

Submitter (Commissioner or Working Group)	Title (Short Description)	Chapter (and Section, if any)	Division	Page	Intent	Suggested Text	Notes	Justification	Tags
1	Affordability Working Group	Income restricted affordable housing management				Allow the management and monitoring of scattered-site affordable units so that they can be made feasible.	Create a certified affordable housing provider certification (with community input at a later time) based on certain criteria. If a developer builds less than 4 income -restricted affordable units, they must partner with this provider for resident income certification and placement. The management and maintainance of the unit must remain the duty of the management of the market rate units.	Council Direction: 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: to increase the supply of missing middle housing, which shall include an affordable housing bonus program where economically viable or, through a density bonus that requires some measure of affordable housing.	
2	Affordability Working Group	Income averaging in income restricted units				Consider income averaging within income restricted units.	Allow for income averaging in income restricted units	Affordability Unlocked AND alignment with other housing programs.	
3	Affordability Working Group	Increase income restricted housing in high opportunity areas				The opportunities for income restricted housing high opportunity areas need to be maximized.	Work with the transition zones working group to identify opportunities for increased transition zone capacity in high opportunity areas to increase income-restricted affordable units by increasing bonus area.	Council Direction: Map revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include broader use of zones that allow for affordable housing density bonuses than in Draft 3. 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.	WORK WITH TRANSITION WORKING GROUP
4	Affordability Working Group	Transitional and supportive housing CUP				Ensure that the CUP requirement for transitional and supportive housing is economically feasible in all zones	Remove the CUP requirement for supportive housing.	Council Direction: Produce Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in sufficient numbers to meet the need.	
5	Affordability Working Group	Transitional and supportive housing CUP				Ensure that the CUP requirement for transitional and supportive housing is economically feasible in all zones	Review the allowability of the CUP requirement for transitional housing under the Fair Housing Act.	Council Direction: Produce Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in sufficient numbers to meet the need.	

6	Affordability Working Group	Transitional and supportive housing CUP				Ensure that the CUP requirement for transitional and supportive housing is economically feasible in all zones	If allowable, ensure that there is no economic cost or time delay associated with the CUP requirement for transitional housing.		Council Direction: Produce Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in sufficient numbers to meet the need.
7	Affordability Working Group	Tenant protections for income-restricted housing				For all AHBP units, require tenant protections similar to what is currently required in the Rental Housing Development Assistance lease addendum.	Require a lease addendum with increased tenant protections for all income-restricted affordable units built under any bonus program anywhere. "Except for a proposed development participating in a government-operated affordable housing program with stricter requirements, the applicant for a proposed rental development: (1) Shall incorporate lease provisions that are consistent with: (a) The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program related to the termination of tenancy by owner; (b) Any lease addendum required as a condition to receive city or Austin Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC) funds; and (c) 24 C.F.R. § 245.100 related to a tenant's right to organize;"		Direction: Action Plan and Bolster Enforcement of Existing Fair Housing Requirements AND ASHB: Austin City Council approved an ordinance establishing requirements for property owners or developers to provide advance notice to tenants when the apartment buildings or mobile home parks they live in will be demolished or closed. The ordinance also created a relocation assistance program for low-income renters and mobile home
8	Affordability Working Group	Tenant protections for income-restricted housing				For all AHBP units, require tenant protections similar to what is currently required in the Rental Housing Development Assistance lease addendum.	Ensure that the above provisions and source of income protections are added to all bonus programs, including those that are not being actively updated in the LDC, UNO and downtown/Rainey.		Direction: Action Plan and Bolster Enforcement of Existing Fair Housing Requirements AND ASHB: Austin City Council approved an ordinance establishing requirements for property owners or developers to provide advance notice to tenants when the apartment buildings or mobile home parks they live in will be demolished or closed. The ordinance also created a relocation assistance program for low-income renters and mobile home

9	Affordability Working Group	Unlimited CC bonus to increase community benefits				Offer an unlimited bonus in the CC zone to increase community benefits, including affordable housing	Work with the downtown working group to identify opportunities for increasing income-restricted affordable units by increasing bonus area in the downtown zones.	WORK WITH DOWNTOWN WORKING GROUP	Council Direction: 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: to increase the supply of missing middle housing, which shall include an affordable housing bonus program where economically viable or, through a density bonus that requires some measure of affordable housing.
10	Affordability Working Group	Internal ADU permitting				Relax permitting requirements for internal ADUs	Relax permitting requirements for internal ADUs	Question for staff - how does this relate to the preservation bonus?	Council Direction: Code revisions to increase the supply of missing middle housing should include: Allowing accessory dwelling units (ADUs), both external and internal/attached, to be permitted and more easily developed in all residential zones.
11	Affordability Working Group	Child care accessibility				Encourage accessible child care by reducing restrictions on child care facilities for 25 children or fewer, including montessori schools in all zoning categories, except industrial and airport zones	Permit, without a CUP, childcare facilities that are considered "large" (13 ≥ and ≤24) in zones LA, RR, R1, R2A, R2B, R2C, R3 and R4. Ensure that this includes montessori and other child care facilities that are not schools.	Question for staff - What was the basis for the initial language and how does this relate to state requirements?	ASHB: NHCD Department goals of providing child care services
12	Affordability Working Group	Child care accessibility				Encourage accessible child care by reducing restrictions on child care facilities for 25 children or fewer, including montessori schools in all zoning categories, except industrial and airport zones	Allow "large" (13 ≥ and ≤24) childcare facilities as an allowed accessory use to a residential use. Ensure that this includes montessori and other child care facilities that are not schools.	Question for staff - What was the basis for the initial language and how does this relate to state requirements?	ASHB: NHCD Department goals of providing child care services
13	Affordability Working Group	Elder care accessibility				Encourage accessible elder care by reducing restrictions on elder care facilities, including occupancy limits, in all zoning categories, except industrial and airport zones	The off-street parking should be '1 plus 1 per every 3 bedrooms'	Example: Table 23-3C-3040(A) Parking Requirements for Residential House-Scale ZonesCurrent definition: SENIOR/RETIREMENT HOUSING. Independent living centers and multi-family residential developments reserved for senior citizens, persons with physical disabilities, or both, where common facilities may be provided (for example, recreation areas), but where each dwelling unit has individual living, sleeping, bathing, and kitchen facilities.	ASHB: Adopt a balanced approach to provide affordable housing resources for low-income workers, seniors, people with disabilities and the thousands of people experiencing homelessness.
14	Affordability Working Group	Review effectiveness of S.M.A.R.T housing				Ensure that the S.M.A.R.T housing section is aligned with previous Planning Commission work	Ensure that the S.M.A.R.T housing section is aligned with previous Planning Commission work as recorded in their exhibits.		Council Direction: Revise S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program

15	Affordability Working Group	Increasing income restricted housing on TPN				<p>The opportunities for income restricted housing in zones on the TPN within non-gentrifying areas need to be maximized. Increased entitlements should be employed to achieve increased number of income-restricted units. This does not apply to naturally occurring affordable housing.</p>	<p>Find opportunities to increase the bonus entitlements, and thus the requirement of income restricted housing, on the corridor on the TPN within non-gentrifying areas, specifically in high opportunity areas.</p>	<p>Council Direction: 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: to increase the supply of missing middle housing, which shall include an affordable housing bonus program where economically viable or, through a density bonus that requires some measure of affordable housing.</p>
16	Affordability Working Group	Administrative variances under Affordability Unlocked				<p>To enhance Affordability Unlocked, in the case of units built under the program, explore options to allow some level of administrative variances for some building form regulations (setbacks, height, building cover, etc.)</p>	<p>Administrative variances may be allowed in the Affordability Unlocked section, "for some building form regulations (setbacks, height, building cover, etc.)"</p>	<p>Council direction: In general, housing affordability should be the primary policy driver of code and mapping revisions and the Manager should explore 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</p>
17	Affordability Working Group	Administrative variances under Affordability Unlocked				<p>To enhance Affordability Unlocked, in the case of units built under the program, explore options to allow some level of administrative variances for some building form regulations (setbacks, height, building cover, etc.)</p>	<p>Explicitly allow for Affordability Unlocked to be used in conjunction with other affordable housing funding and policy programs.</p>	<p>Council direction: In general, housing affordability should be the primary policy driver of code and mapping revisions and the Manager should explore 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</p>

18	Affordability Working Group	Transition zones in gentrifying areas				Transition zones in the "late" and "Continued loss" gentrifying areas should be mapped as 5 lot deep in order to increase housing capacity, including income-restricted units.	Susceptible: 2 lots, Early Type: 2 lots, Dynamic: 2 lots, Late: 5 lots, Continued Loss: 5 lots	Supplemental Staff Report: Continue to reduce transition areas and the application of transition zones in areas susceptible to gentrification. Areas identified as being most susceptible to gentrification in the UT Uprooted Study will be considered to be reduced more than areas in dynamic or late stages of gentrification.	Council Direction: Map revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include broader use of zones that allow for affordable housing density bonuses than in Draft 3. AND Conversation with Authors of Uprooted study
19	Affordability Working Group	Naturally occurring affordable housing in gentrifying areas				Increase protections for naturally occurring affordable housing in gentrifying areas	All naturally occurring multi-family affordable housing (as defined by staff) in gentrifying areas should not be allowed a bonus unless rezoned at a later date.		Council Direction: 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.
20	Affordability Working Group	Increasing income restricted housing in transition zones				Ensure the creation of an on-site income restricted unit in transition areas where feasible.	In transition zones in gentrifying areas, the base zoning should be limited to 2 units per lot with a potential increase to 8 or 10 units (same as R4 and RM1 now). Any use of the bonus must require at least one on-site income restricted affordable unit (unless the calculation supports more).The affordable unit must be comparable to the market-rate units in all ways, including size.		Council Direction: 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: to increase the supply of missing middle housing, which shall include an affordable housing bonus program where economically viable or, through a density bonus that requires some measure of affordable housing.

1	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Transition Area Mapping Process	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	Map transition zones based on city staff process with following mapping changes ("Zoning Map" titled mapping amendments approved by Planning Commission)for mapping transition areas zones.Although lots may be added or removed from different transition areas based on these amendments, the total housing capacity shall not be significantly reduced below the yield of the current draft or above council goal for total housing capacity.	NA	Justification: Refer to Draft Land Code Revision Staff Report pages 10-14 and Supplemental Staff Report (Final 10-25-19) pages 2-3.Question for Staff:We understand that staffmapping created the distance based mapping process to allow for transition zones of equal distance on both sides of the corridor. However, we would like tounderstand why have transition zones with equal distance from the corridor is important.Exhibit TWG-1 and TWG-2
2	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Transition Area Mapping Process	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	Limit the depth of lots to two (2) to five (5) lots behind corridor lot as directed by council with the following changes ("Zoning Map" titled mapping amendments approved by Planning Commission).Although lots may be added or removed from different transition areas based on these amendments, the total housing capacity shall not be significantly reduced below the yield of the current draft or above council goal for total housing capacity.		Justification:Council Direction- 1) 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 betwo (2) to (5) lots deepbeyond 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, and 2) Transition areas shouldstep 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.Comment:This amendment would require additional modeling to determine whether housing goals (total, within 1/4 mile of corridors, affordable in high opportunity, missing middle, etc.) can be achieved.
3	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Amendments Related To Transition Area Mapping in Vulnerable Areas	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	Endorse Affordability Working Group Amendment related to vulnerable zone classifications that receive reduced transition area mapping and zone intensity.		Note:Endorse Affordability Working Group Amendment related to vulnerable zone classifications that receive reduced transition area mapping and zone intensity.
4	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Addition of Zones Types to Map in Transition Areas	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	Include mapping of an R zone that is lower intensity than R4 and provides a gradual increase from R2 zones outside of the transition area.		Justification:Council Directive 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 astep-down effectin 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 astep-down in scalefrom the zone of the parcel fronting an activity corridor, 3) Transition areas shouldstep downto residential house scale as quickly as possible, while providing for a graceful transitionin scale from the zone of the parcel fronting an activity corridor.Notes:Residential Working Group will provide recommendations for this residential step-down transition area zone.

5	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Additional Context Sensitive Mapping Criteria for Transition Areas	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	Increase depth and zone density for transition areas when conditions exist for maximizing density where corridors, centers and high capacity transit co-exist. These are areas where IA and TPN corridors also serve as high capacity transit service routes and intersect IA centers with high density RM, MS and MU zones.	Justification: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....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 Corridorsand 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. Austin Stratetic Mobility Plan -Land Use Policy #1 - Plan and promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network. Exhibit TWG - 3	
6	Transition Working Group	Additional Administrative Relief Procedures	23-2G-2		2G-2 pg. 1	Allow some % of administrative authority for flexibility in zone requirements (height, setbacks, etc.) to achieve number of units allowed by zone in order to achieve other benefits such as added tree protection, other.	Justification: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, and 2) In general, housing affordability should be the primary policy driver of code and mapping revisions and the Manager should explore 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.	
7	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Amendments Related To Transition Area Mapping in Vulnerable Areas	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	Generally, transition areas along TPN and IA corridors that have approved bond funding for improvements (see Exhibit TWG-4) should be mapped with more transition area density (most lot depth and zone intensity) including vulnerable areas adhering to council's limits on lot depths. (Note Affordability Working Group is recommending depth of transition areas in vulnerable areas.)	Justification:Austin Strategic Mobility Plan -Land Use Policy #1 - Plan and promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network. Exhibit TWG - 4. Note: In conflict with council direction for limiting transition area zoning in vulnerable areas, but this is supported by ASMP policies for transit supported densities along IA corridors and TPN.	

8	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Addition of Zones Types to Map in Transition Areas	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	Include a higher density zone than RM1 to be mapped behind high density corridor fronting lots (mapped with zones allowing 60' or more height) along IA and TPN corridors. (This zone will have base height of 45' and bonus height up to 65'.)	Justification: Council Directives 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. Note: This zone would provide for a more gradual transition between corridor lots 60' in height or greater such as RM4, RM5, MU4, MU5, MS3 and the RM1 zones with a 40' height. The other advantage of this zone is that it may actually yield on-site affordable units.	
9	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Transition Areas Near Parkland	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	Map transition areas near dedicated parkland when accessible sidewalks and public safety infrastructure for pedestrian safety exists.	Justification: Imagine Austin Priority 4. Use green infrastructure to protect environmentally sensitive areas and integrate nature into the city/ Goal: Increase access to parks/ Measure: Units within walking distance of parks (1/4 mile in urban core, 1/2 mile outside the urban core)	
10	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Transition Areas Near Schools	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	Map transition areas near schools when accessible sidewalks and public safety infrastructure for pedestrian safety exists.	Justification: Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) and Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint (ASHB) provide general references to increased housing near schools. The ASMP provides goals for increase pedestrian (page 80) and bike travel to schools (page 109), which are better achieved when housing is increased in the vicinity of schools. Question: Is this supported by AISD recommendations?	
11	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Additional Context Sensitive Mapping Criteria for Transition Areas	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	For segments of TPN and IA Corridors that are fronted by a majority of residential zones (currently SF3 or more restrictive), 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. 1) the number of continuous residential blocks or length of residential segment, 2) lack of transit centers/stops, 3) capacity of roadway to handle increased R4 and RM1 density, 4) the high-frequency bus route triggering the TPN designation was established to reach a designation beyond the residential area, 5) orientation of lots on TPN or IA Corridor (houses front corridor), 6) proximity to other TPN, IA corridors and centers, 7) street width and lack of right of way of TPN or corridor make it difficult to support needs of residents (electric, water, trash services, parking, etc.) 8) street width and lack of right-of-way will not support multi-modal transportation options due to lack of space for sidewalks and bike lanes, and 9) wildfire risks.	Justification: Austin Strategic Mobility Plan - Land Use Policy #1 - Plan and promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network. This Policy promotes the principle that IA corridors and TPN having high density commercial zoning facing the corridor and are designated for high capacity transit should be mapped with the deepest and highest density transition areas. IA and TPN corridors fronted with residential should not be prioritized for the same transition area intensity. Council did provide for context sensitive mapping criteria and called for special mapping of "residential TPN" streets as follows: "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." These are additional context sensitive criteria to consider.	

12	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Missing Middle Goal	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	Map transition zones, high opportunity areas and IA centers with missing middle zones to achieve the goal of 30% missing middle housing.		Justification: Council Directive adopting ASHB goal - 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. Question: In modeling to determine whether zoning maps met goal for 30% missing middle, did staff include missing middle on R3 and more restrictive zones outside of transition areas.	
13	Transition Working Group	Zoning Map - Additional Context Sensitive Mapping Criteria for Transition Areas	23-3A-3		3A-3 pg. 1	In addition to not mapping transition zones in Atlas 14 100-yr floodplains, do not map transition areas where localized flooding problems exists (https://Austinlocalflooding)		Justification: Council Directive - 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. Question: What does Watershed Dept. recommend as best course to limit localized flooding while increasing impervious cover in areas prone to localized flooding.	
1	Residential - CK	Townhouse FAR calibration	23-3C-3	3xxx		Correct townhouse 1 unit FAR allotment to allow 3 story townhouses on smaller lots. Keep height maxes.	See intent.	Current townhouse form FAR isn't what anyone thinks of a "townhouse" as.	TK
2	Residential - CK	SF-attached FAR calibration	23-3C-3	3xxx		Sync SF-attached FAR equal to FAR for duplex (and duplex/multifamily FAR in bonuses) Ensure we do not allow gaming of FAR with subsequent subdividing	See intent. Should match whatever the final allotments for duplex are in each zone. Ensure we do not allow gaming of FAR with subsequent subdividing	Current SF-attached has lower FAR than duplex, but is just a subdivided duplex.	TK
3	Residential - CK	Townhouse and SF-attached bonus calibration and clarification	23-3C-3	3xxx		Define internal ADU's: 1 per lot; Must have internal door, does not count as an additional unit on the lot, No additional FAR, separate access encouraged, shared utilities; reasonable limitation on area (750sqft?)	See intent. Applies to whatever R zones have bonuses.	Current townhouse form in R4 (no SF-attached form available) does not have a unit or FAR bonus. This should also apply to a zone with SF-attached forms where a new bonus is available.	TK
4	Residential - CK	R4 impervious cover adjustment	23-3C-3		3130	33 Revise R4 impervious cover to be graduated by unit count, increasing only to incentivize more missing-middle units and taking of the affordable housing bonus.	Impervious cover table (currently 50%) revised by units: 1-2 units: 45% 3-4 units: 50% 5-6 units: 55% (only avail. with bonus) 7-8 units: 60% (only avail. with bonus)	IC for 1-2 units kept low to match current entitlements. 50% is still tight for 3-4 units, but 60% is critical for full bonus to be achieved.	TK
5	Residential - CK	R4 FAR adjustment	23-3C		3130	32 Revise R4 FAR to be graduated by unit count, increasing to incentivize more missing-middle units and re-evaluate bonus FAR in consideration of bonus viability.	Add FAR table to vary FAR by unit count, not form: 1-2 units: 0.4 3-4 units: 0.6 5-8 units: Staff re-examine considering bonus viability.	FAR for 1-2 units is kept low to match current entitlements. FAR is a bit stingy with 3-4 units but is fully unlocked with bonus, making bonus more attractive.	TK

6	Residential - CK	Garages and parking adjustments for R zones	23-3C-3	3xxx		Adjust garage and parking restrictions to allow more flexibility of placement, but restore garage size exemption cap. A) Allow garages to come forward of building facade (NOT into front setback) IF it forms one side of an engaged (2-sides enclosed) front porch; B) Consider increasing front yard impervious cover restriction from 45% to 50%; C) Change 50% limit of building frontage allowed for parking (garage door) from 50% of non-parking frontage (which makes it effectively 33% of building) to 50% of entire building frontage (a true 50%); D) Restore current code FAR exemption limit for garages to 200 sq ft/unit.	See intent.	Note that this does reduce the current allowed 450 sq ft garage FAR exemption if garage is detached/properly placed. This prevents very large garages attached to very large houses.	TK
7	Residential - CK	New R2 zone that bonuses to 4 units in R2B tent	23-3C-3	new	new	A new R zone. Purpose: intended to maintain a house-scale aesthetic in areas well-served by transit; base entitlements of 2 units with an affordable housing bonus up to 4 units. Base: R2B. Bonus: Same as base but max FAR of 1.0, impervious cover of 55%, up to 4 units, and multi-family form. Calibration of bonus likely needs to allow an affordable ADU to get bonus, maybe with a 1-to-3 ratio of affordable-to-market bonus area, and unbundled parking so affordable unit does not necessarily have parking.	Same as R2B, but with bonus entitlements of 4 units, 55% impervious cover, multi-family form. Calibration of bonus is important and likely requires an ADU-sized affordable unit, so a max FAR determined by bonus calculations may be necessary.	Though this is intended for areas without parking minimums, builders say they will still provide parking, especially for market units. Providing parking for the affordable unit becomes difficult, so unbundled parking may be needed. Testing indicates additional FAR of a 1-to-3 ratio of added affordable-to-market area may work best, e.g. a 0.1 FAR income-restricted ADU with an additional 0.3 market FAR. NHCD would likely need to specify number of bedrooms corresponding to square footage.	TK
8	Residential - CK	Double-Lot form for all units/lot R zones	23-3C-3	3xxx		For all R zones with a units/lot standard (all current zones), create a "double-lot" set of allowed forms for all but townhouse and attached SF forms (e.g. single family, duplex, multi-family) that allows double the number of units if a lot has double the minimum lot area AND a width of the minimum standard width PLUS the minimum width needed for a flag lot. Limited to two lots. Maximum building width is unchanged. All other standards (e.g. impervious cover, FAR, exterior setbacks) still apply.	New rows in Lot Size and Intensity tables with double-lot forms, like Cottage Court-6 is a double-lot standard for Cottage-Court 3.	This lowers the cost of housing by not requiring double-size lots that could be subdivided to go through a costly and lengthy subdivision process before development. Reduces flag lots substantially by making subdivision unnecessary to get the additional units. Allows greater preservation of trees and accommodation of environmental feature by allowing more flexibility in placement of units on double-size lots vs. subdividing and placing half of units on each lot.	TK
9	Residential - CK	Cottage Court form - make practical	23-3D-1	1160	19	Remove form requirements, especially of the 3-unit form, that make it difficult to achieve, especially on smaller lots.	Remove requirements: 1,500 sf min. area for courtyard; courtyard have buildings on two sides; courtyard cannot be in front or side st. setback; on a corner lot, units adjacent to the side street must front both the courtyard and the street; parking must be clustered and may not be provided adjacent to or attached to an individual unit. Preserve: 200 sf/unit courtyard size min.; courtyard cannot be use for vehicular access or parking; units must front the common courtyard or the street; a pedestrian connection must link each building to the public right-of-way, court, and parking area; buildings must be separated by a min of 6 ft.	If we're going to make a form available on smaller lots, it should be practical to achieve. The Cottage Court-3 form is impractical on smaller lots; even the Cottage Court-6 could be hard to achieve on 10,000 sq ft. units.	TK
10	Residential - CK	Clarify entitlements for multiple forms	23-3C-3	3xxx		Clarify code when a mix of forms are utilized, such as a duplex and an ADU.	See intent	Current form standards only envision one form being used on a lot, but in R3, R4, multiple combinations are possible.	TK
11	Residential - CK	Zero lot-line for developing adjoining lots	23-3C-3			Adopt townhouse zero lot option for other forms when two contiguous R3 and R4 lots are being developed. (Maximum building mass/width/facade of 90 ft applies.) Fire codes and other restrictions still apply and are not superceded.	See intent.	This gives flexibility for trees and costs on building placement. If all lots are being simultaneously developed, no need to protect one of the lots from a close-in building. All fire codes, etc. still apply.	TK
12	Residential - CK	Scalable version of R4	23-3C-3			Create a units/acre version of R4 to be available to be appropriately mapped for large lots.	See intent and R4 section, but with units/acre equivalent to the units/lot in R4.	This is not intended to be mapped today, but to be available for future mapping.	TK

13	Residential - CK	Replacement zone for SF6	23-3C-3			Create an equivalent to SF-6 in R zones that utilizes units/acre. Do not allow a height bonus but provide an affordable bonus for other entitlements that could produce on-site units on large lots.	See intent and current SF-6 entitlements. Could also map current SF-5 to this zone. Could trade a lower base impervious cover (current is 55%) for a higher units-acre, while allowing more impervious cover under the bonus.	SF-5 and SF-6 are currently mapped to RM-1, but RM-1 is both more intense and uses a units/lot standard, which starts to down-zone SF-6 on larger lots. With no height bonus, this zone should also be palatable to be zoned alongside R2 lots without compatibility issues. However, the large lots also provide opportunity for a workable affordability bonus.	TK
14	Residential - CK	Curb cuts in R4 and RM1	23-3C-3			Allow two curb cuts in R4 and RM1 zones. When on the All-Ages, All-Abilities bicycle network or Bicycle Priority Network, additional curb cut is at discretion of Austin Transportation Director.	See intent.	This is something to make bonuses more viable in R4 and RM1.	
15	Residential - RS	Manufactured Homes -- keep current smaller MH parks compliant under new LDC				some existing MH home parks are on small lots that will become noncompliant under the proposed LDC, even though council articulated desire to keep MH parks; create a smaller lot size for existing MH parks on smaller lots	Redesignate current zone as MH1A (for MH parks); Create new zone MH1B for existing smaller MH parks on lots to ensure small existing parks don't become non-compliant		Council has indicated the need to preserve existing MH parks, this is consistent with that direction
16	Residential - RS	Manufactured Homes -- allow for "tiny home" manufactured home parks/lots				provide tiny home alternatives in both a park setting as well as on lots to enhance affordability with small footprint dwellings	See intent		Tiny homes -- either as part of parks or as small units on lots -- enhances affordability through small footprint homes in parks or on relatively small lots
17	Residential - RS	Shade trees in transition zones				Make walking to transit more pleasant, healthy, and increase city tree canopy by requiring trees for sidewalks transition zones	Apply front yard tree planting requirements to all urban/transition zones (R2B and up); trees should be oriented toward shading sidewalks		proposed landscaping requirements don't apply to R zones.
18	Residential - PS	F25 Review	23-3C-9090			Application of more consistent and predictable zoning and to minimize reliance on prior F25 regulations.	Applies to all F25 zoning triggered by Conditional Overlays and other individual site specific zoning. Does not include NCCD, PDA and "Overlay" zoned areas in 23-3C-10zoned properties. Staff should set a specific timeline indicating the start and completion dates of all reviews at the lot level, the neighborhood notification process plus the departments and commissions involved in the review.		This is consistent with council directives with an added component of the timelines and process involvement.
19	Residential - PS	Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	23-3D-1030			Direct COA departments involved in assessing fees to reduce the cost of building ADUs through fee waivers, shorter approval times, etc.	See intent	Lower cost of entry for ADUs.	
20	Residential-JS	Attic Exemption removed				In calculating FAR (Floor Area Ratio), remove attic exemptions and count all conditioned square footage 6'-8" tall and above counts toward FAR		Attic exemptions are difficult to assess and calculate, and new LDC unlocked attic use anyway. Much easier to just follow counting allowable head clearance code to count to FAR	
21	Residential-JS	Double height space relation to FAR				In calculating FAR (Floor Area Ratio), all conditioned space 15' tall and taller count twice toward FAR		To prevent future busting of FAR by installing future floor system, per previous code, count double height space twice. Also encourages efficiency of dimensional space used	Build usable space not excess bulk
22	Residential-JS	Garage FAR exemption				In calculating FAR (Floor Area Ratio), allow a garage / carport exemption of 200sqft per unit		1. This can prevent overbuilding of parking spaces. 2. Unregulated construction of structured space can cause busting of FAR by future enclosing and conditioning of the space which we have seen in the past	3. With parking minimums eliminated or reduced, this helps to buffer creating parking without penalizing the street or the home owner

23	Residential-JS	Fences for non private frontage properties	23-3D-10060			Simplify fences to be allowed (do not limit at intersections, driveways, alleys) to be built on property line. Fence height regulations same as today, however limit fence in front yard to average 4'-6" to allow fences to be 4'-5' tall.		Solution looking for a problem? PC allowed porches and pools to be in the setback yards. Pool requires 48" fence anyway and with slopes there has to be allowances for additional height. Also Private Frontages can have up to 6' almost a the property line anyway. Should there be special taller height execeptions for lots that front collector streets, or in front of a street which gets hit by headlights? Major issues with existing fences. Are we adding an extra layer of regulation that we dont need?	Current code allows 6'-8' fences at property line. 6' and under without a permit. New code severely limits and would put majority of all visible fences out of compliance. New code also does not allow for slopes. It is also inequitable between properties since buildings and private frontages are allowed to be closer. Additionally, other zoning categories allow buildings to be much closer than 20' to the property line.. up to 5'. If visibility is the issue then take real on the
24	Residential-JS	Front fence height limits	23-3D-5 as pertain to R zones			For private frontages use same fence regulations of 4'-6" average height at front yard, however if on raised frontages, then rail/fence must be mostly see thru.		Code allows private frontages to be up to 36" raised. This requires a 36" tall guard rail system or wall which can effectively be a 6' wall almost at the property line. This recommendation makes it equitable between properties and allows alignments, however with raised frontages it limits the fence presence on the streetscape	
25	Residential - JS	Remove required private frontage (front porch) requirements in R2B and other zones	23-3D-5 as per R zones			Consider eliminating R zone private frontage requirements and replace with street trees		Private frontages will all be different hodge podge mix of styles and different heights (allows up to 36" difference). Shaded streets may be a better idea	Additional cost of building private frontages can be excessive
26	Residential-JS	Accessory apartments/internal ADUs	23-3D-1030			Define internal ADU's: 1 per lot; Must have internal door, does not count as an additional unit on the lot, No additional FAR, separate access encouraged, must be owner occupied, shared utilities; reasonable limitation on area (750sqft?)	Current code already allows this for homeowners to care for additional elderly occupants. This expands this for others regardless of age	Allows inexpensive way for someone to create a rentable space in their own home or to simply be able to adapt the house for what is todays allowance of a Secondary Apartment. Basically allows inclusion of another cooking space.	
27	Residential-JS	Parking reductions	23-3D-2050			Between 1/4 and 1/2 mile from Transit Priority Network corridors, parking reductions should be context sensitive based upon characteristic of the areas, not just whether a sidewalk exists or if planned to exist		"Multi-units on residential size lots also have parking and service needs. Additionally corridor lots with parking eliminations or reductions will also tax the street network. Trash/recycling/composting bins will also need space on the street. Distance between driveways, the width of ROW pavement, availability of sidewalks, all need to be considered for a workable streetscape process plan. Create a mechanism to tune the proposed parking minimums thru parking reductions based on a table of factors or TDM type analysis. (Start with realistic current on the ground patterns and adjust from there.) These factors are as follows but not limited to: -Street parking availability (if there are no parking zones) -Street width -Presence of sidewalks -Distance to public transportation stop (1/4 mile) - Distance to schools -Residence Parking Only Permits -Fire safety compromises - Lot widths and driveway placement - Trash pickup and utility placement -Safe Streets analysis -Transportation Safety Improvements Program -Vision Zero"	

28	Residential-JS	Unified Development Agreements				Special exception to allow development onto two separate lots with a unified development agreement in R3 and R4. Shared setbacks on common property line is reduced to zero and building placement is flexible within the balance of the setbacks. Unit number is the same as the two separate lots.	Is this already allowed? Intent is to create a simple process for two lots to develop like a single lot with intensity of two lots. Cost to subdivide is expensive... this allows an affordable option. In addition this allows adaptability onto sites with special situations. Existence of UDA between the properties will preclude the property from subdividing later	Unified Development Agreement already exists. We are looking to refine the tool and make it more easily attainable.	
29	Residential-CK	Give ADUs the same FAR bump as duplexes	23-3D-3			Sync FAR so an ADU with a single family use gets the same FAR as a duplex does in the same zone	In the FAR tables for each R zone.		
	Non - Residential								
1	Downtown WG	Mapping				Add DC zoning to NW quadrant of Downtown, excluding Judge's Hill			
2	Downtown WG	Cultural Arts	23-4A-2010		4A-1	Add language that lead to regulations to to sustain, diversify, and strengthen the music and arts industries and communities.	Art Music Culture Oct 2019.docx		city-wide regulations to promote arts, music, and culture with the goals of: protecting existing assets and promoting new ones in areas inequitably deficient of art, music, and cultural assets, supporting housing and jobs for musicians and artists, and sustaining these important elements of Austin's economy.
3	Downtown WG	Limitations on Authority	23-1A	2030(A)	1A-2,2	Limits staffs ability to interpret code. How should uncertainty be handled if staff cannot interpret/make determinations? See 23-1B-3030(B)(7) which tells them to interpret.. and also 23-3B-2020 on interpretations.			
4	Downtown WG	Boards and Commissions	23-1B	2050	1B-2, 4	Technical Code Boards – Are these new? Clarify relationship to other Boards and Commissions, like Planning Commission, and their limits of authority.			

5	Downtown WG	Zoning Map	23-3A	3	<p>of CC to allow for maximum development potential in areas of downtown where density is expected (eastern two-thirds and SW corner) and where sites are already constrained by Capitol View Corridors. This would remove CC "transitional" zoning from center of Central Business District. CC Purpose states "intended to implement the DAP.....that transitions from neighborhoods to Downtown Austin." DC Purpose states "most intense urban mixed use zone intended to implement the DAP and serve as regional center for residences, employment, shopping, entertainment and services in downtown Austin." See Proposed Map by Downtown Austin Alliance. All properties within downtown except for those within the area exempt from bonus density per Figure 23-4E-2030(1) Downtown Density Bonus Program Map, should be zoned DC. Many downtown sites, especially those in the eastern two-thirds of downtown (along the Waller Creek corridor and along I-35, the waterfront and the southwest corner) where density is most desired, are already limited by the significant height restrictions of the Capitol View Corridors and other restrictions that limit density in</p>	<p>All properties within downtown except for those within the area exempt from bonus density per Figure 23-4E-2030(1) Downtown Density Bonus Program Map, should be zoned DC. All other properties should be zoned one of the CC subzones as shown on the Draft 3 map.</p>	(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-14) (PD-19) (PD-20)
6	Downtown WG	Growth Concept Map and Transit Priority Network	23-3A	5	<p>Where are the centers and corridors defined at a parcel level, i.e. what are their boundaries, how do you know if a parcel is included?</p>	<p>Centers and Corridors boundaries are defined in Section.....</p>	
7	Downtown WG	Regional Center Zones Allowed Uses	23-3C	7030	<p>Allowed Uses that should be Permitted (P), instead of Conditional Use Permitted (CUP), Minor Use Permitted (MUO) or Not Allowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Transitional and Supportive Housing o Transit Terminal o Research and Development Non-hazardous o Recreation - Outdoor, Natural o Community Agriculture o Helicopter and Aircraft Facility – at Dell Seton Medical Center? o Community Events o Detention Facility – Police Station, Sobering Center, County Jail? o Emergency Shelter – ARCH? o Recycling Center: Transfer Station and Drop-off and Reuse Center sub categories o Special Use Historic o Utilities, Major – Electrical Substations? Current and future chiller plants (at state garage), future micro-grids or other regional energy or water infrastructure? 	<p>Allowed Uses that should be Permitted (P):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Transitional and Supportive Housing o Transit Terminal o Research and Development Non-hazardous o Recreation - Outdoor, Natural o Community Agriculture o Helicopter and Aircraft Facility o Community Events o Detention Facility o Emergency Shelter o Recycling Center: Transfer Station and Drop-off and Reuse Center sub categories o Special Use Historic o Utilities, Major 	(PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-19) (PD-20)
8	Downtown WG	Regional Center Zones Allowed Uses	23-3C	7030	<p>Uses Not Allowed that should be considered some form or permitted: Parking Facility – Should be considered if a stand-alone parking garage were built for the purpose of providing public, shared parking that was managed and promoted as regional or district parking. This use could be built in Capitol View Corridor restricted properties where other uses are not built due to height limits. This would allow housing and office uses to reduce the amount accessory parking levels they build.</p>	<p>Allowed Uses that should be Permitted (P): Parking Facility</p>	(PD-15) (PD-5) (PD-6)

		Regional Center Zones Parking Requirements				<p>Maximum Number of Parking Space – If a building is <8:1, no parking maximum should be required AND if a building will be >8:1, then they receive an increase in FAR from 8:1 to 12:1 if you 1) construct at least 50% of parking underground or 2) construct no more than the minimum parking as referenced in table total. This should apply to all Imagine Austin Regional Centers. Recommend a new table showing maximum number of spaces for Regional Center zones. Referencing the two tables is unclear. Clarify that for Office Use the new draft requires maximum of 2:1,000 SF after the first 2,500 SF. This effectively reduces the parking maximum for downtown by half. And it is more strict than in MS or MU zones. If as proposed, a stand alone parking use shall be allowed to allow separate parking for future total parking reduction. Parking Location Standards – Porte-cocheres for hotels should be allowed in all downtown districts, not just Waterfront District.</p>		
9	Downtown WG		23-3C	7040		<p>o (B) Maximum Number of Parking Space – If a building is <8:1, no parking maximum should be required AND if a building will be >8:1, then they receive an increase in FAR from 8:1 to 12:1 if you 1) construct at least 50% of parking underground or 2) construct no more than the minimum parking as referenced in table total. This applies to all Imagine Austin Regional Centers. o (B) Recommend a new table showing maximum number of spaces for Regional Center zones. o (C) Parking Location Standards – Porte-cocheres for hotels should be allowed in all downtown districts, not just Waterfront District.</p>		(PD-15) (PD-5) (PD-6)
10	Downtown WG	Regional Center Zones Parking Requirements	23-3C	7040	<p>Maximum Number of Parking Space – If a building is <8:1, no parking maximum should be required AND if a building will be >8:1, then they receive an increase in FAR from 8:1 to 12:1 if you 1) construct at least 50% of parking underground or 2) construct no more than the minimum parking as referenced in table total. This should apply to all Imagine Austin Regional Centers. Recommend a new table showing maximum number of spaces for Regional Center zones. Referencing the two tables is unclear. Clarify that for Office Use the new draft requires maximum of 2:1,000 SF after the first 2,500 SF. This effectively reduces the parking maximum for downtown by half. And it is more strict than in MS or MU zones. If as proposed, a stand alone parking use shall be allowed to allowed separate parking for future total parking reduction. Parking Location Standards – Porte-cocheres for hotels should be allowed in all downtown districts, not just Waterfront District.</p>	<p>o (B) Maximum Number of Parking Space – If a building is <8:1, no parking maximum should be required AND if a building will be >8:1, then they receive an increase in FAR from 8:1 to 12:1 if you 1) construct at least 50% of parking underground or 2) construct no more than the minimum parking as referenced in table total. This applies to all Imagine Austin Regional Centers. o (B) Recommend a new table showing maximum number of spaces for Regional Center zones. o (C) Parking Location Standards – Porte-cocheres for hotels should be allowed in all downtown districts, not just Waterfront District.</p>		(PD-15) (PD-5) (PD-6)

11	Downtown WG	Regional Center Zones Parking Requirements for DC and CC Zones	23-3C	7040	<p>Recommendation for DC and CC zoning parking incentive program: Concept: For projects located in downtown Austin (boundary: Lady Bird Lake; I-35; Lamar Boulevard; MLK Jr. Boulevard), offer enough palatable options or incentives so that a project could decide to not build any on-site parking and still meet the demands of the use.</p> <p>Program goals include: unlock the parking supply so it is available to non-tenant users, reduce amount of parking spaces built, with a priority of reducing amount of above-grade parking levels, build parking levels that are ready for future technologies like automation or for adaptive reuse and reduce the amount of trips generated.</p> <p>Create an incentive program that is either included in the Downtown Density Bonus Program or included the mandatory TDM program. Program provides additional FAR, and/or expedited permit review, and/or waived fees. Bonus FAR amount and waived fees to be determined through calibration. Program will be subject to a regular (annual or bi-annual) calibration methodology (consider the available mass transit and multi-modal options) and schedule to determine initial requirements and how and when to</p>			(PD-15) (PD-5) (PD-6)
12	Downtown WG	General to Regional Center Zones: Building Frontage and Placement	23-3C	7050	<p>o (B)(2)(a) Maximum of 20' wide conflicts with Figure 23-3C-7050(1)</p> <p>o (B)(3) Building Entrance - Entrance must face primary street and if corner lot, must face and connect to both streets and must be every 75' – this is very restrictive and will cause multiple conflicts with Frontages and Downtown Plan Overlay requirements; recommend removing.</p>	<p>o (B)(2)(a) For Maximum size, see Figure 23-3C-7050(1)</p> <p>o Delete section (B)(3) Building Entrance - Entrance must face primary street and if corner lot, must face and connect to both streets and must be every 75'</p>		(PD-5) (PD-6)
13	Downtown WG	Urban Center Zone	23-3C	7060	<p>Need clarification on standards/maximums in this table, including tower separation (120') compared with maximum building setbacks of 10' – can these be mutually achieved? This needs clarification.</p>			
14	Downtown WG	Commercial Center (CC) Zone	23-3C	7070	<p>o(A) Purpose: "intended to implement the Downtown Austin Plan....that transitions from neighborhoods to Downtown Austin." CC zoned properties should only be mapped where this applies - only in the NW District of downtown along Judges Hill neighborhood. See Mapping comments.</p> <p>o 23-3C-7070(A) Lot Size and Intensity: Increase all CC subzones to 5:1 FAR (let CC subzone height maximums, not FAR, be the limiting factor) CC40, CC60 and CC80 when tested could only reach 50 - 66% of allowed height.</p> <p>o 23-3C-7070(D) Height: Increase CC subzone heights: CC40 to CC50; CC60 to CC75; CC80 to CC90; CC120 (this allows one additional floor without diminishing the effect of the height limit or compromising the character of the area)</p> <p>o 23-3C-7070(G) Frontages: (2)(a) Arcades and colonnades not defined in 23-3D-5. Provide definitions. Are these types allowed – Storefront, Forecourt, Terrace/Loading Dock, Lightwell, Door yard, Porch projection, Porch engaged?</p> <p>o 23-3C-7070(I) Additional Standards: AEGB 1 Star Rating required – Recommend allowing LEED certification as equivalent compliance.</p>	<p>o 23-3C-7070(A) Lot Size and Intensity: Increase all CC subzones to 5:1 FAR</p> <p>o 23-3C-7070(D) Height: Increase CC subzone heights: CC40 to CC50; CC60 to CC75; CC80 to CC90; CC120</p> <p>o 23-3C-7070(G) Frontages: (2)(a) Arcades, galleries, colonnades, storefront, Forecourt, Terrace/Loading Dock, Lightwell, Door yard, Porch projection, Porch engaged</p> <p>o 23-3C-7070(I) Additional Standards: AEGB 1 Star Rating or LEED certification as equivalent compliance is required.</p>		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-14) (PD-20)

15	Downtown WG	Downtown Core (DC) Zone	23-3C	7080	<p>o (A) Purpose: "most intense urban mixed use zone intended to implement the DAP and serve as regional center for residences, employment, shopping, entertainment and services in downtown Austin." This should then allow for remapping of CC to DC where the property is serving as Regional Center and not in a transition to downtown. See Mapping comments.</p> <p>o 23-3C-7080(A) Lot Size and Intensity: Increase DC FAR from 8:1 to 12:1 to provide FAR equal to Robinson Ranch and Domain current zoning</p> <p>o 23-3C-7080(G) Frontages: (2)(a) Arcades and colonnades not defined in 23-3D-5. Provide definitions. Are these types allowed – Storefront, Forecourt, Terrace/Loading Dock, Lightwell, Door yard, Porch projection, Porch engaged?</p> <p>o 23-3C-7080(I) Additional Standards: AEGB 1 Star Rating required – Recommend allowing LEED certification as equivalent compliance.</p>	<p>o 23-3C-7080(A) Lot Size and Intensity: Increase DC FAR from 8:1 to 12:1</p> <p>o 23-3C-7080(G) Frontages: (2)(a) Arcades, galleries, colonnades, storefront, Forecourt, Terrace/Loading Dock, Lightwell, Door yard, Porch projection, Porch engaged</p> <p>o 23-3C-7080(I) Additional Standards: AEGB 1 Star Rating or LEED certification as equivalent compliance is required.</p>	(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-20)
16	Downtown WG	Former Title 25 Zone (F25)	23-3C	9090	<p>o (A)(2): Is CURE zoning included?</p> <p>o (3) Director shall publish a guide to F25 zone on city's website. When will this be available?</p>	(A)(2): Add (e) CURE Zoning	
17	Downtown WG	Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Zone	23-3C	9140	TOD's are generally kept unchanged which means there are multiple areas of Austin that will have increased zoning entitlements above the TOD entitlements. This seems counter intuitive if we want to encourage car-free lifestyle. Could TOD's be kept with exception of replacing base entitlements (unit/acre, FAR, height, compatibility) with new LDC rules for MU or MS zones that are compatible?		(PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-14)
18	Downtown WG	Downtown Civic Spaces Overlay	23-3C	10070	For (A)(2)(c)(ii) Within 60' of a public ROW that surrounds a park: Are Waller and Shoal Creek considered parks? Or does this just apply to Lady Bird Lake adjacent properties, Republic Square, Wooldridge Square, Brush Square, Palm Park and Waterloo Park?	(A)(2)(c)(ii) - Within 60' of a public ROW that surrounds a park. Add: This applies to parkland in downtown but creeks are exempted.	
19	Downtown WG	Downtown Civic Spaces Overlay	23-3C	10070	The Downtown Austin Alliance recommends that new development adjacent to Waller Creek and within the Waller Creek Local Government Corporation (LGC) boundary be exempted from the existing code's Downtown Creeks Overlay and its equivalent regulations reflected in the Downtown Civic Spaces Overlay of the LDC Revision 2019. Additionally, we recommend a new overlay zone that establishes metes and bounds for a common Waller Creek centerline for consistent planning and regulatory purposes within the LGC, establishes a 60' minimum building setback for new development from the newly-defined creek centerline and provides a variance process for encroaching into the 60' setback. See complementary recommendation for Overlays - New Waller Creek Overlay.	o At (A) Purpose and Applicability (2)(c)(i): Revise to "Within 60 feet of centerline of Shoal Creek;" or Add "(iii) Properties located within the boundary of the Waller Creek Local Government Corporation are exempt from this overlay." (effectively exempts new development adjacent to Waller Creek and within the Waller Creek Local Government Corporation (LGC) boundary from Downtown Civic Spaces Overlay)	(PD-8)(PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-16) (PD-17) (PD-18)

20	Downtown WG	Overlays - New Waller Creek Overlay	23-3C	10		<p>The Downtown Austin Alliance recommends that new development adjacent to Waller Creek and within the Waller Creek Local Government Corporation (LGC) boundary be exempted from the existing code's Downtown Creeks Overlay and its equivalent regulations reflected in the Downtown Civic Spaces Overlay of the LDC Revision 2019. See the complementary recommendation for Downtown Civic Spaces Overlay. Additionally, we recommend a new overlay zone that establishes metes and bounds for a common Waller Creek centerline for consistent planning and regulatory purposes within the LGC, establishes a 60' minimum building setback for new development from the newly-defined creek centerline and provides a variance process for encroaching into the 60' setback.</p>	<p>Add "Waller Creek Overlay" (A) Purpose and Applicability (1) The Waller Creek Overlay Zone protects the unique character, aesthetic value, pedestrian accessibility and use of Waller Creek as established by the Waller Creek Corridor Framework. (2) The overlay zone applies to property located within the boundary of the Waller Creek Local Government Corporation. (B) Development Standards (1) Building Placement (a) Minimum setback of 60' from common centerline of Waller Creek. Refer to section _____ for metes and bounds definition for common Waller Creek centerline. (2) The Land Use Commission may waive the minimum setback in Subsection (B)(1)(a) if it determines that: (a) Compliance is impractical or physical or economic hardship can be demonstrated, and (b) Proposed development is substantially compliant with the aesthetic values of the Waller Creek Corridor Framework, and (c) Adequate precautions have been made for public safety and access. (3) Applicant may appeal Land Use Commission's decision under (B)(2) to City Council.</p>		(PD-8)(PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-16) (PD-17) (PD-18)
21	Downtown WG	Downtown Plan Overlay	23-3C	10080		<p>General concerns: Improve regulations that codify the Downtown Austin Plan recommendations by better coordinating with or deferring to future district planning as called for in the Downtown Austin Plan; Downtown density in CC zones is reduced through additional restrictions like building setbacks. Establishment of building setbacks should be deferred to district planning where context-sensitive regulations can achieve specific goals for immediate surroundings. Remove and defer street categories and associated requirements to future planning. Improve regulations to preserve and enhance neighborhood character, culture and history. Maps and boundaries in this overlay are outdated and do not reflect current conditions. Are F25 and P zones required to comply? o (D)(1) Driveways, Curb Cuts – Need an exception for corner lots on two Pedestrian Activity Streets. o (D)(2) Treatment of Commercial Building Fronts: Are multi-family buildings included in these requirements or (3) Treatment of Residential Building Fronts?Awnings and canopies – Will these need a license agreement? o(D)(2) Treatment of Commercial Building Fronts, Note 2: Regarding reflective surface requirement: The 20%</p>	<p>o (B) Boundaries Defined: Definition of Red River Subdistrict should reflect boundary used by the Red River Cultural District. o (D)(1) Driveways, Curb Cuts – Add: Properties that are located on a corner with two adjacent Pedestrian Activity Streets are exempt from this requirement. o (D)(2) Treatment of Commercial Building Fronts, Note 2: Regarding reflective surface requirement: Change 20% max reflectivity index to 40% reflectance OR remove this requirement. o (D)(4)(a)(i) Minimum Front Setback Requirements o Remove setbacks greater than 5' except when a site is within a block with existing greater setbacks. Or At (a) Front Setbacks (i) change to "Minimum front setback is 5' or equal to existing adjacent block front setback when site is within a block with existing greater setbacks" and delete the Figure (2) map until an updated map developed during a district planning process can be codified. o Figure 23-3C-10080(2) – The base map is outdated and should be updated to reflect current development. o (G)(1) Screening for Parking Structures: (b) - this requirement should not preclude a garage from complying with naturally-ventilated garage requirements in building code and it should not conflict with the Urban Design Guidelines, gatekeeper requirements of the Downtown Density Bonus Program. o (G)(3) Parking Facility Permitted: A stand-alone parking garage built for the purpose of providing public, shared parking is permitted.</p>		(PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-13) (PD-16, 17, 18)
22	Downtown WG	Urban Forest Protection & Replenishment	23-4C	3		<p>Heritage Trees: There are many trees greater than 30 inches in diameter on DC designated sites. Mandating the preservation of these trees can be in conflict with a goal of increased density on the remaining small parcels that are suitable for development. (Imagine Austin prioritizes the greatest density in regional centers and specifically in downtown.) Consider mitigation processes that provide for more trees along sidewalks and also improve nearby parks and squares for use by the public as an option to preservation. Also consider mitigation that allows fee-in-lieu or replacement for trees in downtown zones, as part of base zoning. Pushing tree criteria determination to ECM is problematic and does not allow stakeholders to participate in code adoption process.</p>	<p>1. Include clear determination of goal from tree removal of various sizes by % or other method into the code, not the ECM and provide mitigation requirements below and above this% in an incentivizing manner, i.e. Below target the mitigation requirement is lower, and above the target mitigation requirement is higher.2. Allow all tree removal by administrative rule if meeting clear code definition and allow heritage tree removal process to go through a public/semi-judicial process. Existing Land Development Code: More restrictive than LDC.</p>		(PD-10) (PD-11)

23	Downtown WG	Landscaping	23-3D	3		Landscaping requirements should be based on best practices on how to establish and maintain landscaping in the industry. This is especially true for high impervious cover, high density urban environments like downtown. This includes items such as: soil volumes, plant spacing, and where a specific measurement is provided, it should be in line with the growth habit of the plant and the micro-environment where it is planted.			(PD-10) (PD-11)
24	Downtown WG	Specific to Use: Accessory Uses	23-3D	1050		o Table 23-3D-1050(A) Allowed Accessory Uses - Parking facility should be allowed for additional uses beyond Commercial, Civic, Recreation. o (G)(2) Parking Facility is only permitted as an accessory use in Regional Center Zone. Should be allowed as a Permitted use for purpose of providing district scale, shared parking available to public and private businesses to help reduce amount of parking built as accessory use. See Regional Center parking comments. Confirm that the floor area of parking garages serving commercial uses in Regional Centers is not limited to 10% of the floor area of the primary commercial use. Clarify that a Parking Facility use is one that provides public parking for people who are not primary building occupants if this is the intent.	o Table 23-3D-1050(A) Allowed Accessory Uses - Parking facility should be allowed for additional uses beyond Commercial, Civic, Recreation. o (G)(2) Parking Facility is only permitted as an accessory use in Regional Center Zone.		(PD-15) (PD-5) (PD-6)
25	Downtown WG	Specific to Use	23-3D	1310(B)	33	The additional requirements for R&D uses don't make sense for downtown's planned innovation district in the NE quadrant near the medical school.	Specifically, that the building must be (1) a single tenant building, (2) may not include ground floor pedestrian uses, (3) may not exceed 90 feet in height. Eliminate these additional restrictions.		(PD-5) (PD-6)
26	Downtown WG	Specific to Use	23-3D	1320(C)	33	Supplementary regulations for restaurant uses requires dB level limits for live entertainment. These restrictions are ironically not included for bar/nightclub uses	Coordinate "live entertainment" regulations with the sound ordinance.		(PD-5) (PD-6)
27	Downtown WG	Parking and Loading - Applicability	23-3D	2020(B)(i)		Scope of improvements needs to be clarified such that ROW dedications shall be limited to land owned by applicant			(PD-5) (PD-6)
28	Downtown WG	Parking and Loading - Parking for Persons with Disabilities	23-3D	2040	2-3	Parking for Persons with Disabilities - this regulation exceeds the requirements of federal and state law, by requiring that developments that chose to provide no parking, must still provide some stipulated amount of accessible parking. As written, the proposed regulation requires clarification so as not to be open to interpretation and may force development to do things that run counter to the council's stated policy direction - i.e. adding more parking, more curb cuts, and reducing ground floor developable area in Regional Centers. o For all zones: The requirement is the greater of 1 space on-site OR the # of spaces required by Building Code on-site. o On-site HC parking will cause conflicts with several other requirements like prohibited curb cuts, required active frontage and uses on the ground floor (it would be cost prohibitive and poor use of SF to build a ramp to an upper level which would then need an elevator, fire stair, etc. or to a lower level just for a small number of HC spaces) AND if the site is on a steeply-sloped street where HC spaces are not provided, the burden falls on the development to provide them on-site. Question: is there a variance or	For current CBD and DMU zoned properties, the land development code in place today allows for Fee-In-Lieu payment for accessible parking per 25-6-591(B)(2)(a)(ii). That option was removed in the current code draft. For a small site like the recently developed Aloft/Element hotel on Congress - requiring on-site accessible parking or off-site parking meeting the requirements of this section, may have been impossible. Consider reinstating the fee-in-lieu option. Also, please clarify the following: under 2040(B)(1)(b)(i) regional center zones which have no minimum parking requirement are required to use parking minimums of zone MS3. Clarify if these are base parking minimums or minimums with applicable reductions. For 2040 (B)(3) clarify how the 250' distance is measured - as the crow flies, along an accessible route? (sloping streets downtown may not have an accessible route to parking), measured from the actual space in a garage? How many businesses can count an on-street public accessible space to satisfy this requirement? How does one prove that they have access to an off-site accessible space? How many businesses can count an accessible off-site space to satisfy this requirement? How does someone needing an accessible space know where to find an offsite space?		(PD-5) (PD-6)
29	Downtown WG	Parking and Loading: Parking Reductions	23-3D	2050	3	Parking Reductions: 2050(B)(1)(b) references sites located within "a Center" or "a Corridors". These terms are not defined.	Define these terms and note where that definition can be found in this section.		(PD-5) (PD-6)

30	Downtown WG	Parking and Loading: Loading	23-3D	2060		5>Loading: Per Table 23-3D-2060(A), minimum loading requirements for floor area greater than 100,000 are "As determined by Transportation Criteria Manual" This information is not in the current criteria manual, so it must be the intent to move it into the new criteria manual, which we do not yet have. Loading: The current draft removes two important sections from the existing code which need to be re-introduced. 25-6-592 "schedule of off-street loading requirements for central Austin" which allowed smaller loading spaces for urban areas, and 25-6-501 "Off-site Parking" Loading: 2060E references the term "primary street façade" .If you look up PRIMARY STREET in 23-12A-1030 "General Definitions" the definition is "The primary street of a lot or site is the street with the highest priority that is adjacent to the lot or site". How does one determine the street with the highest priority? Highest priority as determined by what?	State the requirements in 2060 or release the new transportation criteria manual for review. <in current code these requirements are given in 25-6>; Reintroduce 25-6-592 and 25-6-501 from existing land development code. These sections are important and need to be included in the new code. Need clearer definition of primary street.	(PD-5) (PD-6)
31	Downtown WG	Parking and Loading: Bike Parking	23-3D	2070		5-6 Bicycle Parking: These requirements are not properly calibrated for large buildings. For example, Block 185 (future Google office building currently under construction) will be over 800,000 gsf. The code as written would require 804 bicycle spaces. 402 of these are required to be located within 50' of the principal building entrance, publicly available and not obstructed from public view. 400+ bike racks on the sidewalk is infeasible and impractical, and even if it is, it's probably not the look we want for our downtown streets (along with all of the other scooters, bikes, etc.).	Provide alternate requirements for larger buildings or Regional Centers with fewer spaces and a smaller percentage located within 50' of the primary entrance.	(PD-5) (PD-6)
32	Downtown WG	Functional Green	23-3D	3120(C)(1)(i)		Requiring a revision for changes to functional green is a burden; This should be modifiable via a site plan correction.	Requiring a revision for changes to functional green is a burden; This should be modifiable via a site plan correction.	(PD-5) (PD-6)
33	Downtown WG	Open Space	23-3D	4030(A)(5)		This requirement required UC and CC zones to provide open space; Clarification required on exact calculation of required open space.		(PD-5) (PD-6)
34	Downtown WG	Open Space	23-3D	4030(A)(5)	3	This section makes no sense. The way it was written it applies to all zones but DC and lists a much lower minimum open space area than 4020(A). Was this meant to apply to DC, CC, UC?	Change text to " A site that is located inside the DC, CC or UC zones and is more than one acre, must provide at least 150 square feet, plus an additional 100 square feet for each acre of open space. The amount of open space required may not exceed 1,000 square feet.	(PD-5) (PD-6)
35	Downtown WG	Open Space	23-3D	4030(B)(1)	3	Why can't space within a required front setback qualify as open space if it meets the requirements of Table 23-3D-4020 (A)? 4030(A)(3) and (A)(4) requires that spaces adjoin or extend public facilities in the street right of way, so the street setback would be the perfect place for them. As written, this has the effect of pushing the build-to line of the building back behind the established street yard setback. SETBACKS ARE STILL REQUIRED IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN OVERLAY (Refer to Downtown Overlay notes)	Eliminate this restriction.	(PD-5) (PD-6)
36	Downtown WG	Open Space	23-3D	4040(A)(4)		Clarification required: This provision requires a minimum of 10% site area be open space (based on a roof requirement) but earlier provisions in 4030A seem to indicate the maximum SF is 1,000 SF. Clarify how these two sections work together.		(PD-5) (PD-6)
37	Downtown WG	Open Space	23-3D	4040(A)(4)	4	Does this requirement also apply to regional center zones or is there an alternate calculation for regional center zones as implied by 4030 (A)(5)?	For a site that is located inside the DC, CC or UC zones, if more than 50 percent of the required open space is located on a roof, balcony or other area above ground level than the required open space is twice that calculated per 4030(A)(5).	(PD-5) (PD-6)

38	Downtown WG	Building Design Standards	23-3D	6030(A)(1)	2	Reference to "Primary Roadway".Where is this term defined?	Note in the section where the definition of "Primary Roadway" is located within the code. "Primary Street" is listed in 23-12A-1030 but the definition is just "the street with the higher priority" which is not helpful. Higher priority as defined by what?	(PD-5) (PD-6)
39	Downtown WG	Building Design Standards	23-3D	6030(A)(2)	3	References to "building façade relief" and "vegetative screening".Where are these terms defined?	Note in the section where the definition of "building facade relief" and "vegetative screening" is located within the code.	(PD-5) (PD-6)
40	Downtown WG	Building Design Standards	23-3D	6030(A)(3)	3	Requires that 50% of all glazing on the primary building façade have a VLT of 0.6 or higher.This is a new requirement.The previous commercial design standards only restricted VLT for the first two floors.	Change text to require minimum 0.6 VLT for just the first two floors.	(PD-5) (PD-6)
41	Downtown WG	Building Design Standards	23-3D	6040 (A)	6	To qualify for the building material point you must use Limestone or Brick.Why not Granite, marble, sandstone or other quality stone?	Change "Limestone" to "Stone"	(PD-5) (PD-6)
42	Downtown WG	Building Design Standards	23-3D	6050(A)(1)		Clarification required: The 75% masonry applied to the 60% (or less) that is not glazing (per item (A)(5))?		(PD-5) (PD-6)
43	Downtown WG	Building Design Standards	23-3D	6060(A)	9	Requires any building with frontage on more than one street to have an entrance facing each street.	Propose an exception for small buildings (<10,000 sf) as long as they meet the glazing requirements of 6030.	(PD-5) (PD-6)
44	Downtown WG	Outdoor lighting	23-3D	8030(C)	1	"Full Cut-off" is defined in 23-12A-1030 General definitions but "Fully shielded" is not.	Provide definition for "fully shielded"	(PD-5) (PD-6)
45	Downtown WG	Non-zoning Sections	23-4			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolve conflicts between regulations that when applied cumulatively to a site, result in downzoning or less entitlements than existing code and will most likely add time and cost (this was the result of testing these zones on actual sites with last draft, and less density than could be built under the current code was achieved) Clarify how non-zoning regulations like water quality, drainage, landscaping and functional green can all be achieved with a minimum number of design features 		(PD-10) (PD-11)
46	Downtown WG	Regulations related to Austin Water Forward				<p>General Recommendation for All New Austin Water Forward Regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordability impact should be determined by the City and made available to the public for all projects of all types (market rate, Affordable and affordable) and should include 1) Initial project costs, both construction/hard costs and design/soft costs and 2) operational costs. 		(PD-3) (PD-4) (PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
47	Downtown WG	Regulations related to Austin Water Forward				<p>Proposed New Regulation #1 - Water Use Benchmarking Development Project Requirements – Draft LDC Language Proposed by City Staff</p> <p>(A) Beginning June 1, 2020, a small development project applicant shall submit to the director a completed water benchmarking application and water balance calculator as a condition for site plan approval.</p> <p>(B) Beginning June 1, 2020, a large development project applicant, as a condition of site plan approval, shall:</p> <p>(1) submit to the director a completed water benchmarking application and water balance calculator; and</p> <p>(2) meet with the director to discuss water efficiency code requirements, water use benchmarking data, and incentives and rebates for alternative water use.</p> <p>General Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Balance Calculator should be easy to use and integrated with Site Development Permit (SDP) application process; input must not require level of detail that would not be available at site design phase (basic site data, for example: # of units, overall GSF) Benchmarking should serve the purpose of determining the ROI and payback period of installation 	<p>Draft LDC Language Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The definition of "small" and "large" development projects needs to be clarified. If the threshold between small and large is projects >250,000 SF, we recommend defining it as a single building's GSF, not per phase, and not total development if separate buildings. Provide further information on the reason behind 250,000 SF building threshold and consider if appropriate. Meeting with AWU must be held within 10 business days of request for such meeting and/or date of SDP application – consider a standing "office hours" time each week. 	(PD-3) (PD-4) (PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)

48	Downtown WG	Regulations related to Austin Water Forward			<p>Proposed New Regulation #2 - Onsite Water Reuse and Dual Plumbing: Onsite Water Reuse System Rules and Incentive Program – Draft LDC Language Proposed by City Staff</p> <p>By December 1, 2020, the director shall:</p> <p>(1) adopt rules to implement, administer, and enforce this article, including rules to regulate the treatment, monitoring, and reporting requirements for onsite water reuse systems; and</p> <p>(2) develop an incentive program for onsite water reuse systems.</p> <p>Beginning December 1, 2023, onsite water reuse systems are required for large development projects.</p>	<p>Draft LDC Language Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add item (3) Director shall revise original rules prior to December, 2023, to implement lessons learned from findings of life cycle evaluation of voluntary projects in program. • The definition of "large" development projects needs to be clarified. If the threshold is projects >250,000 SF, we recommend defining it as a single building's GSF, not per phase, and not total development if separate buildings. • Provide further information on the reason behind 250,000 SF building threshold and consider if appropriate. Consider total water usage and water meter size as thresholds for compliance in lieu of building size. 		(PD-3) (PD-4) (PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
49	Downtown WG	Regulations related to Austin Water Forward			<p>New Regulation #3 - Reclaimed and Dual Plumbing: Reclaimed Connection Requirements – Draft LDC Language Proposed by City Staff</p> <p>(A) A small development project located within 250 feet of a reclaimed water line shall connect to a reclaimed water line and use reclaimed water for irrigation, cooling, toilet flushing, and other significant non-potable water uses identified in the water balance calculator.</p> <p>(B) A large development project shall connect to a reclaimed water line and use reclaimed water for irrigation, cooling, toilet flushing and other significant non-potable water uses identified in the water balance calculator if the large development project is located within 500 feet of a reclaimed water line.</p> <p>Comments and Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No stakeholder input has been offered on the reclaimed line connection and dual-plumbing requirement; it was not proposed during the Austin Water Utility stakeholder process. We do not recommend codifying these requirements until stakeholder input has been offered. It should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Estimations of construction cost of required extensions (hard and soft) 	<p>Draft LDC Language Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition of a reclaimed water line needs to be clarified. We recommend it be defined as an existing, functioning line at least 60 days prior to the date of SDP application. This should be readily available information available on the AWU website and updated frequently. • The definition of "small" and "large" development projects needs to be clarified. If the threshold between small and large is projects >250,000 SF, we recommend defining it as a single building's GSF, not per phase, and not total development if separate buildings. • We recommend redefining the requirement; Rather than the determining applicable projects based on a linear distance from the property the reclaimed system, the requirement should apply only to projects which are "immediately adjacent to in the reclaimed system in the City ROW", effectively not requiring any off-site extension. 		(PD-3) (PD-4) (PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
50	Downtown WG	Regulations related to Atlas 14 Proposed Draft Ordinance			<p>We anticipate an outcome of the City of Austin's implementation of Atlas 14 report data to include a determination that all stormwater infrastructure in downtown is not sufficient to provide conveyance for the adopted rainfall volumes, even if future development were to install upgraded improvements immediately adjacent to their properties via the current RSMP process.</p> <p>Therefore, we recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City keep the current RSMP process in place until a new process can be implemented, and • The current RSMP should contain a binding determination for a drainage study prior to design of the project to allow engineers and developers to study a reasonable section of storm lines proportional to development size and impact. • The City should plan and design a future downtown-wide conveyance system, revise the RSMP process and develop an equitable, predictable fee structure and process similar to the upcoming Street Impact Fees program where future developments are required to pay a small fee proportionally equal to their impact on the future improvements needed to build out the planned, downtown-wide system. Downtown 			(PD-3) (PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)

51	Downtown WG	Dedication of Parkland	23-4B	2010 (H)		Parkland dedication in the urban core should not compete and limit the ability to achieve compliance with other sections of the code including GSI, Landscaping and Impervious Cover.		(PD-10) (PD-11)
52	Downtown WG	Dedication of Parkland	23-4B	2010-(C)		Add the following: (3) Parkland dedication that complies with this section shall be included in the gross site area for the parcel dedicating land. Zoning entitlements including but not limited to impervious cover and FAR shall be calculated on the gross site area prior to the parkland dedication		(PD-10) (PD-11)
53	Downtown WG	Dedication of Parkland	23-4B	2010(C)		Clarification requested: Site Plans can meet parkland requirements via recreation easements not only dedication of land?		(PD-10) (PD-11)
54	Downtown WG	Dedication of Parkland	23-4B	2010(H)		15% Urban Core Cap is extreme; This limits density, ability to reach impervious cover limits, and ability to place green infrastructure and landscape improvements (public parkland can not include GSI or landscape requirements).		(PD-10) (PD-11)
55	Downtown WG	Dedication of Parkland	23-4B	2010(H)		Reduce the urban core cap at 10% vs 15%		(PD-10) (PD-11)
56	Downtown WG	Fee in Lieu - Parkland Dedication	23-4B	3, General		Is parkland required for R and RM zones with 0-8 units?Parkland is supposed to be required to take a small amount of IC from site but code does not address the allowable "taking".		(PD-10) (PD-11)
57	Downtown WG	Fee in Lieu Authorized	23-4B	3010(A)		Reduce the urban core cap at 10% vs 15%		(PD-10) (PD-11)
58	Downtown WG	Fee in Lieu Authorized	23-4B	3010(A)(2)		Parkland Fee In Lieu is ONLY allowed for sites requiring dedication less than 6 acres; Large densities on sites will increase land dedication requirement. This provision doesn't make sense. Needs to exclude this provision for sites within downtown, urban core or within ½ mile of a corridor.		(PD-10) (PD-11)
59	Downtown WG	Fee in Lieu and Dedication	23-4B	3010(D)		Add the following: (a) Construction of Amenities. The director shall allow an applicant to construct recreational amenities on public or private parkland, if applicable, in-lieu of paying the dedication fee required by this section. In order to utilize this option, the applicant must: (1) Post fiscal surety in an amount equal to the development fee; (2) If a dedication of land is required, construct recreational amenities prior to the dedication in a manner consistent with the parkland dedication operating procedures; and (3) Document the required amenities concurrent with subsection or site plan approval, in a manner consistent with the parkland dedication operating procedures.		(PD-10) (PD-11)
60	Downtown WG	Fee in Lieu and Dedication	23-4B	3010(D)		Add the following: (E) A dedication determination issued under this Subsection is valid for a period of one year from the date of issuance and will not expire if a site plan application is filed within one year from the date of issuance		(PD-10) (PD-11)
61	Downtown WG	Fee Payment and Expenditure	23-4B	3030(D)(1)		Refunds are restricted to portions of sites unbuilt; Should be modified to allow refunds for funds not spent regardless of project site build out status. This provision is intended to require PARD to deploy dollars and be held accountable if they do not, and is not about limitations of what was built.		(PD-10) (PD-11)

62	Downtown WG	Small, Public, Keystone and Protected Trees	23-4C	2030(D)(5)		Consider adding an exception regarding removal of a keystone tree in the ROW or easement without penalty if it limits use of the ROW for streetscape requirements elsewhere in LDC or use of easement as intended.			(PD-10) (PD-11)
63	Downtown WG	Water Quality: Redevelopment Exception in the Urban and Suburban Watershed	23-4D	2030 (D)		Replace (A)(2) with the following: 2) The applicant files one of the following applications, for redevelopment of any property located in an Urban or Suburban Watershed in the City of Austin:(a) a site plan application; or(b) concurrent subdivision and site plan applications, if the exception under Subsection			(PD-10) (PD-11)
64	Downtown WG	Water Quality: Requirements for Redevelopment Exception	23-4D	2050 (D)		Revise (B)(1) to the following: (1) The redevelopment may not increase the existing amount of impervious cover on the site. Over that existing currently or the maximum allowed by current regulations, whichever is greater.			(PD-10) (PD-11)
65	Downtown WG	Water Quality: Administrative modification	23-4D	2070		(A) Compared to 23-4D-1040(A): Clarification requested; The later says DSD is director of this section but the earlier says Watershed shall grant the variance.(C) Add the following: (e) Necessary to allow reasonable development of the property according to the level of development allowed under 23-4.			(PD-10) (PD-11)
66	Downtown WG	Water Quality: Impervious Cover Calculations	23-4D	3040		(C)(3) and (4) Add the following: excluding subsurface water quality controls; excluding subsurface detention basins			(PD-10) (PD-11)
67	Downtown WG	Water Quality Control and Green Infrastructure	23-4D	6		Incomplete until Environmental Criteria Manual is written: Drainage Section calls for greenfield rule + 80% impervious covered sites must comply with drainage requirements and functional green, density can be reduced by Director administratively.	23-4D-6: Create exception for all Regional Center Zones (80% impervious cover sites now required to greenfield rule + drainage + functional green).1. Incentivize use of green controls rather than require density increase to offset cost.2. Allow use of public property (ROW, public parks) for fulfillment of required green stormwater controls along with a shared method of green/standard water quality controls, i.e. 50% green and 50% standard/fee in lieu option.3. Fee in lieu option for impervious cover below a certain % and for affordable units.4. Create code matrix or menu that allows for on-site improvements or fee in lieu and as an alternative incentivizes density for off-site improvements to better the system.5. Incentivize redevelopment by removing greenfield requirement and proposing incentive, like increased density or fee decrease, for reduction in impervious cover with water quality/erosion treatment for all flows. Existing Land Development Code comparison: More restrictive than LDC		(PD-10) (PD-11)
68	Downtown WG	Water Quality Control and Green Infrastructure	23-4D	6030(E)(3)		This should state for sites allowed to build at or greater than 90% (i.e. not based on what is proposed to be built but rather on the allowable impervious cover).			(PD-10) (PD-11)
69	Downtown WG	Water Quality Control and Green Infrastructure	23-4D	6040(C)		Requirements for approval of a fee in lieu of water quality in Urban Watershed should be clarified in the code NOT in the ECM.			(PD-10) (PD-11)
70	Downtown WG	Water Quality Control and Green Infrastructure	23-4D	6060(A)(2)	4D-6, 4	Cost Recovery Program: Provide criteria for cost participation (optional payment)			(PD-10) (PD-11)
71	Downtown WG	Erosion and Sedimentation Control	23-4D	7020(B)		Considerations need to be made for phasing of development work, including infrastructure phasing.			(PD-10) (PD-11)
72	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	Question		Does cost of parking space above base rent considered as part of affordable housing rent?			(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)

73	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	GENERAL		Fees (for Fee in Lieu) should be considered/discussed in code, including transparent rules as to how values are determined, and how and when they are changed. Current proposed fees (see below) will be deterrents from utilizing the density bonus because they are so high. *10/8 Council backup shows: \$135K/eff, \$180K/1bed, \$335K/2bed, \$440K/3bed		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
74	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	GENERAL		Suggest increases to entitlements within TODs to more similarly match density allowed on corridors.		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
75	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	GENERAL		Suggest increases to all downtown zone densities to increase density in downtown (especially northwest sections of downtown that are proposed with 120' height caps) to encourage density in locations where infrastructure exists and there is less impact to neighborhoods.		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
76	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	GENERAL		Existing TOD density bonus system is much more onerous than new City Wide program in Code draft; Consider modifying rules of TOD bonus systems to match in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable requirements based on bonus area/units rather than of total area/units • Affordable requirements for units based on unit calculation (not GSF of units, supplied by RSF of units) • Increase in heights/FAR/unit per acre allowances within certain TOD's to be similar in nature to heights achieved along corridors in City wide program (Plaza Saltillo as an example has heights capped at 60' currently, but most corridors go to 90'). 		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
77	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	GENERAL		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on process, frequency, and transparency of updates bonus requirement map (calibration) • Suggest setting annual goals for affordable units/district based on total projected units over 10 year SHP horizon. Consider identifying sub areas within council districts for consideration of goals based on centers and corridors. • Suggest including required annual review of permitted, permitted via FIL, and built units for comparison with goals. • Suggest including required minimum base requirements to determining an increase or decrease to area's set aside requirements based on performance compared with annual goal set above. Analysis must include a review of any propose FIL changes in coming fee schedule. Note: How do set aside requirements get update – does it require code update? Suggest annual Council adoption of new maps along side new fees? 		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)

78	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methods for determining a fee-in-lieu for the density bonus program and for updating the fees should be in code. (instead of a criteria manual) As part of the calculation for determining the fee, staff should further examine the feasibility of an applicant taking the bonus and ensure that the code allows for enough buildability on sites to ensure that a bonus is taken, and that the fees are appropriately calculated. The code should have language that requires the city to meet the Strategic Housing Plan 10-year Goal, along with provisions for updating the calibration of the bonus. This language should also require an annual review of market rate and subsidized units being built for comparison. 			(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
79	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	1030(D)		Consider removing requirement for bedroom mix match in affordable housing; There is evidence that this creates barriers to use of the program and will incentivize creation of buildings with higher percentage of single bedroom total mix.			(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
80	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	1040 TABLE (Comment 5)		Comprehensive Floor Area calculation is very confusing. Suggest going to GSF.			(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
81	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	1050		Affordable Fee in Lieu for Residential Units is based on per unit (not PSF) – Request anticipated fee schedule for review. (Similar for commercial but not as concerning as there is an anticipated fee based on recent values)			(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
82	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	1060(C)		Clarify method of addition of two fees			(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
83	Downtown WG	Affordable Housing	23-4E	1080		Application information is vague. Suggest adding (1) suggested/required submittal timeline compared with SDP, and (2) maximum review time for staff approval. This should be a considerably short timeline so plenty of time is available to finalize agreement discussed in Section C.			(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
84	Downtown WG	Downtown Density Bonus Program	23-4E	2		<p>General Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since most developable sites downtown are quarter- or half-block, many projects will earn more square footage in the density bonus program than they are given by right. Getting the density bonus program correct is essential to continuing to build tax base that supports the rest of the city. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlimited FAR and height achievable in eastern two-thirds of downtown and SW corner Administrative approval for projects that earn density via the menu of options codified in 2014 and brought forward to Draft 3 Elimination of proportionate bedroom mix for affordable units downtown. As the program is currently structured, this could incentivize developers to build only studio and one-bedroom units for an entire project Recalibrate the Downtown Density Program to maximize the yield of affordable housing units in a way that does not impede taking up of the bonus, particularly related to small lots. <p>Calibration of fees is very important and cannot be understood or tested until Criteria Manual is released – this is critical for a complete understanding of how to achieve desired increased</p>			(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)

85	Downtown WG	Downtown Density Bonus: Application Review - Design Commission Evaluation	23-4E	2030 (A) (2)	Design Commission evaluation for compliance with Urban Design Guidelines as part of Gatekeeper Requirements The Design Commission oversight for compliance with the Urban Design Guidelines was always intended to be an interim solution until design standards were codified, as they will be in CodeNEXT. It was always stated publicly that the commission would no longer evaluate compliance after codification.	Strike 23-4E-2030 (A) (2) Design Commission evaluation should be removed. It will no longer be necessary and was always intended to be a temporary solution. Existing Land Development Code comparison: same, but intended to be different.	(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
86	Downtown WG	Downtown Density Bonus: Application Review - Design Commission Evaluation	23-4E	2030 (B) (6)	23-4E-1070 gives NHCD Director authority to recommend FIL or % units to City Council annually. 23-4E-2030 (B) (6) states that downtown fees may vary by use and district (ok). Claims nine districts, but unclear what those are.	NHCD Director should not be able to adjust without a proper, third-party calibration study. Applying some sort of index does not accurately reflect market conditions.	(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
87	Downtown WG	Downtown Density Bonus: Community Benefits - Administrative Approval	23-4E	2060(B)	Does not appear to require "designated review group" for downtown, but does not indicate how projects receive approval for using codified community benefits other than 100% affordable housing. This seems to be an oversight since downtown projects can currently earn density via a menu of options, as long as at least 50% of the bonus area is earned through providing housing on site or paying a fee in lieu. The only instance that should require PC/Council approval is outlined in section G, in which a project's developer proposes to provide a unique set of community benefits not outlined in code.	23-4E-2060(B) Proposed Code Language Administrative Approval. If the applicant chooses to achieve 100 percent of the density bonus by providing community benefits described in Subsection (C) through (strike E and insert)(F), the director may approve the density bonus administratively. Existing Land Development Code comparison: With correction, it would be the same as LDC.	(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
88	Downtown WG	Downtown Density Bonus: Community Benefits	23-4E	2060(F)(10)	Are green roofs that are used for receipt of density bonus allowed to get dual credit for water quality and urban green?		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
89	Downtown WG	Downtown Density Bonus: Rainey Street Subdistrict Bonus	23-4E	2070	There is no mention in this section of approval method, as there is in 23-4E-2060. Clarify that this section is also administratively approved if following procedure laid out in the section.	Add new 23-4E-2070 (A) (3) Administrative Approval. If the applicant chooses to achieve 100 percent of the density bonus by providing community benefits described in Subsection (B) through (C), the director may approve the density bonus administratively.	(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
90	Downtown WG	Downtown Density Bonus: Rainey Street Subdistrict Bonus	23-4E	2070 (B) (1)	5% on-site bonus: To achieve density above 40 up to 8:1 FAR, we support continuing the on-site affordable housing requirement. However, a seemingly minor change to the code made in 2014 when the full Downtown Density Bonus Program was codified has a negative impact on the Rainey Street area. We support reverting to the on-site requirements in place before 2014, 5% of the number of bonus units (as opposed to 5% of the bonus square footage) be designated affordable to 80% Median Family Income	A development in the Rainey Street Subdistrict may exceed the 40 foot height limit Subsection 23-4D-9140(F)(7)(iii) and achieve a floor area ratio of up to 8:1 if at least five percent of the number of the dwelling units developed within that floor area ratio of 8:1 is available to house persons whose household income is 80 percent or below the MFI HOME Limits, as amended per household size, and as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for the Austin-Round Rock Metropolitan Statistical Area. The Housing Director conducts the income determination. Existing Land Development Code comparison: same.	(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
91	Downtown WG	Downtown Density Bonus: Rainey Street Subdistrict Bonus	23-4E	2070 (B) (6)	Proportionate Bedroom Requirements: Requiring a percentage of bonus area units to be affordable, AND requiring the affordable unit mix to match the unit mix of the building, make downtown residential with on-site affordable housing infeasible. Except for those that were already entitled and therefore exempt, only one new residential projects has been proposed on Rainey Street after this requirement was imposed in 2014, and they declined to build any 3-bedroom units in order to make this new provision feasible.	Strike 23-4E-2070 (B) (6). Existing Land Development Code comparison: same.	(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)
92	Downtown WG	Additional Affordable Housing Incentives	23-4E	5010(B)(1)	Clarify if "maximum cost of system improvements" includes street impact fees and mitigation.		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-19) (PD-20) (PD-1)

93	Downtown WG	Transportation	23-8	GENERAL	Where are rules related to street impact fees? Throughout chapter, "trips" is used interchangeably with vehicle trips and person trips. "Trips" should not be used without a modifier given the importance of TDM in the evaluation of this project. Also should clarify if those trips are before or after TDM measures, MXD calculations, etc.		(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
94	Downtown WG	Transportation	23-8	GENERAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements should not limit density or the ability to develop a site, rather they should be balanced and allow for alternative and innovative options. • Neither TIA nor TDM should be mandatory for downtown, though transportation goals could be achieved via a flexible menu of options • Capacity of the streets language does not indicate a methodology that will determine multi-modal capacity. • Street Impact Fee is not required or mentioned at all; Regional Centers should be clarified. • Rough Proportionality – does not mention Street Impact Fees – but is supposed to fund streets – so SIF's when codified will need to revise RP; Order of RP and SDP (RP must be done first and ahead of SDP and like other impact fees which are; RP should include soft costs (ex design fees) along with construction costs 		(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
95	Downtown WG	Street Impact Fees		GENERAL	<p>Recommendations for Street Impact Fees:</p> <p>According to city staff, trip generation will be basis for impact fee assessments. Trip generation model should be reformed to reflect international best practices and create additional accuracy with respect to vehicle trip generation. Result for projects built in Downtown: they should have lower vehicle trip generation than the same project built elsewhere in the city. This leads to lower impact fees. If model also includes provision of parking, which it should, there would be additional incentive to build less parking: if less parking is built, the street impact fee will decrease for the project and the developer also saves on the cost of providing parking. City also gets the transportation outcomes that they desire.</p>		

96	Downtown WG	Transportation: Sections 23-8A General Provisions, 23-8C Transportation Review and Neighborhood Traffic Impact Analysis, 23-8D Development Application and Transportation Infrastructure Requirements	23-8A; 23-8C; 23-8D	GENERAL	<p>City-wide recommendation: TIA methodology should be adjusted to better align with priorities established within Imagine Austin, Austin Strategic Mobility Plan and the Downtown Vision to foster mode shift away from Single Occupancy Vehicle trips.</p> <p>City-wide recommendation: Evaluate a project's impact using Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT), instead of Level of Service (LOS), as the benchmark of transportation impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify if the project site VMT is at or below an established percentage of the regional VMT average for each applicable land use: residential, office, and retail. (for example: 15% below CAMPO regional average) If yes, then no mitigation, TIA study or TDM measures are required. The department uses VMT efficiency metrics (per capita or per employee) for thresholds of significance. VMT per capita reductions mean that individuals will, on average, travel less by automobile than previously but, because the population will continue to grow, it may not mean an overall reduction in the number of miles driven. If the VMT does not meet the established percentage, the project shall be required to offset impact to the established percentage through TDM 		
97	Downtown WG	Transportation: Sections 23-8A General Provisions, 23-8C Transportation Review and Neighborhood Traffic Impact Analysis, 23-8D Development Application and Transportation Infrastructure Requirements	23-8A; 23-8C; 23-8D	GENERAL	<p>Downtown Austin recommendation: Projects located in downtown Austin (boundary: Lady Bird Lake; I-35; Lamar Boulevard; MLK Jr. Boulevard) will be exempt from TIA and, in accordance with state law, should have a very low street impact fee. In lieu of TIA and low street impact fee, downtown projects will be required to comply with a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program as part of the Site Development Permit review process.</p> <p>The Downtown TDM program shall be flexible, focus on design instead of outcomes and include a menu of compliance paths and measures (similar to San Francisco's SHIFT TDM Ordinance) that can be used together to reduce vehicle trips generated by the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program characteristics: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Each measure is assigned a number of points No single measure is mandatory and project may choose which measures to fit the project Project is required to meet a minimum point threshold based on the project density. Project is required to submit an approved TDM Plan demonstrating 		
98	Downtown WG	Transportation: Purpose and Applicability	23-8A	1010 (B) (3)	Remove "vehicle" trips from language; limiting the potential nexus of improvements		(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
99	Downtown WG	Transportation Criteria Manual	23-8A	1030 (B)	(2) Dedication and alignment of right-of-way (4) Proportionality determinations (5) Transportation demand management plans (6) Transportation impact analysis are all policy elements that should be in the code, not in the criteria manual.		(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
100	Downtown WG	Transportation: Administrative Modifications	23-8A	1040	(1) This section authorizes the director to administratively modify application of this chapter to a proposed development based on the impacts of particular requirements relative to the transportation needs generated by the development." Does this mean that ATD can decide what the rules are as we go through a development process?		(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)

101	Downtown WG	Proportionality Determination	23-8A	2020		<p>"To aid in making a proportionality determination and identifying required infrastructure improvements, the director may adopt administrative guidelines setting forth assumptions, procedures, formulas, and development principles used in making a proportionality determination."</p> <p>There's a lot of policy hidden in those "administrative guidelines."</p>			(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
102	Downtown WG	Proportionality Determination	23-8A	2020(A)		RP should include street impact fees and soft costs associated with and transportation system improvements.			(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
103	Downtown WG	Proportionality Determination	23-8A	2020(B)		RP review needs to occur ahead of application review; Concurrent review allows for manipulation of RP calculation.			(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
104	Downtown WG	Right-of-Way: Timing of Dedication or Construction	23-8B	2020(B)(1)(a)		<p>"Unless an obligation is deferred under Subsection (B)(2), all required dedication or improvement of public right-of-way must occur prior to approval of a development application as provided in Section 23-8B-2030 (Approval Conditioned on Dedication)."</p> <p>They want dedication or improvements completed before they'll approve a site plan? Dedication maybe ok, but improvements will not be possible.</p> <p>Also seems to contradict 23-8B-2030 (A) directly.</p>			(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
105	Downtown WG	Right-of-Way Dedication	23-8B	2030(B)(2)		ROW shall not be required at zoning in any scenario; All sites once zones require a development application prior to building out and ROW should always be requested at that phase.			(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
106	Downtown WG	Transportation Review and Analysis	23-8C	1010 (A)		<p>"(A) This article establishes procedures for analyzing and mitigating the impacts of new development on the transportation system by..."</p> <p>There's not a word in here that tells me how to analyze for impacts. All deferred to TCM.</p>			(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
107	Downtown WG	Transportation Review and Analysis	23-8C	1010(B)(1)		Clarification: Why 100 peak trips? What does this mean for new developments and volume of TIAs?			(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
108	Downtown WG	Transportation Impact Analysis	23-8C	2030		Does not establish what the policy standard is for vehicles. That should be decided now and be consistent with ASMP. If City's priorities are Vision Zero and 50/50 mode split, measuring LOS is counterproductive (actively harmful) to those goals. Current procedures measure the worst 15 minutes of the day. We need to cut all of that to live up to the ASMP.			(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)

109	Downtown WG	Conditions to Development Approval	23-8D	1030		(B)Design and Construction Requirements. If a development application requires review under Article 23-8C (Transportation Review and Analysis), the director or the body responsible for acting on the application may require: (1)Delaying or phasing development until construction of municipal transportation infrastructure required to accommodate vehicle trips generated by the development or other transportation improvements necessary to directly serve the development; or (2)Reducing the density or intensity of the development, to the extent necessary to ensure that the capacity of the street network can safely accommodate vehicle trips generated by the proposed development. That seems bonkers. You're going to let ATD dictate land use based on capacity? So if we can't serve vehicles in the peak hours, we can't have density? Does that mean we stop building downtown? If safe access can be provided, ATD should not have a say in the land use.			(PD-2) (PD-7) (PD-8) (PD-10) (PD-11)
110	Downtown WG	Austin Water Service: Extension of Service	23-9A	3010(B)(2)		Does this apply to required extension of reclaimed water for water forward compliance?			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
111	Downtown WG	Austin Water Service: Extension of Service	23-9A	3040(B)(3)		Available funds is not an appropriate criteria; If the applicant is mandated to upsize the system, the City shall be required to cost share regardless of currently/immediately available funds.			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
112	Downtown WG	Water and Wastewater Impact Fees	23-9C	4070(C)(1)		What are the requirements to get impact fee reduction? Those should be published in code.			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
113	Downtown WG	Reclaimed Water	23-9D	1020(A)		LARGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT: 250,000 SF of building(s) impacts many multi residential uses in the City; Suggest this is revised to only apply to single buildings and for this provision to be re-reviewed at a later date consistent with ongoing Water Forward benchmarking data made available over coming years.			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
114	Downtown WG	Reclaimed Water	23-9D	1030(A)		This requirement is a huge cost impact to development. Consider modifying to only sites with immediately available reclaimed lines in adjacent ROW and include requirements that line must be active and have adequate capacity (see section 23-9D-1060(C)(2) for how the City can deny service based on capacity).			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
115	Downtown WG	Reclaimed Water	23-9D	1030(C)		Define "significant financial hardship" – this is too vague but impacts will be significant as most lines are within City ROW.			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
116	Downtown WG	Reclaimed Water	23-9D	1030(C)		Financial hardship does not apply to large sites.			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
117	Downtown WG	Reclaimed Water	23-9D	1030(C)		Define "significant financial hardship" – this is too vague but impacts will be significant as most lines are within City ROW.			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
118	Downtown WG	Reclaimed Water	23-9D	1030(C)		financial hardship does not apply to large sites.			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
119	Downtown WG	Reclaimed Water	23-9D	1030(E)		What does this mean? Where is this code/information?			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
120	Downtown WG	Reclaimed Water	23-9D	1040(A)(2)(b)		This is a worksheet – what is "approval" consisting of?			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
121	Downtown WG	Reclaimed Water	23-9D	1060(C)(5)		What does this mean? Should this not also apply to requirement to provide reclaimed water?			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
122	Downtown WG	Reclaimed Water	23-9D	1060(D)(2)		Is COA paying extension for sites 250-500 feet away?			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)

123	Downtown WG	Drainage: Obstruction of Waterway Prohibited	23-9E	1060		Add the underlined verbiage below: Unless authorized by a development application approved under Title 23, a person may not place, or cause to be placed, an obstruction in a waterway or drainage easement used for overland conveyance if the obstruction would cause impact to the conveyance of the waterway or drainage easement.	Add the underlined verbiage below: Unless authorized by a development application approved under Title 23, a person may not place, or cause to be placed, an obstruction in a waterway or drainage easement used for overland conveyance if the obstruction would cause impact to the conveyance of the waterway or drainage easement.		(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
124	Downtown WG	Drainage: Duty to Maintain Unobstructed Waterways	23-9E	1070		Edit section per the verbiage below: A waterway or other drainage infrastructure located within a City drainage easement of any type shall be maintained by the City of Austin. The person in control of real property traversed by a waterway or drainage easement is prohibited from obstructing the waterway or drainage easement in accordance with 23-10E-1050 and shall be responsible for alerting appropriate City Officials of any obstructions within the waterway or drainage easement promptly upon discovery. Removal of naturally occurring obstructions is the responsibility of the City of Austin. Removal of unauthorized, manmade obstructions within the waterway is the responsibility of the party responsible for placing the obstructions.	Edit section per the verbiage below: A waterway or other drainage infrastructure located within a City drainage easement of any type shall be maintained by the City of Austin. The person in control of real property traversed by a waterway or drainage easement is prohibited from obstructing the waterway or drainage easement in accordance with 23-10E-1050 and shall be responsible for alerting appropriate City Officials of any obstructions within the waterway or drainage easement promptly upon discovery. Removal of naturally occurring obstructions is the responsibility of the City of Austin. Removal of unauthorized, manmade obstructions within the waterway is the responsibility of the party responsible for placing the obstructions.		(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
125	Downtown WG	Drainage: RSMP	23-9E	3020(C)		Any additional requirements for participation in RSMP shall be adopted via a code amendment and include a stakeholder process; Policy guidelines do not belong in the DCM/criteria manual			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
126	Downtown WG	Drainage: Dedication of Easements and Rights-of-Way	23-9E	5020		Edit section per the verbiage below: (B) The applicant shall allow access through the project site as necessary to allow City operation, maintenance, or rehabilitation of a drainage facility; such access shall be described in the easement terms for the facility, but shall not be required to be dedicated as an easement.	Edit section per the verbiage below: (B) The applicant shall allow access through the project site as necessary to allow City operation, maintenance, or rehabilitation of a drainage facility; such access shall be described in the easement terms for the facility, but shall not be required to be dedicated as an easement.		(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
127	Downtown WG	Drainage: Dedication of Easements and Rights-of-Way	23-9E	5010(D)		Requiring a developer to obtain off-site easements in order to manage public stormwater conveyance is not acceptable. This text modified such that an applicant is only responsible for dedication of easements within their property (i.e. remove the text that says "obtain the dedication of any right-of-way or easements"	This text should be modified such that an applicant is only responsible for dedication of easements within their property (i.e. remove the text that says "obtain the dedication of any right-of-way or easements"		(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
128	Downtown WG	Drainage: Dedication of Easements and Rights-of-Way	23-9E	5020(B)		Why would a development be required to dedicate an easement to the City for privately built and maintained infrastructure? This text should be removed completely.	Remove section.		(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
129	Downtown WG	Drainage: Dedication of Easements and Rights-of-Way	23-9E	5020(E)		Clarification required: How much of the "lot or land that is located in an easement or right-of-way required.." can be including in calculations of density of impervious cover. Text says "some" but suggest text is clarified to a percentage of land or something more clear than "some".			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)

130	Downtown WG	General Definitions	23-12	General Definitions		Functional Green: This definition is contradictory to where it is used/defined in code section related to impervious cover. Definition says sites "with" 80% impervious cover or greater whereas code suggests that it applies to all sites in an >80% IC zone. Prefer definition as quoted in Section 23-12. Reasonable Use: This definition eliminates the use of this term to remove barriers to development that are in Sections 23-3D (landscape requirements) or 23-4D (water quality). Sidewalk: Not all sidewalks are ADA compliant; This might inhibit ability to provide private sidewalks that are narrower or of other materials than approved by ADA guidelines. Facade Zone requires clarification.			(PD-8) (PD-9) (PD-10) (PD-11)
131	Downtown WG	General Definitions	23-12A	1030		At N - Definitions: Net Frontage definition should also include Austin Energy vaults and Fire Pump Rooms.	At N - Definitions: Frontage, 3. Net (measurement): definition should also include Austin Energy vaults and Fire Pump Rooms.		PD-6
132	Downtown WG	General Definitions	23-12A	1030		At P - Definitions: Add Public View	At P - Definitions: Add Public View		
1	PWG	Allow 3-6 Units for Building Permit only	23-2B	2010	2B-2 pg. 1	Add option for 3 to 6 units for projects that are developed under the minimum entitlements offered for that zone.		This will allow developers in R4 or RM1 that are building additional units in house form (45% IC, 35 ft ht) to abide by house permits.	
2	PWG	Allow Limited Site Plan for 3-10 Units	23-2b	2020	2B-2 pg. 2	Extend Limited Site Plan for 10 units so RM1 with Bonus			
3	PWG	Create Options for Limited Site Plan with extra IC	23-2b	2020	2B-2 pg. 2	Create Options that could include on Site Detention that allow Limited Site Plan over 50% IC		Staff could develop options based on Square Footage of additional IC and size of lot.	
4	PWG	Expedited Limited Site Plan for Affordable	23-2b	2020	2B-2 pg. 2	To encourage developers to take the bonus, the expedited review should not impose a longer wait to begin construction			
5	PWG	Explore Options for Subdivision Lite	23-5			to encourage more missing middle housing, allow different ownership options.			
6	PWG	3-8(10) Unit Resi Review: No parking lot review beyond ADA	23-2B	2020		Exempt 3-8 (10?) unit residential site plan review from parking lot engineering review except to review ADA standards.	See intent		
7	PWG	3-8(10) Unit Resi Review: Parkland dedication only in certain circumstances for smaller sites	23-2B	2020		Allow automatic fee-in-lieu for parkland dedication unless a site meets minimum threshold for on-site dedication (1.6 acres) AND is either specifically designated in advance by PARD as potentially desirable for dedication OR meets criteria specified by PARD for desirable dedication (adjacent to parkland, etc.)	Work with PARD; see intent.		
8	PWG	Parking Exceeding Max Should be detached				Staff should develop a process by which parking maximums are allowed at directors discretion if the spaces are detached.			
9	PWG	Create Alternative Compliance Formulas				Create a set of formulas that indicate under which circumstances a project could qualify for variances under development regulations in order to maximize unit yield especially in centers and corridors. Include qualifications (Minimum Development Yield, percentage of site impacted by critical root zones, etc) and variance options (e.g. percent of setback).			
10	PWG	Incentives to redevelop surface parking lots.				To encourage redevelopment of existing surface parking lots in corridors and centers, explore additional options for standard storm water and water quality controls including locating facilities in front set back, regional storm water management and longterm and shortterm targets.			
11	PWG	Sunset f25				Staff should develop a timeline and process for converting all F25 zoning to the new LDC.			

12	PWG	3-8(10) Unit Resi Siteplan: More exemptions	23-2B	2020	2B-2 pg. 2	Direct all departments that perform siteplan review to submit to LDC team sections of development regulations (generally included but not limited to those in 23-2B-2010(B)) that these missing-middle small-scale residential developments may be exempted from, given automatic fee-in-lieu, or given expedited review by DSD staff (may include size or other thresholds/criteria or automatically prescribed methods). Includes Technical Codes and Criteria Manuals and utilities.	Intent	The code is not generally a place to dictate process, but by exempting sites from entire sections (or specifying that fee-in-lieu is automatic), site plan review times and submission requirements are substantially curtailed.	
13	PWG	Set benchmarks for development process timelines				Direct the City Manager to publish an annual review of the time required to complete development tasks and set benchmarks for evaluating staff's efficiency for the following year. Should be informed by relevant sections of Imagine Austin.		These processes are already measured, but there are no benchmarks for whether any are taking too long.	