### Challenges most impactful on infill, missing middle and compatibility

Working Group ID	To solve for this challenge	We would like to learn more about this	specifically,	from this	Or, we might like to consider these	And we also had the following
	How might we	Practice	Description	Location	Ideas	Insights
i1	Mediate density growth in areas with already burdened infrastructure?				Plan to install infrastructure before development; do an honest job of evaluating and aligning infrastructure planning; examine and consider alternative financing tools to resolve infrastructure needs; need to fully utilize infrastructure capacity we have today; rethink what density can do with current or planning infrastructure; need to broaden our understanding of what infrastructure is (schools, parks, transport, housing, etc); better tie CIP planning with sector planning; alleviate pressure from the development community	Land use must go hand in hand with infrastructure; developer costs are not the magic solution because costs go to the consumer; consider economic analysis to find the sweet spot for a viable option to encourage more developer support of infrastructure development costs; analysis of infrastructure impact could help arrive at a threshold that requires infrastructure investment; our current infrastructure might limit redevelopment in already burdened areas
i2	Limit compatibility conflicts by commercial creeping into residential?				Rely on design, best practices and form-based code for compatibility; move from regulating based on use; look at compatibility in a contextual way	Need to insure that particular uses are not all clumped, focus on form; need to consider what should go into a neighborhood today and how that may change tomorrow
i3	Insure that redevelopment along corridors continues to serve the neighbors vs gentrifying businesses?				Build complete communities where businesses can serve their customers; provide smaller low-level development on smaller collector streets but prevent them from evolving into transit corridors; need to better define the pressures of gentrification; need to determine if rigid zoning is appropriate as neighborhoods change and grow; take the power that businesses have in gentrifying areas into consideration in Boards and Commissions	Consider changing contexts based on time, place and business type; consideration for destination, neighborhood serving aspects and transportation corridors with high volume of traffic
i4	Accommodate new and innovative housing solutions, co-living spaces?				Better align zoning categories to promote co-housing in context-driven condition; support a creative land design and menu of housing types (Vancouver hidden density process: "eco-density"); lock-out units and basements; permit-ready plans; create zoning categories for innovative housing to experience less competition	Zone of influence: Expense of upgrades required related to building code for occupants over 6; this type of housing tends to be less profitable than alternatives

# SHAPING THE AUSTIN WE IMAGINE

and	Compatible	Conflicting		
Questions/Why do we care about this?				
How might we fix the current piecemeal system of development that is not fully functional until area is fully developed? How might we give current residents better safety and quality of life? Do we as a community encourage a mode shift from other than 1 car/1 driver? How might we prevent broken infrastructure from becoming a bond issue?				
How might we make the infill tool of corner stores work?				
How might we accommodate secondary business zones as missing middle types? Will the varying types of districts help us solve/manage changing character? How might we help small businesses survive redevelopment (maybe pair small new businesses with VMU)				
How might we provide opportunities for home ownership? How might we provide opportunities for more affordable housing? How might we address occupancy concerns and constraints?				

### Challenges most impactful on infill, missing middle and compatibility

Working Group ID	To solve for this challenge	We would like to learn more about this	specifically,	from this	Or, we might like to consider these	And we also had the following	
	How might we	Practice	Description	Location	Ideas	Insights	
i5	Insure that the missing middle serves middle income families?				Building size should be proportional to lot sizes; preserve or protect smalls structure inventory because it is a current source of affordable housing; need to encourage developments that are desirable to families; look at all housing types; serve seniors and disabled with newer or smaller units	Reducing the price of the lot helps; it is not as simple as "build it and they will come", need to pay attention to structure size; large structures don't help when it comes to affordability; don't want to incentivize teardowns; McMansion Ordinance could have done better to ensure affordable housing (ADU concept); need services that incentivize families; financing and ROI are issues; need insight of lenders	
i6	Better integrate green infrastructure working group with this working group?				Find a way to deal with the expense required		
i7	Honor our commitment to historic districts in neighborhoods that qualify?						
i8	Insure any changes in zoning are fixed and not a starting point to negotiate?				Find a way to make the culture of holistic planning principles pervasive in PDRD, Boards and Commissions, Council; honor that developers need to maximize investment through entitlements in the rezoning process	This will help to deliver the certainty that both the development and neighborhood communities want; can reduce anxiety and speculatively raised land prices cause by unpredictability	
i9	Move now to deal with great ideas (infill, etc) as we annex prior to zoning actions today?				Utilize greenfield opportunities as we move from interim to permanent zoning; plan for public transport in annexed areas; utilize greenfields in annexed areas (form-based code, etc)	Relates to compatibility and missing middle; subdivision regulations are related to annexation; greenfield development needs to be supported by the Capital Planning Office; annexed areas on the edge may not have a supportive framework; when developers seek utilities extension, they may request annexation at the same time; annexation may be nonconsensual; annexation may be delayed due to limited purposes (ex: Del Valley); City typically annex's property that is already developed with zoning	

## SHAPING THE AUSTIN WE IMAGINE

and	Compatible	Conflicting
Questions/Why do we care about this?		
How might we insure that smaller structures show up on smaller lots (proportionality)? How might we encourage homes smaller than 1500 sq. ft. that can fit into the context of neighborhoods? How might we separate out land from improvements (land banking, community land trusts, Guadalupe NDC		
How might we achieve the goal of sustainability outlined in Imagine Austin?		
How might we leverage a unique opportunity to have a blank slate (as far as zoning goes)? How might we prepare for the future (which may seem far off, but isn't)? How might we find additional resources to support infrastructure development on the edge (greenfield)?		

### Challenges most impactful on infill, missing middle and compatibility

Working Group ID		We would like to learn more about this <b>Practice</b>		Or, we might like to consider these Ideas	And we also had the following Insights	and Questions/Why do we care about this?	Conflicting
i10	Set the bar high to require Boards and Commissions to grant variances (super majority)?						

