

| Page           | CAG member      | Comment   |
|----------------|-----------------|---|
| NA             | Melissa Neslund | Generally supportive of the top 10 issues; however, I think #6, #7 and #8 are obvious and represent key reasons the consultants were hired. I'm not sure they warrant being one of the 10 key issues. That said, I believe compatibility standards, addressing neighborhood plans, regulating plans, NCCD's, etc. (head on, not just mentioning them and the complicated opt-in/out processes), and watershed/subdivision/transportation ordinances and sections of the Code could have been included in the top ten.   |
| pg. 12         | Melissa Neslund | Feel Redevelopment and adaptive re-use should be given considerable consideration when rewriting the Code. There are mentions of it in the diagnosis, but I think these are critical to expand upon.  |
| pg. 34         | Melissa Neslund | NCCDs, TODs, Regulating Plans are given some mention here but there is not any clarity on how/if/why/why not these plans will be left untouched, be altered or be scrapped altogether? It mentions the fact that the plans add complicated layers, but it's not clear how they will or won't be integrated into the rewrite. If we're going a different direction in our Code format, regulations, etc., it would seem that these plans would need to be reanalyzed to be consistent with the new approach. I'm interested in understanding their approach as things evolve.  |
| pg. 38-40      | Melissa Neslund | In looking at the Types of Places identified, it would seem logical that the regulations in each type of place would vary based on context, roadway adjacency, etc. That said, what is the plan for Sub E (Commercial Design Standards)? A one-size fits all ordinance extending to MF and some forms of residential mixed use has lended itself to over 80% of alternative equivalent compliance requests. While the ordinance does distinguish between CTCs, Urban Roadways, ICR's and Suburban roadways, I believe there could be much better organization of the document and much better results if there was more flexibility in place and more of a context sensitive approach to get us the results we desire as a City.                    |
| pg. 41, 59     | Melissa Neslund | I agree the one-size fits all approach regulating SF, MF and commercial needs to be addressed and am interested in seeing the approaches the consultants propose. I'd also like to see them analyze Sub F (McMansion). Again, I feel this ordinance is well intended but it stymies architects creativity of design and lends itself to a more predictable, one size fits all type of residential development. Our current SF-3 dominance and restrictive regulations are not allowing for the variety of housing types, smaller units, accessory dwelling units, etc that we so badly need. We have to look at the demographic changes in Austin, the future of Austin, affordability and transportation challenges and tackle this issue head on. |
| pg. 61, pg. 63 | Melissa Neslund | Agree there are many barriers in the LDC that impede the ability to develop a variety of housing types; specifically would like to dive into the onerous parking requirements, lot sizes and the requirement that a full site plan is required if 3+units are developed.  |

| Page   | CAG member      | Comment  |
|--------|-----------------|--|
| pg. 65 | Melissa Neslund | It is critical Opticos is coordinating with the COA staff on the new regulations being proposed for subdivision, transportation, complete streets policy (recent recommendations for Code changes were released by Robert Anderson). These efforts are critical in achieving the compact & connected City we are striving for, but they need to be balanced with our goals for environment and affordability (to name a couple). For example, more connections (streets) and sidewalks are more costly and add impervious cover/increased run-off. These realities need to be considered when imposing new requirements.   |
| pg. 67 | Melissa Neslund | Work with the COA Watershed Protection Department, ASLA stakeholders, etc to implement green infrastructure and sustainability goals. Analyze the Phase II Watershed ord being proposed by COA staff and coordinate efforts to integrate into CodeNext. Currently there is no process in place to permit rain-gardens and other similar green infrastructure water quality controls in SF subdivisions being developed. A local infill developer, PSW real estate has been battling and trying to get these controls in place in their projects to no avail. It's a shame since it's something we as a City say we want, but we can't seem to get over the hurdle of maintenance and inspections.  |
| NA     | Melissa Neslund | Absolutely agree the format of the Code, permitting process and digital code need serious work as well. Also agree that administrative requirements and department organization, beyond PDR, need to be analyzed in conjunction with the Code rewrite. I'd like more information on the Team selected to assist with this process. Furthermore, AWU, AE, PDR, WPDR need to work together instead of against one another. Each dept thinks their rules and their regulations are most important and the conflicts add significant time delays and costs to projects with the ultimate results being absurd in many cases. There needs to be a requirement for everyone to come to the table to coordinate what makes sense on each project (common sense and coordination). |