

RE: CodeNEXT Topics

~~Late Backup~~

Colleagues,

Below, please find a further evolution of the "Topics/Questions," incorporating last week's bulletin board postings of the MPT Tovo and Council Members Alter, Pool, Houston and Kitchen, as organized and elaborated upon by staff and consultants. If this is an acceptable direction, we can still, of course, change and add to it as we see fit. Please make suggestions.

If time allows at today's public hearing, we can continue our discussion of how, starting June 5th, we work collectively to find opportunities for consensus on the topics Council Members have suggested by talking through related questions. A potential process for handling discussion topics, to start conversations, could be as follows:

Beginning June 5th (starting at 10 am and perhaps going no later than 6 pm):

1. City Staff and consultants very briefly present an overview of their recommendations for code text and map, including errata, and addenda.
2. City Staff provide a very brief overview on the recommendations made by Planning Commission, Zoning and Platting Commission, Environmental Commission, and Historic Landmark Commission, and potentially other commissions.
3. Council could check to see if there is general consensus on the Goals document (Alter, Kitchen, Adler) that CM Alter referenced in her post from last week. [<http://assets.austintexas.gov/austincouncilforum/E6-20180209195617.pdf>]
4. Council then could discuss issues raised by each Topic/Question, in turn, beginning with staff/consultants laying out the following information for each:
 - How the Topic/Question is addressed under the current land development code;
 - How each Topic/Question is addressed in the staff recommendation;
 - Planning Commission recommendations made for the Topic/Question;
 - ZAP recommendation made for the Topic/Question;
 - Other City Board or Commission recommendations made for the Topic/Question
 - Any staff and consultant reaction or recommendations related to Commission recommendations
5. Council discussion would begin with a series of higher-level policy questions (such as those in the list below), with the opportunity to funnel down to more specific questions and possible policy direction and/or language. At each point, Council would check to see if a consensus opportunity exists (8 or more council members expressing some level of consensus) on Topics and Questions.
 - Council could employ a method similar to the "fist-to-five" technique we used during our work to develop our Strategic Direction 2023
 - If consensus cannot be achieved on any policy direction for a given Topic/Question, it could be tabled and revisited later in the deliberation process, and Council could move on to the next Topic/Question. Of course, Council could return and reconsider any Topic or Question previously considered.

6. If, after addressing each major topic category, the process suggested above is not resulting in Council finding areas of consensus, the Council may decide to consider an alternate process.

CodeNEXT- City Council Discussion Topics & Questions

LINK: <http://assets.austintexas.gov/austincouncilforum/9C-20180602184709.pdf>

Below are suggested topics, subtopics, and policy questions for guiding Council's CodeNEXT deliberations. This list is not exhaustive and can be expanded if and as new questions arise during deliberations. This staff/consultant list is only a draft and intended to be a starting point for Council to discuss how deliberations might proceed. Please note that several topics are more fleshed out than others for illustrative purposes. Topics in grey are still very preliminary and not yet ready to be discussed in depth.

LINK

I. Encourage the development and preservation of affordable housing

I.A Income-restricted Housing

- I.A.1 What is our income-restricted housing goal? What capacity is needed to reach that goal? How often should we evaluate and recalibrate the program to ensure we meet that goal?
- I.A.2 How should affordable housing bonuses be calibrated to maximize the production of income-restricted units?
- I.A.3 How should base zoning entitlements be calibrated with affordable housing bonuses?
- I.A.4 How should we maximize the development of income-restricted housing in all parts of the city? What should be our goals for producing income-restricted housing in moderate, high, and very high opportunity areas?
- I.A.5 Should there be incentives for providing a greater number of family-sized units in income-restricted housing?
- I.A.6 Should affordable housing bonuses be available in residential house scale zones (LA – R4) to create income-restricted units?
- I.A.7 How could we revise S.M.A.R.T. housing to better incentivize affordable housing projects?

I.B Density Bonus Program Administration

- I.B.1 When should income restricted housing be required on-site vs. off-site vs. fee-in-lieu, etc.? Which entity should make that determination?

I.C Preserving Existing Affordable Housing

- I.C.1 Should preservation incentives, such as larger ADUs or increased FAR, be used to discourage demolition of existing single-family homes?

- I.C.2 How should gentrifying areas and areas susceptible to gentrification (such as the Eastern Crescent) be mapped so as to prevent accelerated displacement of low-income residents?
- I.C.3 How should older, affordable multifamily properties be zoned to promote affordability?
- I.C.4 How can incentives be used to preserve existing housing that is affordable to middle to lower income citizens?

I.D Tenant Relocation Protections

- I.D.1 How can tenant relocation programs assist with affordability?
- I.D.2 How do base zoning entitlements impact the tenant relocation ordinance?

I.E I.E. Live/Work Spaces to Support Artists, Musicians, and Small Business Owners

II. Provide more housing choices and supply for Austinites at all stages of life and incomes

II.A Strategic Housing Blueprint

- II.A.1 What should be our overall housing capacity goal to meet the goals in Imagine Austin and the Strategic Housing Blueprint?
- II.A.2 Does Draft Three or Planning Commission recommendations meet our housing capacity and policy goals in the Strategic Housing Blueprint?
- II.A.3 Which are the best tools in the Strategic Housing Blueprint that help meet housing goals?
- II.A.4 How do we measure and calibrate the non-zoning sections to achieve housing capacity goals along with environmental, transportation and other Imagine Austin goals?

II.B Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's)

- II.B.1 Should ADU's be allowed in more areas across Austin?
- II.B.2 What should be the maximum allowable size of ADUs?
- II.B.3 Should ADU's be made more feasible in single family zones (Residential house-scale zones LA - R4)?
 - II.B.3.a Where should ADUs be made more feasible, such as near transportation corridors or activity centers?*
 - II.B.3.b How should ADUs be made more feasible, such as FAR bonuses for preserving an existing house or parking reductions?*

II.C More Housing Types and Choices (House scale multi-unit buildings)

- II.C.1 Should more housing choices and types be allowed in more areas across Austin?

II.C.2 Where should more housing choices and types be allowed?

II.C.3 Should there be equitable distribution of housing density throughout the city?

II.C.4 In which zones should Cooperative Housing be allowed?

II.D Fair Housing

II.D.1 How do we measure and calibrate how the land development code affirmatively furthers fair housing over the next 30 years?

II.D.2 How do we create more affordable housing throughout the city, including in high opportunity areas?

II.D.3 What land development policies conflict with or hinder the ability to affirmatively further fair housing?

II.E Housing Supply

II.E.1 Where should more by-right housing be allowed through increased base entitlements?

II.E.1.a Should there be by-right housing increases allowed?

II.E.1.b Should additional by-right housing be allowed only through Affordable Housing Density Bonuses?

II.E.1.c How much new housing on corridors should be by-right versus affordable housing bonus?

II.E.2 Where should more intense Residential House Scale Zones (R4) and Residential Multi-Unit Zones (RM1 – RM5) be mapped so as to allow for sufficient housing choice in appropriate places?

II.E.3 How many dwelling units should be allowed per lot (depending on the size) in residential zones R2 - R4?

II.E.4 In which zones should STRs be allowed by-right, or allowed with a Minor Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit?

II.F Prioritize Future Growth along Corridors and in Centers

II.F.1 Should we focus new, denser, mixed-use development achieving our housing goals on transportation corridors and in activity centers, rather than in the core of existing single-family neighborhoods?

II.F.2 What degree of change should be allowed to accommodate transitions between centers and corridors and residential house-scaled areas?

II.F.3 How can we ensure that sites on transportation corridors are able to achieve and balance sufficient housing supply with non-zoning requirements related to environmental protection, open space, reducing flood risk, transportation, infrastructure, urban forest protection, etc.

II.G Cooperative Housing

II.G.1 In which zones should Cooperative Housing be allowed by-right, or allowed with a Minor Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit?

II.H Occupancy Limits

III. Preserve and respect neighborhood identity and quality of life

III.A Building Form and Scale

- III.A.1 How should existing McMansion standards for regulating the scale and form of infill housing be carried forward or changed in a new code?
- III.A.2 How do we incentivize preserving existing affordable structures in residential house scale zones (LA-R4) by making ADUs and additions more feasible?
- III.A.3 Would a lower cap on size or FAR and/or allowing more units on lots help incent more affordable housing options?
- III.A.4 Would further refining the McMansion standards being carried into the proposed new code such that it fully accounts for the entire built square footage of a building help incentivize preservation of existing smaller homes?

III.B Uses and Parking

- III.B.1 In which zones should Short Term Rentals be restricted?
- III.B.2 In which zones should Level 1 and 2 Bar/Nightclubs be allowed by right, or allowed with a Minor Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit?
- III.B.3 Should we require higher level of review for Level 1 and 2 Bar/Nightclubs within 200 feet of residential house scale zones (LA – R4)?
- III.B.4 How could changing parking requirements affect our ability to achieve Strategic Housing Blueprint, public safety, mobility, and other Imagine Austin goals?
- III.B.5 What should the minimum parking requirement be for residential house scale zones (LA – R4)? in areas with narrow streets and in areas lacking sidewalks, different size streets, or different sidewalk conditions?
- III.B.6 What should the minimum parking requirement be for residential house scale zones (LA – R4)? in areas with access to transit, or other context elements?

III.C Compatibility

- III.C.1 How does compatibility affect our Strategic Housing Blueprint housing capacity and other Imagine Austin policy goals?
- III.C.2 Should transition zones be used between centers and corridors and residential house-scaled neighborhood cores?
- III.C.3 Should compatibility standards be used between centers and corridors and residential house-scaled neighborhood cores?

III.C.4 How should we minimize the impact of noise and light pollution, deliveries and trash collection in areas of transition?

III.C.5 Should minimum lot sizes in residential zone districts (LA – R4) reflect patterns found in existing single family areas?

III.C.6 What lot sizes should be allowed in the City?

III.D Historic Preservation Incentives and Historic Preservation Districts

III.E Uses with MUPs or CUPs

III.E.1 In which zones should STRs be allowed by-right, or allowed with a Minor Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit?

III.E.2 In which zones should small (by number of children) child care uses be allowed by-right, or allowed with a Minor Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit?

III.E.3 In which zones should Level 1 and 2 Bar/Nightclubs be allowed by right, or allowed with a Minor Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit?

III.E.4 Should we require higher level of review for Level 1 and 2 Bar/Nightclubs within 200 feet of residential house scale zones (LA – R4)?

III.F Occupancy Limits

III.G Neighborhood Plans

III.G.1 How should Neighborhood Plan Future Land Use Maps inform the proposed zoning maps?

IV. Reduce time and cost of permitting by providing more clarity, certainty, and ease of use

IV.A Notification & Public Input

IV.A.1 Should existing notification timelines be changed from current code?

IV.A.2 Should opportunities for public input on development projects change from current code?

IV.A.3 Should the level of notification and opportunities for input, for example for Minor Use Permits and Conditional Use Permits, be commensurate with the potential impact(s) of proposed type of uses?

IV.B Development Review Timelines and Processes

IV.B.1 Should review timelines be shortened? If so, how?

IV.B.2 Should some types of projects have reduced requirements to reduce permitting barriers and home remodeling costs (for example, to help families stay in their homes)?

IV.B.3 Should we establish pre-approved building and remodel design options (for example to help seniors age in place, and middle and lower income households to remain in their neighborhoods)?

IV.C Residential Permitting

IV.C.1 Do we want to make diverse housing types more feasible by modifying the site plan process?

IV.C.2 How should permitting barriers and home remodeling costs be addressed to help families stay in their homes as directed by the Family Homestead Initiative

V. Better manage the costs of growth and provide more effective planning tools

V.A Development Impact Fees (including Transportation impact fees)

V.B Energy efficient green building requirements

V.C Planning for capacity in our utility and storm water infrastructure

V.D Small area planning process

V.E F25

V.E.1 Should zoning from the current land development code be preserved via F25? Should it be maintained in some cases and not others? What should be the process for future changes to F25?

VI. Support small, local businesses and the creative community

VI.A Should we allow more live/ work/opportunities by-right?(office, retail, and residential spaces)

VI.B Should there be a more specific zoning category for creative spaces?

VII.Reduce wildfire and flood risk and manage runoff as a resource

VII.A Impervious Cover

VII.B Reduce wildfire and flood risk and manage runoff as a resource

VII.C Flood mitigation and wildfire mitigation

VIII. Enable transportation choices, improve safety, and prepare for our mobility future

VIII.A Parking Reductions

VIII.B Street design (traffic signal design, bus stops, bike lanes, curb cuts)

VIII.C Sidewalk design

VIII.D Urban trail connections

IX. Strengthen environmental protections, increase public open spaces, and conserve natural resources

IX.A Parkland, civic space and open space requirements

IX.B Environment and water quality

IX.C Integrated Green Infrastructure Plan

IX.D Dark Skies initiative (flood lighting on facades)

IX.E "Functional Green" tools (green roofs and walls, stormwater collection and re-use, rain gardens)

IX.F Open space requirements