

Am.	Commissioner	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Maxwell Vote	Gannon Vote	Ahmed Vote	Powell Vote	
1	Maxwell	Strike sections L, M & N of the draft ordinance	Due to stakeholder concerns, these requirements should be updated and recalibrated after additional community engagement. Calibration on this should include both changes to requirements within this section as well as changes to commercial requirements within 4-18.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
2	Maxwell	General recommendation: to delay implementation of sections L, M +N to phase II of the DDB process	Due to stakeholder concerns, these requirements should be updated and recalibrated after stakeholder engagement. This should include updating which spaces should qualify for protection. Phase II should apply the updated commercial redevelopment requirements to the entire downtown area, not just the Phase II area.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
3	Maxwell	In PART 8,25-2-65x, Letter C, Revise Line 151 to read: (C) If this section conflicts with (1) Pecan street overlay (PS) district, the more restrictive provision controls and (2) Properties subject to Section 25-2-168 (Downtown Parks (DP) Overlay District are eligible DENSITY BONUS COMBINING DISTRICTS as outlined in PART 7.	Incorporate PC Initiated code changes (10/25/25) to the Downtown Parks Overlay into the Downtown Density Bonus Update Phase I draft ordinance. The proposed changes to the Downtown Parks Overlay were initiated last fall by Planning Commission, and have support from key downtown stakeholders. This update takes into account concerns raised in Attachment C of the staff report	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
4	Maxwell	General recommendation: In Phase II Expand the number of UDS options as outlined in Section R	The costs and impact of current UDS standards as outlined in Phase I are varied and several may not be feasible, particularly on smaller sites or those without historic zoning	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Maxwell	General Recommendation: In Phase II revise section G + H number 2 to adjust the number of optional urban design standards required for participation in the DB 400 and DB 850 programs	Current requirement of 7/14 and 10/14 could prove challenging to achieve particularly for non-historic or small sites	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	Maxwell	General Recommendation: In Phase II revisit and revise UDS-6 (Upper Story Design) to match North Burnet Gateway + PC recommendations for UNO and remove stepback requirements	This revision in Phase II would provide consistency between Density Bonuses where stepbacks requirements have been eliminated in favor of more pedestrian focused design at the street level vs. unnecessary and costly building cut outs that do not address street level view	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
7	Maxwell	Replace Section Q, Mandatory Urban Design Standards (UDS) and Section R, Optional Urban Design Standards (UDS) with revised standards as outlined in PC back up from the design commission, titled Downtown Density Bonus Urban Design Standards (see link https://services.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=473003)	Per City of Austin Design Commission, the revised standards are more precise, and prescriptive set of guidelines that ensure better building outcomes for our downtown community and projects using the DDB program	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
8	Ahmed	General Recommendation: Offer incentives for supporting existing tenants	If we are not striking L, M, and N from the draft ordinance, consider offering incentives to developers for supporting existing tenants instead of making them requirements. This way, landlords downtown are not disincentivized from signing or renewing leases for these types of businesses.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

9	Gannon	General Recommendation: Revisit the Gateway requirements related to Bird Friendly design in Phase II offering more options regarding this requirement	Per 'Bird-building collisions in the United States' (Loss et al., The Condor, 2014), building collisions kill over a billion birds annually — a problem addressable through bird-friendly design. However, the same study finds that less than 1% of collisions occur at buildings over 12 stories; the vast majority happen at mid-rises and residences. Given this, does it make sense to apply this requirement specifically to the downtown density bonus?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Ahmed	General Recommendation: For Optional Urban Design Standards, offer a weighted value for each item proportional to the amount of community benefit. Instead of requiring a minimum number of standards, require a minimum total value from the chosen standards.	Certain standards in this list, like "Enhanced Pedestrian-Oriented Frontage", seem to offer more value to the community than others, like "Stepbacks" and "Match Historic Building Scale". The costs to developers to implement these standards also varies. Instead of incentivizing developers to implement the lowest cost standards, incentivize them to implement the ones that provide the most community benefit.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
11	Gannon	General recommendation to revisit the FIL calibration for DDB, particularly focusing on the cost difference between FIL fees and onsite affordability	Per the consultant report, address the delta between FIL for DDB program vs. the costs as outline for onsite affordable units in the district.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
12	Maxwell	General Recommendation: Expedite the inclusion of the South Central Waterfront District to the map referenced in Appendix _x_ to provide options for that planning district to participate in DDB 400 and DDB 850	Expanding the map to include South Central Waterfront expedites participation from those properties without the delay of waiting for Phase II and offers much needed alternatives to PUD process				