


HOME Public Comments 10/14/23 - 11/7/23

Total comments: 441

Comment	Date	Source
I have a question about the RV portion of the ordinance. Will this allow for RV's to park on the street for more than the currently allowed time (which I think is 3-4 days)? And how many unrelated adults will be allowed to live in one house? I have grave concerns of long term living in an RV in neighborhoods. It will be an eyesore and decrease property values. I'm ok with tiny homes. Thank you.	10/14/23	PublicInput Comment
My family and I are vehemently opposed to this proposed Land Development Code change. I sincerely hope you choose to NOT PURSUE this change. I can hardly imagine an Austin that allows for RVs to be parked next to single family homes and/or multiple non-related parties living in a single residence. This will significantly reduce the sense of community found in our SFR neighborhoods. I am strongly in favor of HOAs, and am concerned this change will supersede any HOA language preventing this.	10/14/23	PublicInput Comment
There is not enough information on this announcement to understand the intent of the proposed change. Is it for established neighborhoods or in specific new undeveloped properties that are now up for sale. If this envelopes all properties within Austin city limits then I am totally against it. I own 2 properties in Austin (78758 and 78754) and this is not desirable nor what I invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in. It seems this would reduce land value in a catastrophic way.	10/14/23	PublicInput Comment
I am a homeowner living in a single-family zoned home, and I am in favor of these changes.	10/14/23	PublicInput Comment
The proposal aligns the economics of current homeowners with the needs of the city to provide more affordable housing units -- not by mandating more affordable housing units, but by simply allowing homeowners to create more housing units of smaller-than-usual square footage.		
<p>I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed changes to the Land Development code pertaining to single family (SF) zoning. Adding multiple units and families to an SF zoned lot will have a negative impact to the affected communities by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing stress on existing infrastructure. - Causing safety issues related to fire evacuation. - Decreasing property values. - Increasing environmental damage. <p>I urge you to not adopt the proposed changes.</p>	10/15/23	Email

I love my neighborhood (Wooten) & moved from Crestview which is now developing to include many multi unit homes on single properties. I am saddened by the loss of the quaint Austin charm that was once so prevalent in our neighborhoods. The draw to Austin is clear, we have a rich culture, beautiful surroundings, and a unique aesthetic. The very aspects that make Austin what it is are being muted. Also the crowding in neighborhoods w/ so many units makes it less conducive to calm family living.	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
My concern with the proposed density changes of buildings on a single lot are how this increase in density will affect the environment. First, loss of permeable surface will increase the likely hood of flood. Also, the benefit of vegetation(grass/trees, etc.) to absorb carbon dioxide and produce oxygen will be lost. Next, the stress on infrastructure, such as water and electricity to accommodate the increase in demand. We are already pushing the limits of these resources.	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
The new building codes put forth the advantage of reducing home ownership costs through more housing availability. I contend that this is a figment of someone's imagination. Developers and builders are the beneficiaries of these changes! We already have excessive traffic in the urban core of the city, this will only make things worse without streets, etc., and that is a problem that we have been dealing with for some time without resolution.	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
This creates so many more problems that it solves. The 68 year old, plumbing, and electrical infrastructure in these areas will not handle additional loads. The existing 5/8 inch water meters barely supply the existing single-family homes. The single car ports will increase street parking in. And electrical cords will be running all over the yards for EV chargers and a trip hazard. try this out with a pilot program in Tarrytown. This will only cause more domestic conflict calls. Educated idiot i	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
I would love to see these changes on the Land Development Code amendments approved, especially allowing tiny homes to be built on residential properties. This would be good for families who are caring for elderly parents. Many older people have sold their homes and left my community to retire elsewhere. The cost of living is becoming too high for retired persons in Austin. This would by an affordable solution and allow families to remain near one another and still maintain their privacy.	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
No, absolutely no, for all 3. Austin will not have housing issue if y'all stop urbanization. Stop benefiting private developers.	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment

Right now, RVs and other vehicles cannot be parked on front or side lawns. They must be on a slab and shielded with a permanent fence from the street view. Will this continue? Also, what about parking? If you have 3 housing units say each with 5 persons who could be unrelated, there could possibly be 15 cars per "single family" property. Would they be required to park on the property -- garage, carport or driveway? 15 cars on the street in front of a single-family property is not workable.	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
I am a 6 year North Loop homeowner and support this. I want more density in my neighborhood.	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
This is an ill-advised, neighborhood-ruining idea that needs to be rethought from square one. You required far more public hearings for the new soccer stadium, yet you are considering changing Austin's very character and only offering three rather inconvenient public hearings. I've reviewed all the suggested changes and believe you will NOT increase affordability. When additional units are built, they will be at market rent or above. PLEASE do not adopt these changes.	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
I don't want a blanket change to zoning that allows mini- homes, rv campers and apartments to be built on single family home lots. There should be a minimum of at least a half acre lot for a lot to be converted to multi family zoning. Restrictions on unrelated persons are antiquated since many people never get married. There is no benefit to having multi family zoning on 1/4 acre residential lots. Parking is already stressed in many subdivisions so why attempt blanket changes?	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
We are STRONGLY OPPOSED to the LDC changes, especially allowing up to three housing units on a SF zoned lot. This is totally incompatible with our neighborhood (Long Canyon).	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed changes to the Land Development code pertaining to single family (SF) zoning. Adding multiple units and families to an SF zoned lot will have a negative impact to the affected communities by: - Increasing stress on existing infrastructure. - Causing safety issues related to fire evacuation. - Decreasing property values. - Increasing environmental damage. I urge you to not adopt the proposed changes.	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
How is going to affect the property value and taxes?	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment
I oppose these changes! It will not result in more affordable housing and it will destroy so many beautiful and safe neighborhoods. Austin is losing its identity!	10/15/23	PublicInput Comment

Many of the PDFs are not available on this website. Please respond back to this email when the documents are again available.	10/16/23	Email
<p>I would like a copy of the agenda and background documents and/or powerpoint for my HOA to review. I'm not sure how to Comment without any information.</p> <p>I think our position would be to leave our zoning alone - we have a Master Planned community, built before COA annexed the area. Our real estate investment was based on a traditional single family homes.</p> <p>Besides, much of our neighborhood is still classified as interim zoning - apparently, it's never been important enough for the COA to change it.</p> <p>Please keep ignoring us - we would prefer it.</p> <p>P.S. I had to get a magnifying glass to read the postcard.</p>	10/16/23	Email
<p>On the subject page at https://publicinput.com/v1473#2, under "HOW DO I PARTICIPATE NOW?", it is stated: "To participate or provide input before the joint meeting on Oct. 26, you may fill out the Commentform on this webpage."</p> <p>There is no Commentform on that webpage.</p> <p>Regards,</p> 	10/16/23	Email
I got a mailer about proposed changes to the Land Development Code that would include allowing up to 3 housing units, including tiny homes and recreational vehicles on single family (SF) zoned lot. If my deed restrictions state that the building on a lot is limited to one single family dwelling, will those deed restrictions be effective even if the new development code amendments are passed?	10/16/23	Email
Please confirm HOA deed restrictions/covenants take precedence over COA Land Development Codes.	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
I'm asking that you not move forward with the current proposed changes to the land development code. This will have a drastic impact on Austin neighborhoods and will only benefit developers, who will build the maximum allowed, while still leaving out middle income housing for those who need it most.	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
I support increasing population density, but I believe it has had a negative impact in other areas where multi-unit buildings put a strain on street parking, and no additional public transportation infrastructure was added. If we are going to put more people per block, we need to think about where their cars will go.	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment

Has resource usage of natural gas, water, and electricity been estimated with increase of housing density increase? Can you publish your findings?	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
Are changes to the requirements for parking spaces also part of the replanning of zoning? Because when such requirements remain in place, additions of housing to properties often cannot be realized if too much space for automobiles is required by the zoning. Getting rid of these mandatory parking spaces - often more space than is allotted to people - will help with the transition out of a car-centric culture.	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
I do not have time to go to public hearings.	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
STRONG no input from me and my family- as lifetime austin residents for well over 60 years!		
Do NOT ruin existing neighborhoods. Do NOT ruin existing neighborhoods.		
Find some new /other areas to do your social experiments that have no value to existing residents. Or perhaps require 90% minimum approval from ALL existing residents in a neighborhood before you consider changing.		
What happened to all those concerns about impervious cover?		
I am registering my strong objection to all of the proposed changes to the LDC. These changes will have significant impact on the quality of neighborhoods and therefore the value of the homes in them. If the City of Austin is determined to reduce income from property taxes, this is a great way to do so! Your proposal will litter the city with overcrowded homes and unattractive trailer homes. Property owners have worked too hard to create nice homes/neighborhoods to have their value destroyed!	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
Our family is strongly opposed to each of these land development code change amendments. There are many other ways that the city can help solve our housing affordability challenge without undermining the lifetime of investment that families like ours have made in our homes and communities. Please reverse course and do not implement the proposed changes. Thank you.	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
Please do not implement these proposed Land use changes as they will hurt our family and decrease the value of millions of peoples property.	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
I live Nextdoor to [REDACTED] and Victoria Dr is a culdusac way to much traffic and MLK is very busy Road [REDACTED] Borders MLK and [REDACTED] So bad move by city planners	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
I'm all for 3 units on 1 SF lot. Tiny homes are great. But RVs? What the are you trying to do to my beautiful neighborhood? Seriously? You're going to allow RVs next to 2 million dollar homes?	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
RVs in the neighborhood would be disgusting. Please tell me I read this wrong and our city council is not that stupid.		

<p>If this is your “solution” to affordable housing in Austin, you are WAY OFF the Mark. Austin’s single family neighborhoods keep Austin vital and desirable. Don’t cheapen our city with this amendment. Do you really want tiny houses and RV’s in the center of Austin??</p> <p>I certainly don’t! We have paid very high property taxes for our homes. I assumed these high taxes insulated our homes fro horrible decisions that would endanger our neighborhoods.</p> <p>I say NO! Leave things as they are!</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>NO thank you!!! We do NOT want these crazy updates to SF zoned properties!</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I support these changes! Missing middle housing is a great way to combat sprawl and address our housing shortage.</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>As a North Austin/North Shoal resident, I am all in favor of increasing density. When revising the codes to allow multi-housing on SF zone parcels, please loosen the set back requirements. The 25ft yard + 10 ft street front setback is particularly difficult for 65x110 ft standard lots to permit parallel front and back units. A 15ft rear setback would us with 1960s era parcels, might have a chance at putting an ADU at the back. Without demolishing the original house. Thanks!</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Which area(s) of the City will be impacted by these proposed changes? I live in a single family area currently.</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Traffic, roads, electricity, water, police, and emergency services are already stretched beyond the ability to respond adequately. Adding more density will only exacerbate the problem even further.</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Will this amendment affect existing home sites or just future home sites?</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>This will create more density and neighborhood resentment to those who exercise these options in this amendment. Already there are too many cars and people living in RVs and under the highways. Clean up the graffiti in Austin first before adding more things that will make Austin less attractive and more ugly. But if approved, no neighborhood should be exempted. Vote against this amendment.</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>All three of these proposed amendments should be rejected. The first two create situations which will exacerbate flash flooding as there is no requirement to offset the land use with permeable ground cover. The restriction on the number of adults in a housing unit is necessary to protect our neighborhoods. Excessive adults in the home is often directly related to excessive vehicles that have no adequate place to park; these homes also generate excessive noise and trash relative to other homes</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I support these amendments</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment

<p>Will tiny homes and RVs be limited to fenced in backyards</p> <p>How will sanitation be managed with RVs</p> <p>What about limitations of HOA rules</p> <p>Is there a moratorium on further STR with the proposed code change, so investors buy a property and place rows of STRs on it</p> <p>How to maintain character of a neighborhood and curb appeal</p> <p>Theoretically 100 people can live in any dwelling at any given time according to proposal</p> <p>How to control noise pollution in tight quarters</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I spoke to City Council to approve Affordable housing in Four Points(2222/620) - Foundation Communities - great organization. It was horrible for me on Nextdoor. But I stood for what was right.. This is not...you can't have RV's, mini homes, 3 homes on one lot....this is not what Austin needs...we need affordable housing...but this is not the answer. 😞</p>	10/16/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Let it be known I am against allowing 3 units on a SF zoned property. It is a money grab greed on developers to make more money disguised as a way to create affordable housing. We do not want to emulate Pottersville?(from "It's a wonderful Life")</p> <p>Let it be known that I am against the revision to regulations that will allow tiny home and RV on zoned SF properties. This will turn our neighborhoods into trailer parks. Eyesores of Recreational vehicles parked without ever moving. It's bad enough that they are parked in driveways and sit there 50 weeks out of the year. Again not a good answer for affordable housing.</p> <p>Let it be known that I am against the revision to regulations of properties with two housing units. The rules in place good.</p> <p>Let it be known that I am against the removal of restrictions on the number of unrelated adults in a housing unit. This would only create a high density living in a SF zoned property and most likely end up an overcrowded slum with vehicles on the street causing parking and traffic problems.</p>	10/17/23	Email
<p>Please send me updates on this issue.</p> <p>thanks</p> <p>██████</p>	10/17/23	Email

Good morning,

10/17/23 Email

I am opposed to the changes in the land development code.

I would like to submit a formal written Comment on the changes to the land development code. How do I submit that Comment so that it is part of a formal making?

My comments are as follows:

1. What are the environmental impacts to the Edwards aquifer and other bodies of water that are at Austin with the increase population density? Have these impacts been considered in this proposal?
2. What are the environmental impacts to the increased automotive traffic on the roadways? Has an air pollution study been completed?
3. I am opposed to this code amendment. The amendment is too broad and encompasses too great of an area in the city of Austin. There may be some portions of Austin that this code amendment would apply. However, in the subdivisions and single-family dwellings, homeowners buy these homes to have green space, and other single family dwellings to raise a family in. I requested the city of Austin step back and allow the HOA's to have input on the neighborhood in which their citizens dwell. To force this code amendment to increase the population density throughout Austin will harm the greater Austin area due to overcrowding, increased air pollution and water pollution, and be a burden to the schools.
4. Have the impacts to the local schools been evaluated?
5. One of the purposes of the land development code is to prevent and rehabilitate a "slum area". Slum areas are characterized by high population density's and inadequate open space. It is my belief that the amendments to the land development code will increase the potential for slum areas in the future.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

I received a public notice from you which mentioned proposed code amendments. I have a question about the second one. "Revise regulations that apply to a property with two housing units". I am a property owner of a duplex in 78704 and would like more details on what the revisions might look like and how it would affect my property.

10/17/23 Email

Also, the third revision involves the number of unrelated adults living in a housing unit. I would like to know more details about that as well.

Thank you. I look forward to a reply.

[REDACTED]

Hi,

10/17/23 Email

I would like to know more information about the land development code changes around my property: [REDACTED]

Thank you!

[REDACTED]

City Council, these changes are totally unacceptable to the residents who live in a quiet community and have a stable community....

10/17/23 Email

These changes benefit developers over residents and will diminish the value of these communities and ruin the single family values that are represented in these residential communities..

You attempt to turn zoning restrictions that have been adhered to for years in a move to tremendously increase the population within these areas...

And we all know, the streets, sewers, electric grid, storm drains and schools will NEVER BE UPGRADED TO HANDLE THE INCREASED POPULATIONS!

This is a knee jerk quick fix that only benefits developers! It is POORLY THOUGHT OUT AND RUINS WHAT ONCE WAS THE ECLECTIC VALUES OF AUSTIN!

STOP RUINING THE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES! Look at developing satellite communities for growth!

THE PRICING OF THESE NEW HOUSING OPTIONS WILL BE SO EXPENSIVE THAT ONLY THE RICH COULD AFFORD THEM... DEFEATING YOUR GOALS ANYWAY!!!

I think it would be great to increase density in the core of the city. My neighborhood, Allandale, would benefit from more families moving in the area. Currently the houses are being torn down and giant houses built. The people moving in to those houses, in my experience, do not interact with their neighbors and if they have kids they go outside of the neighborhood to school. Living in a vibrant diverse neighborhood feels much better than living in an empty soulless one.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I am opposed to all proposed code amendments. As a homeowner in Hunters Chase, I am concerned that companies rather than individuals will benefit from this plan by tearing down existing structures and erecting individual rental units. I empathize with the need for affordable housing in Austin but this is not the solution. Would be preferable for the city to buy or to build multiunit affordable properties. The unlimited resident option allows companies to operate unlicensed care facilities.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I am FOR the code amendments to allow increased density and more flexibility in living situations. Thank you.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Currently the City cannot serve the existing citizenry's power and water needs. Now you want to put more in. You already have 10 pounds in a 5 pound bag. If anything, you should be doing something to reduce the number of allowed development expansions. It is my understanding that the city, county, and state are nonprofit entities. Why do you want to keep growing without supporting? Focus on improving not expansion.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
We feel very strongly that to remove the limit of unrelated adults living in a house will be detrimental to home owners and neighborhoods. It was a problem before which is why the limit was implemented. Do you want 10 college students partying time with 12 cars living next to you? You can't do anything about it, except move out of Austin?	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Another strong opinion is RV's on a housing lot. It's unsightly, can be too close to the neighbors' property line, with too many people on one lot.		
Our family is opposed to these proposed changes in the Land Development Code. You will ruin the character of our neighborhood. The street parking situation and traffic are already bad in our area, and the proposed changes will only make these problems worse. Deal with the traffic situation, first, before trying to increase residential density. This is common sense. Not surprising the City Council lacks it. I will be following developments on this matter and will cast my vote accordingly.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I think this is a terrible idea. I feel it will destroy the single family home neighborhood environment. We have lived in our home for 30 years and have made significant investments in it to make it a safe and serene environment. Last thing we need is a bunch of people crowding in a SINGLE family home and RV's junking up the yards. Don't want to see 12 people living next door with 12 cars parked in the street, or in yards as we currently do, which is not allowed or and seems to be not enforced.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment

Most importantly will be the increase in traffic and parking. Because Barton View Estates has only two means of egress and one is dedicated for the nursing facility on Dudmar, evacuation in case of a fire in the Greenbelt would be severely limited. This is an extremely dangerous proposition for a small, isolated community which deadends into the cliff leading to Barton Creek. Fire hazards in this community are a major concern of our residents. Thank you.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Where exactly does this apply? This is irresponsible. Where are you going to continue to cram people in without adequate infrastructure to support them? There are already ZERO grocery stores within 5 miles of me but 7 Autozones, what the actual hell is the idea here? Single family means single, not three. removing restrictions on adults in housing units is going to breed over populated areas without support that leads to crime. who thought of this? How do I submit a formal protest? insane	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
As a renter who wants to be a homeowner someday but cannot afford the way things are, I strongly support these proposed changes. They're good for renters, and good for the environment.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I think that this is one of the most important and epic changes that could be done to the Land Development Code. Some of us are caring for elder family members and this would allow a small construction where people can continue caring for their loved ones. My question is, would this change over rule HOA restrictions on an ADU?	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Recognizing the City of Austin has identified the need for increased density for additional housing units, the current proposed Amendment will destroy the value and purpose of single family neighborhoods. The definition of "single family neighborhoods" is the intent to be a single family neighborhood, not a community of multi-units and rent houses for unrelated occupants. As a Citizen and tax payer in Austin, I find the current proposal highly damaging to my property values and quality of life.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I've lived in central Austin since 1999. These proposed changes are disastrous. Developers will come in and buy up all the properties, build second and third homes and sell each one for the price of the first. Prices will skyrocket and regular citizens will be stuck with increasingly smaller homes. We saw this with the first wave of changes a few years ago. This is simply a giveaway for developers. Please for once make a decision that benefits the citizens. Vote against these changes.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Austin seems to not understand this will NOT improve housing affordability. The people who can afford to build these ADUs will actually have a home PLUS rental revenue streams, driving home values UP, not down. I implore you to stop this path immediately or we will see an explosion of corporate/wealthy investment, reserving the possibility of homeownership for only the elite class. Everyone else will be renters.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment

While I completely understand the need for more affordable housing in Austin and missing middle housing, I do not believe that it is in the best interest of Austin to rezone all SF lots to allow 3-4 units. Giving developers more lots will not decrease pricing - I work for a developer and I promise that rezoning lots will only work to their advantage while decimating existing SF affordable homes and the historic areas of our city that give it its character.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Is this ordinance going to allow people to be living in RVs in neighborhoods? How is this good for Austin's neighborhoods? Are people just going to be able to put a mobile home in their front yard and have renters in it? I appreciate efforts to increase density, especially in undeveloped areas or newly acquired land, but to have mobile homes being allowed in single family neighborhoods will cause a degradation in these neighborhoods. Can't we at least make sure the structures are permanent?	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I oppose the amendment to allow 3 housing units on a single-family zoned property. This opens the door for developers change the entire fabric of neighborhoods. The amendments are often brought be those looking for high profits not for the needs of Austin citizens.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns regarding the changes to the LDC. Living in Western Trails in South Austin I am concerned that "allowing up to 3 housing units on a single family property" opens things up to over developing in the area already being threatened by lack of parking and heavy traffic. Also would like to take the concerns of the Austin community over the "For Profit" developers wanting to come in and change the culture of our neighborhoods.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Absolutely no to those amendments for changing the land development code this way .Parking and traffic, impervious surface, safety, privacy, noise garbage pollution, who takes care of what,, garbage pickup....	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Many of the large scrape-and-build houses built on properties zoned single-family near downtown are as large as a four or six unit building. Allowing three per property is more of the same -- a city council completely captured by homeowners to the detriment of the city as a whole. The approval process for multi-unit buildings needs to significantly relaxed to make the investment viable, while also allowing such missing-middle housing where it belongs: near the city.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I do not support these changes. Please vote them down and don't approve them.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I bought a single family home because I want to live in a neighborhood where single families live. I do not want to live in a neighborhood with RVs parked everywhere and tiny homes in the yards with even more people! I want a quiet neighborhood. If the City of Austin wants to zone new neighborhoods where anything goes, that's fine. People buy it knowing that is what they are getting like Colony Ridge in Liberty County. Allow long term RV parks. Don't ruin our neighborhoods.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment

These proposals defy common sense and are based on assumptions and wishful thinking rather than facts and everyday experience. The Council's resolution is based on the assumption that it will provide "middle-income" housing. The big winners from the Pool proposal are developers who can sell more high-priced units per lot than they can today in single-family zoning and the City of Austin, which can reap the increased tax revenues. Who won't be winning are the middle-income wage earners. Stop!	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
You all have lost your [REDACTED] minds. Y'all aren't even trying to hide that developers own you and own City Hall. SHAME on you all. Disgusting. Corrupt. Fools. The Tammany Hall of Texas.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Hello - I am a citizen of City of Austin and currently pay property taxes on my home within the City of Austin limits. This proposal is a HORRIBLE idea and not the best way to increase affordability in the city of Austin. This is really the camping band all of again but with RVs and tiny houses. The City of Austin WILL NOT BE able to regulate this code change and will allow for horrible waste or water management, improper insulation of housing units and chaos within neighborhoods.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Higher density is a good idea for PARTS of the urban core (Hwy 71 to Koenig/ Mopac to I35?) but not for outside of that core.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
My husband and I are staunchly opposed to the proposed amendment to the Land Development Code that would allow up to 3 housing units on a SF zoned property. This will diminish the value of our SF home, which is our primary investment.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I am in favor of the proposal to increase density in single-family lots.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I feel that these changes are too much, too fast. The existing code is an evolved set of standards that reflect decades of careful decisionmaking, and should not be dismantled wholesale. I would recommend gradual change, trial areas and limited periods of time. I have doubts about the proposals' effects on appraisals, taxes, water/wastewater/gas capacity, fire access, tree canopy, runoff, parking, noise, etc., plus the fire and tornado risks of RVs as permanent homes.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I am opposed to the proposed code amendments.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
What is the city going to be doing to address the problems with traffic flow at Howard/Lamar/I35 and the entrance to John B Connally High school.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
To Austin City Council, please accept this as a formal written protest regarding the change to the LDCode. As my neighborhood is not HOA, the coding dept. serves as a source of deterrent regarding the amount of cars per residence, housing number of unrelated adults restrictions and zoning laws surrounding housing units. As this may seem like a good try to fix the housing market, it decreases the views and quality of the current residences that own homes, therefore causing more owners 2 sale. TY	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment

Very excited about these changes and the improvements to density and mobility that the trickle down effects will bring!	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Hello How does it affect me and my home in [REDACTED] Thank you [REDACTED]	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
I do not support this amendment- I am concerned how it will affect property values negatively.	10/17/23	PublicInput Comment
Homeowners in the areas labeled "Austin LTD ETJ" on the Property Profile map have received the purple postcard notifications. Will these properties be affected by the changes to the Austin LDC? [REDACTED]	10/18/23	Email
I live in Lakewood subdivision - a PUD. Will any of the proposed land use change effect land use in a PUD? [REDACTED]	10/18/23	Email
I own a duplex which may be affected by the proposed changes to the Land Development Code. Where can I find the text of those changes online? Thank you. [REDACTED]	10/18/23	Email
Ryan, We totally oppose the proposed Land Development Code amendments and request that you do the same. Please reconsider your point of view on the matter: Ask yourself if your values are personalize or universal? [REDACTED]	10/18/23	Email

<p>Hello Mr. Alter, I'm writing to you to express my extreme worry about the proposed Land Development Code that will allow for single family lots to be divided up for more housing units as well as RV's being able to be used as homes and rising property taxes. My south Austin neighborhood is already under threat of serious cultural change due to developers coming in and scraping houses and building two giant units lot to lot with no yards. Cars now line the streets due to no garages and with no sidewalks it makes walking or riding a bike dangerous. We have electrical and water issues during the winter and to add double or triple the number of people will make this worse. The fact that the city wants to allow developers to continue to destroy neighborhoods for their own greed is starting to make Austin a terrible place to live. As a native Austinite I am not against change but this is just one step too far. I chose to live in this neighborhood and put all my savings into my 910 ft sq house. This new proposal will not help the housing crisis or the unhoused population and it will only make developers and real estate companies richer. Please vote against this and the developers and vote for your constituents. Thank you for your service.</p> <p>Street address: [REDACTED]</p>	10/18/23	Email
<p>Is there a map showing what the density of individual properties will be if the current code passes?</p> <p>BTW, I am in favor of the new code.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	10/18/23	Email
<p>Consider for a moment why Austin has such a preponderance of neighborhoods with strict HOAs? Clearly there was a large unmet demand for more restrictive enforcement of housing regulations. If someone purchases a single family home rather than renting an apartment, they want to know that their neighbors won't have an Airbnb next door, won't have a run down RV sitting on the property year-round, and will have a family next door that their kids can play with and feel safe around.</p>	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Wow, I can think of so many reasons this is a bad idea! For starters, if you take down 1 home and add 3-then put many more people in it-all with cars-where will they park? On the street? I bought in a SF neighborhood so my kids could ride their bikes in the street and play kickball. Now cars will obstruct sight lines. Also-property values will skyrocket and developers will kick out the SF people and make a killing on building & selling 3 units. We lose-developers win. Please NO!</p>	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>The potential changes that would permit up to three housing units, including Tiny Homes and Recreational Vehicles (RVs), on a Single-Family (SF) zoned property would almost certainly damage exiting property owners in established neighborhoods. An empty lot in an established single family housing development is not a place for an RV park or multiple "tiny homes". If Austin wants to have RV and tiny homes developments, that type of development should be purposed planned.</p>	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment

I am disabled and unable to attend the hearing. Please consider this comment to be my official opposition to your LDC as proposed. While we struggle to balance the health and well-being of all our citizens and reduce our homeless populations, I do not support laws that allow building on private property or altering conditions of home ownership in communities - unless property owners and/or HOAs have the final decision. Thank you.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
Hello, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed land code change. We have not expended years of investment in our home to have the rug pulled out like this. I also believe that if passed it would not help; those who could afford to build or add an RV would expect to get fair market value as a rental property, not an undervalued 'affordable' rate. I urge you to vote against this. 78759	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
I presume this is for empty or unused land or lots only, not fully developed neighborhoods with homes or apartments on every lot. Can an individual residential home be rented to unlimited people? Thank you.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
This change does not consider the lack of parking space overloading single family properties creates. This is the same as the previous re-zone of many single family properties proposal that was rejected. Many area four residents are dealing with the consequences of over crowded residential properties including duplexes and homes. The current restriction is not enforced, but at least allows residents to seek enforcement when it gets out of hand. The current restriction is eight unrelated	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
How do I submit a written statement without attending a meeting?	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
This change proposed significantly impacts certain single family residential areas and could potentially turn them into RV parks , short term Rentals areas endangering kids and school Communities that depend on the safety of the community and the neighborhood. We in the Avery ranch areas identified as being proposed for Re-zoning strongly oppose this change.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
Tiny Home Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the Tiny Home use be designated as a dwelling unit per Resolution 20230914-083? Will the Tiny Home use be subject to limits on the maximum number of dwellings allowed? • What purpose does defining the Tiny Home form serve if it designated as a dwelling unit subject to dwelling unit limitations in the base-zoning which surpass it (i.e. 1,100 SF max under Two-Unit Residential Use vs. 400 SF max Tiny Home)? • Would this use include converted garage space? 	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment

<p>Three-Unit Residential Use Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would the minimum lot requirements be for this use? • What form-based standards would apply to this use? Height limit? FAR? Limitations and relationships (i.e. attached/detached; primary/secondary; max SF/unit)? • Would this use include converted garage space? 	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Two-Unit Residential Use Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What purpose does limiting the SF of one unit serve? • Would this use include converted garage space? 	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Accessory Apartment Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why would this use only be allowed when there is one principal structure on the lot? Is this use not allowed in the Two-Unit or the new Three-Unit Residential Use? • How would this use be designated as a dwelling unit? • What purpose does limited SF serve? • What changes are proposed to the existing requirements about visibility of a new entrance? • How would STR-specific regulations apply? 	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
I am against the up to 3 housing units on a lot. Neighborhoods that are currently single family homes were built with those restrictions and therefore the restrictions should remain as is.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
Keep Austin Rich has become the new way of operating/decision making. I am sad about this. I value my yard and sky space. These take those away. Bad for existing folks who love their neighborhoods as is.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
This is a HUGE win for affordability and a great first step in addressing the need for housing in Austin!	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
I can see the need for allowing up to 3 housing units on a SF lot, assuming there are still reasonable restrictions. However, I strongly disagree with dropping ALL restrictions on the number of unrelated adults living in a housing unit, especially when there could be 3 housing units on a SF lot. There could a dozen or more people living on a SF lot with a corresponding number of vehicles which originally may have only had room for 2-4 vehicles. We will end up with vehicles parking in the lots.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
I object to the planned changes to the changes to the Land Development Code. The proposals are great for new neighborhoods and new construction, but applying those changes to already-existing neighborhoods is a recipe for disaster. adding new concepts to already existing create basically ghettos and ill-effects that no one wants to live with. one single-family home on one lot is not evil. it leads, instead to peace and harmony and knowing your neighbors, safety and calm.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment

I am against the proposed code amendments. They would drastically change our neighborhoods.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
---	----------	------------------------

If more housing units are allowed on SF zoned property - I feel that there should be a requirement for on property parking. Street parking is already a problem on the narrow residential streets.

I feel like you should put zoning changes like this on a city-wide ballot!

My community is a Property owners association, incorporated non-profit organization in the State of Texas. Our CCRs strictly prohibit any use except single-family homes. Owners bought into their properties with these rules. Why are we showing up on the preposed map?	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
--	----------	------------------------

I support one single family home plus one ADU OR tiny home per lot. I support allowing one unrelated adult per number of bedrooms in a dwelling (e.g., 2 unrelated adults in a 2-br house: but the 2 unrelated adults could share a br). I am against placing RVs on single-family zoned lots. Under the change, we'd have our home plus 2 RVs on our lot: Plus up to 6 vehicles (2 per house/RV), 9 trash/recycling/compost cans (3 per dwelling), many dogs/cats (we have 3 cats). 4plex/duplex better option.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
--	----------	------------------------

How will sewage be handled for tiny homes and RV? Why are these changes needed? Why doesn't the city of Austin provide incentives for home builders so this housing shortage can be ended?	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
---	----------	------------------------

As written, I am opposed to these changes as they do not address the impacts to parking, utilities access and fire codes.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
---	----------	------------------------

What infrastructure provisions are being made to support these changes (sewer, water, roadways, etc)?	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
---	----------	------------------------

Hi- Will the lots with up to 3 homes have the same impervious cover requirements as single house per lot? With climate changes & the current and expected water shortages I believe that the impervious cover requirements must be the same a single family home on the same lot size.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
--	----------	------------------------

My neighbor already has 5 vehicles. Where will the additional occupants park their 4 other cars if he builds 2 morehouses on his property? This will be one big mess.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
--	----------	------------------------

Subject: Opposition to Proposed CODE AMENDMENTS for Housing Units	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
---	----------	------------------------

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed CODE AMENDMENTS allowing up to three housing units, including Tiny Homes and Recreational Vehicles (RVs), on a Single-Family (SF) zoned property. These amendments would have detrimental effects on our neighborhoods and the integrity of our community.

I could not find anything requiring developers to build affordable housing. Where are those requirements?	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
These are great ideas and I love that city council is working to make housing more affordable. Every arbitrary regulation (ie non safety related) that is removed allows for more housing options! I'm a bit wary about the RVs because of their varying quality but tiny homes is a great idea (tuff sheds sheds are incredibly affordable). Please keep pushing these amendments so Austin doesn't turn into California!!	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
As owner of property at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I strongly protest passage any code changes to Residential Uses and Standards, especially to allow 3 units on a residential lot. This would compromise the original intended spirit of neighborhoods in Austin, and put a strain on infrastructure as originally intended in the City.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
[REDACTED] 78702 Govalle Neighborhood .I don't want the proposed Changes.My Neighborhood is Elderly I don't want their property (RV) (more people than rooms) (and more than the code of 2 homes per lots .)	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
[REDACTED] 78702 Govalle Neighborhood .I don't want the proposed Changes.My Neighborhood is Elderly I don't want their property (RV) (more people than rooms) (and more than the code of 2 homes per lots .)	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
I strongly oppose the changes to residential uses and standards on my street, Scenic Drive. I live in a neighborhood of homes, not condos and apartments. Keep building high rises downtown, so people can walk to work and enjoy the close knit community enjoyed by many.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
As a property owner in Austin for over 10 years, I have been unable to add an ADU to my property to allow my 83 year old mother to live with us because it is zoned SF2. As a result we have had to pay over \$5,000 a month in rent for her to stay at a retirement community apartment. For those who are older who need help, and for those who are younger and can't afford to purchase a home, these zoning laws will bring more affordable housing for our loved ones to be able to remain in Austin.	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
If you want to add density make the whole city SF3. Do not decrease lot size to 2500 sq foot and allow 3 residences to a lot. People who pay taxes here DO NOT WANT THIS!!!	10/18/23	PublicInput Comment
I just wanted to let the City Of Austin the development services organization, and the Austin city Council that I am supportive of all of these proposals. Regards, [REDACTED]	10/19/23	Email

Dear LDC Updates,

10/19/23 Email

Regarding the proposed code revisions, if those codes were to be enacted, can an effected Homeowner's Association's members establish covenants that prevent multi-unit construction, establish occupancy count restrictions and/or to prohibit RV dwellings on HOA lots, despite the zoning codes?

I am an HOA president for an association covering 16 single family residences and a single undeveloped lot and would like to know if covenants can be used to protected homeowner interests.

Thank you for your guidance, thank you for your service, and have a nice afternoon!

[REDACTED]

Please find attached my comments on the proposed changes to the Land Development Code affecting single-family zoned property. As detailed in the attachment, I am concerned that some of the changes would adversely affect the quality of life in traditional single-family home neighborhoods in outlying areas of the city. My comments include suggested alternatives for some aspects of the proposed changes that would balance the need for additional housing with reasonable protections to preserve the characteristics of existing suburban neighborhoods. Thank you. (Document Included)

10/19/23 Email

I am interested in the changes the city is making to the Land Development Code and would like any updates or notices that are available about it. I received some purple cards in the mail saying I should email you for the information.

10/19/23 Email

Hello. I'm wondering how neighborhood HOA deed restrictions will be treated/honored with the proposed land development changes? Thanks,

10/19/23 Email

[REDACTED]

Hello,

10/19/23 Email

We have a commercial tire center in Austin. I was wondering if the changes in the Land development code would affect commercial businesses like ours and if we need to have someone present. After reading the notice, it seems like it is regarding residential owners, however I would like to verify.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Council member Ryan: to solve a housing problem on the backs of established neighborhoods is ill-conceived, IMO. I live in Barton Hills. There are no sidewalks or other infrastructure to accommodate 3 families where there once was one. There is no parking. The nearest bus stop is 1/2 mile away. It is already dangerous on the street as is with the constant mansion building construction traffic, that my grandchildren and the children on the block must be very careful. Adding cars on the street and tripling the children shooting hoops or throwing a ball around is frankly unreasonable. If you want housing, condemn property and build multi family properties where public transit can find them. Street address: [REDACTED] Council District: 5	10/19/23	Email
What areas of Austin will be effected by the proposed amendments? [REDACTED]	10/19/23	Email
Hi Jordan, I am interested in the changes the city is making to the Land Development Code and would like any updates or notices that are available about it. I received some purple cards in the mail saying I should email you for the information. Thank you, [REDACTED]	10/19/23	Email
Not in favor of this idea at all!! Austin is not CA stay true to our city culture and do not make the mistakes CA did. Do not approve	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
Texas is big, why don't we build a new city and connect to Austin?	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
2 points of extreme importance: Increased density comes with disappearance of our urban forest, this includes much more than "heritage trees". If we allow more built surface area, we must enforce our current tree removal code (currently ignored by builders who fell trees left and right, then pay fines if reported), and add tree planting requirements (and enforcement) to construction permits. Secondly, we must change driveway code to pervious. Gravel driveways and other solutions.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
2 points of extreme importance to this resident: Increased density comes with disappearance of our urban forest. This includes more than "heritage trees". If we allow more built surface, we must enforce our tree removal code (currently ignored) and add tree planting requirements. And enforcement! Secondly, we must change driveway code to require drainage area. Bring back gravel and use other materials rather than cement.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment

From what I can tell in the provided documentation, these changes do not include modifications to the impervious cover restrictions for a single-family lot. In my opinion, that renders these changes useless for smaller lots. If the goal is to provide higher housing density and lower housing costs, the impervious cover maximum needs to be increased. Real estate in Austin is so expensive that these changes will only benefit the wealthy, unless you allow these changes on smaller lots.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
Any change allowing for greater residential density should provide that permits will not be issued for developments that will or may impede ingress and egress to the affected neighborhood, present obstacles to emergency response vehicles (including firetrucks and EMS vehicles), cause there to be insufficient water pressure for addressing fires, exceed sewage treatment capacity, exceed utility capacity, or exceed established limits for impervious cover. No variances allowed for these.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
Lot size determine the atmospheric quality of a neighborhood. Density invariably imposes greater traffic, stress, noise, crime, litter and other negative side effects.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
RV's are not designed for full-time habitation and don't meet building code. As these units age, they will be a blight on our city.		
Unrestricted occupancy is a pending disaster, we have certificate of occupancy and fire codes for a reason. This sacrifice of quality for quantity, will end up in the courts - COUNT ON IT		
I am 100% against the change in SF zoning. 1) All utilities would be effected by adding more demand on an already taxed infrastructure. Electric, water, wastewater would be stressed to accommodate a greater density of housing and people that was not designed in the original plans. 2) Off site parking for the greater number of vehicles would stress the smaller width of roads within neighborhoods. 3) The easements for most yards would be violated. 4) The unsightly view of RV's, my gosh.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
Are the meetings going to be televised or online?	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
Will this code change apply to my community? Balcones Village. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Austin 78750	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
I oppose these amendments. They will overcrowd the streets with cars and the neighborhoods with people. With this illegal immigration, criminals will be our neighbors. This will reduce the houses property value. I do not see the purpose. But if it is to help people to have a place to live, this will ruin the decent living of all. Help to create jobs for them and build them houses outside of Austin or do the amendments only in the houses of those who are proposing these amendments.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment

I'm trying to submit comments on this website (https://www.speakupaustin.org/v1473) about the proposed changes to the Land Development Code, but the website functionality to attach files is broken. I am trying to attach a text file in TXT, PDF, or DOCX format, all of which are extremely common file formats, but the website blocks the attachment with the message "You can't upload files of this type." Please repair the webpage so users may upload files in commonly accepted text formats. Thanks.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
Will these new regulations supersede deed restrictions?	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
I will be attending one of the planning meetings. I want to voice my support for the proposed changes to the Land Development Code	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
Absolutely NO to RV's and mobile homes being allowed on current SF lots. They are not compatible to existing SF neighborhoods.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
Require 1 off street parking space for each bedroom existing or added. We do not need bicycles pushed into traffic if the streets are lined with curbside parking. Curbside parking is already causing congestion on most of Austin's narrow streets.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
I just want to say that I actively appreciate this amendment, having a large underutilized back yard, I'd love to establish a tiny home for visitors, but always stopped trying when I looked in to it and realized zoning was a problem. Also one day I'd like to get an RV and being able to have it on my property seems great. I appreciate the willingness to let me enjoy my home and property in the manner I'd like to. I'm sure you'll hear disgruntled people, but just wanted to say thanks for trying!!	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
I am OPPOSED to the proposed changes to the City Code proposed by Council member Pool. Obviously, no prior research has been done to analyze the IMPACT on city infrastructure, or the Climate impact due to loss of TREES cut down to allow the additional units to be built. As a former member of the Parks Board, Planning Commission, Water/Wastewater Commission, and Environmental Board, I am really horrified by the Pool proposal. Please REJECT these dangerous and destructive proposals.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
I just wanted to let the City Of Austin the development services organization, and the Austin city Council that I am supportive of all of these proposals.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
Just want to know approximately how long it takes, if it passes, that the code could be part of the Austin Code by law? Just want to know since our development pending on timeline of the decisions	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment

NOBODY WHO IS ACTUALLY FROM AUSTIN WANTS THIS CHANGE!	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>So-called "development" has only brought Austin abnormally high rents, a homeless crisis, and a loss of culture. This city kind of sucks now, and I've been here 20 years and never thought I would say that.</p> <p>Allowing even more people in a small area is going to exacerbate the problems development has brought us.</p> <p>Is city council doing backroom deals with land developers? It looks like it. I will encourage local news to investigate.</p>		
I am concerned that eliminating the restriction on unrelated adults in a housing unit will lead to homes that are being used like frat houses or dorms. Removing the restriction is likely to lead to overcrowding and noise issues. The city already is not enforcing noise ordinance issues so this is likely to increase noise issues. Allowing RV's and tiny homes can pose a problem if the issues surrounding electricity and sanitation are not properly addressed. How will this be addressed?	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
How will the regulations to properties with 2 housing units change? That is not clear.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
No to the proposed amendments to the Land development code. Parking, impervious cover, privacy, garbage collection, traffic on streets which are already a mess for movers, workmen with bicycle lanes, trees, noise pollution with ac, Seems developers will have a great time.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
where can I read the changes being considered regarding RVs ? I am Not In favor of people living in RVs in driveways.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
The Pulic Notice I received states that this site has information for submitting a written protest. I cannot find that. Can you help?	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
Deed restricons are more than limits on what an individual owner can do with their property. They also inure to the benefit of all property owners in that subdivision who rely on those recorded restricions to preserve the architectural character of the subdivision. As such, they are interests in real property. As such, I believe that the Texas and United States constitutions prohibit the City of Austin from removing these restrictions.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Change in coding for new, existing & developed property? 3) Someone sells their house in current code area, can new owner divide into multiple housing? 4) BIG mistake-removing all limits on number unrelated adults living in 1 house unit! Problems now with rentals w/too many living in 1 unit!!! 5) Grandfather codes for existing property lots? <p>Very against this LD Code Change! Too many unknowns, loop holes, & changes look and feel of exiting areas which reduces property value!!</p>	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment

Three dwellings per single-family crowds more people together, aggravating the ability of neighbors to coexist peacefully. Noise and crowding contribute to social ills in big cities; why go there? Also, the use of RVs as permanent living spaces is ill-thought out. These vehicles are intended for temporary use, and begin to deteriorate in much less time than a permanent structure. Ever seen an RV park after a major storm, or stayed in 1 in winter? Who/how will empty sewage tanks?	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
We are opposed to this Code Amendment.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
I vehemently disagree with this path forward. This would retroactively change the character of existing communities and is in direct conflict with existing Homeowner's Association rules in many neighborhoods. If the City desires to change this, it should be a stand alone zoning category that must be applied for with redevelopment and proceed through existing re-zoning pathways. Retroactively changing Single Family zoning is not supported in my community.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
I am against these changes. My neighborhood is already dense enough as it is. This change will not benefit homeowners, it is only a power play being lobbied for by corporations that intend to buy up properties, build multiple housing units, and rent them for exorbitant prices. This will only drive up overall home prices which are already incredibly high and reduce actual home ownership by individuals.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
This sounds like nothing a single family home owner would be in favor of. I believe this would devalue my property and increase density. Who exactly instigated this and what is the value proposition for existing homeowners and taxpayers who you represent. The information on this web site tells us next to nothing. Please elaborate why this is needed and who stands to gain by the change.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
I fully support these changes. We need to allow for denser housing in Austin if we want to stabilize housing prices in central Austin.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
I have lived in the Oak Forest/Balcones Oaks neighborhood for over 40 years, I oppose to the proposed code amendment that allows 3 units to be built in a single family lot, including TH and RV	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
I support the changes. Zoning is theft from property owners and restricts where people may live. Anything that makes zoning looser is better, and lowers rents.	10/19/23	PublicInput Comment
My husband and I are long term Central Austin residents and healthcare providers. We vehemently OPPOSE these proposed code amendments. It appears that the City of Austin is selling off to developers at an alarming rate with no regards to the residents or to the environment. I would like to see an environmental impact study showing how this is even feasible. This rash decision based on economics sounds similar to the Zilker Park proposal that was rejected. VOTE NO for our future!!	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
I oppose the changes.	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment

As a home owner in north central Austin, I see the proposed changes to the development code as a fundamental threat to the 1) safety related to parking, pedestrians, and cycling 2) affordability relating to sky-rocketing proposed taxes 3) general character of the existing neighborhood. Its not the duty of the Austin City Council to try to solve affordability issues associated with housing. I look forward to joining litigation efforts against these unlawful code amendments.	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
The proposed changes should not apply to my neighborhood (Barrington Oaks). The changes--especially as to the number of housing units per SF property and the number of unrelated adults living in a unit--would lead to a drop in property values, which is a direct economic harm to the existing homeowners.	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
Please consider PROHIBITING parking on the street in neighborhoods when updating the land development code. The proposed code change allows property owners more flexibility to build housing structures, thus increasing the population and the number of vehicles in neighborhoods. Prohibiting street parking encourages property owners to also address where additional residents store vehicles, thus keeping streets safer for these new Austinites. Vehicle management must accompany updates to the LDC.	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
We do not want the proposed land use zoning proposal currently being proposed	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
We oppose the current proposed land zoning ordinance. It would have negative implications for austin	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
I am against this coding change. My neighborhood should not be carved up like a turkey. It is Not o.k. to call RV's livable homes. Fire hazards. Parking on a neighborhood street for 9 + adults is a ridiculous concept. I vote democrat-but Will Not vote anyone back in who supports this.	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
I am a long-time home owner in East Austin and am in favor of: Allow up to three housing units, including Tiny Homes and Recreational Vehicles (RVs), on a Single-Family (SF) zoned property; Revise regulations that apply to a property with 2 housing units; and Remove restrictions on the number of unrelated adults living in a housing unit. Thank you, [REDACTED] 78722	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
I oppose rezoning lots to increase density. Already our lot floods from the lack of impervious cover with new developments. My daughter's house floods now with even moderate rain from runoff without needed storm sewers. I am equally opposed to allowing RVs to be used as rentals. We spent our life savings in order to own our single family home. This will greatly increase property taxes reducing current affordability for renters. Only developers will gain from proposed changes.	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment

I'm very against the zone changes. Affordable housing is important, but not at the expense of neighborhoods. This will destroy the culture and relaxed nature of neighborhoods with traffic and reduced green space. Additionally, it will create huge environmental and impervious cover issues that have not be addressed, resulting in increased flooding for existing homes. This is a win for developers and hurts families. There are other ways to promote affordable housing.	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
I am a resident of District 10 and fully support the proposed changes. Increasing density is the most direct path to addressing the affordability crisis and alleviating the sustainability impacts of increased sprawl. It is critical that the increase in allowable housing units is also prioritizes the urban infrastructure that greater density will rely on - namely sidewalks and pedestrian / cycling safety.	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
We are residents of Barton Hills and are against this proposal to allow up to 3 units on a single-family zoned property. It would completely change the neighborhood if 12 homes on our street suddenly became 36 homes. It would likely cause parking issues and potentially overcrowding in the schools. We hope the city reconsiders this idea. At the very least, start with allowing one additional unit, not three!	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
I do not support proposed changes to LDC except for one: allow ONE tiny homes to be used as additional ADU on SF zoned lots in addition to ADUs currently permitted under the CURRENT land development code. This will allow for additional affordable housing with minimum impact on the neighborhood. Insufficient parking and elimination of sunlight and privacy due to OVER density creates an unhealthy environment for everyone. Current restrictions were adopted for reasons that are still valid.	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
Densification doesn't make Austin more affordable. What it does is permit mega-corps to transform lots so they can pull in more cash per lot. It's shrinkflation, but for real estate. People pay more for less. Also, densification alone doesn't necessarily enhance walkability or curb urban sprawl. Rather, it's the presence of small, locally-serving businesses within walking distance that primarily fosters such outcomes. Therefore, the focus shouldn't be on increasing densification, but rather	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
Densification alone doesn't necessarily enhance walkability or curb urban sprawl. Rather, it's the presence of small, locally-serving businesses within walking distance that primarily fosters such outcomes. Therefore, the focus shouldn't be on increasing densification, but rather on eliminating restrictions that hinder small businesses from establishing and operating within neighborhoods at a walkable distance.	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
How to protest this?	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment

<p>I am opposed to allowing up to 3 housing units, including Tiny Homes and RVs, on a SF zoned property. Don't RV's need water and wastewater connections? I am opposed to RV's being permanently parked on the street. Our neighborhood is already lacking street parking because of 1 car driveways.</p> <p>Opposed to Revised regulations that apply to a property with 2 housing units;</p> <p>Opposed to Removing restrictions on the number of unrelated adults living in a unit, unless additional parking is provided.</p>	10/20/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I am opposed to code changes that would allow an increase in the number of unrelated people in a home. Currently at 1414 North St there is a huge new construction with individual door codes on the rooms. It hasn't sold, as it is clearly a stealth dorm. These properties would increase foreign investment in what would essentially be apartment or dorm living in a residential neighborhood.</p> <p>The Austin market is no longer overheated and properties are not selling. Any code changes at this point in time would feed foreign investment.</p> <p>A change to allow 3 living structures will further decimate the tree canopy and grassland, leading only to an acceleration in global warming. Was it not hot enough last year?</p> <p>The real estate industry wants what it wants, but it is not relevant to our current economic and climate situations.</p> <p>Regards, [REDACTED]</p>	10/21/23	Email
<p>Please remove [REDACTED] from your list. He does not live at this address and I have no reason to receive this mail from the City of Austin Planning Dept.</p>	10/21/23	Email
<p>All 3 props explicitly violate the covenants of neighborhood character & Nat'l register voted and approved on in the LHD/Travis Heights historic district. RVs and unlimited # of adults in single unit espec appalling; already chaotic. Where is discussion of impervious cover?</p>	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>As an Austin resident of 39 years and a homeowner for 38 of those years, I happily support these changes. More density is OK by me. We need to create opportunities for young people to be able to afford homes in Austin! These seem to me to be good, practical first steps.</p>	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Terrible idea</p>	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment

<p>More affordable housing is needed to allow people to live in Austin. The vibe of Austin will change if people can only afford a \$500k home. Government workers and teachers won't even be able to live here, let alone all the musicians that can't live the music capital of the world.</p> <p>Making more affordable housing close to the heart of Austin will endure the culture we all came here to live and contribute. The people that are vested in this community clean Town Lake and volunteer at fests.</p>	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I have lived in a SFR neighborhood since 1987. Right now, I am dealing with multiple renters living in neighboring SFRs and, because of that, there is more traffic and more parking on the street. I bought my house on a cul-de-sac for safety. Now, there is double or triple the traffic I used to have. If developers are allowed to build three residences on each small lot, the parking and traffic problems will become much, much worse. Please help us keep our neighborhood safe!!!</p>	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Will these amendments supersede HOA regulations?</p>	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I am against these code amendments. The City should place dense housing near transit instead.</p> <p>This proposal is harmful to children. It will place more cars on streets, cause destruction of trees, and create a hostile environment for kids. This will cause a new segregation between young, wealthy people in the city center and families moving to the suburbs for safety reasons. This is going on in Portland today.</p> <p>I want Austin to be a safe place for children, a place they can call home.</p>	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>We need more density, especially in central areas. I support these changes.</p>	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>We are residents of Zilker Neighborhood and are against this proposal to allow up to 3 units on a single-family zoned property. It would completely change the neighborhood. It would likely cause all kinds of unforeseen issues. We ask that you please immediately throw out this idea.</p>	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I oppose proposed SF lot code changes. Subdivision Restrictive Covenants prohibit RVs on SF lots as it is not appropriate in a neighborhood & negatively impacts home values. RVs lead to transient occupation which is not conducive to a family-oriented community environment. A neighborhood is not the place for a mini RV park. To allow 3 tiny homes on a SF lot usurps the intent of a "single family home" lot. How many structures one can pack on a SF lot should not be the overriding goal for land use</p>	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment

This zoning change will be highly detrimental to Austin & its residents. We do NOT need denser development. Our power grid cannot handle the current load. We do NOT have the water to accommodate this level of population density. Our water source is currently 76% EMPTY. The city must stop or slow this unchecked growth, as we do NOT have the resources to support it. Please stop this proposed zoning change to eliminate Single Family Housing. Homeowners deserve to retain the type of home they purchased	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
I am opposed to these code changes as a 34 year resident of this neighborhood. The code change does not consider the negative impact on existing residents that ensue with greater population density, impact on the environment, added vehicles, drainage, safety of children to enjoy outdoor play, and market values of homes. Clearly this council is pro increasing the tax base for the city without respect for quality of family neighborhoods being preserved.	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
I am against the proposed changes to the City of Austin Land Development Code. Allowing 3 housing units on SF zoned property will have many negative impacts such as 1. Reducing impervious cover and decreasing aquifer recharge 2. Increasing automobile usage which will increase air pollution 3. Increasing school overcrowding 4. Reducing vegetation which will have harmful consequences to wildlife 5. Straining emergency service 6. Straining City's electric, water, and sewer infrastructure	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
We do NOT want changes to the Land Development Code which may allow up to 3 housing units including Tiny Homes and RVs on a Single Family Zoned property. Additional population density will create even more traffic congestion and will ruin the culture of our historic city. Please listen to the voice of your constituents. Thanks for your support. Concerned resident, [REDACTED]	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
Please stop all of re- zoning effort. It is a quality of life issue.	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
To whom it may concern, I worry about the proposed code amendment for the area around June Dr near Barker and Dessau. I am concerned about more traffic and trouble with utilities.	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment

Very much against this proposal, and I know many friends and neighbors who agree. Please, please, please do not pass this. There are better ideas than packing people on top of each other. Austin is already maxing out on resources - grid, water, parking, etc. when there are plenty of other parts of the region with space and land. This idea is not a solution to the growing population and infrastructure issues. This beautiful area and city is being destroyed by builders.	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
I strongly oppose this proposal to allow up to 3 dwellings on a single family lot. The city council encourages large companies to move here, bringing thousands of new residents to our city, but then they complain that we need more infrastructure and higher density housing. So, the corporate owners get richer while we citizens in the lower and middle income neighborhoods are told that we have to allow more people to live (mostly rent probably) next door to us. BAD IDEA!	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
I am opposed to the densification of core neighborhoods as the proposed phased plan will drive. Look anywhere in the core neighborhoods of the 78704/District 5 and you see what 4,000 to 5,000 square feet of housing on a sub 10,000 square foot lot brings. I understand densification means building up but there is not enough up to responsibly develop a sub 5,000 square foot lot much less a 2,500 square foot plot. I do not think existing infrastructure could support what this plan will bring.	10/21/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Dear Jordan Geldman,</p> <p>I received the City's Public Notice on this issue. The card did not explain why this change is necessary. Could you email me the reasons for the changes? I oppose the RV inclusion because it brings a lot of issues with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allows non-residents to park their RV'S on lots without any fees. 2. Where will the sewage from the RV's go and who will pay for that disposal? 3. You could end up with a mini-trailer park without any restrictions for sewage, water, etc. <p>Too much to regulate and enforce the RV's.....mini-houses ok, RV's no.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	10/22/23	Email
<p>Please explain how RVs on urban lots solve any problems. How will water and waste water issues be handled? Do RVs pass fire codes for urban living?</p> <p>Also, how will changes to the land development code affect property taxes.</p> <p>Thanks for your response.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	10/22/23	Email

What are the current restrictions on the number of unrelated adults living in a housing unit? What exactly is an unrelated adult?	10/22/23	PublicInput Comment
The proposed code amendments are too broad to offer meaningful feedback. As they are stated, I object to all 3 proposals, not because I am against density, but because I see enormous problems and issues. Who wants a neighbor with ill-kept RV in their front yard? Where will additional inhabitants of existing neighborhoods park? Who will pay for needed city services such as electric, sewer, water, gas? This plan is just bonkers.	10/22/23	PublicInput Comment
Does the proposed changes supersede the deed restriction covenants of an HOA?	10/22/23	PublicInput Comment
You fools trying to make this place like Beijing or what? We bought our single family homes in neighborhoods for a reason.... and now your dumbass wants to ruin it. Slowly ruining this city - time to resign. City is slowly going to shit.	10/22/23	PublicInput Comment
I am writing in support of these changes. We need more housing and more housing density to lower rent & housing prices, reduce sprawl, and mitigate climate change.	10/22/23	PublicInput Comment
I oppose these changes to residential properties. With more density, the less water can reach our aquifer, Plus if the water has nowhere to go, flooding will occur. Austin and surrounding areas are not like the East Coast regarding water. Google How do Aquifers Work a film by Texas Water Development Board. Lake Travis 34.4% full, Highland Lakes 38%, Edwards Aquifer is refilling at 16% of what it should be. Postpone development till water levels have risen. Can't live here with NO WATER.	10/22/23	PublicInput Comment
Completely against this proposal, it will denegate the existing housing market in the suburbs. We as homeowners did not buy our houses to exist next to mass housing overcrowding units, we bought under the pretense of normal individual family homes to create a neighborhood with unity of community. I do NOT support this proposal in any way, whatsoever.	10/22/23	PublicInput Comment
I am strongly opposed to removing restrictions on the number of unrelated adults living in a housing unit, and I am opposed to allowing up to 3 housing units on SF zoned property. Our neighborhood is already overrun with airBNB and other short-term rentals.. These short-term rentals are commercial endeavors; they are not run by people in the neighborhoods who have to live near them. Put your efforts into creating affordable housing, not into making neighborhoods party and tourist sites.	10/22/23	PublicInput Comment
Do NOT allow more homes and residents per property. We do NOT have the required infrastructure. Austin has plenty of housing opportunities to the north, east and south to expand. We live near downtown and traffic and parking are impossible. We are overusing the parks. We are having an energy crises. We have no subways, trolleys, trains etc. We cannot sustain this potential increase in density.	10/22/23	PublicInput Comment

<p>I have comments! I've lived in Austin since 1982. I live north central, between Lamar and Burnet, Koenig and Anderson. By allowing 3 structures (or RVs or tiny homes) to a lot, you are increasing impervious cover, parking and traffic problems and packing our neighborhoods. We still need single home neighborhoods to retain our Austin character. Please do NOT allow 3 "homes" on a lot, even 2 is too many. 2ndly, removing restrictions on the number of unrelated adults in a home is a bad idea.</p>	10/22/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>To: The City of Austin and the Austin City Council</p> <p>In City Council Resolution No. 20230720-126 ("the Resolution") adopted on July 20, 2023, the City Council, without prior notice to or consultation with property owners, initiated amendments to Austin's land development code that will change the regulations or zoning district boundaries on or affecting my property and surrounding property in ways they have not fully disclosed. This has compelled me to protest against any change in the zoning classification, district, or regulations in effect on the date of my signature pertaining to my property and all property located within 200 feet of my property.</p> <p>I am the owner of the above-described property and my protest includes any changes to zoning regulations proposed pursuant to or described in the Resolution, whether those changes are implemented through one or multiple ordinances or code amendments, including the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reductions in the minimum lot size in single-family zoning districts • Increases in the maximum number of housing units per lot in single-family zoning districts • Creation of a three-family residential use in single-family zoning districts • Modifications to the following site-development standards in single-family zoning districts: setbacks, height, impervious cover, floor-to-area ratio, Residential Design and Compatibility Standards, and minimum site area and building coverage requirements. <p>I also protest any changes to regulations in effect on the date of my signature pertaining to my property and all property located within 200 feet of my property that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow the use of Recreational Vehicles (RVs) as a permitted residential use in single-family zoning districts or • Change or eliminate the dwelling unit occupancy limit for residential uses in residential zoning districts. <p>Street address: [REDACTED]</p>	10/23/23	Email

Is it enough to just check the boxes on the petition form, or do I also have to write in a separate reason that I am protesting the changes?

10/23/23

Email

Thank you for your help with this question,

[REDACTED]

I am unclear on who may sign one petition.

10/23/23

Email

The instructions say a property owner protesting zoning changes to their property or a property within 200 feet of theirs.

1 - Page 1 of the Petition has date plus individual phone number and email, as well as 5 check boxes.

2 - Page 2 of the Petition has a place to state reasons for the protest.

Then Page 2 of the Petition has multiple lines for names and addresses.

The instructions and items 1 and 2 above suggest one property owner should fill out one form.

Also, do a husband and wife fill out separate petitions?

However, the multiple lines on Page 2 suggests one person could fill out Page 1 and many others could sign in agreement.

What is the correct way to file the Petition?

Thanks for assistance - I'm sure you all are very busy.

[REDACTED]

Hello,

10/23/23

Email

I live in 78756 and I support ALL the proposed Land Code changes. I do not believe in the status quo of our neighborhoods. If Austin does not evolve and adapt to the needs of the existing population we will become like other cities that are completely unaffordable for even high income workers & families.

Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

<p>Hi, I'd like to file a zoning protest but don't have access to a printer to print out the form and am unable to get a printed form at the site listed on Austin's website due to transportation restrictions.</p> <p>Can I get a form mailed to me?</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	10/23/23	Email
<p>I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed changes to the Land Development code pertaining to single family (SF) zoning. Adding multiple units and families to an SF zoned lot will have a negative impact to the affected communities by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing stress on existing infrastructure. - Causing safety issues related to fire evacuation. - Decreasing property values. - Increasing environmental damage. <p>I urge you to not adopt the proposed changes.</p>	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I understand you can allow up to three houses on your property. I understand this proposal allows optional rezoning and that the home owner is not required to add housing units.</p>	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Question about Two-Unit - the draft ordinance says "May not exceed a height of 30 feet or is limited to two stories" - would this allow a housing unit above a detached garage which is more than 10 feet away from other structure? I'm hoping the answer is Yes, we can build a housing unit above a detached garage. What does "limited to two stories" mean? If the garage occupies the bottom floor and the living unit occupies the top floor - does that qualify? (I'm hoping for a yes)</p>	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Hello, I live in 78756 and I support ALL the Land Code changes. If Austin does not evolve and adapt to the needs of the existing population we will become like other cities that are completely unaffordable for even high income workers & families.</p>	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Allow single family homes to add one ADU - yes, with sizing restrictions. RVs - no. Deed restrictions should be honored and respected. The limit for unrelated people should be kept as is since it's already too many. You open the door for all kinds of illegal activity and unsafe situations for children by getting rid of how many unrelated people can live in a home.</p>	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I'm a disabled veteran have heart disease, knee injury, bad ankle, high blood pressure and getting injections for severe back injury I can't make the meeting but would like information pertaining to this it is very important information I need to be aware of and prepare that for all and any information that will help me thank you and God bless</p>	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment

I support this proposal. It should help to bring down housing costs, and make our city more bicycle, pedestrian, and public transit friendly.	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
My question, to all concerned Council Members and City Planners, is where is the infrastructure and more importantly the water coming from for this type of density? We heard all summer about the fragility of the Electric Grid??? Austin schools, water lines, power lines, sewer lines, and storm sewers, in older neighborhoods are not built for this density. Streets are not wide enough for safe passage in many neighborhoods. Have any of you heard of global warming? No water no Austin!!!	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
I have no problem with the proposal to allow up to 4 units on SF zoned property, but am very much opposed to allowing occupied RVs on residential lots. RVs are not designed or intended for permanent occupancy, cannot be legally connected to municipal water and wastewater service under the Plumbing Code, and should be limited to legally permitted campgrounds and RV parks.	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
I oppose Council Member Pool's resolution converting single-family zoning into multi-family zoning. It is not what the community wants, and it will displace families and destabilize long-standing neighborhoods. This widespread change is simply the deregulation of our communities. We want to participate in decisions about the future of our neighborhoods.	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
The current regulation also states, "At least one of the two units must have a front porch that faces the front street . . ." Many homes don't have porches these days. Why not change the word "porch" to "door"? Why is the minimum lot size for SF-1 remaining at 10,000 sf? (Two and Three Units and Occupancy Limits Muni Code Version, p. 13.) Why eliminate the McMansion standard with respect to the proposed changes? Don't we want to keep the homes from being very large, and therefore more expensive?	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
I strongly oppose this new measure. I would be fine with more duplexes or tiny homes in my single-family neighborhood with the proper oversight, but this measure contains no protection for trees or permeable cover or utilities and water drainage management, and I see Austin getting hotter and with more extreme storms in the near future. This measure is short-sighted and will make Austin a worse place to live for everyone. Please drop this idea as you dropped the Zilker garage. Thank you.	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
You propose to eliminate the requirement that a duplex share a ceiling, floor or wall; but it still has to share a roof, and the regulation still says: "The two units may not be separated by a breezeway, carport, or other open building element." If it has to share a roof, but doesn't include any of those elements, I don't understand how it could be designed. Why not eliminate one or both of these requirements?	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment

<p>Not enough space to ask my questions</p> <p>Are there ways to incentivize developers to build units for renters, i.e. to be purchased by a management company and rented out, as opposed to all of these units being built for homeowners? Why are you not including any such measures in this proposal to provide much-needed options for renters?</p> <p>You want to eliminate the requirement that a duplex share a ceiling, floor or wall; but it still has to share a roof Why not eliminate one or both of these requirement</p>	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>While I support the spirit of these measures to address Austin's housing and affordability issues, this plan absolutely cannot be implemented without a large scale, coordinated effort to improve availability and accessibility of public transit throughout Austin's cities and suburbs. Adding buildings to a single lot so 4-8 cars now need to be parked where 1-2 park? And drive? We need to increase housing while minimizing cars on our roads. Bike transit, buses, rail, all need to be increased.</p>	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>If not speaking at the joint meeting may a resident speak at the Coouncil meeting?</p>	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Hello, I live in S Austin, I am heavily in favor of updating the land code to allow more small homes on a single property. I have been looking for a way to get together with a small community to buy a property together and build tiny homes. we have run into speedbump after speedbump. The current code favors large expensive development that is unaffordable to most residents. This would allow more options at a lower cost.</p>	10/23/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Nothing is perfect! These amendments will contribute to a larger pool of affordable housing, and will help current residents stay in their homes. I will be proud of the City Council if it takes this action.</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>Rainey St Austin</p>	10/24/23	Email

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to the Land Development Code, which has been put forward for consideration. I believe that these proposed changes would have a negative impact on our community and should not be implemented for several compelling reasons.

10/24/23 Email

Lack of Transparency:

The proposed changes to the Land Development Code have not been adequately communicated to the affected community. Transparency is crucial in such matters, and it is essential that residents and stakeholders are well-informed and given the opportunity to provide meaningful input. As of now, it appears that the changes are being rushed through without proper public consultation.

Impact on Property Values:

The proposed changes could have a detrimental effect on property values in our neighborhood. Altering zoning regulations or land use policies without careful consideration can lead to decreased property values, which would negatively impact homeowners, many of whom have invested their life savings in their homes.

Environmental Concerns:

The potential environmental consequences of these changes have not been thoroughly studied or addressed. We need a comprehensive environmental impact assessment to understand how these changes may affect our local ecosystems, green spaces, and overall sustainability.

Community Character:

Our community is defined by its unique character, which includes architectural features, green spaces, and a particular way of life. The proposed changes may threaten the character of our neighborhood by permitting incompatible developments that do not align with our existing aesthetic and cultural identity.

Traffic and Infrastructure:

Increased development without concurrent improvements to infrastructure, such as roads, public transportation, and utilities, could lead to congestion, strain on resources, and decreased quality of life for residents.

Quality of Life:

Changes that lead to higher population density and greater urbanization could impact the quality of life for current residents. It is crucial to consider how these changes will affect the well-being of our community members.

In light of these concerns, I respectfully request that the proposed changes to the Land Development Code be reconsidered and that a more transparent and inclusive process is initiated. Public input, thorough impact

assessments, and a genuine consideration of the long-term consequences are essential before making any decisions that could significantly alter the fabric of our community.

I urge you to take these objections into account and ensure that any future changes to the Land Development Code prioritize the well-being and interests of the existing residents who Call this community their home.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your response and to the opportunity for our community's voice to be heard and respected.

[REDACTED]

I have some concerns about removing the restrictions on the number of unrelated adults living in a housing unit.

10/24/23 Email

I would like to know what can be done to eliminate/prevent the issues outlined below. If you are unable to address them, please direct me to someone who can. Providing contact information for the person to contact to get the information.

I understand the need to provide affordable housing and how critical the need is. I believe by giving these issue some forthought in the planning phrase will make it better for everyone.

Where there are an unlimited number of adults living in a unit it can increase risk for the area. I've lived in this area for over 40 years (old but not crotchety).

It will increase the number of cars on the street, in driveways and in front lawns. There are a number of streets where both sides of the streets are bumper to bumper parked cars and now only one way traffic can get through at a time. This increases the potential for accidents. If you live in the area you know to watch out for oncoming traffic when you turn on the street. Those unfamiliar may be traveling too fast and once they turn are immediately faced with an oncoming car.

Secondly it impedes fire trucks and emergency vehicles as well as the police access because they need to navigate around all the cars parked on both sides of the street. A fire truck may not be able to even get through.

With all the cars parked on the lawns, unsightly as it is, it creates a muddy/dusty front lawn devoid of all vegetation.

In addition to the traffic problems, with high occupancy it makes it harder for everyone to vacate in an emergency.

Increased adult occupancy has a tendency to increase crime and domestic violence. There is no place to go to cool down causing tempers to escalate.

Lastly, there will be an increase in trash that overflows the containers and smells bad especially during the hot summer months. If they get more trash cans where will they put them? In my situation they did get more trash cans but now they have to walk in my side yard to get around their trash cans and have destroyed all my grass.

Name(s): [REDACTED] 10/24/23 Email

Property: [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED]

To: The City of Austin and the Austin City Council

In City Council Resolution No. 20230720-126 ("the Resolution") adopted on July 20, 2023, the City Council, without prior notice to or consultation with property owners, initiated amendments to Austin's land development code that will change the regulations or zoning district boundaries on or affecting my property and surrounding property in ways they have not fully disclosed. This has compelled me to protest against any change in the zoning classification, district, or regulations in effect on the date of my signature pertaining to my property and all property located within 200 feet of my property.

We are the owners of the above-described property and our protest includes any changes to zoning regulations proposed pursuant to or described in the Resolution, whether those changes are implemented through one or multiple ordinances or code amendments, including the following changes:

- Reductions in the minimum lot size in single-family zoning districts
- Increases in the maximum number of housing units per lot in single-family zoning districts
- Creation of a three-family residential use in single-family zoning districts
- Modifications to the following site-development standards in single-family zoning districts: setbacks, height, impervious cover, floor-to-area ratio, Residential Design and Compatibility Standards, and minimum site area and building coverage requirements.

We also protest any changes to regulations in effect on the date of my signature pertaining to my property and all property located within 200 feet of my property that would:

- Allow the use of Recreational Vehicles (RVs) as a permitted residential use in single-family zoning districts or
- Change or eliminate the dwelling unit occupancy limit for residential uses in residential zoning districts.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

I'm for responsible density. However: What are the plans to expand infrastructure (water/sewer/electric) in line with increased density? Will the cost of expanded infrastructure be borne by all - i.e./developers, new and existing residents, etc.? What are current plans for heights? Respectfully, no heights above the current 2 stories should be allowed if they block sun from adjoining properties, especially where edible vegetation can grow. Thank you.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
Who will be enforcing the permitting of these units. I foresee RVs, broken down trailers and shoddy buildings being erected. Will community HOA restrictions trump new city building codes.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
I have no problem with the proposal to allow up to 4 units on SF zoned property, but am very much opposed to allowing occupied RVs on residential lots. RVs are not designed or intended for permanent occupancy, cannot be legally connected to municipal water and wastewater service under the Plumbing Code, and should be limited to legally permitted campgrounds and RV parks.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
We need to make these changes in the Land development codes because doing nothing is not helping the situation. Those that continue to be against changing zoning are being unrealistic and continuing to perpetuate the problem of housing issues in Austin.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
Will these proposed changes impact homes currently in deemed flood zone areas?	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
I support these impactful changes. We should be allowing more people to live in Austin, with more housing choices for various stages of life, at a variety of levels of affordability. Thank you for doing this important work.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
I am NOT in favor of re-zoning Austin's residential policies	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
I'd like to let the city council know that I support these amendments and the other amendments working their way through the process. I support and encourage all code amendments that reduce regulations that stand in the way of affordable housing and affordable commercial space for small businesses. Allowing neighborhoods to grow or shrink as needed provides communities with the development needed to serve them best.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
Please support and approve this amendment. The sprawl of 1950s style American suburbs has gone too far, we must change course before we become the next San Francisco. We cannot allow the same housing crisis here as there. We cannot afford to become the next Dallas and Houston, addicted to 26 lane highways that still take us 1-2 hours to get to work on. Please increase the housing options available in the city and help ease Americans into this uncertain future where cost of living is skyrocketing	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
I am FOR allowing up to 3 housing units on private property, including tiny (modular) homes. I am AGAINST Recreational Vehicles unless there is a time limit and that they must be in at least "fair" condition. Thank you	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment

I am a resident of Austin and have lived here my whole life. I am 100% in support of the proposed code amendments and any amendments that allow more housing and more density and a greater diversity of housing types. The massive single family zoning in Austin makes trying to find affordable housing nearly impossible, even working full time as a college graduate. We desperately need more and better housing and I am very in favor of the proposed amendments.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
The fact that most people have at least one auto, usually two, I can imagine housing structures on for sale standard residential lot, should pose some parking problems for the residences vehicles, (not enough room for drive ways) so naturally all the cars will be parking on the street, which with most subdivision, not all having wide streets, I would assume congestion and possible hazards to those trying to utilize sidewalks or bike lanes.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
I strongly support all of the "Phase 1 HOME Amendments" and the amendments to "remove restrictions on unrelated adults living in the same housing unit."	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
I greatly appreciate the city's effort to move forward the long overdue Land Development Code update.		
Regards, [REDACTED]		
I strongly DO NOT support the proposed code amendment to allow up to 3 housing units, including tiny homes on single family zoned property. This change would destroy the character and quality of austin neighborhoods. Also, the current city infrastructure is inadequate for this increase in density.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
The amendment SHOULD NOT be passed.		
Thank you. [REDACTED]		
We are extremely opposed to the changes to residential uses. Neighborhoods will totally change, and not for the better. Our home and neighborhood mean a great deal to us. Please do not make these changes.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
I oppose the changes to the building code that would change our neighborhood forever.	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment

<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to the Land Development Code. As of now, it appears that the changes are being rushed through without proper public consultation.</p>	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Impact on Property Values: The proposed changes would likely have a detrimental effect on property values, local ecosystems and overall sustainability, community character, traffic and infrastructure and quality of life. This proposed change will negatively impact the local community.</p>		
<p>I'm deeply in favor of this proposal. We MUST build more</p>	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Expensive housing economically paralyzes a nation</p>		
<p>It is theft from the next generation. I want my kids and their kids for the next 1000 years to be able to have something of their own</p>		
<p>I want to lose money on my home; it's for the good of the country</p>		
<p>A society grows great when old men plant trees in whose shade they know they will never sit</p>		
<p>If we don't build more, we'll become San Francisco, with everything that comes with it</p>		
<p>I live in a historical neighborhood this proposal changes the integrity the historic designation. These changes don't equate into affordable housing. All the new buildings in west campus have higher prices with significant increase in capacity. Also doesn't take into consideration the drainage issues in my neighborhood with all the new building. Austin has plenty of surrounding open space for new housing. Smaller footprint vs other larger TX cities. Can grow out vs ruining our current neighborhood</p>	10/24/23	PublicInput Comment

Hi City Council members,

10/25/23 Email

My name is [REDACTED]. I am currently living in the Far West Boulevard area. I support the HOME Act and other items like compatibility reform, eliminating occupancy limits, and eliminating parking mandates. The HOME Act is one solution to allow more middle class people to afford homes. By increasing the allowable units but keeping in place height limits, setbacks, and impervious cover, it would create limits on the size of new housing that could go on a lot. I also support lowering the minimum lot size. Smaller houses and more density (vs sprawl) would be much better for the environment, infrastructure, and accessibility to services. In the same vein as increasing more transportation options, possibilities for housing needs to be broadened.


With that being said, I know these measures are not targeting low-income people. I have a few concerns that I would like the council to be aware of when implementing this. I worry about displacement of low-income people, who often are BIPOC folks. I would hope that the city will track the new developments that utilize this change, the valuation of properties and the neighborhoods over time, and any demographic changes. The valuation of neighborhoods results in the increase of rents, which is also a problem that even middle-class Austinites are having a hard time with. These data points are important to understand the impact this makes, which will lend the city more information to move in a city where all income types can still afford to live here. I worry about land values increasing because of the ability to add more units on a lot, therefore making land more open for developers and real estate speculation, which has a cascade of negative impacts on lower-income folks. It would not be good for low-income folks if their neighborhoods and houses were viewed as "underutilized" land by developers and more development in those areas increased the neighborhood valuation. Furthermore, there is evidence that shows that trickle down housing happens (specifically for low-income owners) when more supply is created, especially in rapidly growing cities attracting higher income people. Developers are incentivized to make the most on their investments, which usually are buyers who will pay the most, and even smaller housing can be luxury housing.

I certainly support this on the basis that it is for middle-class people. There are many many aspects of this I support and there a lot of benefits to the HOME act and all the other items regarding this subject. I think the limits for house builds do create some boundaries that keep the house builds contained. I would hope the city also secures housing for low-income people at an aggressive rate and increasing public domain city housing programs.

In sum, I support the HOME Act. I would like to see city members pass it. I would like to see accompanying concern for displacement and aggressive acts for housing for low-income people as well.

Thank you,



<p>I'd like to see much more specificity around:</p> <p>Any limits to the number of vehicles per dwelling; if there are no limits, and a three-bedroom home with a two-car driveway has, say, nine single residents, where to the extra (up to 7+) vehicles park?</p> <p>Will single-family homes with multiple non-family residents need to upgrade HVAC?</p> <p>Any expansion of fire codes due to density? Who must comply? Denser housing or less dense (old uses and standards)?</p> <p>Any expansion recognition of increased load on water, wastewater, public access, or non-permeable cover?</p> <p>Any plans to increase public amenities like transit, fire/police stations, water, waste water, retention devices, parks, sidewalks, etc?</p> <p>Will more dense dwellings need to be updated to more stringent fire or building regulations?</p> <p>How do you plan to foster change that results in more housing becoming available at a lower cost to the resident? The vast majority of the people who want and need housing in the Austin metro area aren't interested in cramming more bodies into one dwelling, or in living in a tiny home or RV.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing a lot more about how we plan to make this a better Austin, not just a more dense Austin.</p> <p>--</p>  <p>Austin resident since 1971</p>	10/25/23	Email
<p>I can't make it to the hearings on these changes because I have little kids, but I am an Austin resident that supports these changes. I am lucky enough to own my home in a sweet neighborhood at Braker and 35. But my husband and I looked and made offers on homes for two years before actually getting one. Housing is really hard to come by, and I think these changes are a step in the right direction.</p>	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I support the proposed changes allowing 3 dwellings per lot with the exception that I do not/would not support recreational vehicles to be included. Any 2nd or 3rd unit on any lot should be carefully designed to fit into the physical fabric and character of the neighborhood and this doesn't include recreational vehicles.</p>	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment

Concern - PARKING! I live in Hyde Park and already we have too many cars parking on the street, no sidewalks and it's dangerous. Thinking you can allow as many bodies on a lot and NOT restrict parking is not smart. Because there are already so many cars (and trucks etc) on the side streets, walking	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
Unrelated adults: We live in a college town. Before we had that rule of allowing only 4 unrelated adults in a home, we had blowout parties on my street ALL THE TIME (Hyde Park) because allowing students to shove as many people into a home as they like DOESN'T WORK. We need rules that works for everyone. We had fist fights, arguments late into the nights, red solo cups tossed up and down the street every week when this was allowed. Fight me on this one - its a bad idea to remove that law.	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
RV's as living options: No - just no. You are ruining the fabric of Austin with this one.	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
The Proposed Code Amendment to Residential (R) zoning is a ill thought out and knee jerk reaction to the affordable housing issue. A best case scenario based on an average appraisal of \$300,000 would then require a conservative construction cost of \$150,000 per unit would result in a base cost of \$750,000. Carry cost during construction would add approximately another \$100,000 to the overall development cost. Ignore carry cos. \$233,000 per unit, 5 year carry=\$3,888/mo. Affordable housing!	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
I would like to strongly protest the planned City of Austin drastic changes to the Land Development Code. I am in a pleasant neighborhood and I don't want the City to start allowing RV's, little homes, and increased numbers of people living in the lots that are appropriate for a single family dwelling. I feel this will make the area look trashy and crowded. I feel it will destroy the charm of neighborhood. I feel once you have made this change it will cause problems you can't foresee!	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
I have been trying to get the COA to approve my permit to convert my garage to a studio for my aging mother to stay with us as the main house has stairs that leads to all the bedrooms. It has been a frustrating and expensive process. Passing this land dev code will be a blessing to immigrant families like mine who value multigenerational homes vs that of the traditional nuclear family. I want to be there for my mother and she wants to be there for my kids. Its a shame its so difficult now.	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
The City Council and Planning Commission should consider allowing HUD-Code Manufactured Tiny Homes on SF lots as they are permanent dwellings built to a federal code and have a state program that regulates their sales, installation, and inspection by the TDHCA. These homes are the most affordable market rate home construction available and are currently allowed as ADU's anywhere in California. There are lenders for these ADUs and they are taxable under the current property tax system.	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment

The removal of the 6-adult limit is unnecessary and detrimental to quality of life in our neighborhoods. The language is vague, and with the increase to 3 units per lot, could potentially lead to projects where more than 18 roommates are occupying a lot that was designed to accommodate a single family. The occ. limits were a successful low-effort solution to the problem of "Stealth Dorms" which have proven to cause problems with parking, especially. The 6-roommate limit is reasonable and just.	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
These proposed changes to the Land Development Code are absolutely ridiculous. Putting 3 homes on a lot that serves 1 home, eliminating requirements for setbacks, height, impervious cover and parking is a terrible idea and should not be passed. Does the city realize how existing older homes will be demolished and these subpar houses crowded on the lots. Cutting down all trees, no yards, having no setback where and where will all these people will park? DO NOT PASS THIS! Get input from citizens!	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
DO NOT PASS THIS LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE! It eliminates requirements for setbacks, height, impervious cover and doesn't provide for parking. The City wants to crowd 3 houses on a lot meant for 1. No trees, no yards, crowded inner city rather than our lovely Austin that values nature and landscape. No parking requirements - where will people park? And RVs are allowed with STR - this is the worst idea ever! De-regulating SF zoning without participation of people in the neighborhoods is not right!	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
Eliminating limits on occupancy is reckless/flawed, and will be disruptive for nearby families/children. This will effectively turn every house into a short term rental and will be impossible to regulate. And why would someone wanting to rent their house out for 2 weeks even need to get a city permit if there are no rules on occupants or how long people stay at properties? The people that will suffer most are those in low socioeconomic areas. This is a train wreck you can see from a mile away	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
I am eager for more missing middle-income housing opportunities in Austin. It is such an underserved market and anything we can do to help Austinites live happily and affordably should be something our whole city should get behind.	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
I was born in Austin over 50-years ago and have lived here since. I am not against growth, but I oppose City Council Resolution No. 20230720-126. This resolution is nothing more than the defeated and defunct Code Next rehashed with a different name and will only serve to enrich corporate interest at the expense of families and communities. I urge you to vote down this resolution and seek real solutions to address affordable housing, promote home ownership, and mitigate our increasing flood risk	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment

<p>Please reconsider the proposed changes to LDC. Every neighborhood in Austin is unique and has different residential uses and needs. However, it makes sense to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Allow multi-unit development adjacent to multi-lane roads, commercial property, and city, county, state land. *Allow duplex/two family development on property adjacent to multi-unit development and on corner lots. <p>Also, please maintain building cover, McMansion, STR, and "Stealth Dorm" rules. Attached is example of this change.</p>	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I object to all of the city council's proposed changes to the Land Development Code concerning RESIDENTIAL USES AND STANDARDS (INCLUDING HOME AMENDMENTS) because I do not trust the council and I do not believe the council will stop with these amendments but will persist until the have wiped single-family residences from the face of Austin and replaced them with massive apartment blocks and commercial or mixed-use megastructures, running off current constituents for future ones and developer \$\$\$.</p>	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Our family is excited for the potential to use our property more fully. Having the option to have a tiny home or rv with utilities gives us the flexibility we need to be able to continue to live and work in Austin, staying close to family and the community we love.</p>	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>As a central city homeowner, I STRONGLY oppose the proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for SF, and oppose the proposal to allow 3 units per lot. Texas State government will not allow Austin to regulate rent control nor short-term rentals in a way that would enable these proposals to meaningfully affect affordability. Instead, any densification resulting would increase impervious cover and cause further loss of the tree canopy, potentially leading to severe flooding and heat island effects.</p>	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>Affordability is not just about people looking for new places to live, but some people being able to stay in the places they've built their lives around. With property values and taxes ever increasing, an ADU may be an option that could allow people to monetize their property to allow them to stay and offer them an option to consolidate multi-generationally on one property to allow neighborhoods to stay intact.</p>	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I support these changes, and encourage City Council to go further. I am a homeowner who was born in Austin and over my life I have seen affordable housing options disappear, and my community move out of the city. Housing policy should not serve the interests of wealthy and well-connected, it should serve the majority of Austinites who are working people that rent. Please do not allow do-nothing NIMBYs to keep our housing policy stuck 40 years in the past, and make these urgent changes now.</p>	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment

My name is [REDACTED] I have owned over 15 properties in Austin. This change must happen as it will make Austin more Affordable for workers in Austin. This change will allow me to have the freedom to allow me to have ways to can additional revenue to pay for the high property taxes and also provide a lower rental rate to my clinets. Please pass this code.... it's great for Austin!	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
I'm a resident in the area and I can not make the meeting but I'm a 100% against increasing the resident restrictions in our neighborhood. The homes in our neighborhood should remain one home per household. There are enough multi-family apartment buildings recently built and continuing to thrive. We are suffering from limited parking as it is and a restructuring will make the problem worse without any set resolution.	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
We shall live in our home as long as we can, but your proposed changes make our neighborhood more crowded and less safe. As a 30 year Air Force veteran, we saved for years to buy a retirement home in a safe area. The proposed changes will create too many cars with no parking available and walking to our mail box will become dangerous. Walking for exercise will be dangerous for children, elderly, and handicapped. People will be forced to park on lawns. Our home will lose value as taxes go up!	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
Resident of North Austin and frequent participant in neighborhoods throughout midtown and uptown. The plan to allow three housing units per lot in Austin is a poor means of creating more affordable housing. It will have a tendency to overwhelm city departments (that are already failing to provide adequate service), put a much greater strain on existing infrastructure (water/ sewer/ electricity) as well as create dangerous and damaging streets due to inadequate parking, forcing street parking.b	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
Allowing an unlimited number of unrelated people will remove local authorities ability to remove collections of people engaging in illegal and illicit activity. It will encourage and embolden gangs and club members to exert strong handed control over peaceful people. In some areas, the worst it may do is make street parking so standard that walking or riding a bike is not safe or practical. The council's intent is understandable but needs different means. Resident of North Austin.	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
How does this proposed change to the land development code affect deed restrictions? What if a property's deed restriction does not allow more than one property per lot?	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment
As a Whisper Valley resident, a pocket community surrounded by economically challenged communities, I am against allowing 3 housing units including tiny homes and R.V.'s on a SF zoned property This is NOT what we paid for and will only drive the associated crime rate up, which we struggle to control as it is. Furthermore this is going to drive our property values down. This community is unique and a model for future sustainable living. Please don't amend the SF property to allow this!	10/25/23	PublicInput Comment

ALLOWING PERMANENT RV'S IN NEIGHBORHOOS IS A BAD IDEA. RV'S ARE NOT PERMANENT STRUCTURES. RV'S DEPRECIATE PHYSICALLY QUICKLY AND REQUIRE INENSE MAINTENANCE. THEY ARE NOT HOOKED UP TO CITY WATER & WW. THEY ARE AN EYESORE. THEY WILL REQUIRE INCREASED ENFORCMENT BY THE CITY TO INSURE THEY ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY. HOW DO YOU ENFORCE BUILDING STANDARDS ON AN RV WHICH IS NOT A BUILDING STRUCTURE? NEIGHBORHOODS WILL DECLINE WITH A BUNCH OF DILAPIDATED VEHICLES IN THE DRIVE

10/25/23

PublicInput
Comment

Dear Austin Planning Commission and City Council,

10/26/23

Email

I hope this message finds you well. My name is [REDACTED], and I am writing as a concerned Austin resident in District 1 to express my support for the proposed Land Development Code Amendments. I firmly believe that these amendments are a vital step in meeting our city's sustainability, climate, and walkable city goals, while addressing the pressing issues of urban sprawl and housing affordability.

Urban sprawl has become an increasingly detrimental issue for our beloved Austin and the state of Texas as a whole. Denser housing options can play a pivotal role in preserving our natural surroundings, protecting our trees, and curbing the relentless expansion that threatens to consume our beautiful city. Continuing the norm of single-family housing and urban sprawl is simply counterproductive in light of the challenges we face.

As a young homeowner who envisions a future in this city, I support these amendments because they offer me the possibility of building an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) as a safeguard against rising property costs and taxes. This kind of flexibility is crucial for individuals like me who are invested in the long-term health and sustainability of Austin.

However, I must express my disapproval of removing the limitations on "mcmansion" constructions. This action is contrary to the intentions of the amendment and could have detrimental effects on the character of our neighborhoods. I strongly believe there should be individual housing size limits in urban areas to maintain the integrity of our communities.

Furthermore, I emphasize the need for language within the code that prevents corporations from exploiting these changes for short-term rentals. This goes against the very essence of the proposed amendment and the reasons our City Council is suggesting it. These adjustments should primarily benefit our residents, not transient visitors.

I understand that some residents have reservations about this amendment's potential to improve affordability, and I sympathize with their perspective. While we all seek more affordable housing options, I see this code change as a crucial step toward this goal, not a hindrance. By allowing housing co-ops, tiny homes, and detached duplexes, we can create

opportunities for low and middle-income individuals to find more affordable housing options. These changes can also lead to stronger communities and foster various social benefits.

I would also encourage you to consider measures to address runoff issues, such as requiring or incentivizing new builds to have rainwater storage or green roofs. Protecting our trees is of paramount importance, as they play a significant role in managing runoff, mitigating the heat island effect, and promoting overall sustainability.

In addition, these amendments will contribute to addressing our city's housing crisis by adding housing units. Opposition that stems from a "not in my neighborhood" mentality is, in my view, classist and selfish and should not be the deciding factor in a decision that impacts our city's future.

I urge you to consider the broader picture, one where Austin remains a vibrant, inclusive, and environmentally sustainable city for all its residents. These amendments are a critical step towards that vision. I hope you will give them your full support.

Thank you for your time and dedication to our wonderful city.

Sincerely,




Austin, Texas
District 1 Resident

Lived here for 50+ years. I oppose the proposed changes. I sincerely believe this will NOT address affordability, but WILL increase the congestion that is strangling this city, pushing it past the carrying capacity of the land and services. We continue to PAY MORE for less and less. Austin is broken. This is not the solution.

10/26/23 Email

Honestly, at my age, I'm 70, this won't impact me .. but for future generations, I OPPOSE this change.



Hello City Planning Department,	10/26/23	Email
<p>I would like to go on record as being in favor of the proposed changes to allow better density within our City and improve traffic issues with reduction in long distance commuting. Ideally a better rail system would be included in this project. This also allows property owners more flexibility in how they want to manage their property to address the changing needs of our City. Many people are resistant to change but progress will prevail as it should.</p> <p>I own three properties within the Austin city limits and feel I have a vested interest. I want to stand against resistance the proposed changes will face. In summary I fully support the proposed the land development changes to allow flexibility.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> 		
I am very opposed to this change. Why do you think we need to cram in as many people as possible into Austin? The environment this change would create will put a knife in the heart of our city. There are tons of new apartments being built in or near South Austin right now. Build more downtown condos/apartments and put in a really public transportation system and become a real city.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I would like to have a recording of the meeting on 10-26-23 at 2:00 pm	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
As a residential architect, I serve Austinites day in and day out in trying to achieve their housing needs and desires. I can state emphatically that these changes would greatly benefit the property owners I serve. Many of them are desperate to meet the needs of their changing and aging families without being displaced. My only concern is with the use of RVs to meet those needs as many models tend to degrade quickly and become unsafe/unhealthy places to live. Thank you.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
In my 50 years in Austin, and my 45 years practicing Architecture here, we have never seen any changes to the LDC even close to as dramatic as the changes now being proposed. An issue this far-reaching SHOULD BE VOTED ON BY THE PUBLIC!!! Citizens deserve the right to determine whether they want changes this substantial to the neighborhood they chose to live in. PLEASE give the residents a chance to vote on this, instead of forcing it through. Thank you-	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I was scheduled to speak against the proposed property code changes to remove the limit on related adults & 3 homes per Sf & decrease the lot size but the area I live in was flooded. I did email my remarks to the council.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment

As an Austin resident, I am vehemently opposed to the proposed changes. This harms those of us with single family homes in neighborhoods, which drove our buying decision long ago. I will petition and vote against any council member that supports this proposal.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I strongly support this code amendment. There is a huge need for additional affordable housing in Austin and this amendment would help the City get there.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I am against subdividing lots into smaller parcels of 2,500 sq ft which will make neighborhoods more dense and less livable. Who will pay for the extra sewer and water lines needed? A new tap plan on our current build cost us 60k, making the cost of our project skyrocket. If the goal is more affordable housing, this won't be realized. There will be 3X as many trash cans out each week and there is already a problem with adequate parking. I am very against this proposal! Karen Smith Hyde Park	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I support all housing items. Please approve ASAP.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I am not for this proposal at all. As the owner and primary resident of my single family home, I do not see the benefits of this proposal. Allowing multiple homes to be put in a single-family lot size sounds ideal. However it opens a window For investors to create tiny home villages or even multiple Vacation rentals. As seen in the past these types of homes do not elevate the community or improve the housing issue.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
Where will they park?	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
Will they tie into current city water and septic, electric?	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
What is the advantage or disadvantage? To the power grid for example.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
To water shortages?	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
This doesn't seem like a great idea.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
How exactly are any of these changes going to shift market pricing? What historic model is being used to justify changes with the goal of affordability. To be clear, I am ALL ABOUT DENSITY and I do NOT believe there should be ANY limits on what you can do on land. I do not believe there will be any lowering of market pricing though.. just more availability for people that can afford to live in the city.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment

I have lived in Austin since 1966. I object to the proposal to allow 2 or 3 living units on a single-family lot. City streets in my neighborhood, and many others, are already clogged with parked cars. Older neighborhoods such as mine already have sufficient density. Austin's reputation as a livable city for families would come to be damaged if this change takes effect. Humans need space for lawns, trees, and plant beds to enjoy living in our neighborhoods. Don't ruin them, please.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
What about climate change? The proposed changes would eliminate trees and ground cover that we need to protect the environment. Council is two faced if they approve this proposal. Climate change issues should trump this. This will only make summers hotter than this last year.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I am adamantly opposed to the proposed CHANGES TO RESIDENTIAL USES AND STANDARDS. These type of changes should be decided individually, or at least by neighborhood. One size (ruling) does not fit all situations. I am concerned about the adverse impact this proposal would have on neighborhood traffic and parking, noise, crime, emergency response, property values and increased enrollment at already crowded schools. The way to create affordable housing is not by artificially reducing existing values.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
How will parking be accommodated? Crowded on my street already!	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I've lived in Austin since 1982. It once was a cool city with pride. It has sunken into a homeless camp and trash everywhere. This new ruling proposed is HORRIBLE!! I paid for my home to live in a single family subdivision not an apartment setting. I am very much against this proposal and I hope you will be too! Don't degrade Austin more by stacking people on top of each other.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
don't .. just don't	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I have worked hard to own a home in a neighborhood that I can have a feeling of security and the peace and quiet that we enjoy. Our home is considered one of our biggest assets in the event of either my husband or my death. By allowing this change, you open up our neighborhood to loud and over crowded homesites. You diminish our property values which in turn diminishes our investment for future needs. This will cause a great hardship on two people have worked hard all their lives to have a nest egg	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
Does the unrestricted number of residents revision apply to multi-family properties?	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
This is absolutely not okay. I understand that the city is trying to address a housing crisis that we have been heading into for years now, but the answer is not to pile more people into a smaller space. The answer is to make housing more affordable. Lower housing costs make living here in the homes already available more affordable. That's the direction I believe the city needs to go in, not densifying.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment

Don't like any of these ideas. How will people park if there are multiple family homes on a smaller lot? Only have a driveway and no yard? Parking on the street is not safe nor is there enough room to accommodate more cars in the same or a smaller area. If impervious cover is increased, the landscapes won't be able to support the trees we have left, so we should be ready to see energy demand climb in all seasons. And are we really ready for that? So much of this has NOT been thought through.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
Cramming more people into existing home sites does nothing to address affordable housing. All it does is allow housing to continue to increase while allowing residents to share that continuing housing increase amongst more family/friends sharing the same non-affordable house. This is maddening.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I think this is an imperfect plan that will produce more problems than benefits. If the city wants high volume housing then build it. Don't force low quality options on us. The immediate effect will be a parking issue. The long term effect will be environmental with less grass and natural areas to adsorb rainwater. It also reduces the number of trees in Austin to keep the air cleaner. My recommendation is to investigate the construction of 20 story apartment buildings downtown.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I agree with tiny homes, but not RV's setup on Single family lots. Many newer lots don't have width on either side to get an RV into the back yard, so then they would want them in driveways. Which then that would add more cars parking on the street. Need to keep limit on unrelated persons in single family lot. Each teen/adult typically has a car and then where do they park? On the street causing issue with traffic.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I have been a long time resident in Austin from 1987 and own many properties throughout Austin. I would like to put my support for the current Land Development Land Changes.... I support these changes for the following reasons: 1) Allows avenue for me to increase income to help support me in paying high property taxes 2) This will allow me to provide lower rental housing for lower income people and people working in the service industry THIS MUST PASS!!	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
Hi, My name is Deleigh Hermes and I am a Texas REALTOR and on two committees on the Austin Board of Realtors. I support the 3 units by right and the HOME initiative. Thank you to all of the City Council Members who came and spoke with ABoR today before the public hearing. We know your time is valuable and it meant a lot to us for you to take your time to sit with us. This is a very important issue to tackle and the next generations and the future of Austin counts on this.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I am opposed to the proposed change in zoning because this will not allow for affordable housing. Neighbors living on 31st 1/2 street living in 504 square feet already pay \$1200.00/month. Costs would only increase if existing dwelling were replaced by 3 new units. Heritage neighborhood.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment

Recreational Vehicles. How can these be seen as ADUs? There is no way to permanently tie them in to Austin Electric or our water/sewer system. Does Council propose having dump stations in the neighborhood? Building Code: I am all in favor of allowing ADUs to be built. However, I would hope that the City would apply the extensive Building Code requirements to these structures that they do to other residential buildings. RVs do not meet any minimum building codes.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
Would it not make it more problematic for emergency responders to get to the correct residence? How about firefighters putting out a fire when another home is out of view, and difficult to reach? I am totally opposed to this as it could be more dangerous for victims and first responders.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
We protest the new land code changes proposed by the city of austin. Our neighborhood had been established since 1980 and is zoned fir single family residences. We do not want to see changes that would downgrade our property values by RvS, crowding of small sheds fir living just to appease the city for affordable living options. These lots were built for one house only and would cause more stress on the electric/water usage built for those lots. This proposed change should be for new development	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I am against the changes. They will not effect cost of living in Austin but will increase property taxes for the owners.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
NO! I live in a quiet neighborhood. I want to keep it that way! The infrastructure can't keep up with the people that are already living here! You want MORE crowding and flooding? No Way!	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
Opoused	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
Occupancy limits -Austin should have health and safety limits on occupants based on sq- ft size of bedrooms and number of bathrooms. Houston, Dallas and San Antonio have health and safety maximums per bedroom. HUD is basically 2 per bedroom. Austin has what?	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
5-2-773 Duplex. Edits removes a height limit instead of adjusting it. Why? "Unlimited" is a drastic pendulum swing and shortsighted. It will ruin some neighborhoods for the wrong and unintended reasons. Limits must exist.		
We already have problems with unlimited number of adults living in a residential home. The cars are parked in the street making it difficult for trash removal. They park on the lawn. From my observation, they are more likely to speed through the neighborhood. A crowded area the more tension, more likely for adverse events. It's clear to me the Commission/City are NOT making decisions based on the will of the people of Travis County but on international agreements/models.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I don't want this change to the land development code. It will not make Austin Housing more affordable and no one will want to buy anything in Austin but only in the suburbs.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment

See attached comments.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
Can you please point me to a comprehensive plan which will outline the results of this increased density in single family neighborhood? Also please provide the 20+ year water and infrastructure plan to support this increased density. What are the plans to keep impervious cover restrictions to prevent catastrophic flooding? What are the plans to preserve heritage trees? What are the plans to preserve historic homes and neighborhoods?	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
<p>I OPPOSE any/all proposed changes to Land Development Code that increases the number of housing units allowed on a single-family zoned property.</p> <p>I also OPPOSE any/all changes to the regulations that apply when more than one unit is built on a single-family zoned property, allow for tiny homes and RVs in certain circumstances, and remove the restrictions on the number of unrelated adults living together.</p> <p>I OPPOSE any/all proposed changes to Land Development Code and underlying regulations</p>	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment
I am strongly opposed to all proposed Land and Development Code changes that have been outlined at https://publicinput.com/v1473 . I do not support my neighborhood becoming a trailer park with semi-permanent RVs in driveways and on the street. I do not support an increase of parked cars in driveways and streets when there is no restriction on the number of unrelated adults living in a housing unit. Austin will become dirtier with unkempt property from more transient residents.	10/26/23	PublicInput Comment

I want to express my opposition to allowing more tiny houses and RVs in neighborhoods. Here are my concerns:

10/27/23 Email

1. Where does the wastewater go from an RV or tiny home? Will they be able to temporarily tap into the City's wastewater lines?
2. If they cannot tap into the wastewater lines, then where do they deposit their waste? There are no public dumping stations at any City Parks and only one dumping station at McKinney Falls State Park.
3. How will these additional homes split utilities? How will they be billed and taxed for utilities?
4. Will each new living structure- tiny home / RV- be required to have additional trash cans?
5. This increased the impervious cover on each lot which intern causes less water absorption into the ground - which is especially important over the Aquifers.
6. Increased impervious cover also increased run off into already over burdened creeks and storm water drains. (Many neighborhoods such as mine that drains into the Walnut Creek Watershed do not have adequate storm drains.
7. Increasing the human density in a single family neighborhood also increases sound and lighting issues.
8. Increased impervious cover also increased heat island effects as trees and plants are removed from lots.

Thank you for hearing my concerns. And please do not allow this code amendment to move forward. It is not an answer to affordability and certainly does nothing for the quality of life for the residents in SF neighborhoods.

I also want to add this does not respect the hard work that middle class families have undertaken to afford a home in Austin that is not crammed up next to a bunch of people. This ordinance does not respect those values and work of thousands of people, like myself, who have worked my way from an apartment, to a duplex, to a small home, to a midsize home.

Quantity is quickly becoming the opposite of quality in Austin.

██████████ District 7
Resident of Austin 47 years

Council Member Ryan Alter,

10/27/23 Email

First of all, I am excited about HOME and the much needed flexibility it will provide.

I do have 2 specific concerns.

1. I do not think RVs in general will provide a safe or uniquely affordable permanent home. As an RV owner I know they require constant upkeep and special techniques to keep in good working order. Modular housing represents a better product at a lower cost over the life of it and is HUD/FHA approved which is important for any lending related to it. Additionally, RVs necessarily involve on site above grade storage of human waste. Once again, not an issue for the person ready to manage it, but probably not an ideal situation for a typical individual just looking for an affordable place to stay.

2. Regulations regarding utility hookups will need to be updated for the additional units or it will become cost prohibitive to add small units. The ability to tee a supply off before the meter as opposed to requiring a new tap reduces build costs 10 to 20k per unit. Additionally, ensuring that code allows for macerating toilets and grinder pumps to connect to existing sewer line will make quick addition of small houses fast and cost effective. Both of these practices are typically accepted plumbing practices. Thank you for considering these changes to regulation.

[REDACTED]
Bouldin Creek neighborhood, District 9
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

How were the locations for rezoning determined. I don't understand why [REDACTED] (my home) is included, but [REDACTED] is not included.
Thank you

10/27/23 Email

--
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This message is from [REDACTED]

10/27/23 Email

I saw the notice on the city website about the upcoming public hearings at City Hall regarding proposed land use and development changes the council is considering. The notice listed the following topics:

"The proposed amendments allow:

- Up to 3 residential units (including a small house + RV) allowed in a detached house zoned property
- The regulations that apply to properties with two houses are revised
- Restriction on the number of unrelated adults residing in the housing"

I have been reading as much as I can about the proposed zoning changes, but much of the literature comes from the extremes of the issue pushing either zero changes to single family zoning, to the other end of the spectrum of support for 2500 sq.ft lots with multiple structures, smaller setbacks, higher structures, no off-street parking and presumably far less impervious cover requirements.

I feel like my stance is pretty moderate in that I recognize that more housing flexibility is needed, and some density in SF neighborhoods is the way to go with that. I get it. Because of this I would not send the form letter from Community Not Commodity. At the same time there is not a lot of transparency about what the long term plan is, which I feel is disingenuous on the Councils part.

Before any changes to the code are enacted I would like to see actions to keep homes available for actual Austin residents to live in. Reduce and do not renew licenses for STR's. Crack down on illegal STR's. Any dense infill should be banned from being an STR in perpetuity. Continue to encourage re-development of other tracts of land into mini-Mueller-like developments.

There is so much mixed-use development going on all up and down the Lamar corridor, and no mass transit other than Cap Metro on the horizon. I have few issues with duplexes, triplexes or even townhome-style fourplexes being built on larger lots in amongst traditionally single family home areas. But I have no desire to see them built with no off-street parking and turning our streets into 24-hr parking lots because a few new tri/fourplex residents are parking their 1-2 cars per unit on the street. It is still Texas, most people use cars and the mass transit is not there yet and probably won't be for a long time, if ever. I won't even talk about the heat 4-5 months of the year.

I live on Hether Street and between school traffic and construction traffic there are several times during the day that only one car can navigate down the road at a time. It is not safe for anyone. The loudest proponents of no parking spaces (for the cars they actually DO have) and walkability, also seem to be single, or at least have no children.

I also have a question: When the posting says, "3 residential units (including
