_											idatic	JII IXCL	ort to City Co							
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Vote Tallie:		ANDERSON	KAZI	MCGRAW NUCKOLS	OLIVER SCHISSLER	SEEGER	THOMPSON	WHITE	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
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 Commission 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.	g Passed	11 (0 0				absent		absent		General to Code				Policy	PAZ: 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	2 0				absent	1177	On dais		General to Code				Policy	PAZ: Staff will respond to actions/motions taken by PC, but not unacted-upon motions. Staff will forward the PC deliberation spreadsheet to Council. PWD: 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	0 1				absent	117 30	dais		General to Code				Policy	PAZ: Oppose. Staff will respond to individual motions, but reconcilling contradictory PC motions (that conflict with each other) is outside staff's purview. PWD: 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	0 1								General to Code				Policy	PAZ: Do not oppose		
5	Original Motion Amendment to Original Motion	Reduce length of non 23-4 Sections by 20%. Identify a Master Editor who should identify measures in Nor 23-4 Articles to reduce extreme length to assist in achieving CodeNEXT goal for code simplicity. Reduce by 30% instead of 20%	Passed	12 (0 0			absent absent					General to Code				Policy	PAZ: Oppose. However, staff will look for ways to improve and simplify text between Council readings. DSD: Oppose. DSD drafted content has been consolidated and streamlined. WPD: Oppose. Staff has already worked to reorganize and streamline the watershed regulations by consolidating divisions. ATD: Concur with PAZ PWD: Concur with PAZ	N/A	
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	2 0				absent	117	dals		General to Chapter	23-1			Policy	PAZ: Do not oppose	N/A	

1

								UCINE	AT DIA	III 3 K	recom	illellua	lion Ke	eport	to City Cou	ncii						
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Vote Tallies s Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	HART	KENNY MCGRAW	NUCKOLS PACE NUCKOLS	SCHISSLER SCHISSLER	SHIEH	WHITE	Gen Cha to A Spe	neral to Code, neral to apter, Specific Article, or ecific to	ection Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions
	Original Motion	Add language to 23-1A-6010 and 2301A-6020 regarding Minimum Development Potential as shown in Steven Oliver Exhibit 1	Passed	7	7 5	1														PAZ: Oppose. Amendments can be made, as needed, when conflicts are		
	Amendment to Original Motion	Add language that leaves this to the discretion of the director	Failed	4	4 8	1														identified. DSD: 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. WPD: Oppose. As currently worded, the amendment undermines multiple existing regulations related to the environment, water quality, and drainage, including: Non-degradation standard of the Save Our Springs (SOS) ordinance Stormwater management for water quality and flood risk reduction Restrictions on development in the floodplain		
	Amendment to Original Motion	Exclude Heritage Trees	Passed	100	0 2	1								Spe	2 ecific to Article 6	3-1A-6010 & 23-1A- 020		Oliver Exhibit 1 - Minimum Development	Additional Development Standards	Waterway setbacks for creeks and lakes Setbacks for critical environmental features such as caves, wetlands, and springs Tree and urban forest protections (excluding heritage trees) Requirements for preserving floodplain health Steep slope protections Limitations on the depth of cut and fill Preservation of open space and natural areas Provision of landscape elements and vegetated setbacks 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.	A-1.7.1	
8							П				sent	f dais			ecific to			·				
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		9	9 2	0				Off dais	absent ab	00			ecific to 2	3-2A-3030(B)(2) 3-2A-3040(B)(2)		Sheih Exhibit 1 - Engineer's Letter	Additional Development Standards	Opposed DSD: 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.	N/A	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	1 0	0				absent	absent				ecific to ction 2	3-2G-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.		A-9.16.1
11	Original Motion	Recommend approval of Article 23-3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D with amendments previously approved	Passed	8	8 1	2					absent	Off dais			neral to apter 2	3-3			Policy	PAZ: Neutral	N/A	

							Codei	*LXII	Diait 3	Necc	,,,,,,	iluatio	ıı vet	port to City Council			_			
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Vote Tallies Noes Al	ostains	ANDERSON	KAZI	MCGRAW NUCKOLS	OLIVER SCHISSLER	SEEGER	SHIEH	WHITE	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		Related Planning Commission Motions
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		1			Off dais	bsent				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	NHCD: 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 5.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. DSD: 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	9 2	0			J	absent		Ort dais		General to Article 23-3E		None	Affordable Housing	PAZ: Oppose. Process for adopting code should be consistent.	N/A	
	Original Motion Original Motion Substitute Motion	Recommend approval of Chapter 23-4 with amendments previously approved Strike "that are intended to promote compatible land patterns." and add "that address the social and environmental values described in 23-1A-1020." Reference back to the Comprehensive Plan (23-1A-1020) as recommended by staff	Passed - Passed	- - 12	, 2 2 1	2				- absent		- Off dais		General to Article 23-4 Specific to Section 23-4A-1010			Policy Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose PAZ: Do not oppose	N/A 20.2 20.4	_
17	Original Motion Original Motion	Eliminate the Downtown Plan overlay until Small area plan can be completed with funding assistance provided by DAA. 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	-	-		U								Specific 23-4A-2020(H)			Policy	NHCD: 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. Austin Energy: If intent is reduce frontage requirement because a certain amount will be taken up by necessary infrastructure, staff agrees. ATD: Driveway widths and standards are within the TCM and should not be	20.4	-
18	Substitute Motion	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	2 0	1								Specific to Section 23-4D-6080			Additional Development Standards	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). PWD: 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. PAZ: Do not oppose. Does not carry forward existing 8:1 FAR for CBD. Additional FAR by-right may impact the AHBP. NHCD: Do not support increased base FAR. Generally, for bonus programs any increase in base entitlements will decrease the attractiveness of bonus	20.5	23.205 23.225
	Original Motion	Change DC zone FAR max to 12:1.		7	7 6	0								Specific to Section 23-4D-6080			FAR/ Height	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	

				_			Oodeit	LAI DI	ant J IN	CCOIII	mendat	ion ive	ort to City C							
					Vote Tallies	-		Vot	te by Com	mission	er		General to Code	2,				4		
						- 1	_				Z	2	General to Chapter, Specifi	c						
						- 1	RSOI	× A×	OLS	SLER	- I'R	Е Ш	to Article, or						Original Planning	
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes Ab	tains	IART	ACGF EN	IUCK	CHIS		HAW H	Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC	Related Exhibit	Broad Tonic	Staff Response	Commission Motion	Commission Motions
		INICION	rasseu/ raileu	Ayes	Noes Ab	italiis	Q I Y	2 2 2	2 0	S	SSF	- >	Section	Section Number	Wotton Fage No.	Related Exhibit	Вгоац торіс	Stall Response	IVIOLIOII	IVIOLIOIIS
		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																		
19		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																		
	Original Motion Substitute Motion	mitigated based on the criteria in Subsection (E). Move this section to Specific for Use for Restaurant and Bar	- Passed	12		1				-			Specific to Section	23-4B-1020(F)(2) 23-4E-6: Specific to Use				PAZ: Do not oppose DSD: Do not oppose	21.4	
	Substitute Motion	WHITE Exhibit Conditional Use Permits:	1 45524		3	-							Section	25 42 0. Specific to Osc			Specific to osc	But the topped of	21.4	
		Please amend Draft 3 to reinstate the clear Conditional Use Permit standards and other key provisions in																		
	Original Motion Divided Original	LDC 25-5-142 through 25-5-150.	Divided	-				+++-		-			-				H		H	
	Motion 1	Reinstate LDC 25-5-148 to ensure compliance with conditions imposed by Council or Commissions	Failed	4	8	1														
	Divided Original	Reinstate existing CUP requirement for late-hours bars and restaurants, including current code's 200'											1							
	Motion 2	parking buffer in proximity to House-Scale Residential Zones.	Withdrawn	-	- -								H				H		H	
	Divided Original Motion 3	Reinstate LDC 25-5-150 to prevent revolving door for same CUP requests	Passed	7	6	0												PAZ: Oppose. This requirement can already be found in 23-4B-1040 (G)		
																		PAZ: Oppose. Large/big box retail is not permitted or is a CUP in: MU, MS, RC,		
	Divided Original																	and C/I zones. In addition, uses over 100k sq ft must comply with additional	 	
20	Motion 4	Reinstate LDC 25-5-145(C)(4) to ensure Large Retail Uses do not adversely affect future redevelopment	Passed	12	1	0							H				H	building design standards (23-4E-8).	∐	
																			 	
		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																		
	Divided Original	(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	Tabled and Never																	
	Motion 5	consideration, not as required conditions of approval.	Taken Up																	
	Divided Original															unto e toto				
	Motion 6 Divided Original	Reinstate LDC 25-5-143(C) to ensure advisory board input on CUPs in Waterfront Overlay	Passed	8	5	0			++				H			White Exhibit - Conditional Use	H		H I	
	Motion 6 -					- 1							Specific to			Permits (Pages				
	RECONSIDERED	Leave the Language as is Section 23-4B-1030	Passed	13	0	0							Section	23-4B-1020		15-19)	Policy	PAZ: Do not oppose	21.5	
21		(1) Notice of Application. The director shall provide notice of an application for a minor use permit under																		
	Original Motion	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	
						- 1												PAZ: Code currently reads: "(C) Permitting Decisions. Except as provided in		
22		Section 23-4B-2040				- 1												Subsection (A), a decision by the Development Services Director or another responsible director to approve or disapprove a development application may		
		(C) Permitting Decisions. Except as provided in Subsection (A), a decision by the Development Services				- 1												be appealed to the Board of Adjustment under Article 23-2I (Appeals).		
		Director or another responsible director to approve or disapprove a development application because of- non-compliance with the zoning code- may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment under Article 23-21				- 1		Sent					Specific to				Language	DSD: Clarify that appeal should be aligned with Texas Local Govt Code		
	Original Motion	(Appeals).	Passed	9	2	1		Abs					Section	23-4B-2040			Revisions	regarding operations and duties of the Board of Adjustement.	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	J												Specific to				Language			
-	Original Motion	Change the word "standards" to "regulations" in Section 23-4B-4020(B)(1)(c)(iii)	Passed	13	0	0							Section Specific to	23-4B-4020(B)(1)(c)(iii)			Revisions Language	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							Section	23-4B-4030(C)			Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose	21.18	
																		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.	 	
27																		WPD: Oppose. Will reduce the enhanced natural function provided by larger,	 	
																		contiguous pervious areas. The Green Infrastructure Working Group supported	 	
		In Section 23-4C-1010, create (B)(1) and (2) instead of (C) and (D), add "and that have a zone that requires it", and strike "four acree" and replace with "eight acres."											Specific to	23-4C-1010(B)(1) and			Language	the creation of contiguous areas of pervious cover that also enhance connectivity between sites and serve as desirable public and private open		
	Original Motion	In 23-4C-1040(B)(3), replace "eight acres" with "twelve acres"	Passed	7	6	0							Section	23-4C-1040(B)(3)			Revisions	spaces.	22.5	
	Original Motion	Delete Section 23-4C-1020(M)(2)	-	-				1.1.	<u> </u>									DAT: Oppose Simpler and espier to understand as is		
28																		PAZ: Oppose. Simpler and easier to understand as-is.	 	
		Instead of completely deleting 1020(M)(2), move this standard to the zone districts where the Code lists											Specific to	23-4C-4020(M)/2)				ATD: ATD does not support providing 2x the minimum parking requirements and would rather suggest promoting on-site TDM programs to encourage non	 	
	Substitute Motion	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	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	
•					•														LI CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTO	•

4

							Juc. 112					10111	Корс	ort to City Co	Junion			_			
				Vote Ta	allies	1		Vo	te by Cor	mmissio	ner		П	General to Code, General to	,						
						NOS		×	sil sil .	ER L	~	PSON	ш	Chapter, Specific to Article, or						Original Plannin	g Related Planning
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes Abstair	NDER	IART	ENNY ACGR	DCKC	CHISS	EEGEF	HOMI		Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No. F	Palatad Evhihit	Broad Tonic	Staff Response	Commission Motion	Commission Motions
		INIOLION	Passed/ Falled	Ayes	NOES ADSIAN	15 4	I Y	× 2	2 2	0 8	S S	F >	IS	Section	Section Number	Wotton Page No. 1	Related Exhibit	Бгоац торіс	stan response	Iviotion	IVIOLIONS
													ш						PAZ: Zones that currently have *only* common open space requirements		
																			should have common open space replaced with personal open space.		
																			DSD : For those projects that have no other open space requirement, common open space has provided a benefit not otherwise found since it was expanded		
																			in the 2013 amendments to Subchapter E (Design Standards). Concur with PAZ.		22.7
29																			PARD: The combinatation of this item and #27 mean that no common open		22.8 22.9
													ш						space is required on projects less than 8 acres in size.		22.10 22.12
																			WPD: Oppose. Will reduce the enhanced natural function provided by larger, contiguous pervious areas. The Green Infrastructure Working Group supported		22.13 22.14
																			the creation of contiguous areas of pervious cover that also enhance connectivity between sites and serve as desirable public and private open		22.15 22.16
	Original Motion	Remove Section 23-4C-1030 Common Open Space, eliminating the Common Open Space requirement	Passed	7	6	0								General to Code	23-4C-1030			Open Space	spaces.	22.1	
		Replace language in Section 23-4C-1040(B)(3) with: An application for a site plan or subdivision is not required to provide Civic open space when the site is:																			
		i) less than two acres,																			
		ii) located within one-quarter mile of a safe pedestrian travel distance of an existing and developed dedicated parkland that is at least one acre, measured from the boundary of the site to the nearest																			
30	Original Motion	public entrance of the park, and iii) not located in a Park Deficient Area as determined by the Parks and Recreation Department.	Failed	1	12	0															
		Replace language in Section 23-4C-1040(B)(3) with:																			
		An application for a site plan or subdivision is not required to provide Civic open space when the site is: i) less than four acres,																			
		ii) located within one-quarter mile of a safe pedestrian travel distance of an existing and developed dedicated parkland that is at least one acre, measured from the boundary of the site to the nearest																			
-	Substitute Motion	public entrance of the park, and Replace language in Section 23-4C-1040(B)(4) with:	Failed	4	8	1								Specific	23-4C-1040(B)(3)			Open Space		22.1	7 22.21
		An applicant shall locate each residential lot within: (a) one-quarter mile of a safe pedestrian travel distance from existing or proposed civic open space if the																			
31		development is located within the urban core; and (b) a half mile of a safe pedestrian travel distance from existing or proposed civic open space if the																			
	Original Motion	development is located outside of the urban core Add a definition of "safe pedestrian travel"	Passed	11	0	2							ш	Specific to							
	Substitute Motion	Strike Section 23-4C-1040(B)(4)	Withdrawn		-				-				-	Section	23-4C-1040(B)(4) 23-4C-1040 and all of			Open Space	PAZ: Oppose. Redundant with existing civic open space access requirements.	22.1	8
32	Original Motion	Strike Section 23-4C-1040 and all of Section 23-4C-2	Failed	5	8	0								Specific	23-4C-2			Open Space		22.2	0
		Revise the purpose statement in Section 23-4C-2010 to: This division sets the requirements for a wide range of civic open space types that are appropriate for the											ш								
33		City. Civic Open Space aligns with Imagine Austin Priority "Use green infrastructure to protect																			
	Original Motion	environmentally sensitive areas and integrate nature into the city* and will ensure adequate open spaces are incorporated into comprehensive plan developments creating complete communities.	Failed	3	10	0								Specific	23-4C-2010			Open Space		22.2	6
34	Original Motion	Strike Section 23-4C-2050(D)	Passed	7	6	0								Specific to Section	23-4C-2050(D)			Open Space	Staff response pending	22.3	1 22.32
35	Original Motion	Strike Section 23-4C-2050(E) Where appropriate for the nature of the Civic Open Space, the design shall make shade an integral	-		-		-			-				Specific to					WPD: Oppose. The integration of shade into open space, especially through tree plantings, helps reduce urban heat island impacts and integrates nature		
	Substitute Motion	feature for people utilizing the civic space.	Passed	8	4	1			ŧ					Section	23-4C-2050(E)			Open Space	into the city.	22.3	3
	Original Motion	100% reduction in parking for properties located within a TOD	Passed	9	3	0			Abse												
		Add the following language from current code on CBD/DMU Parking: Except for a use occupying a designated historic landmark or an existing building in a designated historic																			
		district, off-street motor vehicle parking for persons with disabilities must be provided for a use that occupies 6,000 square feet or more of floor space under the requirements of this paragraph. (a) The																			
36		following requirements apply if no parking is provided for a use, other than parking for persons with disabilities: (i) the minimum number of accessible parking spaces is calculated by taking 20 percent of																			
		the parking required for the use under Appendix A (Tables of Off -Street Parking and Loading Requirements) and using that result to determine the number of accessible spaces required under the				ш							ш						PAZ: Do not oppose. staff would need to amend each TOD plan to change the parking reduction from 40% max to 100% max. Not an item that can be		
		Building Code. The accessible spaces may be provided on - or off-site, within 250 feet of the use. (ii) The director may waive or reduce the number of accessible spaces required under Paragraph (2)(a)(i) if the				ш							ш						addressed with D3.		
	Amendment to Original Motion	applicant pays a fee in-lieu to be used by the city to construct and maintain accessible parking in the vicinity of the use.	Passed	10	1								ш	General to Code				Parking	ATD: ATD is in favor of requiring adequate ADA parking spaces, however off- site and/or fees in lieu will need to be addressed within the TCM.	22.3	4
27	Onginal Wolfon	YIGHRY OF THE GOS.	i asseu	10	- '				ent					Specific to				Parking	and and/or rees in field will freed to be addressed within the TOW.	22.3	
3/	Original Motion	100% reduction of parking for properties located within UNO	Passed	7	4	1			Abs					Section	23-4D-9130			Parking	PAZ: Do not oppose	22.3	4
38		List "Live Music Venue" as a separate use that is permitted in all the same use tables with the same permission standards as "Performance Venue/ Theater," but without the requirements for alcohol sales.																Allowed Llsss/	PAZ: Oppose. This would allow live music venues to function as a bar and would be permitted in districts where Performance Venue/Theater is allowed		
	Original Motion	Define in Definitions	Passed	13	0	0								Specific to Article	23-4D			Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	(more permissive than a bar).	23.	1
	Original Motion	Whatever the compatibility trigger is, stepbacks and setbacks both start at the triggering property's lot line (regardless of an alley)	Divided		-																23.2
39	Divided Original Motion 1	Whatever the compatibility trigger is, stepbacks start at the triggering property's lot line	Passed	13	0	0							Ш								23.20 23.145
	Divided Original Motion 2	Whatever the compatibility trigger is, setbacks start at the triggering property's lot line (regardless of an alley)	Passed	13	0	0							Ш	Specific to Article	23-4D			Compatibility/ Transition Zones	PAZ: Do not oppose	23.	23.170 2 23.193
_	·			·		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	· <u>-</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	=

													ort to City Council						
					Vote Tallies	-		v	ote by Co	mmission	ner	Т	General to Code, General to					-	
						_	NO NO		> 0	8	2	20	Chapter, Specific						
						_	DERS	. ×	GKOL	VER	GER EH	# ITE	to Article, or Specific to	Annotated PC				Original Planning Commission	Related Planning Commission
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes Al	stains	A H	X Ä	Σ Z	등 성	3 3 3	Ę ≱ Ŗ	Section Section Number	Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit Shaw Exhibit -	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Motion	Motions
	Original Motion	Con Characteristic A. Dord A. (Donne 7.9.0) for analysis and a second billion about a secon	Not Acted On			- 1									Part 1 (Page 7 and 9)				
	Original Motion	See Shaw Exhibit 1 - Part 1 (Pages 7 & 9) for replacement compatibility standards Alter the Working Group Proposal shown on Page 9 of Shaw Exhibit 1 - Part 1 with the following	Not Acted Off	-					-	-					and 9)		1	1	
		changes: Between 25-50 feet from the triggering lot line: 32 foot height limit				- 1													
		At 150 feet from the triggering lot line: 85 foot height limit Full height at 300 feet				- 1													
	Substitute Motion 1 Divided Substitute	Compatibility is triggered by distance, not adjacency	Divided	-		_													
	Motion 1	Reimplement all compatibility from Title 25, but there must be two or more residential uses within the necessary distances to trigger compatibility	Failed	4	9	0													
	Divided Substitute Motion 2	Compatibility will be triggered solely by distances determined from the triggering lot line. Use and any other trigger from Title 25 will no longer apply.	Failed	5	8	0													
		For zones that require a compatibility stepback, the Compatibility Height Stebacks exemptions shall be modified as follows:				- 1													
		(a) Building height stepbacks are required where a portion of a building is located: (i) across an alley less, than 20 feet in width, from a property zoned Residential House-Scale;				- 1													
	Divided Code stitute	(ii) across a right-of-way less than 60 80 feet in width				- 1		t a											
	Divided Substitute Motion 3	from a property zoned Residential House-Scale; or (ii) adjacent to a property zoned Residential House- Scale.	Failed	6	6	0		Abs											
	Divided Substitute	Between 25-50 feet from the triggering lot line: 32 foot height limit At 150 feet from the triggering lot line: 85 foot height limit																	
40	Motion 4	Full height at 300 feet Intent to staff: From the front of a single-family home, you cannot see anything taller in the background;	Failed	5	8	0							H			Compatibility/ Transition Zones	-	A-23.211.1	
	Substitute Motion 2	the McMansion tent sets the angle for all compatibility (approximately a 45 degree angle from a 6 foot high point on the back of the property line, but the motion is intent only).	Failed	_	7	1										Transition Zones			
					N1/A	- '									Oliver Exhibit 2 -		1		
		Chair Oliver's Exhibit 2 - Compatibility Keep D3 Compatibility Standards with those changes already voted on	Failed Failed	6	N/A N/A 7	0									Compatibility	8 1			
		Alter the Working Group Proposal shown on Page 9 of Shaw Exhibit 1 - Part 1 with the following changes:				- 1													
	Substitute Motion 5 (Original Motion +	Between 25-50 feet from the triggering lot line: 32 foot height limit At 150 feet from the triggering lot line: 85 foot height limit				- 1													
	Substitute Motion 1)	Full height at 300 feet	Not Acted On	-		_													
	Amendment 1 to Substitute Motion 5	Density Bonus is not subject to compatibility after 50 feet from the triggering lot line	Failed	6	6	1													
	Amendment 2 to Substitute Motion 5	Density Bonus is not subject to compatibility after 100 feet from the triggering lot line	Failed	6	6	1													
						- 1													
		Between 25-50 feet from the triggering lot line: 35 foot height limit 50-100 feet: 45 foot height limit				- 1													
		100-150 feet: 65 foot height limit 150-225 feet: 75 foot height limit				- 1													
		225-300 feet: 90 foot height limit Full height at 300 feet				- 1													
	Substitute Motion 5	Affordable bonuses are exempt at 100 feet Change Cooperative Housing to Permitted in R1, R2B-E, R3B-C, R4C, RR and MH; Change Cooperative	Passed	8	3	2							Specific to Article 23-4D				PAZ: Pending review by Frego to determine impact on housing numbers		
	Original Maties	Housing to Permitted in zones R4A-C, RM1A-B; Change Cooperative Housing to Permitted in MH, MS1A, MU3B, MU4	Mada - Disida d			- 1													
	Divided Original		Motion Divided	-		-		+++		+ +			H			.	1	1	
	Motion 1 Divided Original	Change Cooperative Housing to Permitted in MH, MS1A, MU3B, MU5 Change Cooperative Housing to Permitted in R1, R2B-E, R3B-C, R4C, RR and MH; Change Cooperative	Passed	13	0	0							H			H 1	-		
41	Motion 2 Divided Motion 2: A	Housing to Permitted in zones R4A-C, RM1A-B Change Cooperative Housing to Permitted in R3B-C, R4C,R4A-C, RM1A-B;	Motion Divided Passed	- 7		2						<u> </u>				4 1			
			Tabled - Never	<u>'</u>	3												1		
		Change Cooperative Housing to Permitted in R1 and R2B-E	Acted On Tabled - Never	-							1 1					Allowed Uses/	1		
	Substitute Motion	Adopt staff recommendation for Co-Housing Change Daycares that have less than 20 children to Permitted in all R zones.	Acted On	-	-			- -					Specific to Article 23-4D			Specific to Use	Staff recommends the proposed Co-Housing land use.	23.3	23.6
	Original Motion	Change Commercial Daycares to MUP in R2B and above, and to CUP below R2B. Daycares with less than 7 children permitted in R zones,	-	-													1		
42		Daycares with 7-20 children require a MUP in all R zones,																	
		Daycares with 7-20 children permitted in all RM zones; Commercial Daycares require a CUP in R zones; Commercial Daycares in RM zones stay the same as														Allowed Uses/			
-	Substitute Motion	D3.	Passed	7	6	0							Specific to Article 23-4D			Specific to Use	PAZ: Do not oppose	23.4	
43																	DSD: Oppose. This further complicates how height is to be measured, will		
		Update each district to max height of "35 feet from top of slab to top of roof" and "slab height is limited to a maximum of 5' above finished grade and a maximum of 12" above highest finished grade." Staff will															increase plan submittal requirements, and could have unintended consequences, paricualry in the Urban Watershed where there are no no cut		23.68
	Original Motion	continue to work to clarify and correct the height with the intent stated	Passed	13	0	0							Specific to Article 23-4D			FAR/ Height	and fill limits.	23.8	23.75
44																			23.73 23.84
	Original Motion	Delete Frontyard Impervious Cover Regulation in all R Zones	Passed	12	0	0							Specific to Article 23-4D-2			Impervious Cover	PAZ: Oppose, deletion of this provision will allow paving of the entire front yard.	23.10	23.92 23.40
45				13	,	0									White Exhibit 1 -		DSD: Do not oppose. Minimum fence height will need to be revised to 4'-0" to		23.40
46	Original Motion	Allow pools and fountains in required yards without new setback or restrictions as currently allowed.	Passed	13	0	0							Specific to Article 23-4D		Page 40 of 48	Setbacks Articulation/	align with pool barrier req'ts of the technical code.	23.11	23.108
40	Original Motion	Remove articulation from all R zones Add a maximum FAR of 0.3 or 1800 sf to all R zones;	Passed	13	0	0							Specific to Article 23-4D-2			Form/ Frontage	Do not oppose.	23.12	23.109
47	Original Motion	Add a maximum FAR of 0.3 or 1150 sf for single-family attached (the intent is to reduce the available FAR to single-family by 25%)	Passed	12	1	0											PAZ: Oppose. Unecessarily complicated.		
"	Amendment to Original Motion	Intent is to reduce the available 1 Art to single-family by 23/8)	Passed	12	4	9							Specific to Article 23-4D-2			FAR/ Height	DSD: Oppose. Significantly increases complexity.	23.18	22.26
	онушанионоп	principles to reduce by 0.1 PAIX under rudite motions	เ สองชน	12	<u> </u>	U							Opecine to Article [25-4D-2		1	FAN Height	ров. оррозе. окуппоанцу пістеазез соптріехіту.	23.18	23.36

										iiiieiidai		•					
					Vote Tallies		П	Vote by 0	Commissio	oner	П	General to Code, General to					
						N N		> s	8	Z	5	Chapter, Specific					
						DERS(_ ≥	GRAV	/ER	GER	2 E ×	to Article, or Specific to Annotated PC				Original Planning I	Related Planning Commission
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes Abstai	ns AN HAH	KAZ KFN	MCC NUC	OLIN SCH	SHIE	N S		. Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response		Motions
		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															
48		(2) At least one of the two units must have a front entry that faces the front thoroughfare except each unit													DAZ Organis Manda antennetis de antennetis attanta de defenda la llata de la l		
		located on a corner lot must each have a front entry that faces a separate thoroughfare."													PAZ: Opposed. Would prefer units to remain attached as defined by "attached in D3.		
		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										Specific to 23-4E-6170(C)		Terms and	DSD: Opposed. Recommend keeping the units attached to avoid potential		
	Original Motion	single lot." Increase the base heights and bonus heights for Mixed Use and Main Street zones per Kenny's Exhibit 1 -	Passed	7	5	1						Section 23-13A-2	Kenny Exhibit 1 -	Definitions	conflict with application of ADU provisions.	23.21	
49	Original Motion	Page 29 of 29	Failed	6	7	0						General to Article 23-4D	Page 29 of 29	FAR/ Height		23.24	
		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.															
50	Original Motion Amendment to	Add specific language in Specific to Use section for Bars and Nightclubs Allow any non-permitted alcohol uses in Draft 3 (Level 1 or Level 2) as a CUP within the MS zones,	Passed	8	3	2								Allowed Uses/	PAZ: Do not oppose.		
	Original Motion	except MS1A and MS2A	Passed	11	0	2						Specific to Article 23-4D		Specific to Use	DSD: Do not oppose.	23.28	23.274
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	
		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"															
52		to the definitions section as follows: Conserve: to maintain the height, footprint and roof line of an existing building for the first 25' as												Terms/			
	Original Motion	measured from the building line toward the rear lot line.	Passed	11	2	0						Specific to Article 23-4D		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
		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															
	Original Motion	lot width	Divided	-			<u> </u>				<u>. . .</u>]		
	Divided Original	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								-		- 1	
	Motion 1	Divided Original Motion with Amendment 1 only	Failed	4	8	1											
54	Amendment to Divided																
	Original Motion 1	Use the "unit" instead of "family"	Passed	12	1	0										1	
	Amendment to Divided Original Motion 2	Leave "ADU" as a permitted use	Passed	8	4	1							White Exhibit 1 -				
	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									Specific to Article 23-4D	Page 35 of 48, Items A and B	Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use		23.35	
	MOUOTI 2	Create comparable R zones in R1 and R2 that maintain the 5750 sf minimum lot size and a minimum 50'	separate action	-		1 ' '	 	+++-	' '		·	Specific to Afficie 25-4D	Items A and B	Specific to Use		23.35	
	Original Motion	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		_	II	Ι.Ι.				. . .						
55	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 created is to be determined by staff.	Passed	7	6	0									PAZ: Opposed. Creating more zones with slightly different min. lot sizes and lot		
	Divided Original Motion 2	Direct staff to map all existing 5750 as the proposed new zone.	Failed		0	2							White Exhibit 1 -		widths will cause confusion and add complexity.		
	Substitute Motion	Leave all R1B, R1C, and R2C zones as 5,750 sf minimum	Failed	3	8	2						Specific to Article 23-4D	Page 35 of 48, Item B	Lot Size/ Intensity	DSD: Opposed. Concur with PAZ.	23.37	23.35
		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															23.159
56		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,															23.160 23.185
	o · · · · · · · · · · ·	the requirements are intended to produce an environment of desirable character, consistent with the	F 7 .		_							Specific to Section 23-4D-2010		Language			23.191
\vdash	Original Motion	Comprehensive Plan and any applicable area plan.	ralled	6	/	<u> </u>						Table 23-4D-2030(B)		Kevisions		23.38	23.207
57												Table 23-4D-2150(A) Table 23-4D-2160(A)					
	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							Specific to		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Opposed; a use cannot be exclusively CUP	23.43	
	Original Motion	Remove Single-Family Attached as an allowed use in the R2A, R2B, R2C, R3A, and R3B zones	Divided	10	3	<u> </u>						23-4D-2100			The Opposed, a dee calliot be exclusively COF	25.45	
58	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							23-4D-2110 23-4D-2120]		
	Divided Original Motion 2	Remove Single-Family Attached as an allowed use in the R3A and R3B zones	Failed	2	8	3						Specific to 23-4D-2150 Section 23-4D-2160		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use		23.44	23.76 23.81
59		Add clarifying/ symbolic language to the Use Tables regarding the allowance and permitted timeframes												Language	PAZ: STR use is already shown in the use tables. Specifics on timeframes is		
	Original Motion	Add a "Small Lot Single Family Use" as a permitted use in R2C, R2D, and R2E with the following	Passed	12	1	0						Specific to Article 23-4D		Revisions	not appropriate in the use tables (it can already be found in specific to use).	23.46	
		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															
	Original Metics	Small Lot uses."															
60	Original Motion	Impervious Cover add "(2) Small Lot Impervious Cover 65% max, 55% building cover max" Add a "Small Lot Single-Family Use" as a permitted use in R2D and R2E with the following development	-	-											1		
		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													PAZ: Opposed. This is virtually identical to R2D and R2E already in D3.		
		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													DSD: Opposed. Concur with PAZ.		
	Substitute Motion	Small Lot uses." Impervious Cover add "(2) Small Lot Impervious Cover 65% max, 55% building cover max"	Passed	9	4	0						23-4D-2130 Specific to Article 23-4D-2140		Allowed Use/ Specific to Use	WPD: Agree with PAZ/DSD.	23.47	
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,										- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•		-		

							Oode					ation ix	СРО	to City Council						
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Vote Tallies Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	KAZI	MCGRAW NUCKOLS	OLIVER SCHISSLER	SEEGER SHIEH	THOMPSON	G Cl to	eneral to Code, eneral to napter, Specific o Article, or secific to ection Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No. F	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic		Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions
61		In all R Zones, set the required lot size for an ADU to the minimum lot size for a single-family use. Retain															Lot Size/	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		23.64 23.66
62	Original Motion	all affordability requirements Add a new zone to the Residential zones which has the same development standards as R1C, but does	Passed	11	1	1								pecific to Article 23-4D pecific to Article 23-4D			Intensity	identified.	23.62	23.80
62	Original Motion Original Motion	not permit an ADU In the Parking Tables in all zones, add clarifying notes to the term "Other Allowed Uses" that reference back to the Permitted Use Tables	Failed Passed	12	11	1								pecific to Article 23-4D			New Zone Parking	PAZ: Do not oppose.	23.70	
64	Original Motion Substitute Motion 1	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 vize: 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 Porm (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 Rescind the related motion for a "Small Lot Single-Family Use" in the R2D and R2E 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: 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.	- Failed	3	7	2								pecific to Article 23-4D			New Zone	PAZ: Opposed. This is virtually identical to R2D and R2E already in D3. DSD: Opposed. Concur with PAZ. WPD: Agree with PAZ/DSD.	23.78	23.114
	Substitute Motion 2	Add/ amend the below definitions and place in correct location of the Code:	Passed	′	6	0							8	pecific to Article 23-4D			New Zone	WPD: Agree with PAZ/DSD.	23.78	23.114
65	Original Motion	Attached: When used with reference to two or more buildings units, means having one or more common walls or being joined by a roof, ewered perch or covered passageway measured 20 feet in depth, perpendicular to the front property line. 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			nt Absent									PAZ: Opposed regarding the 20' measurement and definition of detached (both are unnecessary).		
	Amendment to Original Motion 1	Add the covered porch or covered passageway back to the definition of attached	Passed	9	2	1			Abser							Alleite Iten	Tama	DSD: Opposed. 20' measurement is arbitrary and adds to impervious cover.		
	Amendment to Original Motion 2	Strike the 20 feet in depth language	Withdrawn	-										pecific to ection 23-13A-1030		White Item 1 - Page 41 of 48	Terms/ Definitions	The definition of "detached" should not allow attachment. Please define "units". DSD: Opposed, Adding language regarding setbacks for these uses would	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				s	pecific to Article 23-4D			Setbacks	DSD: Opposed. Adding language regarding setbacks for these uses would create conflicts with the definitions of these uses. PAZ: Concur with DSD.	23.87	
67	Original Motion Amendment to	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									DSD: Opposed. Proposal increases complexity and will extend review times.		
	Original Motion	Remove the word "public"	Failed	5	8	0			ŧ				s	pecific to Article 23-4D			FAR/ Height	PAZ: Concur with DSD.	23.89	
	Original Motion Amendment to Original Motion 1	Add a bonus of +0.1 FAR for every unit above Single Family Use in all R3 zones Apply bonus only outside 1/4 mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor; all votes regarding FAR would remain intact	Failed Failed	3	9	0			Absei					23-4D-2150 23-4D-2160			ł			
	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		11						pecific to 23-4D-2170 ection 23-4D-2180			FAR/ Height	1	23.90	23.117
	J					v								1						20

													Jort to City Co						
				December 1	Vote Tallies		NDERSON	AZI ENNY	UCKOLS de above	CHISSLER EEGER	HEH	/HITE	General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to	Carter Newshar	Annotated PC	Silvia December of Toronto	St. # Parameter	Original Planning Commission Motion	g Related Planning Commission
	Original M	Motion	Motion Add a bonus of +0.1 FAR for every unit above Single Family Use in all R4 zones	Passed/ Failed -	Ayes Noes	Abstains	■ ₹ ±	2 2	≥ z c	S S	- S	<u> </u>	Section	Section Number	Motion Page No. Related E	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Motion	Motions
70	Substitute Original N	e 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 Amend the height of all accessory structures to 15 feet instead of 12 feet, as applicable	Passed Passed	7 5	5 0			Absent				Specific Specific to Article Specific to	23-4D-219023-4D-22002 23-4D 23-4D-2190 23-4D-2200		FAR/ Height FAR/ Height Lot Size/	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. PAZ: Do not oppose. DSD: Do not oppose.	23.101 23.112	
/1	Original M	Motion	Change all R4 minimum lot widths from 60 feet to 80 feet	Failed	5 7	1							Section	23-4D-2210 23-4D-2210		Intensity		23.121	1
72	Original N	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) 23-4D-3050		Lot Size/ Intensity	NHCD: Opposed, as it would impact abilitity 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	3
73	Original M Substitute	e Motion	For RM1A and RM1B, change the minimum lot size to 5,750 sf and the minimum width to 50 feet For RM1A and RM1B, change the minimum lot size to 3,800 sf	Failed Failed	3 10	0 0							Specific to Section	23-4D-3050 23-4D-3060		Lot Size/ Intensity	H	23.130	o l
74	Original M	Motion	Create a new zone (RM1D) which has the same uses as R2C, but with a permitted density of 14 units permitted and the same uses as R2C, but with a permitted density of 14 units permitted and the same uses as R2C, but with a permitted density of 14 units permitted 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											PAZ: Do not oppose staff would like to evaluate further		
	Original N	Motion 1	Staff to review proposed zone to ensure it does not have a negative impact on Density Bonus program	Passed	13 0	0											DSD: Conflicts with FAR limit in motion 47	Ц	
	Amendme Original M		New zone shall not be used within transition zones	Failed	6 6	1							Specific to Article	23-4D		New Zone	NHCD: Would need to review for any potential impact on Density Bonus program	23.134	4
75	Original M		Eliminate Dwelling Unit per Acre requirements in all multi-unit zones 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	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	5 23.126
76	Original M		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.		8 5	s 0							Specific to Article	23-4D		Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Do not oppose. Currently a CUP in RM2B and RM4A	23.138	9
77	Original M	Motion	Increase impervious cover in RM1A to 60% for all other uses beyond residential, unless the primary use is parking In the RM1A Zone:	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 M	Motion	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 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	-	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	3
-	Cassillate	nouom	and defined in 19 1901, and opposed to the orthogonal required in plant o	, 40304	10		4			4			Jeotion	20 /2 0000			товышного кооринд канаваро ванат гот втитоптивная а аванивы венень.	20.140	23.151
79	Original M	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 Zon	es	23.150	23.152 0 23.153

9

							Oodeite	-// 5/6	uit 0 itt	CCOIII	incinat	lion ite	portio	City Council						
					Vote Tallies			Vote	e by Com	missione	er		Genera	to Code,						
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes Absta	ains	HART	KENNY MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	SCHISSLER	SHIEH	WHITE	General Chapter to Artic Specific Section	, Specific e, or to	Annotated PC Motion Page No	o. Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions
80	Original Motion	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' 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'	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	00.150	
	Amendment to Original Motion	MU1A, MU1B: 32' to 40'	Passed	8	4	0							Specific	to Article 23-4D		Kazi Exhibit - MU/ MS Heights		bonus entitlements without any increases in base entitlements can increase participation in bonus programs.	23.156 23.178	
81	Original Motion	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 Section		4)	White Exhibit 1 - Page 7 of 48	Allowed Uses/ Specific to Use	PAZ: Do not oppose.	23.162	
82	Original Motion	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 For MS1A, MS1B, MU1A, and MU1B the following development standards be altered:	Passed	10	1	1			Absent				Specific Section		3)	White Exhibit 1 - Page 7 and 8 of 48		PAZ: Do not oppose.	23.164	23.183
83	Original Motion	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	23-4D-4060 23-4D-4070 23-4D-5060 to Article 23-4D-5070			Additional Development Standards	PAZ: Do not oppose. DSD: Concur with requiring landscape buffer	23.174	23.199
84	Original Motion	Change all front yard setbacks from 5 feet to 0 feet in commercial zones (RM3A and up)	Passed	13	0	0												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. ATD: ATD concurs witih PWD response; specifically with regards to street trees, utilities, and ADA infrastructure. PWD: On behalf of the cross-departmental, multi-year Utility Alignment & Street		
	Amendment to Original Motion	Start at RM4A, not RM3A	Passed	13	. 0	0							Specific	to Article 23-4D			Setbacks	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.	23.177	23.182 23.162 23.215
85	Original Motion	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	

							Codei	NEXI D	лан э	Necoi	IIIIeiiu	alion i	Kept	ort to City Council						
					Vote Tallies			V	ote by C	ommissio	oner			General to Code,				-		
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes Abs	ains	ANDERSON	(AZI (ENNY	MCGRAW	OLIVER SCHISSLER	SEEGER	THOMPSON WHITE	ĕ	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
Original		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 greater than or equal to one-half block width: Except for building support spaces (including as Austin Energy vault, fire pump), 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 For commercial buildings less than one-half block width: The primary entry must be oriented to the street and located at the sidewalk level.								<u> </u>			3,					PAZ: This would conflict with the Downtown Austin Plan and may have an effect on the Affordable Housing Bonus Program (defer to NHCD) NHCD: Oppose increased base entitlements. Generally, for bonus programs		23.215 23.216 23.217 23.220 23.221 23.222 A-23.206.1 A-23.206.3 A-23.206.3
Divided Motion	Original	Increase heights in the CC zone to the following 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)	Passed	7	3	1			Absent -	-		-						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.		23.216 23.217 A-23.206.3
86 Divided Motion 2		Change CC40, CC60, CC80 FAR max to 5:1 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 greater than or equal to one-half block width: Except for building support spaces (including as Austin Energy vault, fire pump), 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 For commercial buildings less than one-half block width: The primary entry must be oriented to the street and located at the sidewalk level.	Passed	11	1	0			Absent									Opposed. 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. Austin Energy: Reduce gross frontage % to accomodate presence of such items as AE vaults? Agree. If the intent is reduce the width of vault doors, etc. that is based on the need to bring equipment and people safely into the vault, then staff disagrees. Reference to easements should also reference either something like "technical manual requirements" or "utility safety clearances".		23.213 23.215 23.220 23.222 23.221 A-23.206.1 A-23.206.2 A-23.206.3 (FAR)
	nent to Divided Motion 2	Set setbacks to 0 feet unless stated otherwise in 23-4D-9070	Passed	11	0	1												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		
	te Motion 1	Zone Downtown Plan and Judge's Hill to F25 Increase the entitlements allowed in the CC zones, but ensure units received through the bonus are not lost	Failed	4	8	0								Specific to Article 23-4D-6060			Additional Development Standards	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.	23.213	23.206
87 Original		As stated in Kenny Exhibit 2 - ADU Bonus Amendments: Apply Changes to the Citywide Density Bonus Program Create a Corridor Density Bonus Program Create an NHCD Review after the implementation of the bonuses Alter the ADU and R-scale compatibility restrictions Additional provisions not stated in Kenny Exhibit 2 NHCD review will be 18 months after implementation LA and RR zones will have a by-right ADU and it will no longer have an affordability requirement Within 1/8 of a mile of any school, the Corridor ADU Bonus will apply	Passed	7	4	0			Off dais	Absent				General to Code		Kenny Exhibit 2 - ADU Bonus Amendments	Affordable Housing	DSD: Do not oppose with exception of school distance provision- increases complexity of review and will increase review times. NHCD: NHCD recommends a fee-in-lieu, rather than on-site ADUs. NHCD supports ADUs in general. With regard to ADUs and the Affordable Housing Bonus Program, the Department's positions 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 affordablity in ADUs as well – Portland, OR decided not to require ADUs to be affordable after difficulties with their proposal were identified. Staff support evaluation and reporting on Affordable Housing Bonus Program (see Draft 3 23-3E-1070 and response to Item 12)		

							, do. 12					· · opo	rt to City Council						
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Vote Tallies Noes Absta	ANDERSON	HART	MCGRAW MCGRAW	OLIVER SCHISSLER	SEEGER SHIEH	THOMPSON	AW	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
88	Original Motion Substitute Motion	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 to 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. Do not make any changes to F25 other than those changes already voted on	Failed Failed	6	4 7	2		Abonet	Absent				Specific to Section 23-4D-8080			Allowed Uses/		23.247	
89	Original Motion Divided Original Motion 1	In Section 23-4D-8110(F) insert and renumber: (F)(8) exceed the minimum landscaping requirements of the City Code. In Section 23-4D-8110(G)(2)(c) Delete: 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. In Section 23-4D-8110(G)(2)(m) Revise: (m) Preserves all heritage trees; preserves 75 percent of the caliper inches associated with native protected size trees; and—preserves 75 percent of all of the native caliper inches. In Section 23-4D-8110(F) insert and renumber: (E)(8) exceed the minimum landscaping requirements of the City Code. In Section 23-4D-8110(G)(2)(c) Delete: 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. In Section 23-4D-8110(G)(2)(m) Revise: (m) Preserves all heritage trees; preserves 75 percent of the—		- 12	- - 0	0		Aboost	- Hasank								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 23.252 23.250 23.250 23.251
	Divided Original Motion 2 Substitute to Divided Original Motion 2 Amendment to Divided Original Motion 2	ealiper inches associated with native protected size trees; and preserves 75 percent of all of the native caliper inches. Direct Staff to find ways to differentiate Tier 1-T3 defining Tree superiority. 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		***************************************	T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T				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 Staff to work with the University of Texas, UT student body, and the seven neighborhoods who originally	Failed	4	4	4							General to Code			Policy		23.266	
91	Original Motion Original Motion	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 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 Passed	11	1 0	0			Absent				Specific to Section 23-4D-9130 Specific to Article 23-4D			Policy Language Revisions	PAZ: Do not oppose. This is outside of the scope of CodeNEXT PAZ: Do not oppose.	23.269	
93		Where applicable, amend the language to allow engaged porches to only be open on one side, instead					sent	100								Language	PAZ: Do not oppose.		
	Original Motion Original Motion	of requiring two sides as is currently written Eliminate all parking minimums	Passed	9	3	0	¥	***************************************	TO SECOND				Specific to Article 23-4D			Revisions	DSD: Do not oppose.	A-24.5.1	23.49 23.50 23.52 23.53 23.54 23.55
04	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													23.56 23.57 23.58 23.59 23.60 23.61 23.127
94	Amendment to Original Motion 2	Incorporate Vision Zero and Transportation Safety Improvement Program into consideration 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	Passed Failed	11	1 8	0							General to Code			Parking	Staff response pending.	24.8	23.148 23.149 23.165 23.190 23.192 23.234 24.9 24.11 24.12 24.13 24.14 14.15 24.16
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	

	CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council Vote Tallies Vote by Commissioner General to Code																				
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes		ANDERSON	HART	KENNY	NUCKOLS py open	OLIVER SCHISSLER	SEEGER	SHIEH THOMPSON	WHITE	General to Con General to Chapter, Speci to Article, or Specific to Section		Annotated PC Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions
96	Original Motion	In Section 23-4E-4020(A)(1)(c), add the language "and other residential house scale buildings" In Section 23-4E-4040(B), revise the language as follows: B. This section applies to commercial or non-house scale multi-family development that is located adjacent to a public right of way. 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(F) 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-4050(T) Table 23-4E-4040(A) 23-4E-4060(D) 23-4E-4060(F)(2)			Landscaping	DSD: 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 nonhouse 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(P): 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. WPD: 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	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 Substitute Motion 1 Substitute Motion 2	Permit 6 unrelated occupants per dwelling unit, and direct staff to allow more where appropriate Uphold the occupancy limits of 4 in McMansion and 6 outside of McMansion as directed by Council in 2016. 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 occupnancy limits where deemed appropriate	Failed Passed	4	9	0								Specific to Arti	cle 23-4D			Terms and Definitions	PAZ: 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. NHCD: 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	-	Off dais			Article 23-5 Article 23-7			Policy			
100	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	-	Off dais		Specific to Arti Specific to Section	Article 23-8 Article 23-9 Article 23-10 Cle Article 23-12 Article 23-13 23-13A-1030			Terms and Definitions	PAZ: 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	DSD: 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	

	CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report Vote Tallies Vote by Commissioner																						
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Vote Tallies Noes Abstains	ANDERSON	(AZI	VICERAW NUCKOLS	OLIVER SCHISSIER	SEEGER SEEGER	знієн гномрson	WHITE	General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section Section Numb	Annotated PC Der Motion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Commission	g Related Planning Commission Motions				
102		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				Absort	Abselli	Off dais		Specific to Article 23-6			Policy	Not Opposed. DSD: 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. WPD: 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. Austin Energy: 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		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				heart	No selli	bsent					Policy		44.4	44.5				
104		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				Abcort	VIOSEITI VIO	Off dais		Specific to Article 23-11			Policy	PAZ: Not recommended for criteria manuals. Existing rules process allows public process for stakeholders of criteria manuals. DSD: Do not recommend. The Technical Criteria Manuals are administrative. The process for amending them includes a public stakeholder process. WPD: 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. Austin Energy: 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 PWD: There is an established Rules Posting Process to update Criteria Manuals. All notices are posted on the City's website: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/rule-postings-and-technical-criteria-manuals. 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	7770				
105	Original Motion	Add Accessory Apartment as a permitted use in all R zones as shown in Sheih Exhibit 2 - Accessory Apartment 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 leading-decks, 1st floor porches, stoops, basements, attics, stories below grade plane, parking facilities, driveways, and enclosed leading-berths and off-street maneuvering areas.	Passed	8	3 1			Absent					Specific to Article 23-4D			Allowed Use/ Specific to Use	DSD: Opposed. Adds additional review complexity, potential conflicts with the building code, and will increase review times. PAZ: Opposed. FAR needs to be consistent and coordinated with other proposals.	A-57.22.1	A-57.22.2				
	Original Motion	In exchange, in all Residential Zones, allow for an increase of 0.05 FAR Remove the change in FAR GFA excludes loading docks , 1st floor porches, stoops, basements, attics, stories below grade plane, parking facilities <u>up to 450 sf</u> , driveways, and enclosed loading berths and off-street maneuvering-areas.	Passed Failed	5	5 0 7 1								Specific to Section Article 23-13A	·-1030	See White Exhibit 1 - Page 36 of 48	Terms and Definitions	DSD: Opposed. Concur with PAZ. NHCD: 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.	57.4	Į.				

		CodeNEXT Draft 3 Recommendation Report to City Council Vote Tallies Vote by Commissioner General to Code																			
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes		Abstains	ANDERSON	KAZI	MCGRAW Action of the property	OLIVER OLIVER	SCHISSLER SEEGER sandings	SHIEH THOMPSON	WHITE	General to Code, General to Chapter, Specific to Article, or Specific to Section Section Nur		nnotated PC lotion Page No.	Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response	Original Planning Commission Motion	Related Planning Commission Motions
	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																		
107	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													PAZ: Pending. Staff is still in the process of reviewing this and will develop a response after mapping has been tested.		
	Amendment to Divideo Original Motion 1	Revise the Impervious Cover in MS2B to 90%, and MS3B to 95%	Passed	13	0	0												_	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.		
	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 Table 23-4E Section Table 23-4E			Kenny Exhibit 1 - Eastern Crescent Gentrification Protection Zone (Page 28 of 29)	Mapping	NHCD: Combined with the compatibility motion shown in Item 40, staff questions whether this recommendation would prevent the full bonus being allowed on these sites (also see recommendation regarding increased bonus heights in Item 80 and direction on permitting sites to utilize bonus entitlements in Item 12 section 1b).	Mapping Item 1	
108	Final Motion	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 Friendly Amendment: Council to implement transition zones including a public participation process	Passed	40										General to Code			Kazi Corridor Transitions Directive - Original and Modified per actions of Planning Commission		PAZ: Pending. Staff is still in the process of reviewing this and will develop a response after mapping has been tested. WPD: WPD is not opposed on extensive mapping changes without further analysis of the potential drainage and water quality impacts.	Mapping Item 8	
	Original Motion	Remove compatibility from CC zone	-	-		Ů			-					Ceneral to code			Commission	Transition Zones	analysis of the potential drainage and water quality impacts.	Wapping item o	
109	Substitute Motion 1 Substitute Motion 2	Retain current compatibility in the western Judges Hill area per DAP, but with a 270 foot triggering distance 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	Failed Passed	5 10	6	0								Specific to Article 23-4D				Compatibility/ Transition Zones	PAZ: Do not oppose. The CC parcels that are affected by compatibility are under the Historic Landmark overlay. Impact of motion negligible.	Mapping Item 11	20.5 23.205 23.223 23.225
	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													PAZ: Pending. Staff is still in the process of reviewing this and will develop a response after mapping has been tested. WPD: WPD is neutral on extensive mapping changes without further analysis of the potential drainage and water quality impacts.		
110	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													NHCD: 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		23.200 Mapping Items:
	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	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.	Mapping Item 12	46 47 49 53

			IeNEX	T Draf	ft 3 Re	ecom	menda	ation F	Repo	rt to City Co	uncil											
				Vote	Tallies				Vote I	by Comi	mission	er			General to Code,							
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDERSON	KAZI	MCGRAW	NUCKOLS	SCHISSLER	SHIEH	THOMPSON	AW	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
	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		-																	
	Divided Original	Map the areas adjacent to Imagine Austin corridors using the new zoning tools in CodeNEXT such that																		PAZ: Pending. Staff is still in the process of reviewing this and will develop a response after mapping has been tested. WPD: Neutral on extensive mapping changes without further analysis of the potential drainage and water quality impacts. NHCD: Do not support increases to base entitlements, as it may impact the ability to achieve affordable housing benefits. Do support increases to		
	Motion 1	compatibility is not triggered on at least 90% of the properties along these corridors	Passed	9	4	0	ı												-	PAZ: Pending. Staff is still in the process of reviewing this and will develop a response after mapping has been tested. WPD: Neutral on extensive mapping changes without further analysis of the potential drainage and water quality impacts.		
111	Divided Original Motion 2	Map the areas adjacent to core transit corridors and future core transit corridors using the new zoning tools in CodeNEXT such that compatibility is not triggered on at least 90% of the properties along these corridors	Passed	8	5	0														NHCD: Do not support increases to base entitlements, as it may impact the ability to achieve affordable housing benefits. Do support increases to entitlements through a bonus program.		
	Amendment 1 to Divided Original Motion 1 AND 2	Revise the language to set a goal of 90% while also taking into account lot size, localized flooding, existing infrastructure capabilities, connectivity/ access to corridor, and gentrification in applying the zones	Passed	10	3	0																
	Amendment 2 to Divided Original Motion 1 AND 2	See Kenny Exhibit 1 - Eastern Crescent Gentrification Protection Zone (Page 28 of 29) For the areas identified in the Eastern Crescent Gentrification Protection Zone, establish a new zone of RM1C that features the base zoning of R2C with a 15 foot front setback, and the bonus entitlements of RM2A. This would be the default zone for behind corridors in the related map.	Passed	9	2	2																
	Divided Original Motion 3	Exempt TODs from compatibility entirely, by either mapping or text as determined by Staff	Passed	9	4	0														PAZ: Pending. Staff is still in the process of reviewing this and will develop a response after mapping has been tested. NHCD: Staff support updating TOD Regulating Plans		
	Amendment 1 to Divided Original Motion 3 Substitute Motion to	Direct Staff to review policy on exempting TODs from compatibility	Passed	10	3	0																
	Divided Original Motion 3	No additional changes to F25	Failed	4	8	1									General to Code				Mapping		Mapping Item 57.1	23.141 23.129
112	Original Motion	Approve Downtown Map with Amendments and make no further motions regarding Downtown	Passed	11	1	1									General to Code	Мар			Mapping	PAZ: Without understanding the impacts these amendments have on the AHBP staff remains neutral.	N/A	
113		Amend Imagine Austin to reclassify South Park Meadows as a Regional Center. Map South Park Meadows as UC.													General to Code					PAZ: N/A beyond scope of CodeNEXT and requires separate process to ammend Imagine Austin NHCD: Oppose unless an Affordable Housing Bonus option is added to the zone. The Southpark Meadows area is currently proposed to be zoned MU3A-A. Staff believe this change could result in a loss of affordable housing bonus capacity, especially if zoned UC-Unlimited, which is not proposed to have an affordable housing bonus lever. 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.	N/A	

	Vote Tallies Vote by Commissioner General to Code General to Code																				
				Vot	e Tallies		RSON		Vote	s by Con	SIER	ner	IPSON		General to Code General to Chapter, Specifi to Article, or					Original Planning	Related Planning
		Motion	Passed/ Failed	Ayes	Noes	Abstains	ANDE	KAZI	KENN	NUCK	SCHIS	SEEGE	THOM	WHITI	Specific to Section	Section Number	Annotated PC Motion Page No. Related Exhibit	Broad Topic	Staff Response		Commission Motions
114	Original Motion	Approve Regional Centers with Amendments	Passed	13	0	0									General to Code	Man			PAZ: 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. WPD: WPD is neutral on extensive mapping changes without further analysis of the potential drainage and water quality impacts. NHCD: 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.		
	Original Woton	The state of the s	1 assect	10		Ť									Certeral to Code	Map		Mapping	reduced.		
115		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	Мар		Mapping		N/A	
116		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.		12	0	0					Absent				General to Code	Мар		Policy	PAZ: Pending NHCD: Staff support transitioning F25 zones to CodeNEXT zones where appropriate.	N/A	