to schools, civic uses, and parks, and 9) other factors.</p>	<p>3-2-0</p>	<p>Consider mapping these with no greater than three lots [or distance] in from corridor facing lot with only lower density R4 zone. Additional capacity would be considered during small area planning. Provide examples.</p>	<p>1) The following is based on the principle that IA corridors should be mapped with the deepest and highest density transition areas especially where segments have commercial zoning facing the corridor. Council did provide for context sensitive mapping and called for special mapping of <b>"residential TPN"</b> streets. These would be additional criteria to consider. Council Directive: <i>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.</i> 2) ASMP Land Use Policy 1 - TPN density depends on transit supported density required. <i>"The Project Connect high-capacity transit routes planned in Austin run through different types of built environments, including downtown, commercial centers, already-dense mixed-use neighborhoods, and areas dominated by detached, single-family homes.</i></p>

## DRAFT TRANSITION WORKING GROUP PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Intent	Vote	Notes	Justification
			<p><i>Continued from above: Transit-supportive densities are measured for routes as a whole. Planning should be flexible to take into account the existing character of neighborhoods and community input to appropriately allocate density within transit corridors, and we must plan to achieve the transit-supportive density appropriate for the planned mode of transit. The full range of planning tools should be used to establish these densities, including zoning reviews, small area plans, density bonuses, affordable housing investments, transit-oriented development zones, and revisions of the land development code, potentially including zoning entitlements and bonuses tied to the distance from transit. The portions of the Transit Priority Network not planned for high-capacity transit should have transit-supportive densities considered in land use planning, but are a lower priority."</i></p>
<p>Allow removal of heritage trees based on certain factors which allows mitigation and use of funds for adding trees in same corridor area.</p>	<p>3-2-0</p>	<p>Review allowances for removal of heritage trees in corridors.</p>	<p>See above Council directive for increasing missing middle housing in transition areas.</p>

## DRAFT TRANSITION WORKING GROUP PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Intent	Vote	Notes	Justification
<p>Map transition areas around IA centers in order to increase missing middle housing near IA centers.</p>	<p>2-3-0</p>	<p>Staff did not create transition areas around IA centers, assuming that most included IA corridors and TPN or already were covered by regulating plans (TODs, PUDs, etc.) Discuss advantages of increasing zoning around centers-especially where HO, Urban Core and Transit are present.</p>	<p>Council direction: 1) 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. 2) 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. 3) 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.</p>

## DRAFT TRANSITION WORKING GROUP PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Intent	Vote	Notes	Justification
<p>In addition to not mapping transition zones in Atlas 14 100-yr floodplains, do not map transition areas where localized flooding problems exist (<a href="https://Austinlocalflooding">https://Austinlocalflooding</a> ) based council direction for context sensitive mapping below.</p>	1-4-0	<p>Watershed Department does not recommend this as they have determined that the increased impervious cover from transition areas will not significantly increase risks of localized flooding compared to other factors. Transition Working Group agreed that we need Watershed Dept. to explain this and provide recommendations on how to address localized flooding.</p>	<p>Council direction: 1) 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. 2) 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.</p>
<p>Unless typology of the corridors is the same, do not use reference measurement of one corridor for another (i.e. using IA corridor with commercial to map residential TPN).</p>	0-5-0	<p>Working group does want city staff to demonstrate why they mapped transition area distances in areas where it does not follow their procedures.</p>	
<p>Mapping of zones should reflect existing private deed restrictions.</p>	0-5-0	<p>Too difficult for staff to identify all the private deed restrictions.</p>	<p>Justification: Although city does not enforce deed restrictions, the city should not map zones that are in conflict with the legal restriction for development of the property. In addition to many urban core lots, this is a concern mentioned by CM Flannigan and other council members in work sessions.</p>