

Submitter (Commissioner or Working Group)	Title (Short Description)	Chapter (and Section, if any)	Division	Page	Intent	Suggested Text	Notes	Justification	Tags	Vote
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.		Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Hempel; 13-0
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.		Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Hempel; 13-0
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.		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	Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Hempel; 13-0
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		Council Direction: Produce Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in sufficient numbers to meet the need.		Motin by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Hempel; 13-0
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		Council Direction: Produce Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in sufficient numbers to meet the need.		Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Hempel; 13-0

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			Council Direction: Produce Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in sufficient numbers to meet the need.		Motion by Commissioner Azar, seconded by Commissioner Hempel; 13-0
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.			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		Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Llanes Pulido; 13-0
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		

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.	Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Llanes Pulido; 13-0
10	Affordability Working Group	Internal ADU permitting				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 35 children or fewer, including childcare facilities in all zoning categories, except industrial and airport zones		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	Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Llanes Pulido. 9-4 Azhar, Llanes Pulido - Nay Shaw, Shieh, Seeger, and Schneider noted nay.
12	Affordability Working Group	Child care accessibility				Encourage accessible child care by reducing restrictions on child care facilities for 35 children or fewer, including childcare facilities in all zoning categories, except industrial and airport zones		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	DUPLICATE
13	Affordability Working Group	Elder care accessibility				Encourage accessible elder care by reducing restrictions including parking on elder care facilities, including occupancy limits, in all zoning categories, except industrial and airport zones		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.	Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Llanes Pulido; 13-0

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			Council Direction: Revise S.M.A.R.T. Housing Program	Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Howard; 12-0; Llanes Pulido abstained.
15	Affordability Working Group	Increasing income restricted housing on TPN				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 especially in high opportunity area. This does not apply to naturally occurring affordable housing.	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.		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.	Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Howard; 10-2; Commissioners Llanes Pulido and Seeger nay. Shieh abstained.
16	Affordability Working Group	Administrative variances under Affordability Unlocked				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.)			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	Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Vice-Chair Kenny; 10-2. Pullido Llanes and Seeger nay. Shaw off the dais.

17	Affordability Working Group	Administrative variances under Affordability Unlocked				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.)	Explicitly allow for Affordability Unlocked to be used in conjunction with other affordable housing funding and policy programs.		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		DUPLICATE
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.		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		Motion to by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Shaw 9-4; Commissioners Llanes Pulido, Thompson, Seeger and Azar nay.
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 dis-incentivize 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.		Motion by Commissioner Azhar, seconded by Commissioner Anderson 11-0. Commissioners Seeger and Shieh abstained.

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 susceptible, dynamic and early type 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.	Commissioner Azhar, 2nd Vice-Chair Kenny. 10-0 Commissioners Sheih, Llanes Pulido and Seeger abstained.
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 staff mapping created the distance based mapping process to allow for transition zones of equal distance on both sides of the corridor. However, we would like to understand why have transition zones with equal distance from the corridor is important. Exhibit TWG-1 and TWG-2	Motion to by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Shieh 11-0. Shaw abstained; Llanes Pulido off the dais.	
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 be two (2) to (5) lots deep beyond the corridor lot. ii. The depth and scale of any transition area should be set considering context-sensitive factors and planning principles such as those set out in the direction for Question 4, and 2) 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. 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.	Motion to by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Shieh 3-9; Pullido off the dais Aye Shaw, Shieh and Seeger; Llanes Pulido off the dais.	
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 within existing 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 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. Notes: Residential Working Group will provide recommendations for this residential step-down transition area zone.			Motion to by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Seeger 4-8 Commissioners Shaw, Shieh, Seeger and Schneider eye. Llanes Pulido off the dais.
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 Corridors ..., and 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 Strategic Mobility Plan - Land Use Policy #1 - Plan and promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network. Exhibit TWG - 3			Motion to by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Seeger 9-0 Commissioners Llanes Pulido, Flores, Kazi, Seeger abstained
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).		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.		Motion to by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Seeger 11-1. Commissioner Azhar voted nay, Llanes Pulido off the dais.
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 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 the this zone is that it may actually yield on-site affordable units.		Motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Shieh. 4-8 Commissioners Shaw, Shieh, Seeger, and Azar. Vote aye ; Llanes Pulido off the dais.
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 exist ( <a href="https://Austinlocalflooding">https://Austinlocalflooding</a> )		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.				
21	Resi WG - Consent	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		0	
2	Resi WG - Consent	SF-attached FAR calibration	23-3C-3	3xxx		Sync SF-attached FAR equal to FAR for duplex in each zone that allows both. Ensure we do not allow gaming of FAR with subsequent subdividing	N/a	Current SF-attached generally has lower FAR than duplex, but is just a subdivided duplex.	TK	Form and Entitlements		
5	Resi WG - Consent	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 even if not all units are used.	TK	Form and Entitlements		

22	Resi WG - Consent	Limit garage FAR exemption				In calculating FAR (Floor Area Ratio), limit garage/carport exemption to 200 sq ft per unit.	N/a	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	Form and Entitlements	
33 (new)	Resi WG - Consent	Limit preservation bonus FAR				Cap preservation bonus FAR at 0.8.	N/a		TK	Form and Entitlements	
1	Resi WG - Discussion (CK)	Townhouse floor area calibration for small lots	23-3C-3	3xxx		Calibrate townhouse 1-unit floor area allotment to allow 3 story townhouses on smallest lots. Keep height maxes and other entitlements.	Suggest a min floor area of 1,800 sq ft, which is three stories (including 200 sq ft garage allowance) on 0.4 building coverage on an 1,800 sq ft lot.	Current townhouse form has 0.6 FAR and an impervious cover of 45%, but a 35ft (3 story) height limit. This results in at-most 2 story townhouses, and only 1,080 townhouses on the 1,800 sq ft lot min.	TK	Form and Entitlements	
30 (new)	Resi WG - Discussion (CK)	R1 floor area calibration for small lots	23-3C-3	3080	19	Calibrate R1 single-family (small lot) floor area allotment to reflect current allotment of floor area allowed in minimum size equivalent single family zone.	Suggest a min floor area of 1,800 sq ft, which is 0.4FAR on the minimum-sized 5,000 sq ft. R2 lot.	R1 is replacement for small-lot amnesty SF lots, and is currently given a minimum floor area of 2,300 sq ft., which is allotment for minimum-sized SF lot (0.4*5,750 sq ft). This avoids down-zoning existing small lot amnesty lots, which is otherwise not done in Residential zones in LDC rewrite.	TK	Form and Entitlements	
20	Resi WG - Discussion (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		Form and Entitlements	
<b>Impervious Cover</b>										Form and Entitlements	
4	Resi WG - Consent	R4 impervious cover adjustment		3130	33	Revise R4 impervious cover to be graduated by unit count. Keep IC at R2's 45% for 1-2 units (note other amendment may lower IC for 1 unit), and consider increasing IC to greater than 50% under bonus configuration to make bonus viable in more locations.	N/a (note similar staff-suggested change)	AIA recommends increasing FAR for R4 to make units achievable.	TK	Form and Entitlements	
35 (new)	Resi WG - Consent	Impervious cover reduction for single units				Reduce impervious cover for single units in all zones where 45% down to 40% or 2,250 sq ft, whichever is greater. (Rebonds to 45% with ADU, duplex, or other 2-unit form.) Establish rules that grandfather in current level of impervious cover for current owners so their properties are not non-compliant (expires when lot is sold).	N/a	2,250 is the current impervious cover for R2's minimum lot size of 5,000 sq ft, so for lots between 5,000 sq ft and 5,625, there will be no decrease.		Form and Entitlements	
<b>Form Requirements</b>										Form and Entitlements	
6	Resi WG - Consent	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%);	N/a		TK	Form and Entitlements	

8	Resi WG - Consent	Double-lot form for all units-per-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) a lot has double the minimum lot area; AND b) 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 accomodation 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	Form and Entitlements		
9	Resi WG - Consent	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.  <u>Preserve requirements:</u> 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.	<u>Remove requirements:</u> 1,500 sf min. area for courtyard; courtyard have buidings 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.	Matches AIA feedback on Cottage Court form. 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.	Per City Council direction, the draft code should encourage Cottage Courts. Requiring too much open space will discourage their use.	Form and Entitlements		
10	Resi WG - Consent	Clarify entitlements for mutiple forms	23-3C-3	3xxx		Clarify code when a mix of forms are utilized, such as a duplex and an ADU.	N/a	Current form standards only envision one form being used on a lot, but in R2 (preservation bonus) R3, R4, multiple combinations are possible.	TK	Uses		
11	Resi WG - Consent	Zero lot-line for developing adjoining R3 & R4 lots	23-3C-3			Adopt a townhouse-style zero interior side setback option for other forms when two continguous 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.	N/a	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	Uses		
14	Resi WG - Consent	Curb cuts in R4 and RM1	23-3C-3			Allow two curb cuts in bonus configuration of 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.	N/a	This is something to make bonuses more viable in R4 and RM1.	TK	Uses		
36 (new)	Resi WG - Consent	Manufactured home use in RR				Allow manufactured home use in rural residential	N/a	Many RR-zoned lots have restricted covenants that would not allow a manufactured home on-site. Many of the RR properties are developed with septic services rather than COA wastewater. There are strict rules on number of bedrooms and building in septic field.	TK	Uses		
<b>New Zones</b>											Uses	
7	Resi WG - Consent	New R2 zone (R2D?) 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; can serve as a transition between R2 and more intense zoning; base entitlements of 2 units with an affordable housing bonus up to 4 units.  Base: R2B.  Bonus: Up to 4 units. No height or setback changes - must stay inside same building envelope as R2B. Calibrate FAR and impervious cover for feasibility. May only be feasible with an affordable ADU (not full-sized unit).	N/a	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	Uses		
12	Resi WG - Consent	Scalable version of R4	23-3C-3			Create a units/acre version of R4 to be available to be appropriately map on large lots (at a later date).	See intent and R4 section, but with units/acre equivilant to the units/lot in R4.	This is not intended to be mapped today, but to be available for future mapping.	TK	Uses		

13	Resi WG - Consent	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 do 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	New Zones	
15	Resi WG - Consent	Manufactured Homes - keep current smaller MH parks compliant under new LDC				Proposed LDC has large min lot size that would make some existing MH home parks noncompliant. Create a new MH zone on a lot-size scale 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	New Zones	
16	Resi WG - Consent	Manufactured Homes - allow for "tiny home" manufactured home parks/lots				Create zones that provide tiny home alternatives in both a park setting as well as on lots to enhance affordability with small footprint dwellings.	Potentially two new zones (one "park" scale and one "lot" scale), perhaps with limits to steer use towards tiny homes (limit on unit size?).		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	New Zones	
<b>Misc requirements</b>											
17	Resi WG - Consent	Shade trees in transition zones				Make walking to transit more pleasant, healthy, and increase city tree canopy by requiring trees for sidewalks in 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.		
24	Resi WG - Discussion (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			
23	Resi WG - Discussion (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 exceptions 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		
25	Resi WG - Discussion (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		

27	Resi WG - Consent	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"			
<b>ADU Misc.</b>											
19	Resi WG - Consent	Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	23-3D-1030			Direct COA departments - including utilities - involved in assessing fees or permit review to reduce the cost of building ADUs through fee waivers, shorter approval times, etc.	See intent	Lower cost of entry for ADUs.			
29	Resi WG - Consent	Give FAR bump for ADUs to incentivize building in R2	23-3C-3			Give ADUs a 0.1 FAR increase over the single-family-only form in R2 zones. (E.g. single family gets 0.4 FAR, single family + ADU gets 0.5.)	In the FAR tables for each R zone.		TK		
26	Resi WG - Consent	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 today's allowance of a Secondary Apartment. Basically allows inclusion of another cooking space.			
34	Resi WG - Discussion (PS)	Scale the size of ADUs	23-3D-1030		3	Scale the allowable square footage of an ADU to the size of the lot.	Return to CodeNext Draft 3 proportionate size limit of ADU structures as: 2,500 sq. ft (was 3,500 sq. ft) - 4,999 sq. ft. = 750 sq. ft, 5,000 - 6,999 sq. ft = 975 sq. ft, >7,000 sq. ft. = 1,100 sq. ft.	Smaller ADUs are less expensive to build, easier to finance, hopefully have fewer restrictions than larger ADUs. Smaller units could be more attractive to seniors with too much space and limited income, students with little money and reduced need for space, small family units wishing to live in family neighborhoods and property owners wishing to keep family close. Proportionate to lot size would hopefully prevent the overbuilding of "up to square footage" especially with reduced oversight as proposed.			
<b>Mapping</b>											
31 (new)	Resi WG - Discussion (CK)	Correct R1 map to match existing small-lot amnesty lots	map			Make R1 (replacement zone for small-lot amnesty) match current zoning by mapping it everywhere current small-lot amnesty SF zoning is mapped.	All R2 lots under minimum size (5,000 sq ft) in neighborhoods that adopted small lot amnesty tool should be re-mapped as R1.	This avoids down-zoning existing small lot amnesty lots, which is otherwise not done in Residential zones in LDC rewrite.	TK		
32 (new)	Resi WG - Consent	Map greenfield lots more intensely than R2	map			Re-map current R2 on vacant lots to a higher intensity, preferably one with an affordable bonus. Zoning should be compatible with adjacent lots.	n/a	Many vacant lots are zoned R2, which misses an opportunity for greater units and affordable housing where no displacement would occur.			
37 (new)	Resi WG - Discussion (PS)	Preservation Incentive	23-3C-3050		10	Preservation Incentive, as introduced in CodeNext, intended to maintain the block street scape and neighborhood character so ADUs could be added with little disruption. The new code does not preserve the street scape appearance or character. Current proposed code does not specify how long the qualifying dwelling must be maintained.	Direct staff to review the Preservation Incentive for substantive changes to 23-3C-3050 (D)(2)(a-c)	Changes: preserve front-facing façade to comply with appearance preservation.			

1	Non-Resi	Uncap FAR in bonuses				Remove the maximum FAR in the bonus configuration of all MU and RM zones.		There is no maximum FAR in MS zones, and staff has stated that FAR in other zones is intended to be generous enough that it is not a limiting factor. This removes any uncertainty that it may be.			
2	Non-Resi	Restore current code for ground-floor height in corridor zones				Replace the 18' required height for activated ground floors in MS zones, return to the 12' minimum in current code for corridor mixed-use zones with an activated ground floor.		18' is a very high ground floor, which raises the cost and price of ground-floor commercial, and removes the potential of an entire floor in some zone configurations.			
3	Non-Resi	Make FAR in RM1, MU1, and MU2 based on units, not form.	23-3C-4060		12	Change FAR table to correspond to available units. Keep 1-2 units at 0.4 (current zoning for SF2/SF3 sites), and staff should calibrate remaining gradient for feasibility and to incentivize the bonus.		These are the RM and MU zones that have forms other than multi-family available, and tie FAR to the type of form. This would disincentivize few units on these sites and help address confusion when multiple forms are on one site.			
4	Non-Resi	Recalibrate RM1 to allow 4 stories in bonus				Set the height for RM1 in bonus configuration to not exceed 50' or 4 stories.		Current RM1 has 40' base and 40' bonus. This allows only 3 stories, while R4 - the "less intense" transition zone with fewer allowable units - bonuses to 45', allowing 4 stories (depending on lot topography and architecture). 50' allows 4 stories and architectural features like gabled roofs. Including both height and story measurements provides reassurance on the building form. This is also one story more than R2 (or SF3) zoning can achieve under 35', but substantially less than the corridor zoning (60 to 90 feet) RM1 will abut.			
5	Non-Resi	Recalibrate bonus heights in RM, MU, MS, UC zones				Increase heights under bonus configurations in RM2, RM3, RM5, MU1, MU2, MU3, MU4, and MS3 to match natural building heights and sync one of UC's heights to UNO's 300' height. Decrease UC base heights to 60' to match zones that would be rezoned to UC and capture height increase fully in bonus.		Staff answers indicate heights are largely based off current code. The Non-Residential Workgroup's Natural Building Heights study suggests heights that better allow full floors. Matching the UC 240' zone to 300' makes it comparable to the UNO proposal for Inner West Campus (UT tower is 307', Capitol is 311').			
6	Non-Resi	Fix Cottage Court form				Follow residential WG guidance on cottage courts for RM zones	See Resi cottage court recs				
7	Non-Resi	Don't count overhangs against impervious cover				Match non-residential zones to residential zones by not applying incidental overhangs to impervious cover caps.					
8	Non-Resi	Compatibility triggers				Base compatibility on distance from the lot line of any triggering property within compatibility distance. Do not consider adjacency, width of streets/alleys, etc.		This establishes clarity and removes incentives to game flag lots, etc. Compatibility distance is now lower so triggering properties are much fewer.			
9	Non-Resi	Future parking deck conversions				Require all under-building 1-level parking decks to be able to be converted in the future to housing, etc.	Require 10' clear to the bottom of the structure.	Converting multi-level parking decks isn't very feasible, but ground-floor parking could be converted, especially to housing. Especially relevant in RM1 for transition zones.			

10	Non-Resi	Microbrewery tasting room right-sizing	23-3D-1	1240(A)(3)	25	Increase the allowed size of microbrewery tasting rooms on smaller sites.	23-3D-1240 (A) (3) should be revised to state: Except as provided in Subsection (B)(2), the area utilized for on-site consumption may not exceed the lesser of 66% or 5,000 square feet of the total floor area of the principal developed use.	Micro vs Production breweries/distilleries/wineries should be differentiated with respect to the allocation of "on-site consumption" vs production areas as those different businesses models require different kinds of areas of use. Both 23-3d-140 (3) and 23-3d-1230 (F)(1)(c) state that Tasting rooms or "on-site consumption" will be limited to 33% or 5,000 sf. While this may make more sense as a limitation for a production/distribution focused brewery in an industrial area so as to not create what may be excessively large tasting rooms when a building is i.e. 20,000 gross SF. However, the opposite condition occurs in a smaller building on a mixed-use corridor which is more conducive to a microbrewery and its smaller brewing area. For example a small brewpub may need only 1000-2500 SF of production space in a corridor scaled 5,000 SF building. The 33% rule therefore excessively limits the active corridor centric tasting room space while unnecessarily designating building area that is not needed for production. The rule inadvertently incentivizes having larger production spaces and smaller tasting rooms in an area where larger light industrial activities are likely not desirable. Small production and larger			
11	Non-Resi	No parking for bars and tasting rooms				Eliminate parking minimums anywhere for bars and tasting rooms		We shouldn't be encouraging people to drink and drive			
12	Non-Resi	No parking for parks, government use				These government uses will provide parking as needed		Governments are accountable to the people (and we shouldn't require parking for pocket parks on corridors)			
13	Non-Resi	Grandfathered under-parked buildings				Create a process for allowing applicants with change-of-use or minor construction on sites that have not met parking requirements for more than 10 years to continue without adding parking		We have already seen cases where a change of use permit was denied because a site that has never had much parking did not have room to add any additional parking. We should not require the demolition of buildings to change use if they have historically not had parking. This could be reviewed for public health and safety.			
14	Non-Resi	Allow schools to set own parking				Allow public schools to determine their own parking and loading/unloading needs		Schools have particular circumstances and are accountable to voters; let them set their own parking.			
15	Non-Resi	Retail alcohol sales should require an MUP				Require all retail alcohol sales in all zones currently permitted, to obtain a Minor Use Permit instead.		Will help make sure alcohol sales are compliant with state law restricting locations of alcohol sales.			
16	Non-Resi	Allow more restaurants to serve alcohol				Match the permit required for restaurant alcohol sales to whatever is required for those without alcohol in each zone.		Restaurants that serve alcohol are often those more desired in neighborhoods, and restrictions on use ensure that bars are not included under this definition.			
17	Non-Resi	Allow mobile food trucks in all RM, MS, MU zones				Allow mobile food trucks in all RM zones, MU1, and MU2 with a minor use permit (where they are currently prohibited).		Restaurants without alcohol sales are currently a permitted use in all MU zones.			
18	Non-Resi	Create a Data Center use				Create a Data Center use for IT facilities with low number of employees and their attendant needs. Staff should assign use thresholds to zones appropriately.		Draft code may treat them the same as facilities with many employees.			
19	Non-Resi	Parking facilities allowed in MU zones				Allow parking facilities in MU zones where currently not allowed; allow with a MUP.		This is important to facilitating off-site parking and more flexible parking. Does not apply to MS zones (activated ground floors) or RM zones (residential areas and RM1 transition zone).			
20	Non-Resi	Require approval for Drive-Thrus				Require specific CUP approval for drive-through use		Current draft indicates that drive-throughs could be attached to other, allowed uses. The required CUP should apply specific scrutiny to drive-throughs due to their pedestrian and traffic safety impact.			
21	Non-Resi	Allow Hotels in MU1&2				Allow hotels through a CUP in MU1 and MU2.		Hotels are already allowed through a CUP in MU3 and MU4. This would allow hotels in areas zoned for offices, giving more flexibility in zoning and allowing smaller hotels on smaller lots, thus taking some pressure off of STRs in residential areas.			

22	Non-Resi	Create an MS1 zone				Create a new MS1 zone for 3-story commercial with MS uses	Base of 35' (2 stories w/ active ground floor), bonus to 50' (3 stories). Not necessarily mapped now. See Non-Resi chart.	Staff advises that MU1/MU2 are intended to be the low-rise commercial zones, but they have highly restricted uses. This creates a tool for low-rise "village center" commercial uses without going to 65' of height.			
23	Non-Resi	Create a scaled RM1 zone for MF1 equivalency				Create a new version of RM1 that uses a units/acre density; re-assign MF1 from RM1 to this zone.		MF1 uses units/acre and can have larger sites with many units, but RM1 maxes out at 10 units/acre. This also helps to separate out MF1 equivalency zoning from transition zoning from SF to RM1.			
24	Non-Resi	Create new, taller MS and MU zones				Create new sets of MS and MU zones at 135' and 160' for future mapping		135' is a natural height break and 160' is a height used in East Riverside zoning. UC zones have different form requirements that may not be desirable to zone on corridors, but our corridors may want to go that high in the future. This future-proofs our code.			
1		Mapping				Staff to look into adding Downtown Density Bonus to NW area of downtown that is not currently included	Consider the bonus being 1.5 x whatever is being restricted, either FAR or height				
2	Downtown Working Group	Zoning Map	23-3A		3	Staff to explore more sites mapped as DC instead 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.			(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-14) (PD-19) (PD-20)		
3	Downtown Working Group	Commercial Center (CC) Zone	23-3C	7070		o23-3C-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.	o23-3C-7070(A) Lot Size and Intensity: Increase all CC subzones to 5:1 FAR		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-14) (PD-20)		
4	Downtown Working Group	Commercial Center (CC) Zone	23-3C	7070		o23-3C-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)	o23-3C-7070(D) Height: Increase CC subzone heights: CC40 to CC50; CC60 to CC75; CC80 to CC90; CC120		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-14) (PD-20)		
5	Downtown Working Group	Downtown Core (DC) Zone	23-3C	7080		o23-3C-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	o23-3C-7080(A) Lot Size and Intensity: Increase DC FAR from 8:1 to 12:1		(PD-5) (PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-20)		
6	Downtown Working Group	Downtown Civic Spaces Overlay	23-3C	10070		Staff to explore: 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.	oAt (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)		



7	Downtown Working Group	Overlays - New Waller Creek Overlay	23-3C	10		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.	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.		(PD-8) (PD-6) (PD-7) (PD-12) (PD-16) (PD-17) (PD-18)		
8		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)		
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 develops 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.		
1	Azhar	Vertical Mixed Use bonus and -A Effectiveness	Article 23-4E: Affordable Housing	Division 23-4E-1: Citywide Affordable Housing Bonus Program	4E-1 pg. 7	Consider aligning the current Vertical Mixed Use (VMU) and "-A" affordable housing bonus in areas where the VMU bonus currently exists. This may be revised in the future to ensure program participation.			Table 23-4E-1040(B): Affordable Unit Set-Aside Requirements: "The set-aside is shown as a percentage of bonus units. For zones with "-A" in the zone name, all residential dwelling units are bonus units.	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 ii. through a	
2	Azhar	Transition areas in gentrifying areas and overlap with neighborhood	Mapping			Review and ensure that within "Susceptible", "Early Type", "Dynamic" and "Late" gentrifying areas the depth of the transition zone(s) do not overlap with the majority of the existing single-family neighborhood area.			These are all areas marked as vulnerable under the Uprooted Study.	scale of transition zones should be reduced so that the transition zone(s) do not overlap with the	
3	Azhar	Repeat offender affordable housing program participation	Article 23-4E: Affordable Housing and other chapters	Division 23-4E-1: Citywide Affordable Housing Bonus Program and other divisions	4E-1 pg. 1 and other pages	Consider not allowing offenders with any properties registered with the Repeat Offender Program (ROP) to participate in all affordable housing bonus programs, Affordability Unlocked, and the S.M.A.R.T housing program.			All affordable housing bonus programs implies the citywide, downtown, TOD, NBG, ERC, UNO and any other bonus programs	Ordinance No. 20130926-012 - The City is committed to ensuring that residential rental properties in the community are safe and maintained in accordance with public health, safety, and property maintenance standards in the City Code.	

4	Azhar	Post-construction requirements and penalties for affordable housing program participation	Article 23-4E: Affordable Housing and other chapters	Division 23-4E-1: Citywide Affordable Housing Bonus Program and other divisions	4E-1 pg. 1 and other pages	Consider adding requirements similar to the 'Post-Construction Requirements and Penalty' section from Affordability Unlocked (23-4E-7050 ) to all affordable housing bonus programs and the S.M.A.R.T housing program.			Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint: Provide Additional Funding to Monitor Austin's Affordable Housing Investments: NHCD continues to strengthen its monitoring function and identify opportunities for process improvement. As the portfolio of income restricted units grows, there will be a corresponding need to invest in monitoring and compliance.		
5	Azhar	Monitoring and compliance fee for affordable housing program participation	Article 23-4E: Affordable Housing and other chapters	Division 23-4E-1: Citywide Affordable Housing Bonus Program and other divisions	4E-1 pg. 1 and other pages	Consider requiring a monitoring and compliance fee from all participants of the affordable housing bonus programs.		The S.M.A.R.T housing program and Affordability Unlocked are not being considered because they are currently intended to be combined with other forms of subsidies and used by mission driven affordable housing providers.	Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint: Provide Additional Funding to Monitor Austin's Affordable Housing Investments: NHCD continues to strengthen its monitoring function and identify opportunities for process improvement. As the portfolio of income restricted units grows, there will be a corresponding need to invest in monitoring and compliance.		
1	Hempel	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.	<a href="#">Art Music Culture Oct 2019.docx</a>		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.		

2	Hempel	Tree Removal Variance	23-4C-2040		4C-2	Clarify the 'reasonable use' verbiage	Suggest to change to "within reason" or something similar		Allows the City to better control the situation when a tree can come down.	Shaw Exhibit 1 - Compatibility Figure 1	
3	Hempel	Signage	23-7			Ensure that the content from the stakeholder process that was mentioned during the public hearing is incorporated into the LDC draft			So as not to dissuade people from participating in future stakeholder outreach.		
1	Shaw	MU3, MU4, MU5A, MU5B, MS2A, MS2B Compatibility Height Stepback Distance	23-3C	Table 23-3C-5080(D) Height, Table 23-3C-5090(D) Height, Table 23-3C-5100(D) Height, Table 23-3C-5110(D) Height, Table 23-3C-	3C-5 pg. 25, 3C-5 pg. 29, 3C-5 pg. 33, 3C-5 pg. 37, 3C-6 pg. 15, 3C-6 pg. 19	Compatibility Height Stepback Distance from the triggering property for MU3, MU4, MU5A, MU5B, MS2A, MS2B zones should reach base standard height at a distance greater than 100 ft. <del>from the lot line of the triggering</del>	Reference: Table 23-3C-6080(D) Height, (2) Compatibility Height Stepback Distance from the lot line of the triggering property: ≤ 25' = 25', > 25' and ≤ 50' = 35', > 50' and ≤ 100' = 45', > 100' = Set by zone standards.		<b>Justification:</b> Council Direction- Maintain Draft 3's no-build and vegetative buffers between		
2	Shaw	Reduce percentage of short term rentals type 3 allowed in MU and MS zones and prohibit income restricted units from being permitted as a short term rental.	23-3D-1350 D(3)(e)	1350	3D-1 pg. 38	Ensure adequate rental housing by reducing % short term rental type 3 (STR3) allowed in MU and MS zones and prohibiting any income restricted housing to be permitted as a short term rental.	(e) For a Type 3 short-term rental use located in a Mixed-Use or Main Street Zone, no more than <u>5 percent</u> 25-percent of the total number of dwelling units at the property and no more than <u>5 percent</u> 25-percent of the total number of dwelling units located within any building or detached structure at the property are a Type 3 short-term rental use as determined by the Director under Subsection (F); and(i) The structure and the dwelling unit at issue have a valid certificate of occupancy or compliance, as required by 23-2C-5 (Certificates of Occupancy and Compliance) issued no more than 10 years before the date the application is submitted to the Director; or	Ask staff if income restricted are already prohibited from being permitted as a short term rental.	When Austin is struggling to produce the housing needed to serve its own residents, the % of STR3 allowed in MU and MS zones should be kept at a minimum until Austin has adequate housing.		
3	Shaw	Removal of draft code section allowing administrative variance for removal of heritage trees having single stem > 30".	23-4C	3020	4C-3 pg. 2	Remove administrative variance for removal of heritage tree with single stem > 30 inches. The administrative variance for trees with <30 inches is still in place. The approval from Land Commission is still required for > 30".	23-4C-3020 Administrative Modification (C) For a property that fronts a corridor designated by Division 23-3A-5 (Growth Concept Map and Transit Priority Network), the director may grant an administrative modification from Section 23-4C-3010 (Removal or Impact Prohibited) to remove or impact a heritage tree that has at least one stem that is 30 inches DBH or larger after determining, based on the city arborist's recommendation, that the heritage tree meets the criteria in Subsection 23-4C-2040(A) (Protected Trees), and that: (1) Transplanting the heritage tree is not feasible due to tree condition; Who makes this decision? (2) The applicant has applied for and been denied a variance, waiver, exemption, modification, or alternative compliance from another City Code provision which would eliminate the need to remove the heritage tree, as required in Section 23-3C-3060 (Variance Prerequisite); and Can you provide examples? (3) Removing or impacting the heritage tree is not the result of a method chosen by the applicant to develop the property, unless the design will allow for the maximum provision of ecological service, historic, and cultural value of other trees on the site or requirements. How is this determined?		So few variances are required from the Land Use Commission for developments in general the existing requirements do not pose a burden on development withing corridors.	<a href="https://austin.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=d45481abb0804c95a8e6b033188982b9">https://austin.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=d45481abb0804c95a8e6b033188982b9</a>	
5	Shaw	Streamline Permitting for 1-2 and 3-8 Residential Units	23-2B-2010, 23-2B-2020	2010, 2020	2B-2 pg. 1-3	Streamline and simplify permitting missing middle residential units by referencing all the non-zoning regulatory requirements for obtaining a Building Permit for 1-2 Unit Building Permit and Limited Site Plan permit for 3-8 Units are included in 23-2B-2010 and Section 23-2B-2020.		Process Working Group may have an amendment addressing this. Staff will need to determine if any non-zoning requirements are not referenced.	When reading 23-2B-2010 and 23-2B-2020, it reads as if these sections refer to all the required non-zoning requirements. However, the parkland requirements were not referenced.		

6	Shaw	Preservation Incentive	23-3C-3050 (D), 23-3C-4050 (C), 23-3C-5050 (C),	3050, 4050, 5050	3C-3 pg. 10, 3C-4 pg. 8, 3C-5 pg. 12	Preservation incentive needs to be changed as follows: 1) older existing ADUs need to be preserved in addition to the primary structure, 2) limit FAR for lots with 2-3 units using preservation incentive but at higher value than for single units, and 3) do not allow preservation incentive for RM and MU zones when mapping these zones on lots with current non-residential zones or uses.		Residential working group may have amendments covering FAR for preservation incentive units. Need staff to confirm that a single family unit without an ADU can construct a duplex with unlimited FAR.	1) Older ADU providing affordable residential options should also be preserved, 2) Unlimited FAR will create a unit or units that are too large. A reasonable increase in FAR as compared to base zoning should provide an incentive and encourage smaller additional units. 3) Current properties that do not include residential uses should not be provided incentives for keeping older non-residential units.	Shaw Exhibits 2, 3, and 4	
7	Shaw	Zoning Map - Additional Context Sensitive Mapping Criteria for Transition Areas-Localized Flooding	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 based on Watershed Protection identified localized flooding problems areas identified on website.		What does Watershed Dept. recommend as best course of action to limit localized flooding while increasing impervious cover in areas prone to localized flooding. This will be added only if not considered in Transition Working Group Amendments.	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		

8	Shaw	Off-Street Motor Vehicle Parking Reductions - Maximum Parking Adjustment within 1/4 mile of corridors and centers	23-3D-2050(B)(b)	2050	3D-2 pg. 3	Responding to Council Direction to maintain parking requirements for areas where their elimination would be particularly disruptive, in addition to the sidewalk conditions, the widths of streets falling within a 1/4 mile of centers and corridors must accommodate off-street parking on both sides of the street and cars passing in opposite directions to receive 100% parking reductions.	Draft Code: 23-3D-2050 Off-Street Motor Vehicle Parking Reductions (B) Maximum Parking Adjustment. (b) A site located is located within a Center or within ¼ mile of a Corridors, then the maximum cumulative parking reduction is 100 percent if the following conditions are met: (i) any portion of the site is within a Center or within ¼ mile of a Corridor or Center, measuring in a straight line from the centerline of the Corridor or edge of Center to the site; and (ii) the proposed development is connected to a corridor by an accessible sidewalk system; or (iii) is rated "Very High" or "High" in the Sidewalk Prioritization Map as defined in the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan.	Staff defined disruptive as lack of existing or planned accessible sidewalks. This would also define disruptive as inadequate street width to allow cars to park on each side of the street and allow uninterrupted flow of two-way traffic. <b>Draft Code:</b> 23-3D-2050 Off-Street Motor Vehicle Parking Reductions (B) Maximum Parking Adjustment. (b) A site located is located within a Center or within ¼ mile of a Corridors, then the maximum cumulative parking reduction is 100 percent if the following conditions are met: (i) any portion of the site is within a Center or within ¼ mile of a Corridor or Center, measuring in a straight line from the centerline of the Corridor or edge of Center to the site; and (ii) the proposed development is connected to a corridor by an accessible sidewalk system; or (iii) is rated "Very High" or "High" in the Sidewalk Prioritization Map as defined in the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan.	Council Direction: Minimum parking requirements should be generally eliminated in areas that are within the ¼ mile of activity centers, activity corridors, and transit priority network, except that some parking requirements may be maintained for areas where elimination of parking requirements would be particularly disruptive (conditions to be proposed by staff).		
9	Shaw	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.			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		
10	Shaw	23-4	New		Adopt Art/Music Commission Working Group recommendations	Reference Shaw Exhibit 5					

1	Schneider	Creation of a new article: Article 23-3F: Diversify, Sustain, and Cultivate Art, Music, and Culture	<p>of a new article:  Article 23-3F:  Diversify,  Sustain, and  Cultivate Art,  Music, and  Culture  2. Amend  and replace  recently  amended draft  language as  follows:  23-4A-1010  Purpose  (A) This chapter  establishes  standards and  regulations that  apply at multiple  stages of the  development  process and  address a wide  range of impacts  that  development  may have on the  City's residents  and  environment.  (B) The purpose</p>						
---	-----------	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--