

## REZONING, NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN, AND ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REVIEW SHEET

**Amendment:** C20-2024-010 University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Update

**Description:** Amend City Code Title 25 (Land Development) to repeal Article 3 Division 9 University Neighborhood Overlay District Requirements and to create Density Bonus University Neighborhood Overlay (-DBUNO) and rezone property generally located west of the University of Texas, east of Lamar Boulevard, south of 29th Street and north of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to apply -DBUNO and amend the Central Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan, an element of the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan, to change the future land use map for the same property from multiple land use designations to High Density Mixed Use.

**Background:** Initiated by City Council [Resolution No. 20240418-077](#) and [Resolution No. 2025-0130-057](#).

The University Neighborhood Overlay, or UNO, was first adopted by [Ordinance No. 040902-58](#) in 2004 to promote high-density, pedestrian-oriented redevelopment of the West Campus area that maintains the area's existing character and stimulates income-restricted affordable housing development. The overlay supersedes specific site development standards of the base zones and allows land uses to encourage development that serves the primarily student population of the area. This includes reduced required parking spaces, increased maximum allowable building height and bulk, and allowance for a mix of local, pedestrian-serving commercial uses. For a property to develop under UNO, additional requirements must be met, including providing affordable housing and adherence to stricter streetscape and design standards. These regulations were crafted through a robust community process involving residents and stakeholders.

Since their original adoption, UNO regulations were amended in 2014 and 2019 through [Ordinance No. 20140213-056](#) and [Ordinance No. 20191114-067](#). The 2014 amendment allowed participating developments to rent by the bedroom and increased the affordability period from 15 to 40 years. Amendments in 2019 changed the second tier of maximum allowed building height available through the dedication of additional affordable housing units or bedrooms. These amendments demonstrate the commitment to updating UNO to address necessary changes that better serve students and the surrounding community.

Since its adoption in 2004, the UNO overlay has facilitated the development of over 10,000 housing units or bedrooms and has led to the creation of 972 income-restricted bedrooms and 401 income-restricted units.

In April 2024, the City Council adopted [Resolution No. 20240418-077](#), which initiated amendments to the University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO). The Resolution included 29 distinct items for staff consideration, including amendments to the land development code, which are reflected in staff's proposal.

In January 2025, the City Council adopted [Resolution No. 2025-0130-057](#), which initiated a rezoning and neighborhood plan amendment to be completed simultaneously with the proposed code amendments.

### **Summary of Proposed Code Amendment:**


The proposed code amendment will repeal existing Land Development Code Article 3 Division 9 University Neighborhood Overlay District Requirements and create a new density bonus combining district – Density Bonus University Neighborhood Overlay (DBUNO). The new combining district will replace the existing overlay and incorporate many of the elements of the existing regulations as well as the updates requested by City Council. The regulations are divided between regulations that apply throughout the district, referred to as General Requirements, and those that are unique to the three proposed subdistricts – Transit Core, Inner West Campus, and Outer West Campus.

### **General Requirements**

Each of the three new subdistricts will contain general provisions applicable to participating developments. This includes requirements to meet certain provisions of City Code Chapter 4-18 related to general density bonus requirements, generally applicable design guidelines for the area, and restrictions on allowed uses.

### **Applicability**

The DBUNO combining district will contain an applicability map that defines the geographic area where properties will be eligible for the combining district. This includes the areas currently within the University Neighborhood Overlay as well as the proposed expansion areas. Properties within the proposed applicability area will be rezoned to the DBUNO combining district described further in the Summary of Proposed Rezoning section of this report. The development bonus and its additional requirements will apply to properties that elect to participate in the voluntary program. Development using a property's base zoning regulations will not be impacted by the addition of the combining district.



## Use Regulations

The following lists delineate land uses that will be permitted, prohibited, or made conditional for properties within the DBUNO combining district if a land owner chooses to participate in the program. Definitions for each of these land uses is governed by the Land Development Code (LDC) and can be found in [LDC 25-2, Subchapter A](#).

### *Permitted Uses*

Residential Uses including Multifamily Residential and Group Residential, and Local Uses as defined below.

#### *Local Uses:*

Administrative and Business offices	Guidance Services
Art Gallery	Indoor Sports and Recreation
Art Workshop	Medical Offices (under 5,000 square feet)
Business and Trade School	Performance Venue
Consumer Convenience Services	Personal Improvement Services
Consumer Repair Services	Personal services
Counseling Services	Pet Services
Custom Manufacturing	Postal Facilities
Cultural Services	Printing and Publishing Services
Child Care and Adult Care (General, Limited)	Professional Office
Financial Services	Religious Assembly
Food Preparation, in conjunction with Food Sales	Restaurant (General or Limited)
General Restaurant or Limited Restaurant Accessory Use	Theater
Food Sales	A conditional use in the base zoning district that is approved by the land use commission
General Retail Sales (Convenience or General)	

#### *Prohibited Uses:*

##### COMMERCIAL

Automotive Sales  
Agricultural Sale and Services  
Automotive Rentals  
Automotive Repair Services  
Building Maintenance Services  
Campground  
Carriage Stable  
Convenience Storage  
Drop-off Recycling Collection Facility  
Electronic Prototype Assembly  
Electronic Testing  
Equipment Repair Services  
Equipment Sales  
Exterminating Services  
Funeral Services  
Marina  
Recreational Equipment Maintenance & Storage  
Recreational Equipment Sales  
Research Assembly Services  
Research Testing Services

##### Research Warehousing Services

Scrap and Salvage  
Service Station  
Stables  
Vehicle Storage

##### INDUSTRIAL

Basic Industry  
General Warehousing and Distribution  
Limited Warehousing and Distribution  
Recycling Center  
Resource Extraction

##### AGRICULTURAL

Animal Production  
Crop Production  
Horticulture  
Indoor Crop Production

#### *Conditional Uses:*

##### COMMERCIAL

Alternative Financial Services

## C20-2024-010

Automotive Washing  
Bail Bond Services  
Commercial Blood Plasma Center  
Commercial Off-Street Parking  
Communications Services  
Construction Sales and Services  
Electric Vehicle Charging  
Kennels  
Monument Retail Sales

Off-Site Accessory Parking  
Pawn Shop Services  
Pedicab Storage and Dispatch  
Special Use Historic

INDUSTRIAL

Custom Manufacturing  
Light Manufacturing

*Additional Requirements for Certain Uses*

## Local Uses

- Limited to the first two stories of a development
- May not include a drive-through facility

## Multifamily Residential

- Dwelling Units
  - Ground floor dwelling units must be:
    - Adaptable for use by a person with a disability; and
    - Accessible by a person with a disability from on-site parking, pedestrian path, and common facilities
  - 10% must be accessible for a person with a mobility impairment
  - 2% must be accessible for a person with a hearing or visual disability



## General Site Development and Design Standards

General Development and Design Standards		
Exemptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Maximum floor-to-area ratio</li><li>- Maximum building coverage</li><li>- Landscaping requirements</li><li>- Minimum site area</li><li>- Private common open space</li><li>- Impervious cover – defined by subdistrict</li></ul>	
Street Wall	24' minimum height 12' step back required at a height of 65ft	
Occupant Space	Areas intended for occupancy including rentable and common areas - excluding parking and mechanical areas 75% of net street frontage and 42% of Street Wall must contain Occupant Space	
Site Access	Provides limitations on the curb cuts and access points to a property	
Streetscape	Pedestrian Zone dimensions prescribed by the Transportation Criteria Manual + UNO street tree and street furnishing requirements	
Setbacks	No minimum unless necessary to ensure adequate Fire Department access 10' maximum street yard except for public plaza/private common open space	
Building Design	UNO Design Standards 2-Star Rating under Austin Energy Green Building	
Screening	Requirements for screening of trash receptacles and above-ground parking	

### Parking Requirements

Developments must comply with LDC 25-5-591, which institutes parking maximums and minimums for participating developments.

#### *Parking Maximums*

- The maximum off-street parking is 40% of the spaces formerly required by Appendix A
- The maximum can be increased to 60% provided that 50% of the parking is included in an underground parking structure

#### *Bicycle Parking*

- Bicycle parking requirements are increased to a minimum of five spaces or 15% of the proposed vehicle parking spaces, whichever is greater
- For residential uses, the maximum long-term bicycle parking spaces required by the Transportation Criteria Manual must be provided

### Redevelopment Requirements

The proposal includes certain requirements when redeveloping multifamily or commercial property. The redevelopment requirements support the goals of the Equitable Transit-Oriented Development Policy Plan and the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint by increasing the supply of affordable housing while preserving existing affordable housing and community spaces.

A redevelopment of an existing multifamily residential structure must:

- Replace all units that were affordable to a household earning 70% MFI or below

## C20-2024-010

- Provide current tenants with notice and relocation benefits
- Grant current tenants the right to return to a unit of comparable size following completion of the redevelopment
- Allow current tenants to terminate a lease without penalty
- Return security deposits to current tenants

Qualifying non-residential structures are defined as:


- Creative spaces (see § 25-2-654(F) for definition) operating for  $\geq 3$  years
- Adult care services (general or limited) operating for  $\geq 12$  months
- Child care services (general or limited) operating for  $\geq 12$  months
- Cocktail lounges operating for  $\geq 10$  years
- Food sales operating for  $\geq 10$  years w/ gross floor area of  $\leq 20,000$  sq ft
- General retail sales operating for  $\geq 10$  years w/ a gross floor area of  $\leq 5,000$  sq ft
- Personal services operating for  $\geq 10$  years w/ a gross floor area of  $\leq 5,000$  sq ft
- Restaurant (general or limited) operating for  $\geq 10$  years w/ gross floor area of  $\leq 5,000$  sq ft

A redevelopment of an existing qualifying non-residential structure must:

- Provide current tenants with notice and relocation benefits
- Grant current tenants the right to return to a unit of comparable size following completion of the redevelopment

## Subdistrict Regulations

The proposal includes three distinct subdistricts within the DBUNO combining district. The subdistricts are differentiated by their development standards, affordability requirements, and community benefit gatekeeper options.



## Site Development Regulations

Site Development Regulations	Transit Core	Inner West	Outer West
Height Bonus	540' (600' Max)	360' (420' Max)	30' (90' Max)
Impervious Cover	100%	100%	90% or Base Zoning
Uses	Residential, Local <sup>1</sup> , Hotel/Motel <sup>2</sup>	Residential, Local	Residential, Local
Parking Maximum	3 Stories	3 Stories	2 Stories
Community Benefits <sup>3</sup>	Choice of 1	Choice of 1	Not Applicable
Tower Spacing <sup>4</sup>	20' Stepback at a Height of 120'	20' Stepback at a Height of 120'	Not Applicable

<sup>1</sup> Local uses are defined under § 25-2-753

<sup>2</sup> Hotel/Motel use permitted when permitted in the base zoning district and subject to affordability requirements.

<sup>3</sup> Options include Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial, Grocery Store Use, On-site Water Reuse System, Green Roof, and - in the Transit Core -54 Transit-Supportive Infrastructure.

<sup>4</sup> 40ft step-back above 120ft in height from existing building of 120ft in height or greater; OR 20ft from a parcel with a maximum allowed building height greater than 120ft. If the lot frontage is under 100ft, then the maximum building coverage for portions of a building above 120ft is 65%.

### Community Benefit Gatekeeper Requirements

A development must provide one of the following:

- Provide on-site water reuse system
- Provide Transit Supportive Infrastructure approved by the Project Connect Office
- Provide 75% of the ground floor frontage of the building as a pedestrian-oriented use meeting design standards prescribed by Subchapter E
- Provide a grocery store (Food Sales) use of at least 2,500 sq. ft.
- Provide a green roof of at least 4,000 sq. ft. meeting the performance standards of the Environmental Criteria Manual

Developments that provide more than 50% of their dwelling units or bedrooms as affordable are exempt from the community benefit gatekeeper requirements.

### Affordability Requirements

Affordable housing set-aside requirements are defined by subdistrict. The table below outlines affordability requirements.

ADDITIONAL HEIGHT BONUS	TIER ONE	TIER TWO
Transit Core		
+240' (300' Max)	Bedroom: 20% at 50% MFI Unit: 10% at 50% MFI	Bedroom: 20% at 50% MFI Unit: 10% at 50% MFI AND
+300' (600' Max)		Bedroom: 10% at 50% MFI or Fee-in-Lieu Unit: 5% at 50% MFI
Inner West		
+240' (300' Max)	Bedroom: 20% at 50% MFI Unit: 10% at 50% MFI	Bedroom: 20% at 50% MFI Unit: 10% at 50% MFI AND
+120' (420' Max)		Bedroom: 10% at 50% MFI or Fee-in-Lieu Unit: 5% at 50% MFI
Outer West		
+30' (90' Max)	Bedroom: 20% at 50% MFI Unit: 10% at 50% MFI	

### City Code Chapter 4-18 Article 2 Density Bonus and Incentive Programs

In addition to updates to the Title 25 Land Development Code, staff is proposing updates to City Code Chapter 4-18 Article 2, which outlines permitting standards for properties participating in a density bonus program. The updates incorporate additional requirements particular to participation in the DBUNO program.

### *Delay of Occupancy Protections*

- Require a lease addendum with notice and remedy requirements in the case of a delay of occupancy

### *Early Leasing Restrictions*

- Restrict early leasing to 6 months before the start of the lease term; applicable to all leases, lease renewals, and pre-lease agreements

### *Windowless Bedroom Prohibition*

- Require external windows within all bedrooms in all units


## **Modifications to Staff Proposal**

As a result of feedback from community members, the following changes were made to the initial staff proposal:

- Expansion areas within Critical Environmental Feature (CEF) buffers were removed
- The windowless bedroom prohibition was added to the modifications to City Code Chapter 4-18 Article 2
- An exemption from the community benefit gatekeeper requirements was added for developments providing more than 50% of their bedrooms or units as affordable
- Revised the minimum size of the grocery store use community benefit from 8,000 to 2,500 sq. ft.

## **Summary of Neighborhood Plan Amendment:**

The proposed neighborhood plan amendment will amend the future land use map (FLUM) of the Central Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan. The neighborhood plan amendment will designate all properties within the DBUNO applicability area as High-Density Mixed Use. This land use designation supports a mix of uses including residential and commercial uses



with floor-to-area ratios (FAR) in excess of 3:1. A table of the proposed updates to the future land use map is provided in Attachment A.

### **Summary of Proposed Rezoning:**

The proposed rezoning will apply the proposed Density Bonus University Neighborhood Overlay (-DBUNO) combining district to the properties shown in Exhibit A. Properties within the -DBUNO combining district will be eligible to participate in the voluntary density bonus program. Development using a property's base zone standards will not be impacted by the addition of the -DBUNO combining district. The -DBUNO combining district will be applied in addition to any existing district or overlays that may already apply to a property. A table of the proposed rezoning is provided in Attachment B.

### **Staff Recommendation: Recommended.**

#### *Overview*

Staff recommends the creation of the proposed Density Bonus University Neighborhood Overlay combining district, the amendment to the Central Austin Combined neighborhood plan, and the rezoning of properties into the new combining district. These changes aim to align development regulations with the goals identified in City Council's April 2024 Resolution.

#### *Expansion Area*

Staff recommends the proposed program boundaries based on an analysis of parcels adjacent to the existing boundaries for their proximity to campus and transit options and their existing land use and zoning. Further, the 2012 Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan designated the area as part of the Downtown Activity Center, which aligns with the development regulations proposed for the area. Over time, staff estimates that the expansion areas could increase the housing capacity of the district by over 2,000 units.

#### *Subdistricts – Boundaries and Height Limits*

Staff recommends the creation of the Transit Core subdistrict and the expansion of the Inner West subdistrict. These districts are characterized by their allowance for high-rise development and increased residential density. The proposed subdistricts allow for increased development adjacent to the planned light rail line and closest to the University of Texas campus. Achievable height limits allow for increased housing unit capacity in line with the population targets for the district and City Council direction.

Staff recommends the height limit of up to 90ft for developments within the Outer West subdistrict. Analysis of building permit data of UNO participating properties shows mid-rise development (under 90ft in height) as the prevailing typology, with 32 such examples. In fact, within the Outer West subdistrict, no property has developed beyond eight stories despite having the allowance for additional height. Further, stakeholder and community engagement indicated a desire for more mid-rise development, especially in closer proximity

to the district boundaries. Additionally, over 50% of survey respondents emphasized that establishing a transition to surrounding neighborhoods was very important to them.

#### *Subdistricts – Development Standards*

Staff recommends the proposed site development standards of the district, which support goals and implementation strategies of the Equitable Transit-Oriented Development Policy Plan through the development of pedestrian-oriented uses and transit-supportive densities. Further, staff recommends instituting maximum parking allowances to reduce auto-oriented development and uses. Analysis indicates recent developments have provided less than 60% of the required parking spaces, and stakeholders noted that even lower parking ratios are anticipated in planned developments. Limiting off-street parking supports the transit system and enhances land use efficiency.

#### *Subdistricts - Community Benefits and Affordability*

Staff recommends adopting a menu of community benefit options to address Council direction. The approach will encourage creative and original design that accommodates different site conditions. Together, these options will create a complete community with incentives for developments to provide for daily needs of the community such as grocery stores and retail spaces along with infrastructure improvements such as on-site water reuse systems and green roof elements to mitigate development impacts.

Staff supports deeper affordability requirements, reducing the threshold to 50% MFI to enhance housing access for eligible students and residents. Stakeholder input indicates that rental rates at 60% MFI remain unaffordable for many eligible students. Staff has contracted with Economic & Planning Systems (EPS) to calibrate the affordable housing set-asides to ensure that the requirements maximize amount of affordable housing in absolute terms and provide for community benefits within the district. Staff supports the findings by EPS, which indicate the proposed set-asides will continue to incentivize participation in the density bonus program. Further, adjustments to the fee-in-lieu requirements will create additional funds for the provision of more affordable housing through the University Neighborhood Housing Trust Fund. Partnerships with non-profit organizations, religious institutions, and cooperative housing providers active within the UNO area could further expand deeply affordable housing beyond what private development incentives can achieve.

#### *Lease and Redevelopment Requirements*

Staff supports the protection of tenants in existing multifamily developments by including requirements for the redevelopment of existing residential units and requirements for tenant notification and relocation benefits. These provisions align with recommendations from a comprehensive analysis of density bonus programs and are consistent with the ETOD density bonus program's tenant protections.

See Attachment C for additional information and analysis on the recommended code amendment.



**Board and Commission Action:**

March 18, 2025 – Considered by the Codes and Ordinances Joint Committee. No recommendation was made.

April 22, 2025 – To be considered by the Planning Commission

**Council Action:**

May 8, 2025 – To be considered by City Council

**Sponsor Department:**

Planning Department

**City Staff:**

Paul Ray Books, Planner Principal, Parks Department, [Paul.Books@austintexas.gov](mailto:Paul.Books@austintexas.gov), (512) 978-1315

Alan Pani, Planner Principal, Planning Department, [Alan.Pani@austintexas.gov](mailto:Alan.Pani@austintexas.gov), (512) 974-8084


**Attachment A: Applicability of Neighborhood Plan Amendment**

The proposed neighborhood plan amendment would update the future land use (FLUM) designation to align with development entitlements available through the proposed DBUNO density bonus program. High Density Mixed Use designation is intended for areas where a mix of residential and non-residential uses with floor-to-area ratios of 3.0 or higher is appropriate. The proposed update to the future land use designation is shown in Exhibit C.

From (Existing Future Land Use)	To (Future Land Use Under the Proposal)
Mixed Use	High Density Mixed Use
Multi-Family	High Density Mixed Use
Mixed Use/Office	High Density Mixed Use
Office	High Density Mixed Use
Civic	High Density Mixed Use
High Density Mixed Use; Mixed Use	High Density Mixed Use
Mixed Use; Multi-family; Commercial	High Density Mixed Use

**Exhibit A**

Future Land Use Map Request:  
From: Multiple  
To: High Density Mixed Use



**Central Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan**  
**NPA-2025-0019.02**

This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.

This product has been produced by the Planning Department for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.

Subject Tract

Notification Boundary

Single-Family

Higher-Density Single-Family

Multifamily

Commercial

Mixed Use

High Density Mixed Use

Office

Mixed Use/Office

Civic

Recreation & Open Space

Transportation

**Created: 3/21/2025**



0 250 500 Feet

## **Attachment B: Applicability of Proposed Rezoning to DBUNO**

The proposed rezoning would apply the DBUNO combining district to properties shown in Exhibit B. Properties would be assigned a subdistrict based on the map shown in Exhibit C. The DBUNO combining district will apply in addition to any combining districts or overlays that may already apply to the property and may modify certain regulations of each applicable combining district or overlay.

From (Existing Zoning)	To (Zoning Under the Proposal)
CS-1-CO-NP	CS-1-CO-DBUNO-NP
CS-1-MU-H-NP	CS-1-MU-H-DBUNO-NP
CS-1-NP	CS-1-DBUNO-NP
CS-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	CS-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
CS-CO-NP	CS-CO-DBUNO-NP
CS-H-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	CS-H-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
CS-MU-CO-NP	CS-MU-CO-DBUNO-NP
CS-MU-H-NP	CS-MU-H-DBUNO-NP
CS-MU-NP	CS-MU-DBUNO-NP
CS-MU-NP/MF-6-CO-NP	CS-MU-NP/MF-6-CO-DBUNO-NP
CS-NCCD-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	CS-NCCD-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
CS-NP	CS-DBUNO-NP
CS-V-NCCD-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	CS-V-NCCD-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
GO-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	GO-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
GO-CO-NP	GO-CO-DBUNO-NP
GO-H-CO-NP	GO-H-CO-DBUNO-NP
GO-H-NP	GO-H-DBUNO-NP
GO-MU	GO-MU-DBUNO
GO-MU-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	GO-MU-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
GO-MU-CO-NP	GO-MU-CO-DBUNO-NP
GO-MU-H-CO-NP	GO-MU-H-CO-DBUNO-NP
GO-MU-H-NP	GO-MU-H-DBUNO-NP
GO-MU-NP	GO-MU-DBUNO-NP
GO-MU-V-CO-NP	GO-MU-V-CO-DBUNO-NP
GO-NP	GO-DBUNO-NP
GR-CO-NP	GR-CO-DBUNO-NP
GR-H-CO-NP	GR-H-CO-DBUNO-NP
GR-MU-CO-NP	GR-MU-CO-DBUNO-NP
GR-MU-H-CO-NP	GR-MU-H-CO-DBUNO-NP

From (Existing Zoning)	To (Zoning Under the Proposal)
GR-MU-NP	GR-MU-DBUNO-NP
GR-MU-V-DB90-NP	GR-MU-V-DB90-DBUNO-NP
GR-NP	GR-DBUNO-NP
LO-H-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	LO-H-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
LO-H-NP	LO-H-DBUNO-NP
LO-MU-H-CO-NP	LO-MU-H-CO-DBUNO-NP
LO-NP	LO-DBUNO-NP
LR-H-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	LR-H-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
LR-NP	LR-DBUNO-NP
MF-4-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	MF-4-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
MF-4-CO-NP	MF-4-CO-DBUNO-NP
MF-4-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	MF-4-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
MF-4-H-CO-NP	MF-4-H-CO-DBUNO-NP
MF-4-H-NP	MF-4-H-DBUNO-NP
MF-4-NP	MF-4-DBUNO-NP
MF-5-CO-NP	MF-5-CO-DBUNO-NP
MF-5-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	MF-5-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
MF-5-NCCD-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	MF-5-NCCD-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
MF-5-NP	MF-5-DBUNO-NP
MF-6-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	MF-6-CO-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
MF-6-CO-NP	MF-6-CO-DBUNO-NP
MF-6-NCCD-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	MF-6-NCCD-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
NO-NCCD-ETOD-DBETOD-NP	NO-NCCD-ETOD-DBETOD-DBUNO-NP
NO-NP	NO-DBUNO-NP
P	P-DBUNO



# Exhibit B



## REZONING CASE#: C20-2024-010


 DBUNO Combining District

This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.

This product has been produced by the Planning Department for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.



# Exhibit C





0 250 500 Feet

## SUBDISTRICT BOUNDARY CODE MAP CASE#: C20-2024-010

This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.

This product has been produced by the Planning Department for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.

-  Inner West
-  Outer West
-  Transit Core

## **Attachment C: Additional Information and Analysis**

# University Neighborhood Overlay Housing Capacity Analysis Results and Methodology

Staff conducted a quantitative analysis to estimate the potential change in housing unit capacity due to the proposed modifications to University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO). The objective of the analysis was to understand how the proposed changes may impact the potential housing unit capacity and how that related to the program goals and population targets. A housing unit capacity analysis is a projection of how many housing units could be built in a community if expected properties were to develop or redevelop to the maximum extent possible under zoning regulations. To estimate the impacts on housing unit capacity, staff calculated the potential housing unit yield using the existing entitlements of the University Neighborhood Overlay and compared it with the potential housing unit yield using the proposed entitlements offered in the revised density bonus programs.

Staff utilized ArcGIS Urban, a geographic information system software suite designed to provide scenario-based modeling of changes to zoning regulations and resulting development patterns, to conduct the housing unit capacity analysis.

## Population Targets

UNO is a density bonus program with the primary goal of providing housing for nearby universities and colleges, notably the University of Texas at Austin. In addition to the UT campus, the Rio Grande Campus of Austin Community College is also located nearby.

	Count
<b>UT Austin Enrollment</b>	53,082
<b>ACC Rio Grande Enrollment</b>	1,345
<b>Student Subtotal</b>	54,427
<b>Current On-Campus Population</b>	8,896
<b>Off-Campus Housing Need</b>	45,531

Source: University of Texas at Austin, Austin Community College.

Staff researched best practices for housing unit capacity analyses to establish a benchmark for evaluating the capacity under the proposal. According to California's Housing Element Law, local governments must plan for zoning capacity that exceeds the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) to ensure sufficient room for housing development. A best practice is to include a buffer of 15-30% above the RHNA target.<sup>1</sup> This buffer addresses potential limitations in housing production, such as property owners choosing not to develop their land, developers building fewer units than permitted by zoning, or site constraints and market conditions limiting development potential. The buffer helps ensure a planning area can meet its housing targets even if some sites are not built to their maximum capacity. Utilizing this approach for the capacity analysis for the proposed modifications to UNO allows for flexibility and ensures that, despite uncertainties, the district can meet its housing goals and support sustainable population growth.

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: Association of Bay Area Governments, ([https://abag.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2021-10/RHNA\\_Buffer\\_Document\\_Final.pdf](https://abag.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2021-10/RHNA_Buffer_Document_Final.pdf))



Currently, 90% of the population within the UNO area is enrolled in college or graduate school with 10% of the population not classified as a student. The college or graduate school residents are likely to be temporary residents (living in the UNO boundary only during the school year) and the people not classified as students are likely full-time residents. Area residents and businesses expressed interest in seeing a larger proportion of full-time residents within the neighborhood. Additionally, students expressed interest in more businesses, including retail and grocery stores, within the area to serve their daily needs. These businesses require a sufficient full-time resident customer base to be sustainable. To provide this customer base while still meeting the housing needs of the student population, staff set a goal for the district to move closer to having 70% of the population be students and 30% be non-students. Staff adjusted the population target to account for this goal.

**45,531 Student Off-Campus Housing Need + 30% Non-Student Population  
= 65,044 Housing Capacity Target**

### Current Population and Assumptions

Staff collaborated with the City Demographer to analyze the existing population within the UNO boundaries, establishing a foundation for projecting future population growth. Rather than using the most recent census data as a baseline, staff leveraged the Demographic team's 2023 housing unit verification analysis (an analysis identifying the most likely number of units based on a review of multiple internal and external data sources, including City of Austin permitting data, appraisal district data, and Census Bureau data) and added new units developed in 2024 based on internal data sources. Tenure-specific occupancy rates and average household size were then applied to the units to derive the estimate of the population in households. The 2020 Census group quarters population was then added to the population in households to derive the total current population in the area. See below for the data inputs used in the methodology.

	Count
<b>Estimated Total Units</b>	13,706
<b>Times: Rental Unit Occupancy Rate</b>	94.5%
<b>Total Occupied Units</b>	12,952
<b>Times: Avg Household Size</b>	2.01
<b>Total Population in households</b>	26,034
<b>Plus: Group quarters population</b>	2,428
<b>Projected 2024 Population</b>	<b>28,462</b>

Source: 2023 Housing Verification Analysis, Demographics & Data Division; City of Austin permit data, U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 1-Year 2023 Estimates; 2020 Decennial Census.

Staff aimed to provide a realistic projection of redevelopment within the UNO area, which has experienced significant growth over the past 20 years, leaving few remaining development sites. To estimate the remaining housing capacity, staff identified potential redevelopment sites based on criteria designed to reflect their likelihood of redevelopment. Parcels were selected where the appraised land value exceeded the improvement value (the value of buildings) according to appraisal district data. From this list, staff excluded properties under ¼ acre, those owned by the University of Texas, designated historic landmarks, or those with an approved site development application. The remaining parcels were identified as potential development sites, where existing and proposed regulations would be modeled to determine housing capacity that could result from their redevelopment.

Additionally, staff examined the current use of the remaining properties to assess their likelihood of redevelopment. UNO has a diverse set of landowners, including Panhellenic organizations, religious institutions, and other nonprofit or institutional owners. Given the difficulty in predicting whether these entities will redevelop or utilize a proposed density bonus, staff chose to run two scenarios: one including these properties and one excluding them. Based on historical participation in the UNO density bonus program, five properties currently used as Group Quarters and two previously used as Meeting and Assembly have participated in the program. This analysis provided a range of redevelopment projections to better account for the uncertainty surrounding these unique landowners.

Staff utilized general assumptions throughout the analysis of the existing and proposed regulations. Staff assumed occupancy percentages, household size, and group quarters populations would remain consistent with those identified in the current population analysis. Utilizing appraisal district data, staff determined the average unit size in gross square feet, 908 sq.ft., which was used to determine the number of new units created through redevelopment. Additionally, staff used appraisal district data to determine the percent of built space used for commercial purposes, 4%, and that used for residential units, 96%, of properties that had participated in the UNO density bonus program. This allocation would be applied to the building square footage created through redevelopment.

### Existing Regulations Analysis

Staff created a model of the current University Neighborhood Overlay regulations to simulate future development within the area using the maximum heights allowed under the current density bonus program. Staff modeled prototypical buildings to simulate the built form seen through the density bonus program. Staff studied historical site plan data to determine the parking ratio in developments through the UNO program. The prototypical buildings were designed to resemble this observed parking ratio – 1.09 parking spots per unit – allocating the remainder of the built space to residential or commercial uses based on the assumption above.

The prototypical buildings were applied to each development site at the maximum allowed building height and density allowed under the current regulations. This assumed development under the second tier of the density bonus program, which allows developments within the Inner West subdistrict an additional 125ft in height and developments in the Outer West and Guadalupe subdistricts on parcels with a maximum height of 50ft or greater an additional 25ft in height. This amended second tier allowance was incorporated into the program during updates made in 2019.


Under both development scenarios, including and excluding group quarters and churches, staff found that the current regulations do not meet the capacity targets identified. The existing regulations would allow for an estimated capacity of 26,268 housing units if all identified development sites were to utilize the maximum entitlements within the program with an estimated total population of 56,006 – 14% below the identified target population of 65,044. Under the existing regulations, an estimated 5,253 affordable units would be created.

	Excluding Meeting and Assembly and Group Quarters Land Uses	All Development Sites
<b>Housing Units</b>	17,540	26,268
<b>Estimated Population</b>	39,425	56,006
<b>Buffer over Capacity Target</b>	-39%	-14%

This finding supports the need for additional housing capacity to support the University Neighborhood and expressed community goals.


## Proposed Regulations Analysis

Analysis of the proposed regulations was an iterative process with changes to meet the capacity targets and community desires based on information gathered throughout the stakeholder engagement process. Staff created a model of the proposed regulations to simulate future potential development within the area. The UNO height allowances currently override the underlying base zoning district regulations; however, because of the way the density bonus program is applied to each property, the height is offered as an increase from the base zoning district's current height. Currently, base heights range from 40ft to 60ft.



The proposed subdistricts provide varied height allowances that cater to different types of development. The Transit Core and Inner West subdistricts offer significant opportunities for high-rise residential development, enabling taller structures that accommodate a larger number of residents and promote urban density. This approach aligns with transit-oriented development goals, encouraging more people to live in close proximity to public transportation. In contrast, the Outer West subdistrict is designed for mid-rise residential development, allowing for an increase of 30 feet while ensuring a smooth transition to nearby lower-density uses. Through mid-rise development, this area maintains a balance between increased density and the existing neighborhood character. This strategic approach supports a cohesive urban environment that promotes diverse housing options while respecting the surrounding community's scale and context.

Staff modeled prototypical buildings to reflect the proposed modifications, including adjustments to



parking allowances and tower massing. The regulations and models were altered to understand the impact of different policy changes on housing capacity within the overlay area, providing insights into how the proposed height increases and modified parking requirements could influence development patterns and housing availability.

If all identified development sites were to utilize the maximum entitlements, staff found that the proposed regulations create sufficient additional capacity, with a 27% buffer over the population target. The capacity enabled through the proposed regulations would provide the opportunity for more students and other residents to live within the West Campus area. Under this scenario, an estimated 2,795 affordable units or 10,680 affordable bedrooms would be provided.

	Excluding Meeting and Assembly and Group Quarters Land Uses	All Development Sites
<b>Housing Units</b>	25,207	40,351
<b>Estimated Population</b>	53,834	82,756
<b>Buffer over Capacity Target</b>	-17%	27%

The findings of this analysis indicate that the proposed regulations are sufficient to accommodate future growth of the population of the area in response to increased demand for housing.

# University Neighborhood Overlay Existing Program Analysis

Staff and consultants studied the participation in the University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) program, including participation rates and components of building design including height, parking ratio, and prevalence of windowless bedrooms. The findings from this analysis are described below and were used to inform modifications to the program requirements and incentives.

## Density Bonus Participation

Staff, alongside their consultants, analyzed the participation rate and units created through the UNO density bonus program. Due to the significant shift in program requirements in 2014, the participation metrics are broken down between pre- and post-2014.

### Pre-2014

The first iteration of UNO prior to the changes in 2014 included a total of 20 development projects. Data indicates that 17 of those projects have affordability periods that have already expired. The program originally contained a 15-year affordability period, which, in 2014, was extended to 40 years. This has led to the loss of 171 income-restricted units as affordability periods expire, with the remaining 256 units set to expire by 2030 or earlier.

	Active	Affordability Expired	Total
Count	20	17	37
Bldg Sq. Ft.	3,492,616	-*	3,492,616
Affordable Units	256	171	427
Total Units	2,227	1,466	3,693
Total Fee-In-Lieu	\$745,147	\$643,162	\$1,388,309

Source: City of Austin, Affordable Housing Inventory.

\*Building square footage is not available for buildings no longer in the Affordable Housing Inventory Data.

There was a high participation rate among projects eligible to participate in the pre-2014 UNO density bonus program. Of the projects eligible to participate, 82% did so – making up 84% of the building square footage and 86% of the residential units built during this time period.

	Pre-2014 UNO Projects as % of Total Development
Count	82.22%
Bldg Sq. Ft.	83.63%
Total Units	86.29%

Source: City of Austin, Affordable Housing Inventory, Land Database.

## Post-2014

Following the changes to the program requirements in 2014, a total of 37 projects have participated in the density bonus program. The 37 projects include a mixture of developments that report their affordable housing requirements by the unit and by the bedroom.

	Active	Certified	Under Construction	Total
Count	29	4	4	37
Bldg Sq. Ft.	3,600,986	-*	-*	3,600,986
Developments Reporting by the Unit	12	4	3	19
Affordable Units	145	172	210	527
Total Units	1,203	847	1,095	3,145
Developments Reporting by the Bedroom	17	0	1	18
Affordable Units	940	0	200	1,140
Total Units	2,357	0	304	2,661
Total Fee-In-Lieu	\$3,920,156	\$102,238	\$402,909	\$4,425,302

Source: City of Austin, Affordable Housing Inventory

\*Building Square Footage is not available for buildings that have not been completed

The post-2014 UNO projects have achieved high participation rates among redeveloping properties eligible to participate in the bonus program. Specifically, 93.55% of redeveloping properties with the opportunity to participate have done so. These projects contribute 96.67% of the total building square footage and represent 99.58% of total units available in this period. This high participation underscores the effectiveness of the UNO program in engaging properties for development, maximizing both housing capacity and the creation of affordable units in the overlay area.

	Built post-2014 UNO Projects as % of Total Development
Count	93.55%
Bldg Sq. Ft.	96.67%
Total Units	99.58%

Source: City of Austin, Affordable Housing Inventory, Land Database.

## Land Area

Since 2004, when UNO was adopted, there has been significant redevelopment of the West Campus area, leaving fewer remaining parcels for redevelopment through an updated density bonus program. Further, the average lot size of parcels developed since 2004 is almost 150% larger than the average size of the remaining parcels. This indicates that the remaining parcels may be more difficult to develop and yield fewer units than the parcels developed through the UNO program thus far.



	Pre-2014 UNO	Post-2014 UNO	Built Since 2004 (Non-Participants)	Developed Sub Total	Remaining Area	Total Area
Acres	33.22	19.54	5.48	<b>58.24</b>	<b>107.71</b>	<b>165.95</b>
Percent	20%	12%	3%	<b>35%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: City of Austin, Affordable Housing Inventory, Land Database.


Of the remaining 107.71 acres, almost a quarter (26.69 acres) are currently used as churches or group quarters. Data on program participation indicates that these uses are less likely to redevelop through the density bonus program. This suggests that much of the development that was likely to occur in the boundaries through the UNO program has already taken place, with program participation expected to decrease in the coming years compared to the boom seen directly after the program's adoption.

## Building Design

The UNO program is designed to encourage high-density redevelopment of the West Campus area with an emphasis on creating a walkable, high-quality built environment. To evaluate and enhance the program's effectiveness, staff analyzed several design components, including building height, parking ratios, green building rating, and the inclusion of windowless bedrooms. Each of these factors influences the livability, appeal, and functionality of the area for both residents and developers.

## Building Height

One of the primary incentives for participation in the UNO density bonus program is increased building height. Allowed building height within the program has changed through various amendments since the original adoption in 2004. Staff analyzed the mix of development typologies across the different program years to determine which typology – mid-rise or high-rise – was more common. While it is clear that the mid-rise development typology was most common, the revisions to the program in 2019, which amended the additional height bonus, did incentivize high-rise development within the Inner West subdistrict.



Source: City of Austin, Building Permit data 2006-Present. Note: Building Permit data is not available from 2004 to 2005.

Amendments to the program in 2019 greatly increased the allowed building height for the Inner West subdistrict and modestly increased height in the Outer West subdistrict. Staff analyzed the subset of



building permits submitted after this change to determine its impact on building design and program uptake.

	Average of Permitted Stories	Max of Permitted Stories	Count	Count Utilized Second Tier	% Utilized Second Tier
Outer West (Add. 25ft)	7	8	6	5	83%
Inner West (Add. 125ft)	22	30	12	6	50%

Source: City of Austin, Building Permit data 2019-Present.

The second tier of the bonus was particularly popular among development in the Outer West subdistrict where the additional 25ft of building height allowed the development to reach 75-85ft in allowed building height. Among the developments that utilized the 125ft height bonus, five chose to maximize their development potential, reaching 29 or 30 stories, indicating that this additional height bonus provided sufficient development potential to offset the increased affordability requirements.

## Parking Ratio

Staff analyzed parking data in site plans submitted within the UNO district boundaries in the last 10 years. Parking regulations for developments participating in the UNO density bonus program have changed throughout the years, and currently, there are no parking requirements for developments. However, staff analyzed the amount of parking provided against the City's previous parking requirements, similar to the analysis conducted for a recent code amendment to impose maximum parking requirements within Austin's downtown. The formerly required parking ratio provides a useful benchmark from which provided parking can be analyzed. Staff found that, on average, developments provided 56% of the parking that would have been required of typical development, with much of the parking being provided in below-ground parking structures. However, staff did find that in subdistricts that allow for additional building height, Inner West, developments included more above-grade stories of parking than in subdistricts that allowed lower heights – Outer West.

	Average of Below-Grade Stories	Average of Above-Grade Stories	Average of % of Required Parking Provided	Average of Residential Parking Ratio	Total Parking Spaces provided
INNER WEST	2.0	2.1	47%	1.00	4,300
OUTER WEST	1.2	0.8	67%	1.20	1,956
Grand Total	1.6	1.3	56%	1.09	6,326

Source: City of Austin, Site Plan data 2014-Present.

## Green Building

Mandatory Green Building has been a component of the University Neighborhood Overlay since it was first adopted in 2004. Participating developments are required to reach at least a one-star rating under the Austin Energy Green Building program (AEBG program). A one-star rating under the program only includes the basic requirements such as goal setting, bicycle parking, electric vehicle charging, and measures to reduce potable water use, among other requirements. Most developments have met only this minimum standard of a one-star rating; however, 11 developments have received two- or three-star ratings under the program. Two- and three-star ratings require increased point totals

from the core measures of the AEBG program, including elements of site location, energy performance, and water conservation. Increasing the requirement for Green Building from one-star to two- or three-stars reinforces the commitment to the City’s environmental and sustainability goals.

	Count
One-Star	54
Two-Star	3
Three-Star	8

Source: Austin Energy Green Building, 2005 – Present.

## Windowless Bedrooms

Addressing the issue of windowless bedrooms is crucial for enhancing livability for residents of new developments. Access to natural light significantly impacts residents' well-being, mental health, and safety. Ensuring that bedrooms are designed to include windows or alternatives for natural light aligns with UNO's focus on creating high-quality, safe living spaces for all residents.

Staff analyzed site plan documents for multifamily developments within the UNO area and were able to confirm data with property managers for a subset of buildings. Among the developments for which data was available, staff found that 32 buildings included at least one floorplan with a windowless bedroom. Due to limitations in data availability, this analysis does not reflect all developments within the district.

Within the developments studied, staff found that up to 60% of the bedrooms were windowless in some buildings. Staff estimate that at least 13% of bedrooms in the UNO area do not have access to natural light. This percentage was higher in high-rise developments in the Inner West subdistrict, where 17% of studied bedrooms were windowless. Reducing the size of floorplates or increasing the separation between towers can help to facilitate development with more bedrooms with access to natural light by allowing for more windows on exterior walls and reducing the depth of interior space within the development.

# University Neighborhood Overlay Delay of Occupancy and Early Leasing

## Delay of Occupancy

### Proposal:

Require a lease addendum for all UNO participating properties with notice and remedy requirements in the case of a delay of occupancy.

### Notice

- Require notice to all signed tenants if a certificate of occupancy for a leased unit has not been obtained 60 days prior to the lease start date.

### Remedy Options

Tenants are entitled to the following options at their discretion.

- Tenant is entitled to rent abatement on a daily basis until the unit is ready for occupancy and may terminate the lease without fees or additional requirements at any time before the unit is available for occupancy.
- Tenant is provided with compensation for temporary relocation including relocation costs, alternative accommodations, storage, and meal stipends. Rent payment is required under the lease provisions.
  - Alternative accommodations must be within the district, of equal or greater value, and may include a building owned or managed by the property owner of the leased property.
  - Compensation for expenses not including alternative accommodation may not exceed \$6,000.

### Local Best Practices

Staff reviewed both State and Austin tenant relocation requirements to determine best practice requirements. The requirements analyzed are for similar situations where a tenant is not able to access their unit and the landlord is required to provide relocation assistance.

### Sec. 92.023 of the Texas Property Maintenance Code

- If a municipality revokes a leased unit's certificate of occupancy a landlord must provide:
  - The full amount of the tenant's security deposit
  - The pro rata portion of any rental payment the tenant has paid in advance
  - The tenant's damages, including any moving costs, utility connection fees, storage fees, and lost wages
  - Court costs and attorney's fees from any related cause of action

### Austin Tenant Relocation Ordinance

- Requires an applicant to provide tenant notification 120 prior to the submittal of a development application
- Establishes a tenant relocation fee for multifamily redevelopment requiring a rezone or other discretionary land use approval
- Eligibility
  - Household income at or below 70% of median family income
- Relocation and moving expenses covered
  - Application fee, deposit, and first month's rent at replacement housing
  - Reimbursement for moving expenses (truck, movers, and materials)

### Peer City Relocation Assistance Programs

Staff reviewed Peer cities to analyze what other cities require be provided to tenants in need of relocation assistance.

CITY	SOURCE OF ASSISTANCE	TOTAL ASSISTANCE
San Antonio, Texas	City (Risk Mitigation Fund)	<b>Renters = \$2,250–\$3,500</b>  <b>Mobile homeowners = \$5,250–\$7,500</b>
Santa Barbara, California	Property owner	<b>\$5,000 maximum</b>  <b>\$6,000 maximum for households with special needs</b>
Seattle, Washington	50% paid by property owner  50% paid by City	<b>\$5,133</b>
Portland, Oregon	Property owner	<b>Studio: \$2,900</b> <b>1-bed: \$3,300</b> <b>2-bed: \$4,200</b> <b>3+ bed: \$4,500</b>

## Early Leasing

### Proposal:

Restrict early leasing for UNO participating properties to 6 months before the start of the lease term; applicable to all leases, lease renewals, and pre-lease agreements.

### Similar Peer City Programs:

#### Ann Arbor, Michigan

##### Early Leasing and Right to Renew

- Landlords must provide lease renewal offer no earlier than 180 days before the end of a current lease
- Landlord may only show a prospective tenant an occupied unit during the last 150 days of the lease term
- If a renewal is not offered, landlord must provide ground for good cause; if not provided then relocation assistance is mandated

#### East Lansing, Michigan

##### Releasing Process


- Cannot show prospective tenants a leased unit until 150 days before the end of the current lease period
- Cannot enter into a lease agreement with another tenant until 150 days before the end of the current lease period

\*This ordinance was voided after a requirement for nearby municipalities to adopt a similar ordinance was not met.

# Tower Spacing Requirements

## Proposal:

- 40ft step-back above 120ft in height from existing building of 120ft in height or greater
- 20ft from a shared lot line with a parcel with a maximum allowed building height greater than 120ft
- If the lot frontage is under 100ft then the maximum building coverage for portions of a building above 120ft is 65%




*Example of 40' Step-Back between buildings*

## Modeling:

Staff modeled the impacts of the tower spacing requirements on all Development Sites as defined in the Housing Capacity Analysis. Staff modeled the possible developable envelope for every development site within the proposed Inner West and Transit Core subdistricts. When compared to the existing developable envelopes for the same sites, modeling indicates that the proposed development standards increase developable area by an average of 274% and 224%, respectively, when accounting for tower spacing requirements.

	LOT SIZE (SF)	GROSS FLOOR AREA	% OF EXISTING UNO ALLOWANCE
INNER WEST	31,679	818,124	274%
TRANSIT CORE	24,956	886,644	224%

## Peer City Regulations:

CITY	REGULATIONS
DALLAS	<p><a href="#">Mixed Use Districts Tower Spacing:</a> An additional side and rear yard setback of one foot for each two feet in height above 45 feet is required for that portion of a structure over 45 feet in height, up to a total setback of 30 feet. This subparagraph does not require a total side or rear yard setback greater than 30 feet</p>
ATLANTA	<p><a href="#">Buckhead District Sunlight Preservation:</a> Tower level building footprints (for portions of buildings 125 feet in height or greater) shall not exceed 65 percent of the sidewalk level building footprint.</p>
SEATTLE	<p><a href="#">Downtown Mixed Residential Zone:</a> Portions of a structure greater than 65 feet in height: 40ft minimum stepback</p> <p><a href="#">University District Zone:</a> 75ft minimum between high rise structures on separate lots. Average residential gross floor area limit per story: 9,500 sq. ft.</p> 
VANCOUVER	<p><a href="#">West End Tower Separation Requirements:</a> Portions of a building above 60ft in height: 40-ft stepback from interior property line (can be reduced if 80-ft is guaranteed from existing tower) Balconies can extend 6-ft into setback Max Tower Floor Plate 5,500 sf floor plate</p>
PHILADELPHIA	<p><a href="#">CMX-4 and CMX-5 Districts:</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The maximum lot coverage of buildings for the first 65 ft. of building height shall be one hundred percent (100%).</li> <li>(b) The maximum lot coverage for portions of buildings above 65 ft. and up to 300 ft. in height shall be seventy-five percent (75%) of the lot.</li> <li>(c) The maximum lot coverage for portions of buildings above 300 ft. and up to 500 ft. in height shall be fifty percent (50%) of the lot. As an alternative, buildings over 300 ft. and up to 500 ft. in height may be constructed so that the average lot coverage of the building above 65 ft. shall not exceed sixty percent (60%) of the lot.</li> <li>(d) The maximum lot coverage for portions of buildings above 500 ft. and up to 700 ft. in height shall be forty percent (40%) of the lot. As an alternative, buildings over 500 ft. and up to 700 ft. in height may be constructed so that the average lot coverage of the building above 65 ft. shall not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the lot.</li> <li>(e) The maximum lot coverage for portions of buildings, including mechanical space, above 700 ft. in height shall be thirty percent (30%) of the lot. As an alternative, buildings</li> </ul>



**NEW YORK  
CITY**

over 700 ft. in height may be constructed so that the average lot coverage of the building above 65 ft. shall not exceed forty percent (40%) of the lot

[R9 through 912 District Tower Regulations:](#)

Above the maximum base height specified for the particular district, a tower with a maximum lot coverage of:

1. 65 percent shall be permitted up to a height of 300 feet; and
2. 50 percent shall be permitted above a height of 300 feet.

# Resolution No. 20240418-077: Resolutions & Responses

City Council Resolution No. 20240418-077 included direction beyond what can be addressed through amendments to the Land Development Code. This included programmatic direction and procedural changes that will be implemented by various City Departments. This document provides updates on those initiatives from the responsive City Departments.

## Development Services Department (DSD)

Resolution	Response
Requiring all rental developments participating under UNO to be <b>inspected every five years</b> for code violations.	<p>Development Services Department (DSD) is not resourced to provide inspections to all UNO-participating developments (estimated to be approximately 9,500 dwelling units). There are existing programs that could be applicable to existing UNO developments: Boarding House licensing and the Repeat Offender Program.</p> <p>Licensed boarding homes are inspected annually by code compliance inspectors to ensure the property is being maintained to minimum standards and the occupants reside in safe, healthy housing. A boarding home license is required for dwellings occupied by more than 15 adults with meal service being provided.</p> <p>The Repeat Offender Program requires tenant-occupied housing to register with the Department and receive annual inspections if the property shows a history of violating minimum housing standards. There are currently 84 properties registered in this program, containing approximately 16,000 dwelling units.</p> <p>Additionally, there are equity concerns with providing enhanced inspection and oversight to a specific geographic area that does not service the entire community. A majority of the properties enrolled with the Repeat Offender Program are aging multi-family properties suffering from deferred maintenance issues, while many of the UNO-participating properties are generally newer construction. Further, property owners could allege that they are experiencing targeted enforcement in comparison to other similarly situated properties.</p>

## Housing Department

Resolution	Response
<b>Upgrading the Affordable Housing Online Search Tool ("AHOST")</b> so that students have dynamic, frequently updated information regarding affordable housing options for students.	Staff is updating the reporting process for property managers, including new compliance measures that will improve the functionality of the AHOST tool. In addition, staff is planning a technology transformation of AHOST that will allow for any new scalable reporting process. Adding new information to AHOST will occur after the digital transformation is completed and the new reporting process is established.
Requiring participating <b>property owners</b> to provide sufficient <b>support to students</b> in the case of delayed <b>move-in dates beyond the start of a lease</b> , in coordination with the University of Texas at Austin.	Staff is proposing a required lease addendum for participating properties which enumerates tenants' remedy options in the case of a delayed move-in. This will establish a baseline of accommodations for tenants in the instance they are unable to occupy their unit by the start of the lease term.
<b>Reducing the likelihood</b> that participating property owners <b>price-fix rents via software algorithms</b> .	<p>As of now, two cities in the United States, San Francisco and Philadelphia, have enacted regulations targeting rent price-fixing algorithms. While there is growing awareness of the issue these tools pose in the rental market, regulatory efforts have primarily focused on federal anti-trust lawsuits.</p> <p>In the case of Austin, our ability to directly address these concerns is further constrained by Texas state law, which preempts local governments from regulating rent prices. Despite these limitations, the City of Austin remains committed to exploring alternative approaches to promote fairness and competition in the rental market, including collaboration with stakeholders and advocacy for transparency and accountability in the use of pricing algorithms.</p>
<b>Extending the required period of affordability for existing affordable units</b> within UNO through funding after evaluating the relative efficacy of <b>preventing the expiration of affordable units in existing buildings</b> or <b>securing affordable units in new construction</b> .	Staff will continue to consider opportunities to utilize existing funding tools to preserve, acquire, or incentivize income-restricted units at properties with expiring affordability.

## Transportation and Public Works Department

Resolution	Response
Enhanced <b>sidewalks, bikeways, and pedestrian realm improvements</b> on key corridors for <b>east-west travel</b> to the University of Texas from West Campus to expand <b>capacity</b> to move people and increase <b>safety</b> .	Generally, many pedestrian realm improvements are implemented at time of development per the UNO requirements. Bikeway improvements are also made on an ongoing basis per the Bicycle Plan. Updates to the UNO Streetscape requirements will further this outcome. Additional projects will be implemented by the City as funding becomes available.
<b>Expand</b> the boundaries of <b>UNO's Parking Benefit District ("PBD")</b> to more areas of West Campus, in coordination with UNO density bonus expansion.	These four items can all be completed when the Parking Enterprise Division goes through stakeholder meetings to convert the West Campus Parking Benefit District to a Parking and Transportation Management District. A potential timeline would be fall/winter 2025 for completion. Stakeholder engagement meetings have not been started.
Explore the merits of <b>converting UNO's PBD to a Parking and Transportation Management District ("PTMD")</b> .	
Ensure broad stakeholder representation of residents and businesses in <b>PBD/PTMD oversight</b> , especially <b>student representation</b> .	
<b>Engage</b> the West Campus community, especially <b>renters</b> , to <b>identify projects to be funded by the PBD/PTMD</b> , including but not limited to <b>street repair, sidewalks, curb ramps, and in-street scooter corrals</b> .	
Explore and provide recommendations to <b>convert 23rd Street</b> from <b>Rio Grande Street to Guadalupe</b> to a <b>pedestrianized street</b> .	The Austin Light Rail (ALR) project will impact the West Campus street network as vehicle traffic will be removed from The Drag. Evaluating 23 <sup>rd</sup> Street as a pedestrianized street will have to occur in coordination with the ALR project.
Utilize a data-driven, community-informed approach to <b>identifying and implementing micro-mobility parking spaces</b> , in coordination with <b>MetroBike expansion planning</b> , and <b>prioritize on-street corrals</b> .	The Parking Enterprise Division is coordinating with MetroBike's expansion planning. Staff can utilize data from the City's Ride Report system to identify corral locations. Staff can then meet with the community to vet the locations. A potential timeline would be early summer 2025 for completion.

Identify potential <b>funding opportunities</b> and a <b>timeline</b> for <b>street safety improvements</b> for <b>high injury network streets</b> within and adjacent to UNO.	Funding for street safety improvements on High-Injury Network streets within and adjacent to UNO could come from several different sources, including future Bond funding or State or Federal grants. All Vision Zero funding from the 2018 and 2020 Mobility Bonds is currently allocated to named projects for design and construction; however, future bond programs, if passed, could include funding for UNO projects. Vision Zero has been successful in securing funding for safety projects through TxDOT's Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). The HSIP is a competitive grant program that allocates funding based on a location's history of injury and fatal crashes. An HSIP application could be submitted for UNO safety projects in future HSIP calls for projects if they are determined to likely be competitive by staff. Vision Zero has also been awarded funding for safety projects through the federal Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) grant program, which could potentially be used for projects within UNO if they rank highly compared with other locations citywide based on safety and equity factors. At this time, staff have not identified specific projects in the UNO boundaries that are being considered for SS4A funding given the grant program's focus on funding projects in historically underserved communities in the Eastern Crescent.
Explore, with CapMetro and the University of Texas, a more holistic approach to <b>campus shuttles</b> and other mobility options to <b>expand accessibility to grocery stores</b> and other healthy food destinations.	CapMetro is currently developing Transit Plan 2035. The plan includes a comprehensive evaluation of CapMetro's transit system and how people travel in Central Texas. The final plan will outline strategies to update transit services, upgrade infrastructure and better meet needs over the next five to ten years. The plan will be complete at the end of 2025.

## Planning Department - Urban Design Division

Resolution	Response
Amended <b>design guidelines</b> to further encourage <b>ground floor activation</b> and <b>store fronts</b> instead of parking, and further <b>concealment of parking structures</b> and <b>dumpsters</b> .	Design guidelines for the University Neighborhood Overlay are adopted by administrative rule and contained in Section 12 of the Building Criteria Manual. The Urban Design team within the Planning Department is expected to update the design guidelines through the Technical Advisory Review Process (TARP).

## University Area Partners Kick-Off Meeting Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

August 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team and related staff met with interested members of University Area Partners (UAP) to present on the UNO Resolution and gather feedback on its proposals, as well as listen to any comments or concerns they have about UNO as it exists today. The meeting was held in-person at University Presbyterian Church on Tuesday, August 6<sup>th</sup>.

The purpose of the Workshop was to:

- Present on the UNO Resolution to educate UAP committee members on the Overlay's intent and goals
- Receive feedback from the community on the UNO Resolution as presented
- Listen to concerns expressed by UAP committee members
- Continue to gather input on community priorities and desires as well as feedback on the UNO Resolution

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Planning Department and UAP members in attendance. Prior to the meeting, members of UAP developed written comments on each resolution item. At the meeting, members of UAP read the pre-written comments. As each item was presented, members and City Staff were given the opportunity to ask questions or provide additional feedback on the topic area.

### Feedback Summary

During the in-person meeting, questions and comments were fielded and answered by Planning Department staff. Throughout the presentation when specific inquiries were made to or about the City and its policies, project team members provided verbal answers to the questions, and several attendees were encouraged to also submit this feedback to the publicly available UNO project site.

**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Built Environment</b>	Expansion of UNO Bonus Program	Mixed response to potential expansion of UNO Bonus Program boundaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated that more data is needed to understand if program expansion is necessary</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Unlimited height limits for Inner West and Dobie	Mixed response to increasing allowable building height <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern of tax implications for properties that have not redeveloped</li> <li>Dobie district is mostly owned by the University of Texas</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Ground Floor Commercial Requirements	Expressed that onerous commercial requirements could disincentivize use of the program
<b>Built Environment</b>	Concealment of parking structures and dumpsters	Expressed interest in exploring a unified contract for garbage service for UNO area Requirements for underground parking may increase the cost of development
<b>Built Environment</b>	Pocket Parks	Funding for the acquisition of parkland and park improvements should come from parkland dedication fees paid
<b>Housing</b>	Windowless Bedrooms	Concerns that requirements for windows in bedrooms would increase the cost of development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated that the price of each bedroom would be increased by \$1,500 to \$2,000 to comply with the regulations</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Tenant Protections	Expressed interest in a more uniform contract created in partnership between developers and UT Dean of Students
<b>Housing</b>	Dispersal of Affordable Units	Concerned that this would increase the burden of the inspection and compliance requirements
<b>Housing</b>	Delayed Move-Ins	Indicated that contractors are often aware of delays in project delivery well in advance and notification to the City and Dean of Students is essential in these circumstances. Indicated that a pre-construction conference could be beneficial. Also indicated that there are residents who do not attend UT so additional notification may be necessary to reach all residents.
<b>Mobility</b>	Converting PBD to PTMD	Coordination with UAP is necessary for converting to a parking and transportation management district
<b>Other Topics</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desire to understand the occupancy of existing residential developments</li> </ul>

### Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
Alan Pani  
Makayla Ponce



## Central Austin Neighborhoods Planning Area Committee (CANPAC) Kick-Off Meeting Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

September 04, 2024

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team and related staff met with interested members of the Central Austin Neighborhoods Planning Area Committee (CANPAC) to present on the UNO Resolution and gather feedback on its requests, as well as listen to any comments or concerns they have about UNO as it exists today. The meeting served as a kick-off meeting with CANPAC for community engagement over the UNO amendments, was held in-person at Lamar Senior Activity Center on Wednesday, September 4<sup>th</sup>.

The purpose of the Workshop was to:

- Present on the UNO Resolution to educate potentially affected residents on the Overlay's intent and goals
- Receive feedback from the community on the UNO Resolution as presented
- Listen to concerns expressed by CANPAC committee members
- Continue to gather input on community priorities and desires as well as feedback on the UNO Resolution

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Planning Department and CANPAC members in attendance. The Planning Department gave a presentation on the history of UNO and the requested modifications to the program from the City Council resolution. Throughout the presentation, Planning Department staff encouraged participants to ask questions on the presentation materials.

### Feedback Summary

During the in-person meeting, questions and comments were fielded and answered by Planning Department staff. Throughout the presentation when specific inquiries were made to or about the City and its policies, project team members provided verbal answers to the questions, and several attendees were encouraged to also submit this feedback to the publicly available UNO project site.

**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Built Environment</b>	Expansion of UNO Bonus Program	Mixed response to potential expansion of UNO Bonus Program boundaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interest in maintaining program boundaries as previous neighborhood efforts and involvement helped to craft the boundary</li></ul>

<b>Built Environment</b>	An appropriate step down of heights in expansion areas	Mixed response to increasing allowable building height <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heights impact surrounding neighborhoods including Judge's Hill and Heritage</li> <li>• Higher height limits within Inner West Campus kept taller structures from surrounding neighborhoods</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Windowless Bedrooms	Concerns the construction of windowless bedrooms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expressed interest in a requirement for windows to an exterior wall within every bedroom</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Housing Trust Fund	Expressed interest in geographically constraining fee-in-lieu expenditures to ensure funds are spent to benefit development of affordable housing within the district
<b>Other Topics</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire to understand the occupancy of existing residential developments</li> </ul>

### Attendees

Jo Sue Howard – Judges Hill  
 Paul Gosselink – Judges Hill  
 Jim Montgomery – Judges Hill  
 Megan Meisenbach – Judges Hill  
 Chris Ruun – West University  
 Robin Abrams – Heritage  
 Simon Atkinson – Heritage  
 Jay Farrell – Heritage  
 John Good – Heritage  
 Ron Sawey – Owuna  
 Karl R. – Owuna  
 Bruce Fairchild – HONA  
 John Foxworth – Heritage  
 Alice J. – SCNA  
 Adam Stephens

### Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
 Alan Pani  
 Jordan Feldman  
 Chad Sharrard

## UT Off-Campus Living Resources Meeting Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

August 15, 2024

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team met with UT Staff involved in the University's Off-Campus Living Resources branch to discuss the University Neighborhood Update code amendment. The meeting was held virtually on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024. This meeting served as a conversation with UT Staff familiar with students' off-campus needs and frequently engaged with the University Neighborhood Overlay area.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Introduce the City team to staff working in the UT Off-Campus Living Resources division
- Gather feedback on specific requests of the City Council Resolution
- Gain insight into concerns with the existing program requirements

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Long-Range Planning Team. The Long-Range Planning Team gave a presentation on the UNO proposal, including a background on UNO, description of the City Council resolution, and the staff proposal based on the resolution's goals. After the presentation, staff encouraged attendees to ask questions and provide feedback on the information presented.

### Feedback Summary

During the virtual meeting, staff presented on the UNO proposal and had a verbal conversation with the attendees regarding the proposal and noted their feedback. The attendees were encouraged to follow-up through the contact information provided.

**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Housing</b>	Resources for Visiting/ Temporary Students and Faculty	<p>Interest in housing options that are suited to visiting residents for the University</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants noted that there is a housing options for those who may need to only stay for a semester – something that is a 4-5 month lease and has similar rates to regular housing</li> <li>• Interest in a wider access to food and grocery options within West and North Campus, especially affordable options</li> <li>• Attendees were interested in the required number of mobility accessible units being increased beyond the proposed 10%</li> <li>• Attendees were interested in the required number of visual/hearing-impaired units being increased beyond the proposed 2% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Attendees were concerned as to how these standards would be maintained; Were informed by staff that Code Enforcement can be informed of any violations to these standards</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Delayed Move-Ins	<p>Interest in a more organized/streamlined approach to predict delays in move-ins and ways to support students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently the Dean of Students and Student Emergency Services works with students and developments to support students when there is a delay in move-ins (finding alternative housing, providing daily stipends, maintaining communication between management and students, etc.)</li> <li>• While there is a system in place for addressing this issue, it occurs frequently enough that having a more established regulation for it may better support everyone involved</li> </ul>
<b>Mobility</b>	Servicing Students	<p>General support for increased housing closer to campus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From 2023 data, roughly 78% of students were living within CapMetro catchment areas</li> <li>• While this is the case, there are naturally more options/support available to students living closer to campus</li> </ul>
<b>Other Topics</b>		<p><i>Clean/Discrete Waste Management and Cleanliness of Parking Garages</i> – Concern expressed from several residents over presence of dumpsters/trash out on streets, as well as some trash/other waste accumulation in some parking garages</p> <p><i>Safety Concerns for Students Navigating Campus and Nearby Areas</i> – General concerns regarding general student safety within the Campus and in West and North Campus</p>

## Attendees

Paige Muehlenkamp – Associate Director of Programming and Outreach  
Mylon Kirksey – Assistant Vice President Residence Life, Housing and Dining  
Bianca – Parking and Transportation Services; Liaison with CapMetro  
Deisy Jaimes – Director of Local Affairs & Dell Medical School Government Affairs  
Bethany Wendler – Director of Texas Leadership Education and Development  
Muneka Nwoko – Administrative Program Coordinator, Housing and Dining  
Meredith Pruitt – Associate Vice President for Communications and Engagement

## Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
Jordan Feldman  
Alan Pani  
Makayla Ponce

## University Tenants Union Townhall Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

October 17, 2024

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team and related staff met with UT students, UNO residents, and interested members of the public to present on the UNO Resolution and gather feedback on its proposals, as well as listen to any comments or concerns they have about UNO as it exists today. The meeting was held in-person at Goldsmith Hall at UT Campus on Thursday, October 17, from 5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

The purpose of the Workshop was to:

- Present on the UNO Resolution to educate potentially affected residents on the Overlay's intent and goals
- Receive feedback from the community on the UNO Resolution as presented
- Listen to concerns expressed by current UNO residents regarding their living conditions, issues they've experienced due to the built environment, and issues they've encountered with developers and/or building management services
- Continue to gather input on community priorities and desires as well as feedback on the UNO Resolution

The meeting began with the University Tenants Union (UTU) introducing themselves and the City staff present to the audience, as well as Councilmember Zo Qadri, who represents the district UNO falls within. Councilmember Zo Qadri spoke on his and the City's commitment to listening to the students' voices and incorporating their feedback into policy. This was followed by UTU discussing some of the hardships they and other students have experienced while living in UNO, as well as some of their work to combat these issues, and their future goals. After this, the Long-Range Planning Department presented on the UNO Resolution and encouraged audience members to participate in the public survey collecting resident feedback on the resolution, as well as ask any questions they had during the meeting. After this, UTU presented specific recommendations they created to optimize UNO for Austin student-renters.



Throughout UTU's presentation, UTU encouraged real-time feedback and comments on the resolutions and any other experiences attendees wanted to share. During this engagement, project team members heard about a variety of issues student renters had faced, what aspects of West Campus they enjoy and those they don't, and what support they want from the City and the University. Project team members offered insight on some policy concerns attendees shared, and UTU and project team members directed some attendees towards specific resources such as Code Enforcement for issues they expressed and didn't know there were established avenues for. After this discussion, wrap-up information was shared and the meeting concluded. Project team members followed up with UTU for their presentation document and to keep in touch.

## Feedback Summary

During the in-person meeting, questions and comments were fielded via UTU members and project team members present. Throughout the presentation when specific inquiries were made to or about the City and its policies, project team members provided verbal answers to the questions, and several attendees were encouraged to also submit this feedback to the publicly available UNO survey.

**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Built Environment</b>	Expansion of UNO Bonus Program	Mixed response to potential expansion of UNO Bonus Program boundaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some interest in these boundaries expanding</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Increasing Allowed Building Height	Mixed response to increasing allowable building height <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for more housing availability due to difficulty in finding available units, but worried about losing neighborhood character</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Ground Floor Activation	Residents appreciate more housing availability, but are worried about the loss of smaller-scale/neighborhood atmosphere <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong concern regarding the amount parking that takes up the ground floor to second or third floor of several buildings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong support of underground parking requirements for parking garages, or ground floor activation with public spaces</li> </ul> </li> <li>Strong support of adding a grocery store into the UNO boundaries, besides the existing Target store. It is a desire we have heard from several residents now</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Tenant Protections	Concerns about lack of protections from poor building management and pressured leasing practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several offices ask for signed leases far in advance, doesn't give renters time to consider options</li> <li>Concerned that renewal offers acceptances are expected too soon – requesting a standard 30 days to respond</li> <li>Several renters have been affected by delayed move-ins</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ban or restrict allowability of “window premium” as an amenity for a bedroom</li> <li>Address language that allows for window facing into living room that receives natural light; change so that this is not accepted as a window for a bedroom</li> <li>Concerns over high number of poor/unsafe building management practices, such as mold, insects, breaking/decaying space, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interest in more resources to address these issues in addition to City Code Enforcement</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Incentivizing Affordability	<p>Strong interest in increasing affordability of units, and ensuring that affordable units still have quality of life improvements and basic amenities (such as windows)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong concern over common leasing incentive practices in UNO (ie. Gift cards, rent reduction, prizes, etc.) since many renters are in financially vulnerable positions that these practices seem to target</li> <li>Management of several buildings add additional fees for subletting when that isn't a common practice elsewhere</li> </ul>
<b>Mobility</b>	Parking District	<p>Little feedback was received on the proposed Parking District but did hear concerns regarding parking and parking costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over high parking rates in parking garages and parking specifically for residents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These rates are high enough that several attendees noted that renters would either 1) Not bring their vehicles with them when moving in or 2) Chance parking on the street or other spaces to try to avoid the high rates</li> </ul> </li> <li>Concerns that parking garages are wasted/underutilized space due to these high fees</li> <li>Opposition to surface parking lots, residents would prefer that space be used in another way</li> </ul>
<b>Mobility</b>	Micro-Mobility & Walkability Improvements	<p>Some feedback about micro-mobility options (ie. Biking, scootering, etc) not feeling safe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some residents note that traveling by bike, scooter, or other similar modes don't feel safe due to car traffic</li> </ul>
<b>Mobility</b>	Campus Shuttles	<p>Residents are supportive of Campus Shuttles to HEB, as well as potentially other grocers, and several were unaware and pleased to be informed of the existence of the current program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents would support more shuttles and/or shuttles that ran more often to HEB, as well as other grocers</li> </ul>
<b>Other Topics</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Alerting UT of Housing Issues</i> - Interest in housing building managers alerting UT of building-wide issues; Potential of Student ID's being able to be shared with building managers to aid in communication between UT and manager, but there was a strong concern over privacy</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Resources for Student Renters</i> – Interest in a virtual repository where students can submit information/reviews and give details on experiences with developments to inform potential future renters; Interest in UT consolidating renter resources and actively sharing with students</li><li>• <i>Grocery/Food Access</i> – Strong support for another grocery store within the UNO Boundaries besides Target; several students noted food insecurity/difficult in accessing fresh produce and products</li></ul>
--	--	---

### Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
Alan Pani  
Warlan Rivera  
Chad Sharrard  
Makayla Ponce

## Real Estate Council of Austin (RECA) Kick-Off Meeting Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

December 9, 2024

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team met with the Real Estate Council of Austin (RECA) to discuss the University Neighborhood Update code amendment. The meeting was held virtually on December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2024. This meeting served as a kick-off meeting with a workgroup from RECA with experience working in the UNO area.

The purpose of the Workshop was to:

- Introduce the City team to the RECA Workgroup
- Gather feedback on specific requests of the City Council Resolution
- Gather feedback on the staff proposal
- Gain insight into concerns with the existing program requirements

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Long-Range Planning Team. The Planning Department gave a presentation on the history of UNO and the requested modifications to the program from the City Council resolution. After the presentation, staff encouraged participants to ask questions and provide feedback on the information presented.

### Feedback Summary

During the virtual meeting, staff asked participants questions aloud and noted their responses, as well as any additional questions or comments that participants had, verbal or through the meeting's chat. Participants were encouraged to follow-up through the contact information provided.

**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Built Environment</b>	Building Heights	<p>Mixed feedback on what height adjustments would be appropriate for UNO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multiple participants noted that 75' height is the most efficient for mid-rise developments, and that we'll likely see more of these as older developments redevelop</li> <li>Some participants noted that higher allowances than current would help developers to reach targets due to new restrictions on windowless bedrooms/subsequent loss of pro forma</li> <li>Provided 300'-420' number as height that is still below "super high-rise" classification but would still support development that is required to have smaller floorplates</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Potential Step-Back or Spacing Requirements	<p>Mixed feedback on step-back/spacing requirements and their feasibility for UNO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that additional setbacks would create a loss of efficiency</li> <li>Interest in step-backs and setbacks being preserved and/or being expanded for light access on streetscape and for visual + light quality for units facing other towers</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Ground Floor Requirements	<p>Interest in retail/grocery store(s)/pedestrian-oriented ground floor requirements, but concerns over feasibility of these spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frequent vacancies make it a challenge on developers/financing</li> <li>Many of the spaces on ground floor are not large enough to accommodate retail space requirements (access to alley, arrangement of vault on ground floor, etc.)</li> <li>General uncertainty on feasibility of grocery store in West Campus – could one be developed along Guadalupe/Lamar that services multiple neighborhoods and has a little more flexibility in its site?</li> <li>Suggestion: maintain flexibility for the spaces, don't necessarily require retail but maybe just publicly accessible/pedestrian-oriented/allow lobby spaces to count towards requirements</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Streetscape Standards	<p>Participants noted that trash handling, mail delivery, and overhead powerlines are the main concerns with the current UNO streetscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interest in screening provisions for trash receptacles and utilities as well as enforcement of their use</li> <li>Noted that overhead powerlines limit developable area and reduce the pedestrian experience</li> <li>Interest in potential requirements for curb cutouts/ROW design that builds in space for delivery and rideshare drivers</li> </ul>

<b>Housing</b>	Development Capacity	<p>Participants are seeing a need for more year-round residents in UNO, and generally feel positively towards additional housing opportunities in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that newer developments don't necessarily need to be focused on students, and that having some market-rate/year-round housing would bring disposable income to the area and better support businesses to reduce vacancies/turnover</li> <li>• Possibility for a couple of developments that rent by the unit for market-rate units, potentially incentivize them along MLK or closer to Downtown</li> </ul>
<b>Mobility</b>	Parking Requirements	<p>Mixed feedback on potential parking requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request to consider at least 30-40% parking ratio</li> <li>• Participants noted that there has been a general decrease in the number of students driving/arriving with cars from previous years</li> <li>• Request to consider that market-rate developments will need more parking than student-oriented developments, and would likely need above-grade parking to remain feasible</li> </ul>

## Attendees

RECA gathered members

Joe Deshotel, RECA

Scott Burns, LV Collective

Mike McHone, UAP

David Kanne, LV Collective

Scott Wuest, Wuest Group

Justin Brodnax, HOAR

Leah Bojo, Drenner Group

Amanda Swor, Drenner Group

Jim Stephenson, STG Design

## Staff in Attendance

Paul Books

Alan Pani

Makayla Ponce



## On the Moov Meeting Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

December 18, 2024

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team met with the leads of the UT org, On the Moov, to discuss the University Neighborhood Update code amendment. The meeting was held virtually on December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024. This meeting served as conversation with a specific organization that closely engages with the University Neighborhood Overlay and its residents.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Introduce the City team to On the Moov and its mission to support students with disabilities and advocate for accessibility on and near campus
- Gather feedback on specific requests of the City Council Resolution
- Gain insight into concerns with the existing program requirements

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Long-Range Planning Team. The Long-Range Planning Team gave a presentation on the UNO proposal, including a background on UNO, description of the City Council resolution, and the staff proposal based on the resolution's goals. After the presentation, staff encouraged the attendees to ask questions and provide feedback on the information presented.

### Feedback Summary

During the virtual meeting, staff presented on the UNO proposal and had a verbal conversation with the attendees regarding the proposal and noted their feedback. The attendees were encouraged to follow-up with the contact information provided.

**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Housing</b>	Accessible Units	<p>Interest in language for “fully accessible” units being refined, as well as increased percentages for different types of accessible units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendees noted that language presented, i.e. “fully accessible”, may be too vague and the standards may need to be further stipulated</li> <li>Attendees were interested in the required number of mobility accessible units being increased beyond the proposed 10%</li> <li>Attendees were interested in the required number of visual/hearing-impaired units being increased beyond the proposed 2% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendees were concerned as to how these standards would be maintained; Were informed by staff that Code Enforcement can be informed of any violations to these standards</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Ground Floor Units	<p>Concern regarding ground-floor activation favoring retail/public spaces or parking amenities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendees noted that ground floor units are the safest for many individuals with disabilities in case of an emergency</li> <li>Attendees noted that there is a shortage of ground-floor units, and that the number of available ground-floor units for rent would be immensely helpful</li> </ul>
<b>Mobility</b>	Mobility-Focused Resolution Items	<p>Interest in how the mobility-focused resolution items are being addressed in a disability-supportive framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were informed that CapMetro and the Transportation and Public Works departments would be addressing that portion of the resolution</li> </ul>
<b>Other Topics</b>		<p><i>Interest in properties being required to post 311/Code Enforcement contact details in public areas, such as elevators – Staff will look into if this can be made a requirement</i></p>

## Attendees

Aria Welch  
Fabiola Amaya

## Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
Jordan Feldman  
Alan Pani  
Makayla Ponce

## SafeHorns Meeting Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

December 16, 2024

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team met with the President of SafeHorns to discuss University Neighborhood Update code amendment. The meeting was held virtually on December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2024. This meeting served as conversation with a specific organization that closely engages with UNO.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Introduce the City team to SafeHorns and their mission
- Gather feedback on specific requests of the City Council Resolution
- Gain insight into concerns with the existing program requirements

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Long-Range Planning Team. The Long-Range Planning Team gave a presentation on the UNO proposal, including a background on UNO, description of the City Council resolution, and the staff proposal based on the resolution's goals. After the presentation, staff encouraged the attendee to ask questions and provide feedback on the information presented.

### Feedback Summary

During the virtual meeting, staff presented on the UNO proposal and had a verbal conversation with the attendee regarding the proposal and noted her feedback. The participant was encouraged to follow-up through the contact information provided.

**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Built Environment</b>	CPTED	<p>Interested in how CPTED principles are integrated in the City's neighborhood overlays and planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Referred staff to Florida House Bill 837 for inspiration on potential recommendations</li><li>• Participant was informed that Urban Design department would generally be in charge of the streetscape standards related to CPTED principles, but that many of its principles are related to buildings and building management and wouldn't be under the purview of the Planning Department,</li></ul>

		but that Code Enforcement could be contacted for some issues related to management/safety
<b>Built Environment</b>	Mid-Rise vs. High-Rise Developments	<p>Concerns regarding building management differences between the two development types</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In her experience with UNO, she has noticed that management/security practices for mid-rise developments aren't as available or responsive as they are for high-rise developments</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Proposed 23 <sup>rd</sup> Street Closure	<p>Requested clarification for reasoning behind proposed 23<sup>rd</sup> Street Closure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expressed that she had heard confusion from the community for the proposed 23<sup>rd</sup> Street closure and conveyed the community's concerns at how traffic would be rerouted and how that space would be updated to be welcoming to the local community</li> </ul>
<b>Other Topics</b>		<i>Interest in more frequent surveys/reviews of UNO than current proposal</i> – Participant expressed interest in surveys/reviews of UNO being conducted every 2-3 years rather than every 5 years as proposed

## Attendees

Joell McNew – President of SafeHorns

## Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
Jordan Feldman  
Alan Pani  
Makayla Ponce

## Central Austin Neighborhoods Planning Area Committee (CANPAC) UNO Proposal Engagement Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

February 24, 2025

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team and related staff met with interested members of the Central Austin Neighborhoods Planning Area Committee (CANPAC) to present on the draft UNO Proposal and gather feedback on it, as well as listen to any comments or concerns they have about UNO as it exists today and/or what is being proposed. The meeting was held in-person at Lamar Senior Activity Center on Monday, February 24<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

The purpose of the Workshop was to:

- Present on the draft UNO Proposal to educate potentially affected residents on the Overlay's intent, goals, and proposed changes
- Receive feedback from the community on the draft UNO Proposal as presented
- Listen to concerns expressed by CANPAC committee members
- Continue to gather input on community priorities and desires

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Long-Range Planning Team. The Long-Range Planning Team gave a presentation on the UNO proposal, including a background on UNO, description of the City Council resolution, and the staff proposal based on the resolution's goals. After the presentation, staff encouraged participants to ask questions and provide feedback on the information presented.

### Feedback Summary

During the in-person meeting, questions and comments were fielded and answered by Planning Department staff. Throughout the presentation when specific inquiries were made to or about the City and its policies, project team members provided verbal answers to the questions, and several attendees were encouraged to also submit this feedback to the publicly available UNO project site.

**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Built Environment</b>	Expansion of UNO Bonus Program	Opposition to proposed expansion of UNO Bonus Program's boundaries

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interest in maintaining program boundaries as previous neighborhood efforts and involvement helped to craft the boundary</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Infrastructure	<p>Concerns regarding ability of current infrastructure's ability to handle additional development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants expressed concern and interest in stormwater management expansion and mitigation strategies, specifically to reduce flooding risk in Hemphill and Shoal Creek areas</li> <li>Concerns about general electrical and traffic infrastructure and its ability to support increased population + developments</li> <li>Concerns regarding emergency vehicle response times being affected by heightened density (if transit corridors aren't updated in tandem)</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Affordability Requirements	<p>Concerns for the current 20% base requirement for affordable bedrooms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants interested in a higher base requirement of affordable bedrooms/units being proposed, such as 40% of bedrooms</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Development Capacity	<p>Concerns that the amount of housing that will result from redevelopment will exceed demand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants note seeing rotating/available housing in West Campus and so it does not seem that occupancy limits have been reached and need to increase</li> </ul>
<b>Other Topics</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Interest in more EV and Mode 3 Charging Stations</i> - Some participants requested that the number of electric vehicle charging stations required in new developments is increased</li> </ul>

## Attendees

John Foxworth – Shoal Creek  
 Bruce Fairchild – Heritage  
 Brian Tweedy – North University  
 Ford Turner – North University  
 Linch Roark – North University  
 Betsy Greenberg – Heritage  
 Kent Nutt – Shoal Creek  
 Homer Parsegian – North University  
 Jay Farrell – Heritage  
 Bertha Lopez – Shoal Creek  
 Charles d'Harcourt - Heritage  
 Ron Sewey – Old West Austin  
 Ikarl Richichi – Old West Austin



Pamela Bell – North University  
Rick Iverson – North University  
Karen McGrew – North University  
Eliza Thomas – Shoal Creek  
Robert Jarry – Shoal Creek  
Alicia Jarry – Shoal Creek  
Adam Stephens – Shoal Creek  
Bart Whatley – Hancock  
Sarah Campbell – Shoal Creek

#### Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
Alan Pani  
Makayla Ponce

## UT Staff Proposal Engagement Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

February 19, 2025

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team met with UT Faculty that frequently interfaces with the University Neighborhood Overlay and its residents to present on the draft UNO Proposal and gather feedback on it, as well as listen to any comments or concerns they have about UNO as it exists today. The meeting was held virtually on February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2025. This meeting served as a continuation to an initial meeting virtually held with UT Staff on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Present on the draft UNO Proposal to educate relevant UT Staff on the Overlay's intent, goals, and proposed changes
- Receive feedback from participants on the UNO Proposal as presented
- Listen to concerns expressed by present UT Staff
- Continue to gather input on community priorities and desires

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Long-Range Planning Team. The Long-Range Planning Team gave a presentation on the UNO proposal, including a background on UNO, description of the City Council resolution, and the staff proposal based on the resolution's goals. After the presentation, staff encouraged participants to ask questions and provide feedback on the information presented.

### Feedback Summary

During the virtual meeting, staff presented on the UNO proposal and had a verbal conversation with participants regarding the proposal and noted their feedback. The attendees were encouraged to follow-up through the contact information provided.

**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Housing</b>	Breaks Between Lease Dates	<p>Concern for students that experience an interim period between leases, such as those that end in July and a typical start date of Late August/September</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants expressed interest in options that could address these common gaps in housing timelines for students</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Early Leasing Restrictions	<p>Concerns regarding restrictions on early leasing and potential impacts to renting and occupancy rates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff communicated that the team's research hasn't shown negative impacts on availability of units, interest in local development, or affordability of units</li> <li>Staff communicated that the proposed timeline falls in line with standard practices of development across the city</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Transit Core Heights	<p>Concerns regarding the potential 420'/600' Height Allowance in the Inner West and Transit Core subdistricts (respectively)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall sense that these height allowances may be too tall for their context</li> </ul>
<b>Mobility</b>	Servicing Students	<p>General support for increased housing closer to campus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From 2023 data, roughly 78% of students were living within CapMetro catchment areas</li> <li>While this is the case, there are naturally more options/support available to students living closer to campus</li> </ul>

## Attendees

Paige Muehlenkamp – Associate Director of Programming and Outreach  
 Mylon Kirksey – Assistant Vice President Residence Life, Housing and Dining  
 Martin Serra – Attorney, Legal Services for UT Students  
 Kelly Soucy – Executive Director of Student Support, Dean of Students  
 Valeria Martin – Assistant Director for Basic Needs and Terry Scholars  
 Aaron Voyles – Director for Residence Hall Operations, Housing and Dining  
 Yancey Young – Director of Real Estate Planning  
 Deisy Jaimes – Director of Local Affairs & Dell Medical School Government Affairs

## Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
 Jordan Feldman  
 Alan Pani  
 Makayla Ponce

# University Area Partners (UAP) UNO Proposal Engagement Summary

## University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

February 25, 2025

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team met with interested members of the University Area Partners (UAP) and interested members of the community to present on the draft UNO Proposal and gather feedback on it, as well as listen to any comments or concerns they have about UNO as it exists today and/or what is being proposed. The meeting was held as a hybrid meeting at University Presbyterian Church on Tuesday, February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2025 from 2:00-3:30 PM. This meeting served as a continuation to a Kickoff Meeting held in-person on Thursday, October 17<sup>th</sup>.

The purpose of the Workshop was to:

- Present on the draft UNO Proposal to educate potentially affected residents on the Overlay’s intent, goals, and proposed changes
- Receive feedback from the community on the draft UNO Proposal as presented
- Listen to concerns expressed by UAP members
- Continue to gather input on community priorities and desires

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Long-Range Planning Team. The Long-Range Planning Team gave a presentation on the UNO proposal, including a background on UNO, description of the City Council resolution, and the staff proposal based on the resolution’s goals and community feedback received thus far. After the presentation, staff encouraged participants to ask questions and provide feedback on the information presented.

### Feedback Summary

During the hybrid meeting, questions and comments were fielded in-person and in the meeting’s zoom chat and were answered by Planning Department staff. When specific inquiries were made to or about the City and its policies, project team members provided verbal answers to the questions, and several attendees were encouraged to also submit their feedback to the publicly available UNO project site.

Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
Built Environment	Setbacks	Concerns regarding frontages of new developments not aligning/being pushed further back than existing frontages <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concerns around a more mixed frontage style developing from these requirements rather than a completely linear frontage type</li></ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over how setbacks will affect building footprints</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Streetscape Standards	<p>Interest in including CPTED language explicitly in proposal, as well as maintaining/bringing forward pedestrian-friendly streetscape elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were informed that proposed streetscape standards adhere to several CPTED principles but use plain/common language already present in code required, as well as wide setbacks</li> </ul>
<b>Other Topics</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Concerns on if existing structures will become non-conforming</i> - Participants were informed that their existing developments will not become non-conforming as a result of this overlay</li> <li><i>Interest in how affordability requirements are reviewed and tracked</i> - Participants were informed of the City's Housing Department's tracking of affordable housing in the city and how noncompliance is fined</li> </ul>

## Attendees

Paige Muehlenkamp  
 Brannin Prideaux  
 Carol Edwards  
 Tres Howland  
 Robert O'Brien  
 Jeff Shindler  
 Nancy Prideaux  
 Jim Montgomery  
 Jon Standley  
 Jo Sue Howard  
 Claudia Chidester  
 Ryan Crowley  
 Claire Curtin  
 Alexia Cox  
 Morris Stephanie  
 Cathy Norman  
 Walter C. Wukasch II  
 David Kies  
 Karen Pope  
 Mike McHone  
 Claire  
 Laura Parker  
 Robert DuBois  
 Suzi S  
 Ann Pickens  
 Carla George  
 Aseufert  
 Jesus

Alexia  
Tim  
Gina Rodriguez  
Laura  
Deisy A. Jaimes – UT Austin  
Jennifer Evans  
Kendra  
Stephanie  
Shannon Pettey  
Ayumi  
Stephen Papandon  
Amy Wanamaker  
Gabriel  
Monica  
Cathy  
Megan Meisenbach  
Adele Morris  
Karen  
Kelli Hanks  
Sandra

#### Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
Alan Pani  
Makayla Ponce

## Real Estate Council of Austin (RECA) UNO Proposal Engagement Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

February 24, 2025

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team met with RECA and related stakeholders to present on the UNO Proposal and gather feedback on said proposal. The meeting was held virtually on Microsoft Teams on Monday, February 24, 2025, from 1:00-2:30 PM. This meeting served as a continuation to a Kickoff Meeting held virtually on December 9th, 2024.

The purpose of the Workshop was to:

- Present on the current staff proposal
- Gather feedback on the staff proposal
- Gain insight into concerns with the existing program requirements, as well as with potential new requirements

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Long-Range Planning Team. The Long-Range Planning Team gave a presentation on the UNO proposal, including a background on UNO, description of the City Council resolution, and the staff proposal based on the resolution's goals. After the presentation, staff encouraged participants to ask questions and provide feedback on the information presented.

### Feedback Summary

During the virtual meeting, questions and comments in the meeting's chat and asked aloud were fielded via the Long-Range Planning Team. Throughout the Discussion when questions and comments were made, the Long-Range Planning Teams provided live, verbal answers to the questions, and participants were encouraged to follow-up through the contact information provided and/or the public survey shared after the meeting.



**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Built Environment</b>	Subdistrict Building Heights	<p>Concerns regarding the difference in maximum height between Inner West Campus (Max 420') and Outer West Campus (Max 90') subdistricts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worried that the 90' Outer West subdistrict height cap is lower than the current cap</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the change in scale and lack of gradation of heights between the subdistricts</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Proposed 20' Setbacks	<p>Concerns that the 20' setback at 120' height in the Transit Core and Inner West subdistricts will negatively affect new developments' pro forma</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that this size of setback will be large enough that it will make some projects unprofitable</li> <li>• Interest from some participants in more calibration being done before setback is codified</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Gatekeeper Community Benefits Options	<p>Some participants voiced that none of the proposed options would be feasible in their projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participant(s) suggestion: Could the 3-story above ground parking cap not be a cap across the proposal, but instead a gatekeeper benefit?</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Streetscape Standards	<p>Interest in streetscape standards maintaining neighborhood or historic character in parts of West Campus, as well as including CPTED language explicitly in proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants were informed that streetscape along Guadalupe would have updated/enhanced standards based on Project Connect development</li> <li>• Participants were informed that proposed streetscape standards adhere to several CPTED principles but use plain/common language already present in code</li> </ul>
<b>Mobility</b>	Parking Garage Cap	<p>Opposition to the 3-story above ground parking cap, and concerns about lack of public parking through increased development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the 3-story cap is too low, since underground parking is more costly and may be too cost-prohibitive for some projects</li> <li>• Concern from some non-residential institutions that a lack of public and easily-accessible parking will deter visitors from their establishments</li> <li>• Request for clarification on how a neighborhood would be viable year-round (rather than just during the months school is in session) without the amount of parking Austin residents are used to</li> </ul>
<b>Other Topics</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Concerns regarding ground/foundation integrity of sites within proposed boundary - Some sites included in the proposed boundary along Lamar Blvd. Pose a concern to participants due</i></li> </ul>

		<p>to potential instability of geology in these areas; request for sites to be thoroughly reviewed during site plan review process to ensure new developments are only built on stable geology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Lack of car access on Guadalupe from Project Connect</i> - Concerns regarding lack of access by car along Guadalupe from the proposed light rail; Concerned by the increased traffic this may direct through West Campus proper</li> </ul>
--	--	---

## Attendees

Jim Stephenson – STG  
 Marisela Maddox – Judges Hill  
 Megan Meisenbach – Judges Hill  
 Scott F. Burns – RECA  
 Scott Wuest – RECA  
 Mike McHone – UAP  
 Leah Bojo – RECA  
 Justin E. Brodnax – RECA  
 Joell McNew – Safeguard Strategy  
 Deisy James – UT Austin  
 David Hartman  
 Bradley Bailey  
 Huntington Prater  
 Ryan C.  
 Harrison Williams  
 Stephanie Morris  
 Jacqueline Dudley  
 Kelli Hanks  
 Alina Carnahan  
 Joseph Cantu  
 Rowena Dasch  
 Jennifer Evans  
 Amy Wanamaker  
 Brannin  
 Walter W.

## Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
 Alan Pani  
 Makayla Ponce

## Austin Chapter of The American Institute of Architects (AIA) Roundtable Summary

### University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Code Amendments

Austin, Texas

March 24, 2025

### Engagement Approach and Event Details

The Long-Range Planning Team met with interested members of the Austin Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) to present on the draft UNO Proposal and gather feedback on it, as well as listen to any comments or concerns they have about UNO as it exists today. The meeting was held as an in-person meeting at the AIA Austin Chapter Headquarters on Monday, March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2025 from 12:00-1:00 PM.

The purpose of the Workshop was to:

- Present on the draft UNO Proposal to inform Austin AIA members on the Overlay's intent, goals, and proposed changes
- Receive feedback from the community on the draft UNO Proposal as presented
- Listen to concerns expressed by AIA members
- Continue to gather input on community priorities and desires

The meeting began with a brief introduction by the Long-Range Planning Team. The Long-Range Planning Team gave a presentation on the UNO proposal, including a background on UNO, description of the City Council resolution, and the staff proposal based on the resolution's goals and community feedback received thus far. After the presentation, staff encouraged participants to ask questions and provide feedback on the information presented.

### Feedback Summary

During the hybrid meeting, questions and comments were fielded in-person and were answered by Planning Department staff. When specific inquiries were made to or about the City and its policies, project team members provided verbal answers to the questions, and several attendees were encouraged to also submit their feedback to the publicly available UNO project site.

**Table 1: Summary of Discussion Topics**

Topic Category	Subtopic	What We Heard
<b>Built Environment</b>	Proposed Boundary	<p>Interest in reasoning for proposed boundary not passing MLK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were informed that the area is generally under or adjacent to the Downtown Density Bonus program, and so it will be reviewed under that program's calibration</li> </ul> <p>Interest in reasoning for not pushing boundary to Lamar along entire edge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were informed that the proposed boundary and intent is to encompass lots that were already zoned at a greater density than Single-Family</li> </ul>
<b>Built Environment</b>	Infrastructure	<p>Concerns regarding increased development and its impacts on area's stormwater and sewage capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were informed that Austin Watershed have been involved in the process and don't have concerns regarding the proposal</li> </ul> <p>Concerns regarding handling of traffic increase from additional development and the potential light rail</p>
<b>Housing</b>	Analysis	<p>Interest in what analysis has been done on the need for increased housing capacity in West Campus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were informed generally on staff's process and sources for examining student housing and mobility patterns and how it informed the UNO capacity analysis</li> </ul> <p>Interest in what engagement has been done to ensure students' experiences with leasing and pre-leasing are taken into account in the proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants were informed of the community engagement staff has done with UTU and other student/local group and how their feedback has informed the proposal</li> </ul>
<b>Other Topics</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Request that City Staff present the UNO Proposal to the Landmarks Commission at one of their regularly scheduled meetings</i> – Participants expressed concern at churches and other small organizations in UNO being negatively impacted by development pressures; Staff followed up to setup a meeting time</li> <li><i>Interest in the possibility of a Grocery Store being required</i> – Participants were informed that a grocery store can only be incentivized through this process</li> <li><i>Concerns over above-ground parking still being permitted in proposal</i> – Participants were informed that the current proposal is a balance between reducing parking requirements to promote public transit usage, while also recognizing many users' needs for vehicles still and the high expense of underground parking</li> </ul>

## Attendees

Michael Hsu – HKS  
Carlos Garcia – HKS  
Kevin Kinsey – HKS  
Chris Bent - HKS  
George Blume – HOK  
Jana McCann – McCann Adams Studio  
Stephi Motal – Black + Motal Studio  
Heyden Walker – Black + Motal Studio  
Loren Kirkpatrick  
Erin Thompson  
Travis Schneider – Page  
Nai'lah Bell - Gensler  
Bryan Jones – Beck Architecture  
Ben Heimsath – Heimsath Architects  
Gretchen DuPre – Forma and Flora Landscape Design  
Emmanuel Moran – WGI

## Staff in Attendance

Paul Books  
Alan Pani  
Makayla Ponce



# Affordability Impact Statement

## University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Update

Res. [No. 20240418-077](#) and [No. 2025-0130-057](#)

Date: 04/02/2025

### Proposed Regulation

The proposed code amendment will repeal existing Land Development Code Article 3 Division 9 University Neighborhood Overlay District Requirements and create a new density bonus combining district – Density Bonus University Neighborhood Overlay (DBUNO). The new combining district will replace the existing overlay, incorporating many of the elements of the existing regulations as well as the updates requested by City Council. The amendment includes:

- **Expanding** the district to the west and north, incorporating more of the multifamily and commercial uses that are adjacent to the current district boundaries
- **Updating** subdistrict boundaries and **increasing** height limits based on those subdistricts' base zoning

<i>Subdistrict</i>	<i>Height Bonus</i>	<i>Uses</i>	<i>Community Benefits</i>	<i>Tower Spacing</i>
Transit Core	540' (600' Max)	Residential, Local, Hotel/Motel (with limitations)	Choice of 1	20' Stepback at a height of 120'
Inner West	360' (420' Max)	Residential, Local	Choice of 1	20' Stepback at a height of 120'
Outer West	30' (90' Max)	Residential, Local	Not applicable	Not applicable

- **Requiring** Community Benefit Options for Transit Core & Inner West developments using DBUNO
  - Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial
  - Grocery Store Use

- Transit-Supportive Infrastructure
- On-site Water Reuse System
- Green Roof
- Affordable housing projects that set aside 50% or more units at 50% MFI will be exempted from requiring a community benefit.
- **Implementing** new Affordability Requirements
  - Affordable bedrooms and units are required at 50% MFI
  - Tiered system so property owner can select height while maximizing affordability
  - Development leasing by unit may provide a lower proportion of affordable units
  - Fee-in-lieu re-calibrated to be equivalent to cost of on-site units
- **Establishing** New Lease and Redevelopment Requirements
  - Dispersion of affordable units and equal access to amenities
  - Tenant protections for existing multifamily units
  - Early Leasing Restrictions
  - Delay of Occupancy Accommodations
  - Exterior window requirement

## Land Use/Zoning Impacts on Housing Costs

The proposed changes would have a **neutral** land use impact on housing costs compared to current regulations.

The Planning Department conducted quantitative analysis to identify the housing needs within the UNO district. 45,531 students live off-campus, and the DBUNO proposal helps absorb that housing need by incentivizing developers to build more housing options. Stakeholder engagement also indicated a desire for more non-student residents in the neighborhood to support local businesses. Thus, in conjunction with the student housing need, there is a projected, non-student demand to be induced by building more housing. Under maximum entitlements and land utilization, DBUNO's rezoning will allow for up to 40,493 units, accommodating 83,026 residents.

While DBUNO will not inherently lower housing costs, allowing for densification and the accompanying community benefits can attract more residents and potentially reduce demand in tighter sub-markets of the city. Historically UNO has been a well-utilized incentive program for purpose-built student housing. Since UNO's 2014 update, 94% of developments in the district have opted into the program; thus, it is likely that the proposal will add housing stock to the city.

## Impact on Development Cost

The proposed changes would have a **neutral** impact on development costs.

The Planning Department contracted Economic & Planning Systems (EPS) to calibrate the affordable housing set-asides. Under the DBUNO proposal, EPS identified increased construction costs for taller buildings, because of the shift from wood to steel frames. However, taller buildings currently in UNO or the Central Business District



(CBD) typically achieve higher rents, which should offset the increase in development costs. Developers will also have the option to lease by the bedroom, which cumulatively generates more rent for the property owner while keeping individual students' rent low.

## Impact on Affordable Housing

The proposed changes would have a **mixed impacts** on affordable housing compared to current regulations.

The DBUNO proposal has requirements of redevelopment and new leasing that protects tenants (stated above in regulation summary) such as early leasing restrictions and accommodations for delayed occupancy, which will maintain housing market affordability and livability for residents.

EPS research also identified that participating DBUNO developers will need to achieve high market rents to support the cost of development, particularly as construction costs increase for taller developments. The increased construction cost for taller developments may require even higher rent, luxury apartments and condominiums comparable to the downtown sub-market, which could compete with the student housing sub-market. The set-aside requirement for affordable units is also proportionally less than the set-aside for affordable bedrooms.

Additionally, renting by the bedroom is not without risks to affordability and livability, as it commodifies individual components of residential unit to offset the increased construction costs of taller buildings and [strategically enables higher rents than non-student rental developments](#). Leasing individual bedrooms reduces the savings that come with living with roommates and enables property owners to charge higher rental rates per person. According to a [2023 COA study](#), a three-bedroom unit in UNO costs an average of \$1,595/month total more in rent than the average three-bedroom unit in Austin. According to the staff report, high rise developments tend to have higher proportions of windowless bedrooms, suggesting that the windowless bedroom trend is becoming more entrenched in the building practices of UNO participants, and potentially due to the desire to maximize bedrooms.

At the same time, in absolute terms, DBUNO presents the opportunity to build more affordable units for the area, almost 2.5 times the current feasible affordable units per acre, and the units will be at a deeper affordability (50% MFI). The proposed program is calibrated to achieve maximum affordable units given the cost of development.

## Other Policy Considerations

None

Manager's Signature

