Zapalac, George

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2014 5:20 PM
To: Zapalac, George
Cc: matt.dugan@austintexas.gov; Gibbs, Carol; Jean Mather; Sarah Campbell
Subject: Re: NP Goals and IA Themes

Thank you, George.

Terry

On 5/28/2014 11:29 AM, Zapalac, George wrote:
> Terry,
>
> Thank you for your comments. We will delete "Improve Business Environment" and "Other" from the summary for Goal 08 in the Greater South River City Combined Neighborhood Plan. This will leave "Affordability" and "Diversity" as the themes for this goal.
>
> Please let me know if you have additional comments or questions.
>
>
> George Zapalac
> Division Manager
> Planning& Development Review Department
> (512) 974-2725
> george.zapalac@austintexas.gov
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Terry [redacted]
> Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2014 5:17 PM
> To: Zapalac, George
> Cc: matt.dugan@austintexas.gov; Gibbs, Carol; Jean Mather; Sarah
> Campbell
> Subject: Re: NP Goals and IA Themes
>
> George,
>
> Thank you for your message and the draft documents. We are pleased that you incorporated all our recommendations. However there are two IA themes, namely "Improve Business Environment" and "Other" associated with the NP Goal you identified as 08 in the draft Appendix to Land Development Code Diagnosis that were not in our list , and "Improve Business Environment" was not in the City's previous draft list. Please remove "Improve Business Environment" from the list since it was included in error. Also please describe or explain what is intended by including the vague "Other" category. We would like to narrow it down to ensure that it is consistent with our Neighborhood Plan Goal.
>
> Thanks,
> Terry
>
> On 5/9/2014 9:34 AM, Zapalac, George wrote:

>> Thank you for your comments on the Greater South River City Combined Neighborhood Plan goals. We have modified the plan summaries in response to your comments and have included them in the appendix for the draft Land Development Code Diagnosis report. The appendix is available online at:
>>
>> http://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Planning/CodeNEX
>> T /Austin_CodeDiagnosisAppendix_PublicDraft_web_050514.pdf
>>
>> We concurred with the addition of several themes to describe the goals in the Greater South River City Combined Neighborhood Plan. The results are shown in the table on p. 13 of the Appendix.
>>
>> Pages 27-28 of the Appendix also include definitions of the themes that we used to categorize the various goals. This information was requested by several contact teams that reviewed the neighborhood plan summaries.
>>
>> Please let me know if you have any questions about this process or wish to discuss how we assigned the themes to the plan.
>>
>> You may also want to review the entire Code Diagnosis document, which is a summary of major issues that have been identified with the present Land Development Code. It is available online at:
>>
>> http://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Planning/CodeNEX
>> T /Austin_CodeDiagnosis_PublicDraft_web_050514.pdf
>>
>> Public comments on the Diagnosis or the Appendix should be submitted by June 30, 2014 to Speak Up Austin at
>> https://austintexas.granicusideas.com/discussions/cracking-the-code-top-issue-with-land-development-code. Any comments received will be considered for inclusion in the final version of the report.
>>
>> I appreciate your participation in the review of the information and your constructive suggestions for improvement of the report.
>>
>>
>> George Zapalac
>> Division Manager
>> Planning& Development Review Department
>> (512) 974-2725
>> george.zapalac@austintexas.gov
>>
>
>

Zapalac, George

From: Nuria [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2014 9:10 PM
To: Zapalac, George
Subject: RE: Summary of Neighborhood Plans- Review is now complete- Please send to the City ASAP

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello George,

I'm sorry for the communication break. I am no longer on CANPAC but so I will bring the sub-committee who worked on the document into the loop for their comments.

After reading the Code Diagnosis, I now realize you were just looking for general trends and not for specifics about our planning area that were likely to have parcel specific repercussions (as I thought).

Please add the additional themes you requested clarification on.

Thank you for thoughtfully answering our questions.

Nuria Zaragoza

From: George.Zapalac@austintexas.gov
To: [redacted] Matthew.Dugan@austintexas.gov; George.Adams@austintexas.gov
Subject: RE: Summary of Neighborhood Plans- Review is now complete- Please send to the City ASAP
Date: Wed, 14 May 2014 22:10:40 +0000

Ms. Zaragoza,

Thank you for your comments on the summary of the Central Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan. I am sorry that we did not receive your comments in time to include them in the draft Land Development Code Diagnosis report. However, we have reviewed your suggest changes to the themes in the CACNP (on the first three pages of your letter) and agree that they are all reasonable additions which we will include in the final version of the Code Diagnosis.

We did want to request one clarification on your comments. Pages 4 and 5 identify several additional themes that were not listed on pages 1-3 (for example, Diversity, Cultural Arts and Civic Institutions, and Environment). Did you wish to include these items as well? If so, we would be glad to list them under the appropriate goals.

The draft Code Diagnosis Appendix contains the tables of neighborhood plan goals. It is available online at http://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Planning/CodeNEXT/Austin_CodeDiagnosisAppendix_PublicDraft_web_050514.pdf.
Pages 27 and 28 of this document also contain definitions of the themes that we used to categorize the various goals. This information was requested by several contact teams that reviewed the neighborhood plan summaries.

To respond to the additional items in your letter related to the Land Use Changes:

1. We did not include the North University NCCD in the table because NCCD's are a special case. They make more substantial regulatory changes to the base zoning districts beyond what is allowed in a typical neighborhood plan. In looking at the land use changes made through other neighborhood plans, we were attempting to identify patterns in the changes made by different neighborhood plans. This in t[redacted] need for different base zoning districts that are more consistent with the desires of the various neighborhoods. It was difficult to compare the other neighborhoods with the NCCD's because the other neighborhoods do not have the same tools that are available to the NCCD's.

2. The table of land use changes was developed by analyzing the zoning ordinances that accompanied each neighborhood plan. The streets listed are the major roadways within each neighborhood. We reviewed all of the restrictions for properties along each corridor and looked for general patterns of prohibited and conditional uses that are summarized in the table. We realize that this is a laborious process and that many citizens may not have the time to check this table in detail, but we wanted to give anyone who was interested an opportunity to review our work. We'd be glad to meet with representatives of the contact team if you'd like more information about how the results were obtained.

3. According to the ordinances which implemented CACNP, Group Residential is prohibited in four subdistricts of the North University area but is only prohibited on certain parcels in the Hancock area. The Hancock ordinance is online at http://www.cityofaustin.org/edims/document.cfm?id=82818, and the North University is online at http://www.cityofaustin.org/edims/document.cfm?id=78283.

4. You are correct that the base zoning prohibits many uses that are not shown on the table. The table is intended to show only the changes from the base zoning that were adopted in conjunction with the neighborhood plans. Again, the purpose is to look for patterns that might help us develop better zoning tools for implementing neighborhood plans, not to change what is in the plans.

You may also want to review the entire Code Diagnosis document, which is a summary of major issues that have been identified with the present Land Development Code. It is available online at: http://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Planning/CodeNEXT/Austin_CodeDiagnosis_PublicDraft_web_050514.pdf. [redacted]

Public comments on the Diagnosis or the Appendix should be submitted by June 30, 2014 to Speak Up Austin at https://austintexas.granicusideas.com/discussions/cracking-the-code-top-issue-with-land-development-code. Any comments received will be considered for inclusion in the final version of the report.

I appreciate your participation in the review of the information and your constructive suggestions for improvement of the report.

George Zapalac
Division Manager
Planning & Development Review Department
(512) 974-2725
george.zapalac@austintexas.gov

From: Nuria [mailto:tedandnuria@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 1:47 PM
To: Dugan, Matthew; Adams, George; Zapalac, George
Subject: Summary of Neighborhood Plans- Review is now complete- Please send to the City ASAP

Dear Mr. Dugan, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Zapalac,

Please accept our review of the Neighborhood Plan Summary for CANPAC. We apologize for submitting this past the deadline of April 3rd. A combination of our meeting dates and the complexity of the task, make the deadline impossible for our group.

A subcommittee spent many hours sifting through our neighborhood plan and the task requirements. We respectfully ask that you report back to us to let us know how our comments will be utilized in amending your report. As an example, per the sub-committee, NUNA's NCCD was omitted. We are very interested in knowing how this, and other gaps, will be addressed.

Thank you for your work, and for accepting this information past the deadline.

Respectfully,

Nuria Zaragoza and Adam Stephens
Co-Chairs CANPAC

Summary of Neighborhood Plans Draft (2/5/14): -Page 3
CENTRAL AUSTIN COMBINED NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

The Themes in bold text have been added to the existing Summary of Neighborhood Plans by the Central Austin Neighborhood Combined Advisory Committee.

After careful review of the Central Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan, the contact team for CANPAC decided that for each of the 6 priorities and goals, **an expanded list of themes** were added in **bold text**, in addition to the already existing themes determined by the staff and the consultants. A further explanation with page numbers for these references follows as valid reasons for inclusion. (This would constitute "extensive research.")

GOALS (p. 13)	THEMES
1. Preserve the integrity and character of the single-family neighborhoods.	*Maintain Established Neighborhood Character (and assets) ***Preserve Historic Character** *** Compatible Land Uses**

Preserving the integrity and character of the single-family neighborhoods was the number one goal in the CACNP, and it is reflected by the theme, *Maintain Established Neighborhood Character* (and assets), (pp. 52-71).

A reason for adding another theme such as **"Preserve Historic Character"** is that since the demand for student housing puts much pressure on these neighborhoods, there was a desire to preserve the "unique sense of place" that brought the residents to these "charming and historic inner-city neighborhoods," (pp. 57-9, 62,180). This statement combines 2 themes- *Maintain Established Character* and *Preserve Historic Character*. There is also the implied rationale for the theme, *Preserve Historic Character* within the CACNP's residential neighborhoods merely by the reference of the phrase, " historic inner-city neighborhoods," (p. 52). Furthermore, the objective regarding SF housing stock- existing and new- supports historic character in scope. New construction in the residential areas for SF "should compliment, reflect, and respect the vernacular building traditions of the SF housing in the area," (p. 57). Mentioned specifically about how to preserve "the historic integrity" of West University Neighborhood (now called OWUNA- Original West University Neighborhood) concerns reducing future multi-family near or abutting its neighborhood boundaries, (p. 59). On p. 62, preservation is mentioned relating to the historic collection of houses in North University Neighborhood for maintaining the character of the that neighborhood. Hancock Neighborhood reflects a diversity of housing styles ranging from "historic estate homes to more modest bungalows and cottages" that define, distinguish and reflect that area, (p. 69). Additionally, Eastwoods Neighborhood wants to "maintain the mix of housing that currently exists in the neighborhood without causing further deterioration of the historic single-family character of the neighborhood," (p. 66). This would be the implied case for all of the residential neighborhood within the CACNP; that is, to *preserve the historic character* of the neighborhood.

Compatible Land Uses is a theme that should be considered within this section particularly with reference to multi-family next to the residential neighborhoods embedded in West Campus, (p. 59). There was a reference to land use changes that are compatible with the surrounding uses and structures in North University Neighborhood, (p. 65). Compatibility Standards which would imply Compatible Land uses is mentioned specifically in relationship with Eastwoods Neighborhood's multi family construction, (p. 66), while in Shoal Crest Neighborhood the focus of concern rests with compatible (modest increase) single family density by lessening "the negative impacts of multi-family housing," (p.59). Similarly, Heritage Neighborhood was concerned with "promoting neighborhood-scaled redevelopment of apartment complexes" in their area, which would be reflective of compatible land uses, (p. 62). Hancock Neighborhood, with a more homogenous blend of single family zoning, states clearly a compatible land use issue, " preserve the traditional single – family land use in the Hancock Neighborhood," (p. 71).

2. **Preserve the historic character and resources Of the CACNP Neighborhoods,** (p. 13).	*Preserve Historic Character ***Maintain Established Neighborhood Character (and assets)** ***Community Identity**

There was a clearly stated mandate in the Neighborhood Plan for local historic districts to preserve and protect historic neighborhoods- the housing stock/buildings and the other historic elements such as bridges, gateways, etc, (p.72). This emphasis on historic character goes hand-in-hand with Maintaining Established Neighborhood Character (another theme that must be added here) and in Community Identity.

3. **Allow mixed use development along the existing commercial corridors that is pedestrian friendly, neighborhood friendly, neighborhood scaled, and serves the neighborhood needs,** (p. 13).	*Encourage Mixed-Use- **MU lite (lower density SF areas)** *Maintain Established Neighborhood Character (and assets)

Supporting compatible mixed-use throughout the specific 6 neighborhoods, MU should be only on specific corridors (pp. 66,76, 77, 80, 81, 82, 84) and should be compatible with adjacent residential structures (p. 65). These neighborhoods are composed differently from West Campus, a density node, even though there are 2 embedded neighborhoods within West University Neighborhood and Shoal Crest (p. 86); these 2 neighborhoods are "protected" by a height map which steps down appropriately to SF/residential zoning, pp. 87, uno-7. The major point here is that the mixed-use in the residential neighborhood areas- Eastwoods, Hancock, Heritage, North University, Shoal Crest, West University – is **very different from mixed-use** from MU in a density-node like West Campus/UNO; the distinction of mixed use in these neighborhood areas would be considered less intense and more compatible with residential zoning and uses.

4. **West Campus should become a dense, vibrant, mixed –use and pedestrian oriented community,** (p. 13).	*Encourage Mixed-Use **(higher density)** ***Focus Growth**

By adding the theme, "Focus Growth," this would exemplify the desire to increase density and provide more housing opportunities in a student oriented district, UNO in West Campus, (p.83). The purpose of creating this added density node within the area would create an "urban village"- "across from the University of Texas while preserving the adjacent historic neighborhoods," (p.84).

5. **Provide a safe environment and opportunities for all modes of transport,** (p. 13).

*Complete Streets
* Transit

There is a map of planned and future pedestrian corridors for West Campus/UNO, (p. 94), as well as proposing bicycle and pedestrian trails to Pease Park and at 30th and Whitis, (p. 100) shows that this planning area is committed to increased planning for pedestrian and bicycling opportunities, pp. 96- 108. One of the major focuses in this older area of Central Austin is to obtain the "promised sidewalks" from many years ago. This amenity- sidewalks- would increase connectivity throughout the area,. Safety is a primary concern for all participants involved in transport including crosswalks, bikelanes, sidewalks old and new, (p. 97-9). Improvements are needed with lighting for safety (Speedway and West Campus), as well as, with the need for more trees that give a more friendly, neighborhood street appearance (not to mention the environmental benefits of trees regarding air quality, cooling and evaporative qualities, and shade, etc), pp. 101-2, uno-18,

Increased safety in Adams/Hemphill Park is part of a "safe environment," (p. 112).

6. **Enhance and preserve existing open space, parks, and the natural environment,** (p. 13).

*Preserve and Enhance Parks

***Protect and Enhance Creeks & Open Spaces**
***Create Additional Public/Green Spaces**

There are compelling reasons to include some additional themes from the Summary of Neighborhood Plans:

* Protect and Enhance Creeks and Open Spaces
* Create Additional Public Green spaces

The CACNP planning area has 2 branches of Waller Creek running through it- East Waller Creek and West Waller Creek; both tributaries are important natural features within 2 of our existing Parks- Eastwoods Park and Adams/Hemphill Park,(pp. 110, 112). Not only are the creeks important, but the trees within these parks need attention with proper maintenance and replacement scheduling, (p.111). The Neighborhood Plan clearly states that an objective is to" increase and preserve green spaces- pocket parks. neighborhood greens, creek beds, public right-of-ways, etc.- in areas where it is needed and desired, (p. 113). Sparky Park is an example of a new pocket park since the CACNP was adopted in 2004, and it is an ongoing, beautification and renovation project, (p.114).

Chart needs corrections of themes and number of times referenced throughout the CACNP by page number as evidenced below:

CENTRAL AUSTIN COMBINED NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Affordability

Affordability- not applicable to the CACNP
Encourage Homeownership- not applicable to the CACNP

Community Character

Maintain Established Neighborhood Character (and assets)- mentioned 9 times (pp.52,57-59,62,65-6,69, 71).
Public Safety- not applicable to the CACNP
Diversity- mentioned 3 times- demographics and values (p. 18-9,46).
Preserve Historic Character- mentioned **7 times**- (pp. 14, 52,57,59,62,66,69,72)
Appearance/Orderliness/Maintenance
Cultural Arts and Civic Institutions- mentioned 1 time- (p. 58 UT reference).)
Community Identity- mentioned 1 time- (p. 46- identifying that the area does provide much needed housing for students because of its proximity to UT but also acknowledges the appreciable vitality that population brings to our neighborhoods).
Health and Human Services- not applicable to the CACNP
Youth- not applicable to the CACNP

Design of Development

Compatible Land Uses- mentioned 6 times- (pp.59, 62, 65,66,71, 72)
Encourage Mixed Use- mentioned multiple times throughout plan on pages designated (pp. 74-82 for **residential neighborhoods** with specific parameters= **MU lite;** pp.83-8 for UNO density node in West Campus= MU- higher density)
Focus Growth- mentioned 1 time (pp. 83-4)

Economy

Retain and Attract Neighborhood Serving Businesses- not applicable to the CACNP
Improve Business Environment- not applicable to the CACNP
Support and Attract Local Businesses- not applicable to the CACNP

Natural Resources, Environment and Open Spaces

Preserve and Enhance Parks- mentioned 6 times (pp. 109-114)
Create Additional Public/Green Spaces- mentioned 2 times- (pp. 113-4)
Environment: mentioned 3 times in relationship to green space/parks/creeks (pp. 110-2, 109)
Drainage- not applicable to the CACNP
Pollution- not applicable to the CACNP

Transportation, Parking, Streets

Complete Streets –(Great Streets?) mentioned multiple times, but at least 2 times (pp.101, 105)
Transit- mentioned multiple times (3X?) in Appendix D, (pp.50, 186-207)- removed from planning process as a planning element because Cap metro changed its focus.

Parking- please add this new theme- mentioned 4 times, (pp. 91-92, 107-8)

Traffic

Connectivity- mentioned multiple times- (pp. 96-108)

Streetscape mentioned multiple times-at least 6 times (p.87-95; uno-16-18 for UNO; p.100- Hancock, NUNA; p. 101 NUNA)

Other

Enforcement- not applicable to the CACNP

Other

It should be noted for reference by the consultants that there are representative examples of housing stock from the CACNP of the residential neighborhoods- Eastwoods, Hancock, Heritage, North University, Shoal Crest, and West University or now called OWUNA- Original West University Neighborhood:

Eastwoods- pp. 67-9;
Hancock- p. 70;
Heritage- p. 63;
North University (NUNA)- p. 64;
Shoal Crest- p.61;
West University or now called Original West University (OWUNA) p.60

Compiled and reviewed by Mary Ingle, 4/14/14

Concerning the LAND USES CHANGES recommended in CANPAC:

1. The table for CACNP was incomplete as it did not included the area covered by the North University NCCD. How the NCCD be used in this evaluation is not known yet, nor has anything about it been explained to the Contact Team by the staff or the consultants.

2. The streets listed in the table do not align with the neighborhood plan tracts; thus, a difficulty exists for evaluation of the table. It is unreasonable to expect volunteers to check a multiple page detailed table without instructions or without explanations about the tools used to generate the table.

3. Group Residential is supposed to be prohibited throughout CACNP except within UNO (University Neighborhood Overlay).

4. Many uses are restricted (conditional and prohibited) within the bas zoning. The CACNP only recommends those additional restrictions that were needed in addition to the bas zoning. ALL conditional and prohibited used should continue.

Compiled and Reviewed By Betsy Greenberg and Bart Whatley, 4/14/14

Zapalac, George

From: Gayle <[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2014 6:25 PM
To: Zapalac, George; Carl Braun; Dawn Cizmar; Toni House; Toni House; Krebs, Fred; John Harms; Linda Land; Jan Long; Linda J. Watkins; Malcolm Yeatts; 'Judy Price'; [redacted] Amber Wilkins; Kendall Krebs; Jean Mather; Jane Ann Parker
Cc: Dugan, Matthew
Subject: Re: EROC response to Codenext exercises

George--

I have not reviewed your email below but am forwarding it to the EROC Contact Team including the current Chair, Malcolm Yeatts.

Gayle

On 5/15/2014 4:27 PM, Zapalac, George wrote:

Hi Gayle,

Thank you for your comments on the East Riverside/Oltorf Combined Neighborhood Plan goals. I'm sorry that I didn't have an opportunity to fully review and respond to your questions and comments before the publication deadline for the draft Land Development Code Diagnosis report. As a result, we haven't yet modified the plan summaries in response to your comments but still have an opportunity to do so before the report is finalized.

The neighborhood plan summaries are included in the draft Appendix to the Code Diagnosis, which is available online at:
http://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Planning/CodeNEXT/Austin_CodeDiagnosisAppendix_PublicDraft_web_050514.pdf.

The reasons why the CodeNEXT team analyzed the goals in the adopted neighborhood plans and developed themes to summarize them were: to identify issues that are important to the residents of Austin; to help the consultants become more familiar with Austin and its neighborhoods; and to identify similarities and differences among the various neighborhoods that should be respected when developing a new Code. The approach of the consulting team is to develop a Code which is placed-based and responsive to local situations, instead of trying to modify the existing zoning districts with various overlays and exceptions as we have often done in the past.

Pages 27-28 of the Appendix include definitions of the themes that we used to categorize the various goals, as you and several other contact teams requested. The themes were developed by reviewing the goals and attempting to summarize in a few words the essence of each one. Using common terminology for different neighborhoods enables us to more readily compare and contrast the issues that are important to different areas. This is in no way intended to diminish the more detailed explanations of the goals and objectives contained in the plans but only to help us better understand which issues are of importance to different neighborhoods in the city.

After reviewing your comments and the EROC plan in more detail, I am proposing to add a number of additional themes to the plan goals, as indicated by italics in the following table.

Goal	Themes
01. Preserve and enhance the character of existing residential neighborhoods.	• Maintain Established Neighborhood Character & Assets

	• *Compatible Land Uses* • *Environment* • *Connectivity* • *Traffic* • *Enforcement* • *Appearance/Orderliness/Maintenance*
02. Increase home ownership opportunities that are compatible with surrounding properties.	• Encourage Home Ownership • Maintain Established Neighborhood Character & Assets • *Compatible Land Uses*
03. Improve the appearance, vitality and safety of existing commercial corridors and community amenities and encourage quality urban design and form that ensures adequate transition between commercial properties and adjacent residential neighborhoods.	• Appearance/Orderliness/Maintenance • *Focus Growth* • *Streetscape* • *Compatible Land Uses* • *Traffic* • *Complete Streets*
04. Encourage a balanced mix of residential, civic, commercial, office and other land uses without adversely affecting adjacent residential neighborhoods.	• Encourage Mixed Use • Maintain Established Neighborhood Character and Assets • *Retain and Attract Neighborhood-Servin Businesses*
05. Enhance the transportation network to allow residents and visitors to travel around safely and efficiently by foot, bicycle, automobile and public transit.	• Complete Streets • Transit • *Traffic* • *Public Safety* • *Drainage*
06. Protect and enhance the Town Lake Waterfront as well as creek areas and other natural amenities.	• Protect and Enhance Creeks & Open Spaces • *Create additional public/green spaces* • *Environment* • *Appearance/Orderliness/ Maintenance* • *Pollution*
07. Preserve and enhance existing parks, the 18-hole Riverside Golf Course, the Country Club Creek Trail and other open spaces and wetlands to create opportunities for additional public open space and natural areas.	• Preserve and Enhance Parks • *Create additional public/green space* • *Connectivity*
08. Provide affordable rental housing opportunities through the redevelopment of existing multifamily developments.	• Affordability
09. Create interesting, lively, inviting, attractive, safe and comfortable non-residential environments that will encourage walking, biking, and transit use and be appealing to passing motorists.	• Complete Streets • Transit • *Streetscape* • *Create Additional Public/Green Spaces*
10. Create convenient and accessible parking areas that do not dominate the environment and provide safe interaction between vehicles and pedestrians.	• Streetscape
11. Encourage urban design strategies for single-family neighborhoods that preserve, complement and enhance existing character.	• Maintain Established Neighborhood Character & Assets • *Streetscape*
12. Promote multifamily structures that relate well to the surrounding environment, utilize a variety of building forms, have a thoughtful	• Maintain Established Neighborhood Character & Assets

parking scheme, provide public open space and include a variety of appropriate landscaping features.	
13. Minimize the visual impact of industrial properties from other districts and public spaces in the Neighborhood Planning area.	• Compatible Land Uses

The information in the Zoning Analysis Chart came from the zoning ordinances that implemented the neighborhood plan (available online at http://www.cityofaustin.org/edims/document.cfm?id=99705 and http://www.cityofaustin.org/edims/document.cfm?id=99731). The purpose of this review was to look at the major corridors in the planning area and identify changes to the base zoning districts that affected allowable land uses along each corridor. We identified four major corridors in EROC: Riverside, Pleasant Valley, Ben White, and Oltorf. The only changes we found in permitted land uses were for certain tracts along Riverside and Pleasant Valley, where multi-family zoning was prohibited. These are the items that are included in the spreadsheet. This table is intended to show only the changes from the base zoning districts that were adopted in conjunction with the neighborhood plans, not to show all the uses which are already prohibited in the base zoning districts. The objective was to look for patterns that might help us develop better zoning tools for implementing neighborhood plans, not to change what is in the plans.

You may also want to review the entire Code Diagnosis document, which is a summary of major issues that have been identified with the present Land Development Code. It is available online at: http://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Planning/CodeNEXT/Austin_CodeDiagnosis_PublicDraft_web_050514.pdf

We are asking that any additional comments on the Diagnosis or the Appendix be submitted by **June 30, 2014** to Speak Up Austin at: https://austintexas.granicusideas.com/discussions/cracking-the-code-top-issue-with-land-development-code. Any comments received will be considered for inclusion in the final version of the report.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this process or wish to discuss how we assigned the themes to the plan. I'd be glad to meet with you and other members of the contact team if you'd like to discuss these issues in more detail.

[redacted]

George Zapalac
Division Manager
Planning & Development Review Department
(512) 974-2725
george.zapalac@austintexas.gov

From: Gayle [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 02, 2014 9:19 PM
To: PDRD Code Next
Cc: Carl Braun; Dawn Cizmar; Toni House; Toni House; Krebs, Fred; John Harms; Linda Land; Jan Long; Linda J. Watkins; Malcolm Yeatts; [redacted]; [redacted] Amber Wilkins; Kendall Krebs; Jean Mather
Subject: EROC response to Codenext exercises

The EROC Contact Team met and tried earnestly to work within the parameters for The Neighborhood Plan Review of Goals & Priorities. However, after much discussion we were left with only questions: Where are the definitions of the "themes"? What is the Zoning Analysis

Chart and where did the information come from? Why has EROC been incorrectly divided into 4 areas on this chart -- the EROC NPA has always had 3 distinct geographic sub-areas: E Riverside, Pleasant Valley and Parker Lane. Why is the exercise even necessary?

For the EROC 3300+-acre NPA, the broad categories are far too general to accurately reflect the intent of the goals for this neighborhood plan. Sketchy "themes" do not represent the vision that was created over a 10-year span, culminating with the adoption of the East Riverside Corridor Regulating Plan in 2013. This attempt to categorize precise goals and priorities into indistinct themes does not add clarity to the NPA's vision and seems only to detract from it.

The CodeNext website states that the new land code should make neighborhood plans more accessible and easier to understand. In reviewing our plan, we find the vision and goals to be very straightforward, in language that is easily understood, and the specific recommendations for the goals assist a reader in understanding how to accomplish them. For example, there is a complete list of objectives and recommendations under Goal number 1 "Preserve and enhance the character of existing residential neighborhoods", so that the goal will not be misunderstood. The recommendations cite codes instrumental in maintaining and enhancing the individual goals. This information is essential and underlines the importance of the inclusion of specific existing codes in any future code structure. In any case, the vision and goals themselves are clear and well-defined.

We have pasted below an addendum with the EROC vision and goals so that you can see the exact language in the plan.

We need clarification on the EROC Neighborhood Zoning Analysis Chart. What is the purpose of this chart and how will the information be used? For example, the description directly above "Roadway Character" refers to conditional overlays, but the identified categories for scoring refer to conditional and prohibited uses. Where did the information come from? Why are there only 2 specifications in the information for EROC? We see no reflection of the NP in this chart.

We support a code that is easy to understand, but this exercise does not increase transparency. We believe the EROC Neighborhood Plan IS clear and uncomplicated. We believe the specifics help readers define the goals correctly. Generality and ambiguity do not support the vision for this area, but render it irrelevant.

Malcolm Yeatts
Chair, EROC Contact Team
(E. Riverside/Oltorf Combined Neighborhood Plan Contact Team)
(submitted by Gayle Goff with permission)

w/Addendum

Vision and Goals

EROC Plan pages 10 and 11

<u>Vision</u>
We who live, work and own property in the East Riverside/Oltorf Area wish to preserve and improve the quality of life in our residential neighborhoods, honor the cultural diversity of our

residents, be good stewards of the natural environment, support the success of our locally owned businesses and major employers, and build and maintain a strong sense of community.

Goals

1. Preserve and enhance the character of existing residential neighborhoods.

EROC Plan pages 28 through 30

Obj 1.1 – Obj 1.4 / R1- R23

Retention of SF uses; consideration of existing & future residential densities & housing stock in zoning & land use decisions; compatibility specifics, mature tree preservation; compatible uses, compatibility standards between residential, multifamily, office and commercial uses; list of streets to remain unconnected for autos, but consider for bike & pedestrian connections; Code enforcement, residential & commercial property maintenance, particularly with regard to foundation requirements due to soil conditions in this NPA; notification procedures & access to restrictive covenants.

2. Increase home ownership opportunities that are compatible with surrounding properties.

EROC Plan pages 30 through 31

Obj 2.1, R24 & R25

Specifics on tools that promote home ownership.

3. Improve the appearance, vitality and safety of existing commercial corridors and community amenities and encourage quality urban design and form that ensures adequate transition between commercial properties and adjacent residential neighborhoods.

EROC Plan pages 31 through 33

Obj 3.1 – Obj 3.3 / R26 – R29

Redevelopment of underutilized properties; specifics for streetscapes, parking, bikes and pedestrians, gateways, buffers, building heights, signs, etc.; preservation of downtown views; LI & IP development specifics.

4. Encourage a balanced mix of residential, civic, commercial, office and other land uses without adversely affecting adjacent residential neighborhoods.

EROC Plan page 33;

Obj 4.1 – Obj 4.2 / R30 – R33

Specifies locations & development tools to promote true mixed-use; specifies locations & development of office & commercial properties.

5. Enhance the transportation network to allow residents and visitors to get around safely and efficiently by foot, bicycle, automobile and public transit.

EROC Plan pages 33 through 38;

Obj 5.1 – 5.8 / R34 through R68

Improvement of roadway networks; traffic calming needs; addresses safety & efficiency issues; traffic signage needs; pedestrian safety, bikeways, and sidewalk needs; pedestrian & bike connectivity;public transportation; flooding issues.

6. Protect and enhance the Town Lake Waterfront as well as creek areas and other natural amenities.

EROC Plan pages 38 through 42

Obj 6.1 through 6.4, R69 through R89

Increase setbacks, document & acquire CEFs, monitor appearance and water quality, maintain visual & physical access to water, strict compliance with Waterfront Overlay, protect Lakeshore Tree Canopy, develop neighborhood greens, increase access to all parks.

7. Preserve and enhance existing parks, the 18 - hole Riverside Golf Course and other open spaces and create opportunities for additional public open space.

EROC Plan pages 42 through 45

Obj 7.1 through 7.4 / R90 - R106

Maintain existing parks, preserve Riverside Golf Course, identify pocket parks, specifics regarding completion of CCC Trail.

8. Provide affordable housing opportunities through redevelopment of existing multifamily developments.

EROC Plan pages 45 through 46
Obj 8.1 R107
Specifics properties for redevelopment.

9. Create interesting, lively, inviting, attractive, safe and comfortable non - residential **environments that will encourage walking, biking and transit use and be appealing to passing motorists.**
EROC Plan pages 127 through 128

10. Create convenient and accessible parking areas that do not dominate the environment and provide safe interaction between vehicles and pedestrians.
EROC Plan pages 128 through 129

11. Encourage urban design strategies for single - family neighborhoods that preserve, complement and enhance existing character.

EROC Plan page 130

12. Promote multifamily structures that relate well to the surrounding environment, utilize a variety of building forms, have a thoughtful parking scheme, provide public open space and include a variety of appropriate landscape options.
EROC Plan page 131

13. Minimize the visual impact of industrial properties from other districts and public spaces in the neighborhood planning area.
EROC Plan page 129