

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions		
				Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW
1	Original Motion	General Policy Guidelines 1. Establish triage points after the Council adopts the codes such as quarterly check-ins as problems are found with code language. Problems first are revisited by Planning Commission and then Council. 2. Complete rework of the Plan to Plan including transitions, centers, TODs, and Neighborhood Plans. Following the adoption of CodeNEXT, Land Use Commission revisit the Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors. 3. Process to phase out F25 with stakeholder input regarding items such as Conditional Overlays, TODs, etc. Process to be revisited by Planning Commision and then Council. 4. Prior to the Code being enacted, test and model the code in a wide-range of development scenarios with stakeholder participation, and testing of the financial impacts of the Code, including additional staffing needs, development fee increases, Density Bonus Program resources, and a quantified effect of working in two codes. Staff and consultants to prepare a Report Card of the Planning Commission mapping recommendations. After the Code has been implemented, additional testing to help inform the triage process and measure if the added density is delivering. the anticipated affordable units. 5. Entire Code needs to be reviewed by a Master Editor prior to adoption 6. Planning Commission Recommendation is the starting point for Council Review. 7. Land Use Commission's recommendation is shown to Council by each Division. Prior to the Code adoption, Staff to show Council what major elements of Title 25 are not being included in CodeNEXT. 8. Performance mechanisms be identified by PC and staff to show the success and failures of the Code, particularly as it relates to Affordable Housing, displacement, demolition, review times/ permitting, and Imagine Austin Performance Indicators. 9. Staff and Council explore methods to capture the added value of the added density along corridors to help finance transit projects along corridors.	Passed	11	0	0								absent		absent					General to Code			Policy	<b>PAZ:</b> 1. Staff anticipates that amendments will be needed after adoption. 2. Oppose 3. Oppose 4. Staff anticipates testing after the code is adopted (before it is effective). 5. Do not oppose 6. Do not oppose 7. Do not oppose 8. Do not oppose, but it will take many years of on-the-ground changes to make this evaluation. 9. Do not oppose	N/A	
2	Original Motion	Staff to continue to review items and exhibits in all Chapters presented in the May 25th Planning Commission CodeNEXT Draft 3 Deliberation Spreadsheet by individual commissioners that were unacted on, and to identify ways to continue to improve Draft 3 for Council's Deliberation. Planning Commission CodeNEXT Draft 3 Deliberation Spreadsheet shall also be given to Council.	Passed	9	2	0								absent		Off dais					General to Code			Policy	<b>PAZ:</b> Staff will respond to actions/motions taken by PC, but not unacted-upon motions. Staff will forward the PC deliberation spreadsheet to Council. <b>PWD:</b> Concur with PAZ	N/A	
3	Original Motion	Where there is conflict between amendments made by the Planning Commission, Staff works to rectify those conflicts utilizing voting data and other related motion to help prioritize the final recommended action, and present them to Council for their action.	Passed	10	0	1								absent		Off dais					General to Code			Policy	<b>PAZ:</b> Oppose. Staff will respond to individual motions, but reconciling contradictory PC motions (that conflict with each other) is outside staff's purview. <b>PWD:</b> Concur with PAZ	N/A	
4	Original Motion	Recommend all Divisions that do not have comments presented in the May 22nd Planning Commission CodeNEXT Draft 3 Deliberation Spreadsheet	Passed	12	0	1															General to Code			Policy	<b>PAZ:</b> Do not oppose		
5	Original Motion	Reduce length of non 23-4 Sections by 20%. Identify a Master Editor who should identify measures in Non 23-4 Articles to reduce extreme length to assist in achieving CodeNEXT goal for code simplicity.	Passed	12	0	0								absent							General to Code			Policy	<b>PAZ:</b> Oppose. However, staff will look for ways to improve and simplify text between Council readings. <b>DSD:</b> Oppose. DSD drafted content has been consolidated and streamlined. <b>WPD:</b> Oppose. Staff has already worked to reorganize and streamline the watershed regulations by consolidating divisions. <b>ATD:</b> Concur with PAZ <b>PWD:</b> Concur with PAZ	N/A	
	Amendment to Original Motion	Reduce by 30% instead of 20%	Passed	12	0	0								absent													
6	Original Motion	Recommend approval of Chapter 23-1 with amendments previously approved and the following additional changes: 1. Where Article 23-1 conflicts with current policy related to the Neighborhood Planning Contact Team, corrections to those discrepancies are made.	Passed	9	2	0								absent		Off dais					General to Chapter	23-1		Policy	<b>PAZ:</b> Do not oppose	N/A	

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

			Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions			
Motion		Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW	
7	Original Motion	Add language to 23-1A-6010 and 2301A-6020 regarding Minimum Development Potential as shown in Steven Oliver Exhibit 1	Passed	7	5	1																					
	Amendment to Original Motion	Add language that leaves this to the discretion of the director	Failed	4	8	1															<p><b>PAZ:</b> Oppose. Amendments can be made, as needed, when conflicts are identified.</p> <p><b>DSD:</b> This is a policy decision concerning the hierarchy of code requirements where the city's codes have conflicting provisions and impacts. This adds a layer of review, and is potentially more complicated and less predictable than the variance processes in Draft 3. DSD is supportive of the concept of a hierarchy of code to address regulatory conflicts that arise during the review process; however, additional policy direction is needed to determine regulatory priorities.</p> <p><b>WPD:</b> Oppose. As currently worded, the amendment undermines multiple existing regulations related to the environment, water quality, and drainage, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Non-degradation standard of the Save Our Springs (SOS) ordinance</li><li>• Stormwater management for water quality and flood risk reduction</li><li>• Restrictions on development in the floodplain</li><li>• Waterway setbacks for creeks and lakes</li><li>• Setbacks for critical environmental features such as caves, wetlands, and springs</li><li>• Tree and urban forest protections (excluding heritage trees)</li><li>• Requirements for preserving floodplain health</li><li>• Steep slope protections</li><li>• Limitations on the depth of cut and fill</li><li>• Preservation of open space and natural areas</li><li>• Provision of landscape elements and vegetated setbacks</li></ul> <p>Many sites across the city are significantly constrained by natural features such as floodplains and steep topography. As worded, the amendment would allow for development to encroach on environmental setbacks and reduce the footprint of stormwater control measures in order to accommodate the entitled amount of impervious cover. Staff recommends upholding the current policy of reducing impervious cover entitlements as necessary to accommodate environmental features and protections. To the extent that the reasonable use of a property is eliminated, the existing variance process allows for adjustments to water quality and drainage regulations.</p>						
	Amendment to Original Motion	Exclude Heritage Trees	Passed	10	2	1															Specific to Article	23-1A-6010 & 23-1A-6020	Oliver Exhibit 1 - Minimum Development	Additional Development Standards		A-1.7.1	
8	Original Motion	Recommend approval of Chapter 23-2 with amendments previously approved	Passed	9	2	0							absent		Off dais						Specific to Chapter	23-2		Policy	<b>PAZ:</b> Neutral	N/A	
9	Original Motion	Sections 23-2A-3030(B)(2) and 23-2A-3040(B)(2) Direct Staff to look at on-site alternatives that could be applied without triggering an engineer's letter and these should be directly proportional to the size of the expansion or construction such as the following alternative language: (2) Provide an affidavit from both owner and applicant, agreeing to preserve or improve existing drainage patterns and to provide an engineered grading plan and complete the work specified therein if it is determined by the Building Official that there has been an adverse impact to adjoining lots attributable to an as-built condition within one year from the date of the certificate of occupancy, if the construction, remodel or expansion is: (A) more than 300 square feet; and (B) Located on an unplatted tract or within a residential subdivision approved more than five years before the building permit application was submitted.	Passed	9	2	0							absent								Specific to Section	23-2A-3030(B)(2) 23-2A-3040(B)(2)	Sheih Exhibit 1 - Engineer's Letter	Additional Development Standards	Opposed  <b>DSD:</b> DSD is does not recommend revisions to this section that would result in a needed increase in the resources required for review but remains open to exploring options in partnership with WPD.	3.7	18.80
10	Original Motion	Where an existing single-family home has been made non-conforming by the new code, that home can be renovated or rebuilt under today's standards. Staff to adjust language to not penalize existing homes that do not conform to the new zoning.	Passed	11	0	0						absent	absent								Specific to Section	23-2G-1060-D-1		Policy	Not opposed with the condition that the motion is limited to the zoning chapter. Water quality and drainage standards added for 1-6 units by 23-2A-3 should still apply.	9.3	A-9.16.1
11	Original Motion	Recommend approval of Article 23-3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D with amendments previously approved	Passed	8	1	2							absent		Off dais						General to Chapter	23-3		Policy	<b>PAZ:</b> Neutral	N/A	

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions			
				Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW	
12	Original Motion	Recommend approval of Article 23-3E (Affordable Housing Bonus Program), but with direction for staff to develop revisions that will address the following concerns:  1. Establish as additional items of intent for the program to: a. meet the annual affordable housing goals set forth by city council; b. generally permit sites to utilize affordable bonus entitlements; and c. maximize affordable units in high-opportunity areas, whether built on-site or financed via fee-in-lieu. 2. Reinstate expedited review for SMART Housing and expand it to the Affordable Housing Bonus Program at all stages for projects that participate in the program per the original requirements of 2000. 3. Explore a Super Density Bonus for large-scale affordable projects that offer over 50% of units as affordable 4. Establish a Density Bonus pilot program with a revision and review window of 18-months with an annual re-evaluation period to ensure the program is properly calibrated, and staff and consultants to continue to hold workshops with stakeholders, including affordable housing advocates, builders, affordable housing builders, construction companies, developers, and community advocates to continue to work out the bonus program. 5. Staff to use White Exhibit 1 Pages 20-25 (Edits to the SMART program) and White Exhibit 1 Pages 45-48 (SIMPLICITY & HOUSING BLUEPRINT GOALS - yellow from Housing Coalition) as a directive to prioritize those changes as they review this Article	Passed	10	0	1						Off dais		absent							General to Article	23-3E		White Exhibit 1 Pages 20-25 (Edits to the SMART program) and White Exhibit 1 Pages 45-48 (SIMPLICITY & HOUSING BLUEPRINT GOALS)  Kenny Exhibit 3 - Affordable Housing Bonus Program	Affordable Housing	<b>NHCD:</b> Generally not opposed, but opposed to the following elements: 1 a) Remove goals - not appropriate for Code  5) Staff do not recommend requiring density bonus projects to comply with S.M.A.R.T. Housing requirements unless it can be evidenced that typical density bonus projects would be S.M.A.R.T. Housing compliant and that this would not deter participation in density bonus programs.  <b>DSD:</b> Review turnaround times for SMART Housing projects are currently in a policy document and have been in effect since the program's inception. Staff adheres to these review times to the extent possible; however, turnaround times are impacted by application volume and available resources. DSD does not recommend reincorporating review times into the land development code. Review times are administrative and were removed from Title 25 and moved into the criteria manuals to be adopted via the rules process. Adopting review times by rule preserves the public stakeholder engagement component and provides staff with the flexibility to make adjustments based on the previously identified factors without having to initiate a code amendment.		
13	Original Motion	Upon Council's review of Article 23-3E, Council consider sending that division back to the Planning Commission for additional feedback	Passed	9	2	0							absent		Off dais						General to Article	23-3E		None	Affordable Housing	<b>PAZ:</b> Oppose. Process for adopting code should be consistent.	N/A	
14	Original Motion	Recommend approval of Chapter 23-4 with amendments previously approved	Passed	7	2	2							absent		Off dais						General to Article	23-4			Policy	<b>PAZ:</b> Do not oppose	N/A	
15	Original Motion	Strike " <del>that are intended to promote compatible land patterns-</del> " and add " <u>that address the social and environmental values described in 23-1A-1020.</u> "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4A-1010			Language Revisions	<b>PAZ:</b> Do not oppose	20.2	-
16	Original Motion	List NCCDs and NP as Overlay Zones in Section 23-4A-2020(H)	Failed	5	8	0															Specific	23-4A-2020(H)			Policy		20.4	-
17	Original Motion	Eliminate the Downtown Plan overlay until Small area plan can be completed with funding assistance provided by DAA.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4D-6080			Additional Development Standards	<b>NHCD:</b> Do not support increased base FAR. Generally, for bonus programs any increase in base entitlements will decrease the attractiveness of bonus entitlements, and could lead to decreased participation in the bonus program or decreased numbers of affordable units. Increases in bonus entitlements without any increases in base entitlements can increase participation in bonus programs.  <b>Austin Energy:</b> If intent is reduce frontage requirement because a certain amount will be taken up by necessary infrastructure, staff agrees.  <b>ATD:</b> Driveway widths and standards are within the TCM and should not be within Code (see previous ATD comments on various drafts). "Support spaces" requirements are dictated by various utility agencies, many of which are protected by franchise agreements and by environmental laws at the State level - these requirements can change periodically and should not be specifically called out within Code (should be within the UCM).  <b>PWD:</b> Driveway standards are in the Transportation Criteria Manual. Need to verify which building support spaces (AE vault, fire pump, etc.) are regulated by national, state & local standards and must go through the proper channels in order to be changed. The stairs/ramps are not allowed in required setbacks so that the City can meet ADA requirements within the ROW.	20.5	23.205 23.225
	Substitute Motion	Increase the base entitlements in DC per DAA recommendation, including: - Increase driveway width maximum to 30' to allow for 3 lanes of traffic flow - Frontage Requirements: Create exception for <1/2 block sites. Either significantly reduce the % gross frontage requirement or change requirement to "net" frontage or only require one block face of the site to comply. Or remove requirement in DC base zone and allow for a district planning process to dictate which streets and which uses are appropriate. And reduce requirements for many building support spaces (AE vault, fire pump, etc.) that must be located directly on ROW. The definition of active commercial uses (Commercial Group A in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone) needs to be clarified or refined to allow for ground level office or multi-family lobbies. Additionally, revise the requirement that prohibits stairs/ramps in required setbacks to allow them in required setbacks. - (intent) Recalibrate the Downtown Density Program to maximize the yield of affordable housing units in a way that does not impede taking up of the bonus, particularly related to small lots - FAR and height for the PID area, not including Judge's Hill, be increased to unlimited for the Density Bonus Program	Passed	12	0	1																						
18	Original Motion	Change DC zone FAR max to 12:1.		7	6	0															Specific to Section	23-4D-6080			FAR/ Height	<b>PAZ:</b> Do not oppose. Does not carry forward existing 8:1 FAR for CBD. Additional FAR by-right may impact the AHBP.  <b>NHCD:</b> Do not support increased base FAR. Generally, for bonus programs any increase in base entitlements will decrease the attractiveness of bonus entitlements, and could lead to decreased participation in the bonus program or decreased numbers of affordable units. Increases in bonus entitlements without any increases in base entitlements can increase participation in bonus programs.	23.223	

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

				Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions		
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW
19		23-1020 Conditional Use Permit (F)(2) Late Hours Permit (a) If the Land Use Commission approves a conditional use permit for bar, nightclub, or restaurant with a late-hours permit or with outdoor seating, the having a parking area associated with the use must be a minimum of less than 200 feet from a Residential House-Scale Zone Is required to obtain approval of a conditional use permit. , unless the use is located within an enclosed shopping center. (b) The Land Use Commission may waive the 200-foot restriction if it finds that the effects of a parking area are sufficiently mitigated based on the criteria in Subsection (E).	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4B-1020(F)(2) 23-4E-6: Specific to Use		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Do not oppose DSD: Do not oppose	21.4	
	Original Motion	Move this section to Specific for Use for Restaurant and Bar	Passed	12	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-						
20	Original Motion	WHITE_Exhibit_Conditional Use Permits: Please amend Draft 3 to reinstate the clear Conditional Use Permit standards and other key provisions in LDC 25-5-142 through 25-5-150.	Divided	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
	Divided Original Motion 1	Reinstate LDC 25-5-148 to ensure compliance with conditions imposed by Council or Commissions	Failed	4	8	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
	Divided Original Motion 2	Reinstate existing CUP requirement for late-hours bars and restaurants, including current code’s 200’ parking buffer in proximity to House-Scale Residential Zones.	Withdrawn	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
	Divided Original Motion 3	Reinstate LDC 25-5-150 to prevent revolving door for same CUP requests	Passed	7	6	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
	Divided Original Motion 4	Reinstate LDC 25-5-145(C)(4) to ensure Large Retail Uses do not adversely affect future redevelopment	Passed	12	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
	Divided Original Motion 5	Reinstate all current requirements in LDC 25-5-145, Evaluation of Conditional Use Site Plan (a) Draft 3 deletes the current mandate to determine compliance with specific requirements (b) Draft 3 deletes at least seven specific standards that CUPs must meet under current code (c) Draft 3 replaces specific requirements with three broad concepts and provides criteria only for consideration, not as required conditions of approval.	Tabled and Never Taken Up				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
	Divided Original Motion 6	Reinstate LDC 25-5-143(C) to ensure advisory board input on CUPs in Waterfront Overlay	Passed	8	5	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
	Divided Original Motion 6 - RECONSIDERED	Leave the Language as is	Passed	13	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4B-1020		White Exhibit - Conditional Use Permits (Pages 15-19)	Policy	PAZ: Do not oppose	21.5
21	Original Motion	Section 23-4B-1030 (1) Notice of Application. The director shall provide notice of an application for a minor use permit under Section 23-2C-5010 (Notice of Application) and allow parties to submit comments on the application for a period of at least 44- 30 days.	Failed	3	10	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific	23-4B-1030		Policy		21.6	
22	Original Motion	Section 23-4B-2040 (C) Permitting Decisions. Except as provided in Subsection (A), a decision by the Development Services Director or another responsible director to approve or disapprove a development application <del>because of non-compliance with the zoning code</del> may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment under Article 23-2I (Appeals).	Passed	9	2	1	-	-	-	-	Absent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4B-2040		Language Revisions	PAZ: Code currently reads: "(C) Permitting Decisions. Except as provided in Subsection (A), a decision by the Development Services Director or another responsible director to approve or disapprove a development application may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment under Article 23-2I (Appeals). DSD: Clarify that appeal should be aligned with Texas Local Govt Code regarding operations and duties of the Board of Adjustment.	21.11	
23	Original Motion	Change the word "Applicant" to "Owner" in Section 23-4B-3040	Passed	12	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4B-3040		Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose	21.14	
24	Original Motion	Change the word "standards" to "regulations" in Section 23-4B-4010(A) and (B)	Passed	13	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4B-4010(A) and (B)		Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose	21.16	
25	Original Motion	Change the word "standards" to "regulations" in Section 23-4B-4020(B)(1)(c)(iii)	Passed	13	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4B-4020(B)(1)(c)(iii)		Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose	21.17	
26	Original Motion	Change the word "may" to "shall" in Section 23-4B-4030(C)	Passed	13	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4B-4030(C)		Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose	21.18	
27	Original Motion	In Section 23-4C-1010, create (B)(1) and (2) instead of (C) and (D), add " <u>and that have a zone that requires it</u> ", and strike " <del>four acres</del> " and replace with "eight acres." In 23-4C-1040(B)(3), replace " <del>eight acres</del> " with "twelve acres"	Passed	7	6	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4C-1010(B)(1) and (2) 23-4C-1040(B)(3)		Language Revisions	PAZ: Oppose. Will reduce opportunities for civic open space.  PARD: Oppose, the combination of this and #29 mean that no open space is required on projects 8 acres and greater.  WPD: Oppose. Will reduce the enhanced natural function provided by larger, contiguous pervious areas. The Green Infrastructure Working Group supported the creation of contiguous areas of pervious cover that also enhance connectivity between sites and serve as desirable public and private open spaces.	22.5	
28	Original Motion	Delete Section 23-4C-1020(M)(2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
	Substitute Motion	Instead of completely deleting 1020(M)(2), move this standard to the zone districts where the Code lists parking maximums, and if the applicant wishes to exceed the parking maximum of the zoning district then the site must incorporate at least three of the items listed in Table 23-4C-1020(A).	Passed	9	4	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Specific to Section	23-4C-1020(M)(2) 23-4D		Parking	PAZ: Oppose. Simpler and easier to understand as-is.  ATD: ATD does not support providing 2x the minimum parking requirements and would rather suggest promoting on-site TDM programs to encourage non single-occupancy vehicle trips and the need for excessive on-site parking.	22.6	

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																
				Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														
29																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									



Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

						Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------	--	--	----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

			Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions			
Motion			Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH									THOMPSON	WHITE	SHAW
48	Original Motion	In 23-4E-6170(C), change the following: "A duplex must comply with the requirements in this subsection. (1) The two units must be attached or no greater than 12 feet apart; and (2) At least one of the two units must have a front entry that faces the front thoroughfare except each unit located on a corner lot must each have a front entry that faces a separate thoroughfare."  In 23-13A-2, change the following: "DUPLEX. Two dwelling units on a single lot that are either attached or separated by no more than 12 feet A residential building containing two attached dwelling units on a single lot."	Passed	7	5	1														Specific to Section	23-4E-6170(C) 23-13A-2		Terms and Definitions	PAZ: Opposed. Would prefer units to remain attached as defined by "attached" in D3.  DSD: Opposed. Recommend keeping the units attached to avoid potential conflict with application of ADU provisions.	23.21		
49	Original Motion	Increase the base heights and bonus heights for Mixed Use and Main Street zones per Kenny's Exhibit 1 - Page 29 of 29	Failed	6	7	0														General to Article	23-4D	Kenny Exhibit 1 - Page 29 of 29	FAR/ Height		23.24		
50	Original Motion	Require a CUP for all Bars/ Nightclubs (Level 2 only) within 200 feet of a Residential zone rather than permitting by-right. Beyond 200 feet remains permitted by-right. Add specific language in Specific to Use section for Bars and Nightclubs	Passed	8	3	2														Specific to Article	23-4D		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Do not oppose.	23.28	23.274	
	Amendment to Original Motion	Allow any non-permitted alcohol uses in Draft 3 (Level 1 or Level 2) as a CUP within the MS zones, except MS1A and MS2A	Passed	11	0	2																					
51	Original Motion	Amend Section 23-4B-1030 Minor Use Permits to allow an appeal to City Council if Planning Commission does not approve by 2/3	Failed	4	9	0														Specific to Section	23-4B-1030		Policy	PAZ: Opposed. This would create a new precedent of having two separate appeal bodies and a two-step appeal process.	23.30		
52	Original Motion	For Residential Zones that allow an ADU Preservation Incentive, change the name to ADU "Streetscale Incentive," and change the word "preserved" to "conserved." Add the definition of the word "conserved" to the definitions section as follows: Conserve: to maintain the height, footprint and roof line of an existing building for the first 25' as measured from the building line toward the rear lot line.	Passed	11	2	0														Specific to Article	23-4D		Terms/ Definitions	PAZ: Do not oppose.	23.33		
53	Original Motion	Apply the Street Scale Incentive (formerly the Preservation Incentive) to all Residential zones	Passed	12	1	0														Specific to Article	23-4D		Policy	PAZ: Do not oppose. - only makes sense for R zones that have FAR limit	A-23.33.1	23.77 57.3	
54	Original Motion	Reduce the number of uses to single family, two family, and multi-family Create a comparable Residential zone that maintains the 5,750 minimum lot size and a minimum 50 foot lot width	Divided	-	-	-														Specific to Article	23-4D	White Exhibit 1 - Page 35 of 48, Items A and B	Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use		23.35		
	Divided Original Motion 1	Reduce the number of uses to single family, two family, and multi-family	-	-	-	-																					
		Divided Original Motion with Amendments 1 and 2	Failed	6	6	1																					
		Divided Original Motion with Amendment 1 only	Failed	4	8	1																					
	Amendment to Divided Original Motion 1	Use the "unit" instead of "family"	Passed	12	1	0																					
	Amendment to Divided Original Motion 2	Leave "ADU" as a permitted use	Passed	8	4	1														Specific to Article	23-4D	White Exhibit 1 - Page 35 of 48, Item B	Lot Size/ Intensity	PAZ: Opposed. Creating more zones with slightly different min. lot sizes and lot widths will cause confusion and add complexity.	23.37	23.35	
Divided Original Motion 2	Create a comparable Residential zone that maintains the 5,750 minimum lot size and a minimum 50 foot lot width	Taken up under separate action	-	-	-																						
55	Original Motion	Create comparable R zones in R1 and R2 that maintain the 5750 sf minimum lot size and a minimum 50' lot width. Number of zones to be created is to be determined by staff. Direct staff to map all existing 5750 as the proposed new zone.	Divided	-	-	-														Specific to Article	23-4D	White Exhibit 1 - Page 35 of 48, Item B	Language Revisions	PAZ: Opposed. Creating more zones with slightly different min. lot sizes and lot widths will cause confusion and add complexity.	23.38	23.159 23.160 23.185 23.191 23.207	
	Divided Original Motion 1	Create comparable R zones in R1 and R2 that maintain the 5750 sf minimum lot size and a minimum 50' lot width. Number of zones to be determined by staff.	Passed	7	6	0																					
	Divided Original Motion 2	Direct staff to map all existing 5750 as the proposed new zone.	Failed	2	9	2																					
	Substitute Motion	Leave all R1B, R1C, and R2C zones as 5,750 sf minimum	Failed	3	8	2																					
56	Original Motion	Revise the purpose statement in Section 23-4D-2010 to: This division establishes the land use and building form requirements for property zoned residential house-scale. The requirements are intended to implement the Comprehensive Plan and address the social and environmental values described in 23-1A-1020. are intended to ensure that proposed development is compatible with existing and future development on neighboring properties. Additionally, the requirements are intended to produce an environment of desirable character, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and any applicable area plan.	Failed	6	7	0														Specific to Section	23-4D-2010						
57	Original Motion	Allow a three units, attached or detached, as a residential use in the R3 zones. Exact definition and alterations to Use Tables to be determined by staff.	Passed	10	3	0														Specific to Section	Table 23-4D-2030(B) Table 23-4D-2150(A) Table 23-4D-2160(A) Table 23-4D-2170(A) Table 23-4D-2180(A)		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Opposed; a use cannot be exclusively CUP	23.43		
58	Original Motion	Remove Single-Family Attached as an allowed use in the R2A, R2B, R2C, R3A, and R3B zones	Divided																	Specific to Section	23-4D-2100 23-4D-2110 23-4D-2120			Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	23.44	23.76 23.81	
	Divided Original Motion 1	Remove Single-Family Attached as an allowed use in the R2A, R2B, and R2C zones	Failed	6	N/A	N/A																					
	Divided Original Motion 2	Remove Single-Family Attached as an allowed use in the R3A and R3B zones	Failed	2	8	3																					
59	Original Motion	Add clarifying/ symbolic language to the Use Tables regarding the allowance and permitted timeframes of STRs	Passed	12	1	0														Specific to Article	23-4D		Language Revisions	PAZ: STR use is already shown in the use tables. Specifics on timeframes is not appropriate in the use tables (it can already be found in specific to use).	23.46		
60	Original Motion	Add a "Small Lot Single Family Use" as a permitted use in R2C, R2D, and R2E with the following development standards: min. lot size: 2500 sf. max lot size: 4999sf min. lot width: 36' Building Size (max) for all Small Lot uses: the greater of .4 FAR or 1500 sf Building Placement add Small Lot Setbacks: Front 15', Side St. 10', Side 3.5', Rear 10'. Building Form (1) Building Articulation New Construction add "Building Articulation is not required for Small Lot uses." Impervious Cover add "(2) Small Lot Impervious Cover 65% max, 55% building cover max"	-	-	-	-														Specific to Article	23-4D-2130 23-4D-2140			Allowed Use/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Opposed. This is virtually identical to R2D and R2E already in D3.  DSD: Opposed. Concur with PAZ.	23.47	
	Substitute Motion	Add a "Small Lot Single-Family Use" as a permitted use in R2D and R2E with the following development standards. R2C remains the same. min. lot size: 2500 sf. max lot size: 4999sf min. lot width: 36' Building Size (max) for all Small Lot uses: the greater of .4 FAR or 1500 sf Building Placement add Small Lot Setbacks: Front 15', Side St. 10', Side 3.5', Rear 10'. Building Form (1) Building Articulation New Construction add "Building Articulation is not required for Small Lot uses." Impervious Cover add "(2) Small Lot Impervious Cover 65% max, 55% building cover max"	Passed	9	4	0																					

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions
				Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON	WHITE	SHAW						
61	Original Motion	In all R Zones, set the required lot size for an ADU to the minimum lot size for a single-family use. Retain all affordability requirements	Passed	11	1	1																	PAZ: Opposed. There are some zones where an ADU is allowed at a smaller min lot size than a single-family (eg when combined with single-family attached)  NHCD: NHCD recommends a fee-in-lieu, rather than on-site income-restricted affordable ADUs.  NHCD supports ADUs in general. With regard to ADUs and the Affordable Housing Bonus Program, the Department's position is that property owners opting into the program through ADU development pay a fee-in-lieu into the Housing Trust Fund, rather than income-restrict the ADU on their sites. We take this position for many reasons, including the higher per-unit cost associated with monitoring these units and potential issues related to how tenants are selected. City Council has expressed interest in creating a waitlist for affordable housing units that may include priorities for people with housing barriers (including criminal backgrounds, poor credit, or who are exiting homelessness). Employing this waitlist approach for ADUs may cause potential bonus program applicants to decide not to utilize the program at all. Other cities are grappling with how to enforce affordability in ADUs as well – Portland, OR decided not to require ADUs to be affordable after difficulties with their proposal were identified.	23.62	23.64 23.66 23.80
62	Original Motion	Add a new zone to the Residential zones which has the same development standards as R1C, but does not permit an ADU	Failed	2	11	0																		23.70	
63	Original Motion	In the Parking Tables in all zones, add clarifying notes to the term "Other Allowed Uses" that reference back to the Permitted Use Tables	Passed	12	0	1																		23.72	
64	Original Motion	Add a "Small Lot Single-Family Use" as a permitted use in R3 zones, R4 zones, RM1A, and RM1B to allow small houses on small lots without requiring them to be attached min. lot size: 2500 sf. max lot size: 4999sf min. lot width: 25' Building Size (max) for all Small Lot uses: the greater of .4 FAR or 1500 sf Building Placement add Small Lot Setbacks: Front 15', Side St. 10', Side 3.5' or 0 when adjacent to Small Lot Uses, Rear 10'. Building Form (1) Building Articulation New Construction add "Building Articulation is not required for Small Lot uses." Impervious Cover add "(2) Small Lot Impervious Cover 65% max, 55% building cover max																							
	Substitute Motion 1	Rescind the related motion for a "Small Lot Single-Family Use" in the R2D and R2E	Failed	3	7	2																			
	Substitute Motion 2	Make one new zone (staff to determine which zoning base [R, RM, etc.]) for the Small Lot Single-Family Use with the following development standards: min. lot size: 2500 sf. max lot size: 4999sf min. lot width: 25' Building Size (max) for all Small Lot uses: the greater of .4 FAR or 1500 sf Building Placement add Small Lot Setbacks: Front 15', Side St. 10', Side 3.5' or 0 when adjacent to Small Lot Uses, Rear 10'. Building Form (1) Building Articulation New Construction add "Building Articulation is not required for Small Lot uses." Impervious Cover add "(2) Small Lot Impervious Cover 65% max, 55% building cover max  Staff to prepare a new zone that only permits the single use.	Passed	7	6	0																		23.78	23.114
65	Original Motion	Add/ amend the below definitions and place in correct location of the Code: Attached: When used with reference to two or more <del>buildings units</del> , means having one or more common walls or being joined by a roof, <del>ecovered porch or covered passageway measured 20 feet in depth, perpendicular to the front property line</del> . Detached: Fully separated from any other building, or joined to another building by structural members not constituting an enclose or covered space Staff to analyze intent of above language and recommend a definition that encompasses the intent of a clear definable difference	Passed	8	4	0					Absent														
	Amendment to Original Motion 1	Add the covered porch or covered passageway back to the definition of attached	Passed	9	2	1					Absent														
	Amendment to Original Motion 2	Strike the 20 feet in depth language	Withdrawn	-	-	-															White Item 1 - Page 41 of 48	Terms/ Definitions		23.82	
66	Original Motion	Add language to applicable zones regarding sideyard setbacks exemptions for Small Lot Single Family Attached, Single Family Attached, and Townhouse	Passed	11	0	1					Absent													23.87	
67	Original Motion	Add a bonus of "+150sf for each three bedroom unit within 500' of public school." for Single-Family and Duplex uses in R2-R4 zones where McMansion applies	Passed	8	1	3					Absent														
	Amendment to Original Motion	Remove the word "public"	Failed	5	8	0																		23.89	
68	Original Motion	Add a bonus of +0.1 FAR for every unit above Single Family Use in all R3 zones	Failed	3	9	0					Absent														
	Amendment to Original Motion 1	Apply bonus only outside 1/4 mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor; all votes regarding FAR would remain intact	Failed	2	10	0																			
	Amendment to Original Motion 2	Apply the bonus of 0.1, but with a maximum of 0.3 bonus FAR per lot	Failed	4	8	0																		23.90	23.117



Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

				Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit		Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions	
	Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON	WHITE										SHAW
69	Original Motion	Add a bonus of +0.1 FAR for every unit above Single Family Use in all R4 zones	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-								
	Substitute Motion	Staff to find a way to alter the development standards to make R4 more feasible and recommend those changes to Council, particularly impervious cover	Passed	7	5	0						Absent								Specific	23-4D-219023-4D-22002			FAR/ Height	PAZ: Do not oppose. - will require all depts to re-evaluate R4.  WPD: WPD generally opposes increases in impervious cover limits without analysis of the potential impact. Would need to study the potential impacts on floodplains, erosion potential, etc., based on the mapping extent.	23.101	23.100 23.120
70	Original Motion	Amend the height of all accessory structures to 15 feet instead of 12 feet, as applicable	Passed	13	0	0														Specific to Article	23-4D			FAR/ Height	PAZ: Do not oppose. DSD: Do not oppose.	23.112	
71	Original Motion	Change all R4 minimum lot widths from 60 feet to 80 feet	Failed	5	7	1														Specific to Section	23-4D-2190 23-4D-2200 23-4D-2210			Lot Size/ Intensity		23.121	
72	Original Motion	Increase the base standard units of Cottage Court in the R4 zones from 3 to 4 units 6 to 8 units	Passed	11	0	1														Specific to Section	Table 23-4D-2190(A) Table 23-4D-2200(A) Table 23-4D-2210(A)			Lot Size/ Intensity	NHCD: Opposed, as it would impact ability to achieve affordable housing benefits.  Generally, for bonus programs any increase in base entitlements will decrease the attractiveness of bonus entitlements, and could lead to decreased participation in the bonus program or a decreased number of affordable units. Increases in bonus entitlements without any increases in base entitlements can increase participation in bonus programs.	23.123	
73	Original Motion	For RM1A and RM1B, change the minimum lot size to 5,750 sf and the minimum width to 50 feet	Failed	3	10	0														Specific to Section	23-4D-3050 23-4D-3060			Lot Size/ Intensity		23.130	
74	Original Motion	Create a new zone (RM1D) which has the same uses as R2C, but with a permitted density of 14 units per acre maximum. 0.4 FAR limit for the site R2C height limits, building form (mcmansion) and setback tables, 1 space per unit with additional proposed parking matrix reductions, Add Note to Table A: minimum 10' separation between buildings. No compatibility setbacks. No multi-unit buildings	Passed	12	1	0																					
	Amendment to Original Motion 1	Staff to review proposed zone to ensure it does not have a negative impact on Density Bonus program	Passed	13	0	0																					
	Amendment to Original Motion 2	New zone shall not be used within transition zones	Failed	6	6	1														Specific to Article	23-4D			New Zone	PAZ: Do not oppose. - staff would like to evaluate further DSD: Conflicts with FAR limit in motion 47 NHCD: Would need to review for any potential impact on Density Bonus program	23.134	
75	Original Motion	Eliminate Dwelling Unit per Acre requirements in all multi-unit zones	-	-	-	-																					
	Substitute Motion	Increase units per acre by 20% in all multi-unit zones for base and bonus units and always round the numbers up	Passed	8	5	0														Specific to Article	23-4D			Lot Size/ Intensity	PAZ: Need to understand effect on affordable housing bonus program  NHCD: Oppose increased base entitlements. Generally, for bonus programs any increase in base entitlements will decrease the attractiveness of bonus entitlements, and could lead to decreased participation in the bonus program or a decreased number of affordable units. Increases in bonus entitlements without any increases in base entitlements can increase participation in bonus programs.	23.135	23.126
76	Original Motion	Add Parking Facility as a permitted use with a CUP in RM2 zones and greater when adjacent to a Main Street or Mixed Use zone with the following design requirements to be stated in Specific to Use: (A) Screening: All areas used for parking, storage, waste receptacles or mechanical equipment shall be screened from a triggering property. Such screening may be a fence, berm or vegetation and shall be maintained by the property owner. Fences shall not exceed six feet in height. (B) Lighting: Exterior lighting shall be hooded or shielded so that it is not visible from a triggering property. (C) Noise: The noise level of mechanical equipment shall not exceed 70 db at the property line of a triggering property. (D) Waste: Waste receptacles, including dumpsters, shall not be located within 50 feet of a triggering property. The City shall review and approve the location of and access to each waste receptacle. Collection of such receptacles shall be prohibited between 10pm and 7am. (E) From a parking structure facing and located within 100 feet of a triggering property: (1) Vehicle headlights shall not be directly visible, and shall be shielded from view (2) Parked vehicles shall be screened from the view of any public right of way; and (3) All interior lighting shall be screened from the view of a triggering property. (F) No vehicle entrances or exits from parking accessible to a MS or MU property may be located within 100 feet of a triggering property.	Passed	8	5	0														Specific to Article	23-4D			Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Do not oppose. Currently a CUP in RM2B and RM4A	23.139	
77	Original Motion	Increase impervious cover in RM1A to 60% for all other uses beyond residential, unless the primary use is parking	Passed	13	0	0														Specific to Section	Table 23-4D-3050(F)			Impervious Cover	WPD: WPD generally opposes increases in impervious cover limits without analysis of the potential impact. Would need to study the potential impacts on floodplains, erosion potential, etc., based on the mapping extent.	23.140	
78	Original Motion	In the RM1A Zone: Option 1: Eliminate compatibility setback, consider changing landscape buffer to semi-opaque. Option 2: 1. Eliminate additional setback if Intermittent Visual Obstruction Buffer (20 ft) is kept 2. Reduce landscape buffer height to 23-4E-4100 (Semi Opaque Buffer, 6 ft) and reduce setback to 15 feet on side and rear 3. Eliminate additional setbacks and just have Semi-Opaque Buffer 4. Change which residential house scale zones trigger compatibility - ie R4A & R4B with MF allowed should not trigger compatibility for other MF	-	-	-	-																					
	Substitute Motion	For RM1A and RM1B the following development standards be altered: McMansion tent (as McMansion is applied in Draft 3) apply Within 30 feet from a rear triggering property, height be limited to 2 stories Eliminate landscape buffer and articulation Side setback of 10 feet, as opposed to the 5 that is currently required in Draft 3	Passed	10	1	0	Absent							Absent						Specific to Section	23-4D-3050 23-4D-3060			Additional Development Standards	Not opposed with the following conditions: Recommend adjusting landscape buffer to width of compatibility setback. Recommend keeping landscape buffer for environmental & aesthetic benefits.	23.143	
79	Original Motion	Staff to review setback, landscape buffer, and stepback and eliminate one from the requirements	Fails	6	7	0														Specific to Article	23-4D			Compatibility/ Transition Zones		23.150	23.151 23.152 23.153

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

				Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit		Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions	
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON										WHITE
80		Increase the height maximums in Main Street zones as follows: MS1A, MS1B: 35' to 40' MS2A, MS2B, MS2C: 45' to 65' MS3A, MS3B: 60' to 80', 120' with AHBP Bonus  Increase the height maximums in Mixed Use zones as follows: MU1A, MU1B: 32' to 40' MU1C, MU1D, MU2A: 45' to 65' MU2B, MU3A, MU3B: 60' to 80' MU4A, MU4B: 60' to 80', 120' with AHBP Bonus MU5A: 100'	Not Acted On	-	-	-																	PAZ: Defer to NHCD; need to understand effect on Affordable Housing Bonus Program  NHCD: Oppose increased base entitlements. Need clarification on whether this motion included any increases in BASE heights, or if all height increases are achieved only through the affordable housing bonus program. Generally, for bonus programs any increase in base entitlements will decrease the attractiveness of bonus entitlements, and could lead to decreased participation in the bonus program or a decreased number of affordable units. Increases in bonus entitlements without any increases in base entitlements can increase participation in bonus programs.				
	Original Motion	Change the bonus heights to those listed in the Kazi Exhibit MU/ MS Heights (see Kazi Exhibit) Keep the base heights as D3 for all zones except: MS1A, MS1B: 35' to 40' MU1A, MU1B: 32' to 40'	Passed	8	4	0															Specific to Article	23-4D	Kazi Exhibit - MU/ MS Heights	Affordable Housing	23.156 23.178		
81		Allow Senior Housing with less than 12 residents as a permitted use in all MU1 zones Allow Senior Housing with greater than 12 residents as a MUP in MU1 zones	Passed	12	0	0						Absent									Specific to Section	Table 23-4D-4030(A)	White Exhibit 1 - Page 7 of 48	Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Do not oppose.	23.162	
82		Allow the following uses as a permitted use in all MU and MS zones except MU1A and MU1B: Residential Care Facilities, Senior/Retirement Housing, Work/Live, Library, Museum, or Public Art Gallery, Meeting Facility, Mobile Food Sales, General Retail Under 5,000 SF, Performance Venue/Theater, Live Music, Indoor Recreation (all sizes), Cooperative Housing, Group Residential, Manufactured Home, and all sizes of Daycares	Passed	10	1	1						Absent									Specific to Section	Table 23-4D-4030(A) Table 23-4D-4030(B) Table 23-4D05030(A)	White Exhibit 1 - Page 7 and 8 of 48	Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Do not oppose.	23.164	23.183
83		For MS1A, MS1B, MU1A, and MU1B the following development standards be altered: Within 30 feet from a rear triggering property, height be limited to 1 stories No parking deck on top No deck or patio for alcohol or food Eliminate articulation (landscape buffer is still required) Side setback of 10 feet McMansion tent (as McMansion is applied in Draft 3) apply	Passed	12	0	1															Specific to Article	23-4D-4060 23-4D-4070 23-4D-5060 23-4D-5070		Additional Development Standards	PAZ: Do not oppose. DSD: Concur with requiring landscape buffer	23.174	23.199
84		Change all front yard setbacks from 5 feet to 0 feet in commercial zones (RM3A and up)	Passed	13	0	0															Specific to Article	23-4D		Setbacks	Opposed.  DSD: Eliminating front setbacks would create conflicts with utility placements. DSD concurs with PWD's response, specifically with regard to street trees-- this impacts our ability to provide adequate soil volume, increases conflict with tree canopy, potential ADA and tree conflicts, and site distance.	23.177	
	Original Motion	Start at RM4A, not RM3A	Passed	13	0	0														ATD: ATD concurs with PWD response; specifically with regards to street trees, utilities, and ADA infrastructure.  PWD: On behalf of the cross-departmental, multi-year Utility Alignment & Street Tree Standards working group: 5' setbacks or greater are needed unless there are adjacent alleys that carry utilities. Conflicts with 0 foot setbacks include: impact ADA accessibility if there are architectural details or other encroachments into the sidewalk clear zone; interfere with placement & access to water meters; likely violate safety clearances for overhead power lines and utility poles; interfere with placement and access to customer water cutoffs & wastewater cleanouts on the private lot; and may preclude frontage landscaping such as street trees (as per the City's Complete Streets Policy and Great Streets standards). An illustration of values in conflict with 0 setbacks is available.					23.182 23.162 23.215		
85		Require a CUP for all Adult Entertainment in all applicable zones	Passed	11	0	0						Off dais		Absent							Specific to Article	23-4D		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Opposed; a use cannot be exclusively CUP	23.208	

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						
				Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEEGE	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
86	Original Motion	Change CC40, CC60, CC80 FAR max to 5:1, and increase heights Replace CC40 with CC50; Replace CC60 with CC75; Replace CC80 with CC90. eplace CC40 with CC50 (50' overall max height); Replace CC60 with CC75 (75' overall max height); Replace CC80 with CC90 (90' overall max height) Remove all minimum setbacks for all CC zones, and clarify reference to easements. Revise CC zones to increase heights & FAR. Allow exceptions for small sites downtown such as: Create exception for <1/2 block sites. Either significantly reduce the % gross frontage requirement or change requirement to "net" frontage or only require one block face of the site to comply. Or remove requirement in CC base zone and allow for a district planning process to dictate which streets and which uses are appropriate. And reduce requirements for many building support spaces (AE vault, fire pump, etc.) that must be located directly on ROW. Table G: For commercial buildings <u>greater than or equal to one-half block width</u> : <u>Except for building support spaces (including as Austin Energy vault, fire pump)</u> , entries must be oriented to the street and located at sidewalk level. No ramps or stairs allowed within public right- of-way or front setback <u>For commercial buildings less than one-half block width</u> : <u>The primary entry must be oriented to the street and located at the sidewalk level.</u>	-	-	-	-																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									</

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

			Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions			
Motion		Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE	SHAW	
88		Add the following language to Section 23-4D-8080 (E) Regardless of the requirements of the former Article 25 (including NCCDs and F25 zones): (1) one ADU that meets the base zoning requirements of R2 is allowed per residential lot that that meets the standards of R2 or greater, including but not limited to, placement, height, impervious cover, FAR, and setbacks; (2) the minimum lot size is equal to the minimum lot size required for Single-Family; and (3) Parking requirements are determined by the roughly equivalent requirements from this Title, as determined by the Director. (4) The Director of Neighborhood Housing must determine if a roughly equivalent zone has an AHBP that should apply to an F25 zoned property.																									
	Original Motion	Failed	6	4	2						Absent									Specific to Section	23-4D-8080			Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use		23.247	
	Substitute Motion	Do not make any changes to F25 other than those changes already voted on	Failed	5	7	0																					
89		In Section 23-4D-8110(F) insert and renumber: <del>(F)(8) exceed the minimum landscaping requirements of the City Code.</del> In Section 23-4D-8110(G)(2)(c) Delete: <del>Uses green water quality controls as described in the Environmental Criteria Manual to treat at least 50 percent of the water quality volume required by this Title.</del> In Section 23-4D-8110(G)(2)(m) Revise: (m) <del>Preserves all heritage trees; preserves 75 percent of the caliper inches associated with native protected size trees; and</del> preserves 75 percent of all of the native caliper inches.	Divided	-	-	-																				23.250 23.251 23.252	
	Original Motion	In Section 23-4D-8110(F) insert and renumber: <del>( F)(8) exceed the minimum landscaping requirements of the City Code.</del> In Section 23-4D-8110(G)(2)(c) Delete: <del>Uses green water quality controls as described in the Environmental Criteria Manual to treat at least 50 percent of the water quality volume required by this Title.</del>	Divided																								
	Divided Original Motion 1	In Section 23-4D-8110(G)(2)(m) Revise: (m) <del>Preserves all heritage trees; preserves 75 percent of the caliper inches associated with native protected size trees; and</del> preserves 75 percent of all of the native caliper inches.	Passed	12	0	0						Absent														WPD: Do not oppose. The landscaping requirement reflects current code for Tier 1. The green stormwater option is no longer necessary since CodeNEXT is proposing making GSI a standard requirement.  DSD: Concur with WPD response.	23.250 23.251
	Divided Original Motion 2																										
	Substitute to Divided Original Motion 2	Direct Staff to find ways to differentiate Tier 1-T3 defining Tree superiority.	Passed	7	5	0																					
	Amendment to Divided Original Motion 2	Direct staff to find a way to require superior standards for Tier 1 and Tier 2 PUDs apart from standard code	Passed	7	5	0						Absent								Specific to Section	23-4D-8110			Landscaping	DSD: Not opposed.	23.250	23.252
90	Original Motion	If CodeNEXT is in conflict with the existing Neighborhood Plan, the Neighborhood Plan takes precedent	Failed	4	4	4														General to Code				Policy		23.266	
91	Original Motion	Staff to work with the University of Texas, UT student body, and the seven neighborhoods who originally crafted UNO and the Central Austin Neighborhood Plan for opportunities for housing around UT, and consider adding height within Uno and extending the boundary of UNO	Passed	11	1	0							Absent							Specific to Section	23-4D-9130			Policy	PAZ: Do not oppose. This is outside of the scope of CodeNEXT	23.269	
92	Original Motion	Where appropriate, add a note detailing that other state or local laws may prohibit alcohol within certain distances, and clarify where to find those specific alcohol distances	Passed	12	0	1														Specific to Article	23-4D			Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose.	-	-
93	Original Motion	Where applicable, amend the language to allow engaged porches to only be open on one side, instead of requiring two sides as is currently written	Passed	11	0	0		Absent				Absent								Specific to Article	23-4D			Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose. DSD: Do not oppose.	A-24.5.1	
94	Original Motion	Eliminate all parking minimums	Passed	9	3	0						Absent															23.49 23.50 23.52 23.53 23.54 23.55 23.56 23.57 23.58 23.59 23.60 23.61 23.127 23.148 23.149 23.165 23.190 23.192 23.234
	Amendment to Original Motion 1	Direct staff to get as close to no parking requirements as possible while balancing ADA accessibility, and finding ways for neighborhoods to use residential parking and metered parking as a solution, RPP, and parking benefit districts. Excludes the areas that have already been voted on to have no parking requirements. Methods to be vetted through the Fire Department and Public Safety.	Passed	8	4	0																					
	Amendment to Original Motion 2	Incorporate Vision Zero and Transportation Safety Improvement Program into consideration	Passed	11	1	0																					
	Substitute Motion	Purse further parking reductions, but staff to bring back their research for the Planning Commission to review. Factors to review: meters in front of all commercial properties, studies for how exemptions that reduce parking are working, review the Planning Commission Residential Working Group Recommendations, flag lots, RPPs, and address the AIC	Failed	3	8	1														General to Code				Parking	Staff response pending.	24.8	24.11 24.12 24.13 24.14 14.15 24.16 24.18
95	Original Motion	Direct Staff to find a solution to preserve parking at specific sites near schools, of any type or district, where parking is an identified problem, utilizing school permit parking systems or other street parking restrictions. Staff to take pedestrian and bicycle safety into consideration.	Passed	9	2	1							Absent							General to Code				Parking	PAZ: Outside the scope of CodeNEXT. ATD: ATD suggests reviewing AISD parking requirements to include school-specific TDM policies for staff, parents, and students to include Vision Zero goals and to enhance pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to/from school sites during the site plan phase.	24.23	

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions	
				Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON									WHITE
96	Original Motion	In Section 23-4E-4020(A)(1)(c), add the language " <u>and other residential house scale buildings</u> ." In Section 23-4E-4040(B), revise the language as follows: B. This section applies to commercial or <u>non-house scale</u> multi-family development that is located adjacent to a public right of way. In Section 23-4E-4050(C), revise to say " <u>commercial zones</u> " In Section 23-4E-4040, Exempt CC and DC (and any other urban zones) from this section as written (and it is recommended that CC does not require any minimum setback). In Section 23-4E-4040 Table A, reduce Front Yard Landscaping to 25% In Section 23-4E-4050, remove Foundation Buffer because some areas should not have landscaping next to the slabs. Soils engineers are against this on larger buildings. In Section 23-4E-4060(D), revise language to require an island every 10 spaces instead of 8 spaces In Section 23-4E-4060(F)(2), revise language to require a 9 foot landscape island instead of the 10 foot Direct Staff to take into consideration the results of the June 5th ASLA analysis of the Code, and ASLA's recommendation to move all landscape requirements to the Environmental Criteria Manual.	Passed	8	2	1						Off dais	Absent							Specific to Section	23-4E-4020(A)(1)(c) 23-4E-4040(B) 23-4E-4050(C) 23-4E-4040 Table 23-4E-4040(A) 23-4E-4050 23-4E-4060(D) 23-4E-4060(F)(2)			Landscaping	<b>DSD:</b> In Section 23-4E-4020(A)(1)(c): Do not oppose. In Section 23-4E-4040(B): Do not oppose. In Section 23-4E-4050(C): Opposed. Foundation buffer is appropriate for non-house scale RM. Suggest revising to say "commencial and non-house scale multi-family." In Section 23-4E-4040: Opposed. Site without sufficient area for Front Yard Planting in CC and DC zones is probably going to use Functional Green; keeping applicability general allows building design to dictate landscape requirments. In Section 23-4E-4040 Table A: Opposed. In Section 23-4E-4050: Opposed. In Section 23-4E-4060(D): Opposed. In Section 23-4E-4060(F)(2): Opposed. Larger islands are necessary to support tree health and allow trees to grow to full size and shade-giving potential. <b>WPD:</b> Oppose reductions in the amount of required landscaping. The Green Infrastructure Working Group recommended providing as much nature as possible at a variety of scales. In addition, they recommended ensuring that greenery on the public and private side of the property line work together to form a cohesive and functional green space.	A-24.26.1 24.27 24.28 24.29 24.30 A-24.30.1 24.31 24.32 24.33
97	Original Motion	In all zones, require that all Townhouses and Live/Work units have at least one block face to be permitted	Failed	4	8	0						Absent								Specific to Section	23-4D			Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use		24.45
98	Original Motion	Eliminate Short Term Rental as a permitted use	Failed	1	9	1						Off dais	Absent							Specific to Section	23-4D			Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use		24.53
99	Original Motion	Permit 6 unrelated occupants per dwelling unit, and direct staff to allow more where appropriate	-	-	-	-																				
	Substitute Motion 1	Uphold the occupancy limits of 4 in McMansion and 6 outside of McMansion as directed by Council in 2016.	Failed	4	9	0																				
	Substitute Motion 2	Throughout the City (regardless of McMansion), set occupancy at the following standards: Single Family: 6 Duplex: 3 + 3 Single Family + ADU: 6 + 2 Duplex + ADU: 3 + 3 + 2 ADU alone: 2 Cottage court leave as is, with direction to staff to recommend to council additional occupancy limits where deemed appropriate	Passed	10	2	1														Specific to Article	23-4D			Terms and Definitions	<b>PAZ:</b> Do not oppose. proposal changes 2016 Council occupancy policy, however this proposal simplifies adminstration and enforcement of occupancy limits. Adding flexibility to occupancy limits would support the Strategic Housing Blueprint. <b>NHCD:</b> Adding flexibility to occupancy limits would support the Strategic Housing Blueprint.	24.73
100	Original Motion	Recommend approval of Chapters 23-5, 23-7, 23-8, 23-9, 23-10, 23-12, and 23-13 with amendments previously approved	Passed	9	1	1							Absent								Article 23-5 Article 23-7 Article 23-8 Article 23-9 Article 23-10 Article 23-12 Article 23-13 23-13A-1030			Policy		
	Amendment to Original Motion	In Article 23-13: Definitions and Measurements, revise the definition of Microbrewery from 15,000 barrels to 5,000 barrels, and review Draft 3 for any terms that have been left undefined, using motions from Planning Commission CodeNEXT Draft 3 Deliberation Spreadsheet as guidance	Passed	8	1	1							Recused	Absent						Specific to Article Specific to Section				Terms and Definitions	<b>PAZ:</b> Do not oppose. However, by redefining microbreweries, which zones microwbreweries and breweries are permitted in should be reviewed.	N/A
101	Original Motion	Require a variance for all Flag Lots as is required in Title 25	Passed	7	4	1														Specific to Section	23-5C-2040			Policy	<b>DSD:</b> Opposed. Flag lots are an important tool to address affordability, encourage infill and fight sprawl. The current code allows flag lots by-right for unplatted land, but requires a variance for platted lots when resubdividing. This is not a best practice. Staff's recommendation is to remove the variance requirement, but retain all other current standards. The following standards will remain: • Driveway/utility plan for residential lots. • Minimum lot width (20') with option for narrower width (15') with shared access. • Addresses for flag lots posted at closest point to street access. • The flag portion must meet minimum requirements of the applicable zone (size, width, etc). The pole does not count toward lot size.	A-27.8.1



Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner										General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions		
				Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHEIH									THOMPSON	WHITE
102	Original Motion	Recommend approval of Chapter 23-6 with amendments previously approved and the following additional changes: 1. Direct Staff to revisit Site Plan Lite and establish a process not to exceed 2 months that is administered by DAC with Watershed Protection review.	Passed	8	3	0							Absent		Off dais				Specific to Article	23-6			Policy	Not Opposed.  <b>DSD:</b> Site Plans are the tool that the City uses to demonstrate a project's compliance with all applicable regulations across multiple departments and disciplines, reviewing the building and development in context with the site work. All interconnected disciplines evaluate a proposed development in context and ensure a conflict free construction. The scope of review matches the scope of the regulations; therefore, regulations would need to be reduced for these projects in order for the required review (and review mechanism) to be condensed. Additional policy direction is required in order to determine which regulatory areas the City would be willing to relax to incentivize this project type.  <b>WPD:</b> Open to working on this process with staff and policymakers. However, the Environmental Officer does not think 2 months is a reasonable timeframe for full environmental and drainage review.  <b>Austin Energy:</b> The length of a site plan review is often determined by the applicant's original effort put into the design and subsequent efforts to address comments or not	N/A	
103	Original Motion	Remove Section 23-9D-1030 (B)(1) Add (intent) language for the Article in general that the goal of the transportation Article is to take steps to reduce carbon pollution caused by vehicles as part of our commitment to the Paris Climate Accord, and we must work as a community to come up with solutions to our dependency on Single Occupancy Vehicles. Direct staff to look at vehicle miles traveled rather than level of service in terms of mitigation	Failed	5	5	1							Absent		Absent								Policy		44.4	44.5
104	Original Motion	Recommend approval of Chapter 23-11 with amendments previously approved and the following additional changes: 1. Technical Criteria Manuals go through a public process that are ultimately discussed at Planning Commission and possibly Council	Passed	11	0	0							Absent		Off dais				Specific to Article	23-11			Policy	<b>PAZ:</b> Not recommended for criteria manuals. Existing rules process allows public process for stakeholders of criteria manuals.  <b>DSD:</b> Do not recommend. The Technical Criteria Manuals are administrative. The process for amending them includes a public stakeholder process.  <b>WPD:</b> Need clarification of intent. 23-11 is the Technical Code (e.g., Building Code) and not the same as the Technical Criteria Manuals (e.g., Environmental Criteria Manual). The code establishes an administrative process for the adoption of rules and technical criteria.  <b>Austin Energy:</b> Are technical criteria merely to be "discussed" at PC and Council or debated? Technical criteria should be based on sound engineering rather than political judgements  <b>PWD:</b> There is an established Rules Posting Process to update Criteria Manuals. All notices are posted on the City's website: <a href="http://www.austintexas.gov/department/rule-postings-and-technical-criteria-manuals">http://www.austintexas.gov/department/rule-postings-and-technical-criteria-manuals</a> . Please contact the Rules Posting Manager to see if there are distribution lists for rules posting notices that individuals or groups can be added to.	N/A	
105	Original Motion	Add Accessory Apartment as a permitted use in all R zones as shown in Sheih Exhibit 2 - Accessory Apartment	Passed	8	3	1					Absent								Specific to Article	23-4D			Allowed Use/ Specific to Use	<b>DSD:</b> Opposed. Adds additional review complexity, potential conflicts with the building code, and will increase review times.	A-57.22.1	A-57.22.2
106	Original Motion	Revise the definition of Residential Gross Floor Area (GFA) to reduce the number of exemptions as follows: RESIDENTIAL GROSS (GFA) The total enclosed area of all floors in a building with a clear height of more than five feet, measured to the outside surface of the exterior walls. The term excludes loading-decks, 1st floor porches, stoops, basements, attics, stories below grade plane, parking facilities, driveways, and enclosed loading berths and off-street maneuvering areas. In exchange, in all Residential Zones, allow for an increase of 0.05 FAR	Passed	8	5	0													Specific to Section	Article 23-13A-1030		See White Exhibit 1 - Page 36 of 48	Terms and Definitions	<b>PAZ:</b> Opposed. FAR needs to be consistent and coordinated with other proposals.  <b>DSD:</b> Opposed. Concur with PAZ.	57.4	
	Amendment to Original Motion 1	Remove the change in FAR GFA excludes loading-decks, 1st floor porches, stoops, basements, attics, stories below grade plane, parking facilities up to 450 sf, driveways, and enclosed loading berths and off-street maneuvering areas.	Failed	5	7	1												<b>NHCD:</b> Generally, for bonus programs any increase in base entitlements will decrease the attractiveness of bonus entitlements, and could lead to decreased participation in the bonus program or a decreased number of affordable units.								

Planning Commission																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														
				Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner										General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																													
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON	WHITE	SHAW	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
107	Original Motion	Map Imagine Austin Corridors as follows: 1) All commercial lots will be zoned as MS with the following rules: lots under 140 sq ft. deep zoned as MS2B, and lots between 140-220 sq ft. deep zoned as MS3B. Map Imagine Austin Corridors in gentrifying areas as follows: 2) All D3 R-zoned lots immediately adjacent to the (1) above MS lots AND have part of their lot within 1/8 mile of an IA corridor are rezoned as RM1C. 3) All D3 R-zoned lots that have part of their lot within 1/4 mile of an IA corridor are rezoned as R2C. Gentrifying areas defined by Kenny Exhibit 1 - Easter Crescent Gentrification Protection Zone (Page 28 of 29).	Divided	-	-	-																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
	Divided Original Motion 1	Map Imagine Austin Corridors as follows: 1) All commercial lots will be zoned as MS with the following rules: lots under 140 sq ft. deep zoned as MS2B, and lots between 140-220 sq ft. deep zoned as MS3B.	Passed	13	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
	Amendment to Divided Original Motion 1	Revise the Impervious Cover in MS2B to 90%, and MS3B to 95%	Passed	13	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
	Divided Original Motion 2	Map Imagine Austin Corridors in gentrifying areas as follows: 2) All D3 R-zoned lots immediately adjacent to the (1) above MS lots AND have part of their lot within 1/8 mile of an IA corridor are rezoned as RM1C. 3) All D3 R-zoned lots that have part of their lot within 1/4 mile of an IA corridor are rezoned as R2C. Gentrifying areas defined by Kenny Exhibit 1 - Easter Crescent Gentrification Protection Zone (Page 28 of 29).	Never taken up	-	-	-														General to Code Specific to Section	Table 23-4D-5080(H) Table 23-4D-5120(H)	Kenny Exhibit 1 - Eastern Crescent Gentrification Protection Zone (Page 28 of 29)	Mapping																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
108		Map Corridor Transitions per modified Kazi Corridor Transitions Directive, as voted on by Planning Commission  By general consensus, context sensitive mapping would be included in the Corridor Transition Mapping including: Planning commission shall propose mapping strategies for creating transition zones along IA corridors for City Council consideration. Although absolute distances are suggested for certain mapping strategies, actual mapping within transition zones shall take into consideration the character of the corridor and surrounding neighborhoods. This context sensitive mapping will take into consideration, but is not limited to the following: 1) Orientation of blocks relative to corridor. (Does block run parallel, perpendicular or at an angle?) 2) Block form (i.e. cul de sac, non-linear block form, grid) 3) Residential blocks sided by MS or MU zoned lots 4) Vicinity to transit centers 5) Direct access to the IA corridor 6) Proximity to an IA center 7) Near other major thoroughfares extending from the corridor 8) Bound by other zones, uses or environmental features																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
	Final Motion	Friendly Amendment: Council to implement transition zones including a public participation process	Passed	12	1	0														General to Code			Kazi Corridor Transitions Directive - Original and Modified per actions of Planning Commission	Compatibility/ Transition Zones																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						
	Original Motion	Remove compatibility from CC zone	-	-	-	-																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
109	Substitute Motion 1	Retain current compatibility in the western Judges Hill area per DAP, but with a 270 foot triggering distance	Failed	5	6	2																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
	Substitute Motion 2	Direct staff to remove the compatibility impacts to CC zoning in the Downtown area, particularly related to the two parcels zoned R2C-H near Judge's Hill and the property on the southern corner of 15th street with R zoning. This includes F-25	Passed	10	3	0														Specific to Article	23-4D		Compatibility/ Transition Zones																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
110	Original Motion	Map Imagine Austin Regional Centers as UC-Unlimited, unless affected by compatibility. If affected by compatability, zone to the highest attainable UC per the limit of the affecting compatibility	Passed	13	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
	Amendment to Original Motion 1	Direct staff to look at current projected yield of affordable units for the Regional Centers and ensure that the anticipated yield is not being diminished by the effect of the prescribed zoning	Passed	13	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
	Amendment to Original Motion 2	Establish a program for Regional Center that uses opt-in methods similar to UNO, requiring certain development features, such as streetscaping, large-site connectivity, and mobility in order to get maximum heights.	Passed	13	0	0														General to Code			Mapping																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

				Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner												General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic			Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
Motion		Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON	WHITE	SHAW																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
111	Original Motion	Map the areas adjacent to core transit corridors, future core transit corridors, and Imagine Austin corridors using the new zoning tools in CodeNEXT such that compatibility is not triggered on at least 90% of the properties along these corridors Exempt TODs from compatibility entirely	Divided	-	-	-																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																

Planning Commission  
CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council

				Vote Tallies			Vote by Commissioner											General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic			Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions	
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KAZI	KENNY	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	OLIVER	SCHISLER	SEGER	SHIEH	THOMPSON										WHITE
114	Original Motion	Approve Regional Centers with Amendments	Passed	13	0	0															General to Code	Map		Mapping	<p><b>PAZ:</b> Some Regional Centers fall partially or completely outside the City's zoning jurisdiction. Also, some have PUD designations that will need further review beyond this initial PC mapping amendment process. In reality, this motion mostly effects the Highland Mall/Airport Regional Center. Lastly, staff will need to fully compare CodeNEXT landscaping and transportation standards compare to UNO's streetscape standards.</p> <p><b>WPD:</b> WPD is neutral on extensive mapping changes without further analysis of the potential drainage and water quality impacts.</p> <p><b>NHCD:</b> Oppose unless an Affordable Housing Bonus option is added to the zone. The UC-Unlimited zone is currently designed without an affordable housing bonus lever. Staff believe this change would result in a loss of affordable housing bonus capacity in regional centers. If Council would like to pursue rezoning regional centers to a UC zone that has a bonus (UC80, UC120, or UC180), staff would like to model projected yields under the UC zone and the Draft 3 zones assigned to each regional center and make a recommendation on which zones to utilize. Note that when additional community benefits (like streetscaping) are required to achieve a bonus, the amount of affordable housing that can be generated by a bonus program is reduced.</p>		
115	Original Motion	Staff to work with AISD to remap AISD properties with most appropriate, non-triggering zoning instead of the existing P zoning	Failed	5	5	1						Absent		Absent							General to Code	Map		Mapping		N/A	
116	Original Motion	Staff to establish a 3-year sunset process for F25, including community participation - particularly those areas that have already completed a small area planning process. New zones or subzones may need to be created to accommodate the sunset process. For areas scheduled to undergo a Small Area Plan, F25 will get phased out as part of that review if it has not already been phased out.	Passed	12	0	0								Absent							General to Code	Map		Policy	<p><b>PAZ:</b> Pending</p> <p><b>NHCD:</b> Staff support transitioning F25 zones to CodeNEXT zones where appropriate.</p>		N/A