

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
1	6308	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	typo... missing "and" with "Zoning Platting Commission"	28	Chapter-23-1--Introduction.pdf	23-1B-2
2	6303	Process (Administrative)	Jolinda Marshall	suggest the letter to the director from the Neighborhood Plan Contact Team be supported by a representative from each interest area (1-4)	37	Chapter-23-1--Introduction.pdf	23-1B-4
3	6426	Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	consider the input from the Board of Adjustments to recognize their state rights to decide cases and set times for appeal with proper notification.	15	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2A-1
4	6504	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	CodeNEXT should not eliminate the right to appeal an administrative decision on a sign permit application. Table 23-2A-1030(A) (◆Overview of Legislative and Administrative Approvals◆) fails to indicate any right to appeal an administrative decision on a sign permit application.	16	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2A-1
5	6226	Subdivision or Flag Lots Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	The safety of the public and environment would be better served if subdivision variances preceded environmental variances wherein the subdivision impact would be more evident....is there some reason these variances cannot be considered together since the impact is mutual?	17	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2A-2
6	6354	Site Development Standards Affordable Housing (Generally)	chris allen	This would add a significant new cost for small projects. It also appears to apply to remodels that are >300 s.f., even if they are interior-only, or not on the ground level- meaning no impact on existing drainage. The Intentions behind this provision are good, but this is just making small projects for homeowners more expensive. This might be more reasonable if the square footage was raised to 500-800 s.f. of NEW space on the ground floor.	20	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2A-3
7	6292	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	dkfoster	Add, "is required."	21	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2A-3
8	6227	Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	application requirements B1bii Why does the clock stop if payment has NOT been made?	27	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2B-1
9	6228	Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	E) where does it say that all new Plats must have an expiration date to eliminate the long term problems of vested rights- (for example, old inadequate storm water regulations) ? There should be an advantage to development in a timely manner which ultimately benefits the existing residents. Isn't it factual that the expiration date requirement of plats (and other applications) is under the authority of Council despite the fact that plats are protected by state law?	31	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2B-2
10	6428	Process (Administrative)	Allan McMurtry	Where under D-2 shall the meeting be held?	60	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
11	6429	Definition or Measurement	Allan McMurtry	F-1-d A reapplication should be at least 2 years	61	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
12	6430	Review Authority	Allan McMurtry	Why is the applicant only considered in a hardship ruling? The neighborhood should be considered as well. The whole idea is to create a plan during specified times only due to the hardship on neighborhoods of having to go to meetings any day of the year. Too much arbitrary power. Shift to PC.	61	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
13	6431	Review Authority	Allan McMurtry	Should shift this up to PC. Neighbors should be considered.	61	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
14	6432	Definition or Measurement	Allan McMurtry	Define affordable	61	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
15	6248	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Codecatching	H2....I am confused...shouldn't it be " the denial of the proposed amendment would xxx (omit "not") jeopardize..."	62	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
16	6284	Definition or Measurement	BradP	Where is the definition of Single Family Attached. Also, your search box above will not accept Single Family Attached. Also when search terms are entered, it is not readily apparent how to scroll through multiple results to the search term. All of this seems intention to make it hard to find things in this code.	72	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2F-2
17	6249	Process (Administrative) Other	Codecatching	This error might be acceptable but there should be a stiff penalty for errors or they risk becoming standard of practice....another case of "Giving it away!!!"	72	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2F-2
18	6437	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Process (Administrative)	Allan McMurtry	Strange. Implies that the Code does not consider health, safety, and welfare on a regular basis. One has to ask why only the Director can make this determination when that is the role of the Commissions and Council	74	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2F-2
19	6251	Nonconforming Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	please be specific regarding applicable non-conforming uses to be abandoned by non-conforming parking	92	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2G-2
20	6348	Parking Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	This portion (section B) doesn't make sense as written. Is it trying to say that the parking requirements must be met under conditions 1 and 2 below? That is, the modification to the parking requirements would be denied? The next section (c) speaks to when the parking requirements can be modified.	92	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2G-2
21	6423	Process (Administrative) Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Janis Smith	Where is the section that is now LDC 25-2-964 that covers repairing/rebuilding structures that are damaged? I thought that this document was supposed to have all regulations for certain kinds of structures in one plane. The boat dock rules are spread out all over the place, and the search mechanism is cumbersome and inefficient. I look up code multiple times a week, and this document is much more unwieldy and complicated than what we have today.	93	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2G-2
22	6385	Process (Administrative) Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Bobby Levinski	Given the history with letters of accommodation, it may be more clear to say, "Except as otherwise provided by the [Land Development Code], the director may not waive or modify applicable regulations or provide relief not required by Chapter 245 . . ."	143	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2K-2
23	6411	Vested Rights	k2018	How do you petition for developers to NOT have vested rights? A new "energy efficient" neighborhood should not be building off regulations from the '80s. Shame on anyone approving such.	145	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2K-2
24	6438	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Allan McMurtry	Let's put in health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Austin	11	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3A-1

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
25	6439	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	Within 1/5 of a mile. That puts parks where new people are. Assuming Austin took care of past citizens as well as it wants to take care of new citizens, then the park areas need to be accessible and need to originate from the developments themselves.	15	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
26	6440	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	How about putting parks where the new people are? Fails to meet public health and welfare standards	15	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
27	6441	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	People of less means don't deserve parks. What does Fair Housing Standards Act have to say about that? Seems prejudiced to me. Does it to the City? It should, shouldn't it.	15	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
28	6442	Review Authority Environment (Generally) Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	Seems odd that somebody other than Parks would be in charge of Parks. The City Manager can personally intervene, under his name, but delegating Parks jurisdiction to say transportation of public Works doesn't make sense. Eliminate the delegation.	16	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
29	6443	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	One or more. Say 15? This is Parks, right? Parks should control Parks. Take out delegation	16	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
30	6444	Process (Administrative) Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	This reads so much like reverse payola. One pays money not toput in a park. How does that possible serve the people along a corridor where folks are massing? It DOES NOT.	16	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
31	6247	Definition or Measurement	alandalehalter@gmail.com	Where is keystone tree defined? Is it just defined by its size or does this mean more? Would be nice to have a clear definition in the glossary of terms for more clarification.	30	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3C-1
32	6352	Reference Error	Joyce Statz	section title has changed; need to fix this reference	35	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3C-3
33	6353	Error Reference	Joyce Statz	Renumbering needed? several sections appear to have been removed	36	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3C-3
34	6198	Flooding, Stormwater, Water Quality Impervious or Building Cover	Farmer	Impervious cover is a blunt tool. There are plenty of developments that cover entire yards with compacted gravel and have much runoff. I propose an alternative compliance method: If a licensed engineer provides drawings showing that the surface flow of a given rain event, say a 50 year storm or whatever threshold you deem worthy, is decreased by at least 10 % (or again whatever threshold you deem worthy) beyond the runoff of the max impervious cover allowed by zoning, then the property can go over the impervious cover limit. This would be accomplished through rainwater harvesting, raingardens, etc. It would encourage creative and progressive water control methods and decrease runoff/storm water infrastructure needs while increasing percolation and allowing for more density.	56	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-3

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
35	6312	Flooding, Stormwater, Water Quality	lcoker	I second this. At my address corner of Springfield Dr and Colton Bluff Springs there is nearly a quarter on an acre of compacted rock directly in the floodplain and leading into Marble Creek Greenbelt. This area floods many times a year and these rocks will definitely do some damage. There has been no permit issued or even a review.	56	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-3
36	6315	Parks, Open Space, Trails	achen	all multi use trails should be excluded. why only ones open to the public and located on public land?	56	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-3
37	6224	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	scott.hiers@austintexas.gov	Delete Drinking Water Protection Zone, Contributing Zone and Water Quality Transitions zone, since CEFs are not likely to occur in these areas or the area within these zone are cover by the remaining triggers; CWQZ, Floodplain, Edwards Aquifer, or 15% slopes	75	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-5
38	6316	Parks, Open Space, Trails	achen	hiking trail is not defined anywhere else. This should be natural surface multi-use trail.	77	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-5
39	6317	Other	achen	there is no environmental criteria manual. Is it section 3d?	77	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-5
40	6279	AHBP Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	robertmfostr	This chart 100% needs to be here. Or at least in the document at all.	106	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-1
41	6278	AHBP Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	robertmfostr	Unless there is an existing affordability program that we do not want to effect, I see no reason to have this provision. It would be difficult to implement with all the other conditions of F25 but we are not paying y'all to do easy tasks.	106	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-1
42	6280	AHBP Other	robertmfostr	Thanks! This is a national best practice, glad to see it in the code	106	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-1
43	6281	AHBP	robertmfostr	Wait, should this not say 30,000 SF? If we are getting the 10k bonus SF with the additional units, I don't know why it would still be 20k?	109	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-1
44	6347	Mapping	k2018	Why is affordable housing only being pushed for East Austin? Particularly South East Austin (the un trendy East Austin) West Austin gets big yards, maintained roads, and water ways. East gets developers operating on regulations from the 80s because they paid off politicians. Code next is a joke.	121	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-2
45	6291	Affordable Housing (Generally) Other	robertmfostr	Great move!	143	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-5
46	6331	Mapping	dendres1	901 W 31ST ST. IS A HISTORIC LANDMARK RESIDENCE IN THE MIDDLE OF A HISTORIC DISTRICT NEIGHBORHOOD AND YOU HAVE A PROPOSED ZONING OF MAIN STREET 3B. COULD IT BE ANY MORE WRONG?!	6	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4-TOC
47	6424	Other	Janis Smith	I'm trying to navigate to the boat dock section, and when I click on the section, it pops me back to this page. This is incredibly difficult to navigate.	9	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4-TOC

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
48	6445	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Allan McMurtry	I think you meant it violates the Comprehensive Plan. If you would, insert that. Thanks.	15	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4A-1
49	6250	Zones (Generally)	paul strange	Where is detail on R2C. Setbacks, impervious cover, minimum lot size for an ADU, etc.? Want to look a specifics.	17	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4A-2
50	6446	Neighborhood Plans, Character Zones (Generally)	Allan McMurtry	This is dead wrong. Character includes lots sizes, deed restrictions, State Statutes, housing types, sizes, and styles, density, street and sidewalk widths, type of and amount of canopy, location of schools, and retail services. These zones do not meet any of these characteristics but are stand alone overlay smeant in whole to terminate the current characteristics in violation of Imagine Austin the comprehensive plan. Saying they will does not make it so.	17	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4A-2
51	6452		Allandale Neighbor Comments		31	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-1
52	6454	Site Development Standards Process (Administrative)	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Land Use Commission may impose conditions such as limits on FAR, setbacks etc. This seems to perpetuating zones with additional conditions like we have now. Aren't we trying to avoid conditional overlays or something similar?	31	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-1
53	6265	Process (Administrative)	Bobby Levinski	Because the comment period would be closed by the time the director would issue a disapproval of the application, there would be no opportunity for interested parties to provide input on an update submitted after such denial. I would suggest that the update trigger a notice to interested parties and an additional comment period (perhaps shorter in length).	32	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-1
54	6266	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Bobby Levinski	Based on the chart in 23-2I, I believe this provision is meant to say "Land Use Commission" instead of the PC. It would make sense for MUPs to be considered by the LUC with experience approving projects within their delegated areas.	33	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-1
55	6453	Site Development Standards Process (Administrative)	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Director may impose conditions such as limits on FAR, setbacks etc. This seems to perpetuating zones with additional conditions like we have now. Aren't we trying to avoid conditional overlays or something similar?	33	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-1
56	6455	Process (Administrative)	Allandale Neighbor Comments	(A)(2) is the recent Council decision to require disapproval by 3/4 of the Land Use Commission to trigger requirement for approval by 3/4 of Council for PUDs on unzoned property which is a higher bar than PUDs on zoned properties. This was a rule created by Council during the Grove at Shoal Creek PUD hearings and needs to be reconsidered. There is no justification for PUD's related to unzoned properties to be handled any differently than zoned properties. Suggest that this section be deleted so that requirements for all PUDs are equal.	47	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-2
57	6395	Error	Joyce Statz	typo - "side" should be "site"	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
58	6396	Zones (Generally)	Joyce Statz	Since not all the applicability requirements are listed here, is this really helpful. The individual portions that follow provide more details.	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
59	6456	Definition or Measurement	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Large sites is a new term and needs to be defined in 23-2M-1030 Terms.	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
60	6457	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	The change from 2 acres to 1 acre trigger will assure we have open spaces as the density increases. However, there may be some confusion as threshold requirements vary for each zone in Article 23-4D: Specific to Zones using Table J-Open Space.	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
61	6458	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	(D) Civic Open Space required for sites > 4 acres. These large thresholds for the addition of open space combined with the lack of large undeveloped tracks of land within the urban core make the thresholds unreasonable and ineffective for meeting the Imagine Austin goals for open space. Recommend that these thresholds be removed and the requirements be established for each zone in Articel 23-4D: Specific to Zones using Table J-Open Space. Recommend reducing threshold to 2 acres or more.	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
62	6462	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	If Common Open Space is restricted to residence of a development and their visitors per the definition, it serves a different purpose than those shared by the public (civic and parkland) and should not be used interchangeably.	58	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
63	6459	Definition or Measurement Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	COMMON OPEN SPACE is defined in 23-13A-1 pg. 21as A privately-owned outdoor or unenclosed area intended for use by the residents, employees, or visitors to a development. This means Common Open Space is not for public use but rather restricted to use of those within development or their visitors. However, this section has design criteria seem to provide for public use. Is definition accurate?	58	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
64	6460	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	B) Needs to be the same as Section 1010 and specify the range of one to four acres for compliance.	58	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
65	6461	Definition or Measurement Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	States that site partially complies when site provides Civic Open Space or Dedicated Parkland. What does partially comply mean?	58	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
66	6282	Transportation and Mobility Parks, Open Space, Trails	Jolinda Marshall	Recommend transit plaza requirement on private property be eliminated. Open space as a default at transit stops separates services, amenities, and people from people riding or waiting for transit. Transit service is dynamic and this requirement does not appropriately serve people accessing transit.	59	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
67	6283	Transportation and Mobility	Jolinda Marshall	The intent is good but the requirement does not serve the transit user as it does not speak to safe design - pedestrian scale lighting, low/high landscape, visibility. Nor does it speak to alternate modes now or in the future, Rapid, BRT, Light Rail, Express, etc. Please address	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
68	6397	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	?? "may not to exceed" - what is intended? "may not be required to exceed" perhaps?	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
69	6398	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Error	Joyce Statz	fix "measures" to "measure"	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
70	6464	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	What and Where are the requirements for DC Zones?	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
71	6463	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	(C)(5) This is the only section that specified quantity of open space and is poorly written. This needs to be moved to its own section as it does not fit under Location Criteria. Table 23-4D-2130(G) Open Space also includes Common Open Space Requirements. Which requirement takes precedent?	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
72	6487	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Should state "Common open space" so as to not confuse civic open Space requirements.	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
73	6399	Other Error	Joyce Statz	a quarter of what?	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
74	6465	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	B)2) Site Plans must include 10% of net developed area (subtract street area) set aside as civic open space. What is the basis for this percentage? 23-3B Parkland Dedication levels are based on number of residence and caps at 15% of gross site area.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
75	6467	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	B)3) exempt sites less than 8 acre and 1/4 mile from existing park. The threshold is too large and will not allow for the code to meet the intent of this section which is to increase the amount of parks and open space from non-residential development. This needs to take into consideration park deficient areas. To align with 4)a) should be worded "and each residential lot is within 1/4 mile" Need to change "park" to "dedicated parkland." How to measure distance of 1/4 mile? The basis for 1/4 mile must defined in terms of connectivity and be safe and walkable. Refer to section Division 23-4E-6: Specific to Use/6240- Multi-Family. If there is not a safe route to the Civic Space, then the excemption should not be allowed.Recommend reducing this to 2 acres.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
76	6466	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	B)3) exempt sites less than 8 acre and 1/4 mile from existing park. The threshold is too large and will not allow for the code to meet the intent of this section which is to increase the amount of parks and open space from non-residential development. This needs to take into consideration park deficient areas. To align with 4)a) should be worded "and each residential lot is within 1/4 mile" Need to change "park" to "dedicated parkland." How to measure distance of 1/4 mile? The basis for 1/4 mile must defined in terms of connectivity and be safe and walkable. Refer to section Division 23-4E-6: Specific to Use/6240- Multi-Family. If there is not a safe route to the Civic Space, then the excemption should not be allowed.Recommend reducing this to 2 acres.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
77	6468	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	The basis for 1/4 mile must defined in terms of connectivity and be safe and walkable. Refer to section Division 23-4E-6: Specific to Use/6240- Multi-Family for example of how to measure 1/4 mile. If there is not a safe route to the Civic Space, then the exemption should not be allowed.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
78	6469	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	The basis for 1/2 mile must defined in terms of connectivity and be safe and walkable. Refer to section Division 23-4E-6: Specific to Use/6240- Multi-Family for example of how to measure 1/2 mile. If there is not a safe route to the Civic Space, then the exemption should not be allowed.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
79	6470	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Reduce threshold from 8 acres to 4 acres.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
80	6471	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	This would effectively exclude the larger civic open space types, such as much needed Nieghborhood Parks. Also, missing unit of acres after "quarter."	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
81	6401	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	nothing below relates to "and Conflict" so that can be removed	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
82	6400	Error	Joyce Statz	"om?" something missing here	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
83	6473	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	C) This section is not clear. Does development have to comply with both and provide separate amounts of land or can one be used for the other. If one can be used to satisfy the other, does one regulation take precedent? Need to be clear when if there are conflicts between the two?	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
84	6474	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	This should be the other way around as Civic Open Space by definition is accessible to the public and common space is not.	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
85	6472	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	The Purpose section must clearly explain why the new land development code includes the two new open space/park requirements, Common and Civic Open Space. In discussions with PARD, Civic Open Space was added to supplement the Parkland Dedication Ordinance in 23-3B required for residential development to increase open space and parkland needed to support non-residential uses. The Common Open Space and Civic Open Space sections of Draft 3 of CodeNext needs to rewritten to clearly explain the purpose and relationship between them and the Parkland Dedication requirements.	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
86	6475	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	This still exempts parking for Civic Open Space for significantly sized public parks up to 5 acres. Should require parking and adopt PARD standards for parking. The parking should only be exempted when there is other public parking included in the development.	69	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
87	6476	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	PARD should have authority to specify type of civic open space within a development based on their data of parkland needs in area?	69	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
88	6477	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Why were Metropolitan and District Parks were removed from the list types.	70	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
89	6533	Other	austinscott	Can you add page numbers to the table of contents and a link to the text?	2	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-TOC

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
90	6210	Mapping	Tstowell	CC and DC cover downtown, but UC-Urban Center is not found in any of the other Imagine Austin Regional Centers that aren't already covered with a unique regulating plan (F-25). Extend UC to other Regional Centers (Highland, et al).	5	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-1
91	6402	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	This table has no label, and it has no legend. Add those.	9	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
92	6422	Uses	Codecatching	Is senior retirement housing indicated to be allowed < =12 in all zoning by minor use permit in R1-b or c? How is this possible when limited to 2 units?	9	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
93	6478	Uses ADU Zones (Generally)	Allandale Neighbor Comments	R1 zones only allow ADU when density bonus included so this should not show as permitted outright.	9	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
94	6479	Uses	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Coop housing should not be permitted in R2 zones as will introduce issues with occupancy limits and surely result in parking issues in single family neighborhoods that are currently safe and walkable.	12	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
95	6480	Uses	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Single Family Attached requires Specific to Use Requirements to assure that house form is not abused. This use should not be allowed in single family neighborhoods except close to corridors. Also, if this is it supposed to be an option to duplexes allowing ownership of property for both sides, then it should be restricted to only lots where duplexes are allowed.	12	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
96	6482	Uses	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Single Family Attached requires Specific to Use Requirements to assure that house form is not abused. This use should not be allowed in single family neighborhoods except close to corridors. Also, if this is it supposed to be an option to duplexes allowing ownership of property for both sides, then it should be restricted to only lots where duplexes are allowed.	15	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
97	6300	Building Form or Design Standards	chris allen	If this is correct (see comment above)- it would appear that "Snout houses" are discouraged, unless a small lot is created from a larger one. That's adding insult to injury, IMHO...	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
98	6299	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	chris allen	Looks like there are some editing issues with this section. It's not clear what the writers were trying to say. (c) ends with "or", but there's no following text, for example.	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
99	6403	Error	Joyce Statz	extra "the" here	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
100	6404	Site Development Standards Parking	Joyce Statz	this constraint makes a whole lot of Austin homes non-compliant - what's the point?	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
101	6412	Nonconforming	zoethecat	<p>This clause appears to make houses in which the front of the garage is forward of the front of the house. This will make a very large number of existing houses non-conforming.</p> <p>In any case, it's a bad idea. Garages close to the street minimize the impervious cover for driveways.</p>	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
102	6413	Building Form or Design Standards	zoethecat	This clause and the previous clause start with "If the parking structure is less than 20 feet behind the building facade." One of the two must be wrong.	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
103	6481	Parking	Allandale Neighbor Comments	This conflicts with statements from Planning and Zoning Department that the "market" will determine number of parking spaces and even though minimums are established, developers are allowed to put in as many parking spots as they want.	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
104	6484	Error	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Subsection (2) includes only definitions - not sure does not apply to lots 30 ft. or less.	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
105	6194	Other	Farmer	Yay!	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
106	6196	Parking	Farmer	Moving in the right direction. How about 1 per unit if no street parking is available within one block. If there is RPP then 0, if within 1/2 mile of Imagine Austin corridor then 0, if corner lot with available street parking, 0.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
107	6206	Uses	Witt Featherston	Why not?!? Increase a small, locally owned businesses overhead by requiring them to get office space outside of their home, and log vehicle miles getting there? For what??	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
108	6201	Uses	sc1366	We should encourage small business owners to use their home office so they can nurture their enterprises.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
109	6197	Zones (Generally)	Farmer	So much for form based zoning...	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
110	6483	Parking	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Residential units should maintain 2 parking spot per unit at a minimum in single family residences that do not connect to corridors. Many neighborhoods without connectivity are safe walkable areas where there are not sidewalks. Increased on-street parking in these types of neighborhoods will change the character in that they will no longer be safe walkable streets.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
111	6485	Uses Parking	Allandale Neighbor Comments	The occupancy limits for residential dwelling units can be from 4-6 unrelated adults. Furthermore, most families have a minimum of two cars. One parking spot per unit is unrealistic and given the limited mass transit options available to most Austinites, it is not the right time to reduce parking requirements, At a minimum, R3and R4 Zones are the only zones that should be allowed reduced parking as they are meant for areas with access to mixed-use and main street zones within walking or biking distance. R1 and R2 Zones are not.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
112	6486	ADU Parking	Allandale Neighbor Comments	ADUs allow 3 unrelated adults and it is incomprehensible that none of these adults would require parking.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
113	6493	Uses Parking	Tstowell	Have you seen all the R2 that is literally backing up to all the mixed use corridors like Burnet, Lamar, S. 1st, Congress, etc.? Also just because parking isn't required doesn't mean it won't get built - just that it gives folks options.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
114	6531	Parking ADU	ernest	Accessory Dwelling Units must have at least one parking space on the property.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
115	6532	Uses	ernest	That would depend on the flow of customers into the home office. I would not want a small business in my neighborhood that had a lot of people coming and going.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
116	6414	Affordable Housing (Generally)	zoethecat	This category only allows single family homes so how can there be a density bonus program?	28	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
117	6229	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	46	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
118	6230	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	52	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
119	6285	Lot Size and Intensity Zones (Generally) Definition or Measurement	BradP	Single Family Attached needs to be better explained. It was hard to search for and find the basic definition of it, which does not fully explain it. Does this mean R2A, R2B, R2C lots could be subdivided down to 2,500 sf lots if Single Family Attached structures are used?	52	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
120	6488	Site Development Standards	Allandale Neighbor Comments	R2 Zones have already been reduced from 7000 s.f. to 5,750 s.f. and now with draft 3 to 5,000 s.f. with an option to subdivide every lot to 2,500 s.f. Then there is the option to add ADUs. This will dramatically change the number of units allowed an negatively alter most single family neighborhoods.	52	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
121	6489	Uses	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Single family attached should not be in R2 zones. There are also no design criteria for this house form which will lead to abuse.	52	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
122	6490	Uses	Allandale Neighbor Comments	If Single Family Attached remains as option for R2, ADUs should not be allowed on these smaller subdivided lots.	52	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
123	6335	Site Development Standards Zones (Generally)	krayon516	This is confusing. Do you mean 40% or 50% of the overall site impervious coverage cannot be in the front yard?	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
124	6491	Error Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	23-4C-1030 states that it is for sites 1 acre or larger. Change through code.	56	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
125	6286	Definition or Measurement Zones (Generally) Lot Size and Intensity	BradP	Single Family Attached needs to be better explained. It was hard to search for and find the basic definition of it, which does not fully explain it. Does this mean R2A, R2B, R2C lots could be subdivided down to 2,500 sf lots if Single Family Attached structures are used?	58	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
126	6436	Process (Code Development) Zones (Generally)	ZATX	This code next debacle was meant to introduce a fair and straight forward, form based code where there were minimums, maximums, and proportionate allowances based on lot size and base zoning. What this has become is a complete and utter mess. Sad we had to spend so much money to get an equally restrictive, complex, and confusing code. Reflects poorly on our ability as a city to work together to come up with a common sense plan to move forward while taking into account best practices in urban planning.	63	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
127	6220	ADU	matthews789	CodeNext needs to address ADU garage space (unfinished space) vs. livable space. Since an ADU garage is most likely used by the single-family home in this zone, it shouldn't count towards max ADU sf. What difference does it make if the garage is attached to the single-family vs. the ADU? It's still taking up the same amount of space.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
128	6207	Other	Witt Featherston	Complete failure of leadership among staff and consultants. Kowtowing to the gentry fearmongers.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
129	6217	ADU	Tstowell	This tiered ADU sizing is totally uncalled for and moving in the WRONG direction, overriding what council enacted only a couple years ago allowing 1,100sf. Why make it more difficult? Why jeopardize more family-friendly ADU construction? Especially if someone preserves a small old front house, why not allow a full 1,100sf in the back? ADU's are difficult enough to make pencil out already, we need to be increasing flexibility and viability, not restricting and constraining.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
130	6219	ADU	matthews789	Does garage space counts towards the max ADU sf? For example, my neighborhood has alleys, so most garages are detached and off of the alley. If garage space counts toward max ADU sf, then the ADU is effectively useless considering a 2 car garage is ~550 square feet.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
131	6218	Lot Size and Intensity	matthews789	Single-Family Attached is defined as a 25' lot 2,500 sq ft min. Since most lots in R2C are at least 50' wide, does this mean a developer could legally split the lot into two lots and build two Single-Family Attached - each with an ADU? They would effectively be squeezing four units onto one lot (split into two lots)? If so, seems sneaky...	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
132	6222	Lot Size and Intensity ADU	Pete	You can't have an ADU on lots less than 3,500 and so, you couldn't split a standard lot under 7,000 sqft into 2 and also have ADUs.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
133	6225	Lot Size and Intensity	matthews789	Lots in my neighborhood are 50x140 = 7,000 sf, which is why I'm asking. So is that a yes then?	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
134	6260	Lot Size and Intensity	Matthew McEvoy	Legit question. Yes, looks like on a 7,000sf lot you could have duplex (aka single family attached) and ADU for each side of duplex..	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
135	6270	Lot Size and Intensity Definition or Measurement	chris allen	Single-Family Attached needs clarification. Under current LDC, it's a little-used and confusing use. We need to understand how widespread this use might become and how many demolitions it will trigger. This contradicts the consultant/staff's pitch that the district names tell you how many units are permitted on a given lot (R2 = 2 units, for instance).	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
136	6310	ADU	wayne	Why not include ADUs in an overall FAR calculation? Why separate it out? This seems overly prescriptive.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
137	6202	ADU	sc1366	Why would the code decrease the average home owners ability to build an ADU already allowed under the current code. This is moving the wrong direction. Should be increased to 1200 SF	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
138	6191	Other	Farmer	This is good.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
139	6190	Other	Farmer	Spineless.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
140	6223	Lot Size and Intensity	Pete	"Single Family" use should be reduced to 25' width and 2,500 sqft minimum lot size. Or a new form should be added with a 25' width and 2,500 sqft minimum lot size called "Single-Family Small Lot." If the ADU min lot size is kept at 3,500 sqft, that would still prevent current lots from having more than 2 units. If you can have two units attached, why not unattached on separate lots? Both attached and detached forms should be allowed.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
141	6189	ADU	Farmer	Is this really necessary? Let the ADU's act as detached duplexes if they want to.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
142	6203	Lot Size and Intensity ADU	Pete	The minimum lot size to build an ADU should be brought down to 2500 sqft.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
143	6259	Lot Size and Intensity	Matthew McEvoy	Where is the provision to codify standards for small lots? People have been paying property taxes for decades on legal long platted lots that only through the stroke of a pen at city hall (McMansion) have now made modifications or rebuilding on the lots extremely tedious, expensive or impossible. The last code next draft let smaller then 5,000sf lots use 'cottage' standards. Please codify zoning for all legal platted lots regardless of size in entire city.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
144	6188	Other	Farmer	Woohoo the one paltry change to SF3 zoning (other than the name). Good thing we spent millions and heaps of time to have one tiny change to our suburban land use code that most downtown neighborhoods are made of.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
145	6252	Lot Size and Intensity	Witt Featherston	Your comment bubble makes it look like minimum area is now 15,000SF, which given how wrongheaded draft3 is, didn't actually surprise me. Glad to figure out it's actually 5k	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
146	6216	Lot Size and Intensity ADU	Tstowell	Reduce this down to 2,500sf to match the SF-attached allowed use. No reason to disallow ADU's on lots between 2,500<3,500sf if they with FAR, imp. cover, setbacks, etc.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
147	6272	Neighborhood Plans, Character ADU	pilivelez	Do you still have to comply with Neighborhood Plans? Travis Heights does not allow for ADU in the front on the lot. They City will require a variance(fee of \$1,700) to "leave" our 85 year old house . Basically, encoring us to demolish it.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
148	6231	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
149	6287	Lot Size and Intensity Definition or Measurement	BradP	Single Family Attached needs to be better explained. It was hard to search for and find the basic definition of it, which does not fully explain it. Does this mean R2A, R2B, R2C lots could be subdivided down to 2,500 sf lots if Single Family Attached structures are used?	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
150	6261	Lot Size and Intensity ADU	Matthew McEvoy	Overall, this rewrite really keeps the water muddy. Just standardize everything (ADU size) and let impervious coverage and FAR limits act as the backstop on overbuilding. Example, small older house on front of lot on alley. Let owner build up to max SFR size in back. Front house is 'ADU.' Back house is main. Preserving the bungalow, street character.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
151	6221	Transportation and Mobility	matthews789	R2C contains some of the few alleys in the city, yet there is no mention of altered code for lots with alleys? The increased accessibility should allow for additional ADU sf allowances.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
152	6319	Uses ADU	ChrisBBradford	What does "Single-Family Attached" mean? It needs to be a defined use. Does it mean a SF home with an attached accessory dwelling unit? If so, does this mean an attached ADU is allowed on lots with 2,500 sf but a detached ADU requires a 3,500 sf lot? We shouldn't have to guess about these things.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
153	6320	ADU Uses	ChrisBBradford	If this isn't a reference to an ADU, what's the difference between Single Family Attached and Duplex?	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
154	6333	Zones (Generally) Lot Size and Intensity ADU	ssimpson	Failure to address needs for incrementally added density. Accessory dwelling units should be allowed by right on ALL properties, regardless of primary building type.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
155	6334	Zones (Generally) Other	ssimpson	More building types should be allowed, particularly townhouses.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
156	6380	Zones (Generally) Site Development Standards ADU	schorre	Why make this more complicated than it needs to be? Just set the max size of an ADU to 0.15 FAR with a max size of 1,100 SF?	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
157	6421	Site Development Standards Definition or Measurement	chris allen	FAR is defined as Gross Floor Area / Lot area. Gross Floor Area exempts Attic, Basement, Porch, Stoop, Stories below grade, parking facilities. None of the above is defined in the code, so the effective FAR could be massive. On a 7,000 s.f. lot, Building Cover would be appear to be the de facto limiting factor, resulting in homes ranging from 8,400 s.f. to 11,200 s.f. Under the current McMansion rules, the max square footage on a 7,000 s.f. lot would be roughly 3,500 s.f., using the exemptions built into the code. Suggest that this needs a lot of work before it's released into the wild.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
158	6434	ADU Preservation	ZATX	Does this prohibit additions to the preserved structure? Why limit this to ADU? If someone has a 1200 front house and decides to preserve it they could still build in rear with duplex use, does electing the preserved house as ADU limit its size increases? Say there is an existing 600 sqft front bungalow and someone wanted to add to it as a duplex why should it count against FAR? Just pick an FAR and stick with it. If people will be building up to on average (1200 preserved + 2300 new) 3500 sq ft then just set the new max to .7 FAR and let people do what they please. If there is an incentive to keep a house built in 2008 and allow someone to build an additional 2300 sq ft this is a silly way to right a code.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
159	6492	Definition or Measurement Building Form or Design Standards	lpodgore	Fully agree, code needs details and specifics. Code needs specifics to avoid loopholes.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
160	6209	Lot Size and Intensity	Witt Featherston	You have to have depth and length switched, right???	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
161	6208	Building Form or Design Standards	Witt Featherston	Ugly and dumb. McMansion ordinance is a complete failure. We should retire these "articulations", and let the ones that do exist serve as reminders of how ridiculous and counter productive a form-based code can be. A form-based code can work, but not like this.	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
162	6336	Error	David Carroll	These are mixed up	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
163	6433	Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ZATX	If this is on an alley, why should it matter whether this is a duplex or ADU and why limit height? People can get creative and use less impervious coverage to retain green space. This seems at odds with good design.	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
164	6435	Uses	ZATX	Let the market figure this out. You can stick a manufactured home on most lots in town and people are wringing there hands over architectural choices.	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
165	6271	Definition or Measurement Height	chris allen	What exactly is a "top plate"? It's not defined in the code, and this could open up some interesting workarounds with walls that have no plate at all.	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
166	6288	Other	BradP	Why are you using new terms that have not been defined. This is not the only such term. This really seems intentionally opaque and like you are trying to hide things. This is Austin, we have months, we will find everything. DO NOT EVEN TRY TO HIDE THINGS.	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
167	6337	Building Form or Design Standards	David Carroll	There is no need to define a top plate height. One maximum building height would suffice. By defining both you are dictating design style.	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
168	6381	Zones (Generally) Site Development Standards	schorre	Presumably the intention of limiting the top plate height is to prevent three story boxes and force the design of gabled roofs.	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
169	6382	Building Form or Design Standards Site Development Standards	schorre	This seems crazy. There are many sloping lots that necessitate the placement of a porch that may be more than 3' above grade. Is this a solution in search of a problem?	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
170	6427	Zones (Generally)	wtravisl	I agree that this has an unintended effect of dictating style. Get ready for mansard and barrel roofs, because that's the workaround for this provision - 3rd floor behind roof-like material above the 'top plate'. Why not limit the highest occupied floor, and the overall structure? Also, 22' is tight for 2 stories on pier & beam. 1st floor @ 2' + 10' ceiling + 18" structure = 2nd floor limited to 8'-6" ceiling.	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
171	6193	Impervious or Building Cover	Farmer	Building Coverage in unnecessary. FAR and Impervious cover already limit development, get rid of one of the three and let the other two control.	67	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
172	6273	Definition or Measurement	chris allen	"Front Yard" needs a definition	67	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
173	6211	Lot Size and Intensity Impervious or Building Cover	Witt Featherston	Why is this a metric? Aren't you trying to simplify the code? You already have FAR and impervious, so why is this a thing?	67	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
174	6192	Other	Farmer	This note is unnecessary.	67	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
175	6338	Parking Neighborhood Plans, Character	David Carroll	This violates neighborhood plans.	67	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
176	6289	Zones (Generally)	BradP	This zone seems unnecessary. Appropriately not used much in the map. Are you saving this for upzoning later? Delete this zone from the code and map.	69	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
177	6213	Lot Size and Intensity	Witt Featherston	Why?? There are already plenty of other metrics dictating intensity of development (FAR, Impervious Cover, AND Building Coverage. Why not let them do their job without getting down to this level of oppression? Wasn't CodeNext supposed to be simpler??	70	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
178	6290	Zones (Generally)	BradP	This zone seems unnecessary. Appropriately not used much in the map. Are you saving this for upzoning later? Delete this zone from the code and map.	75	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
179	6232	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	76	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
180	6233	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	82	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
181	6234	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	88	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
182	6205	ADU	Pete	There should be an option to put two units in the ADU and have the primary structure a single family structure. Some people may want to live in a single family home instead of a duplex. It would also allow for smaller units in the ADU that would be more affordable. Again, all forms of 3 units should be allowed in the 3 unit zone.	94	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
183	6204	Uses	Pete	Triplexes should be an allowed use. This type of missing middle is still missing within the land code. If 3 units are allowed, then all forms of 3 units should be allowed.	94	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
184	6253	Uses	Witt Featherston	Why not triplexes?? This zone is for 3 units, so what's the deal? There are still FAR, impervious cover, and building cover metrics that control intensity of development, so who cares if the 3 units are attached to eachother, or if 2 are attached and one is separate. Pointless regulations.	94	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
185	6235	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	94	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
186	6236	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	100	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
187	6293	Site Development Standards	schorre	Why no pools in front yards? Many urban homes have larger front yards than rear yards.	102	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
188	6294	Definition or Measurement Preservation	schorre	This seems silly. Who is going to tear down a house less than 10 years old? This "at least 10 years old" language is not needed. Also, is "preserved" clarified somewhere? I've seen many "remodels" where one wall is left standing and rest of structure is torn down and rebuilt.	106	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
189	6237	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	106	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
190	6298	Site Development Standards ADU	schorre	I believe this should be reduced to 20' to allow more room for the addition of ADUs in back yard. 5' may not seem like much, but it makes a big difference on smaller city lots. More room for back yard ADUs = more affordable housing.	107	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
191	6295	Definition or Measurement	schorre	How will overall height be measured on homes on sloping lots? Averaging low and high points?	108	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
192	6296	Impervious or Building Cover Site Development Standards Zones (Generally)	schorre	It will be very difficult to built multi-family uses with an allowable FAR of 0.6 with impervious cover limits of only 45%. Under MF-4 zoning, this limit was much higher. I believe an acceptable compromise for multifamily impervious should be around 55% to find a balance between greenery preservation and density. Otherwise, all structures built on R4A zoned lots are nearly guaranteed to be three stories.	109	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
193	6297	Building Form or Design Standards	schorre	This is an excellent change but needs to be clarified as driveways get closer to garages.	109	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
194	6238	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	112	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
195	6239	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	118	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
196	6407	Error	Joyce Statz	extra "the"	128	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
197	6240	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	138	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
198	6262	Building Form or Design Standards Site Development Standards Affordable Housing (Generally)	BeeGee	Is there an affordable housing height bonus >35' allowing a fourth story in this zoning? If not, it is difficult to take advantage of the affordable bonus units/FAR on infill properties because of setbacks.	140	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
199	6241	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	150	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
200	6242	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	156	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
201	6408	Error	Joyce Statz	drop the "shall"	177	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
202	6267	Reference	Tstowell	Incorrect reference. Table is "Off-Street Parking Requirements for **Mixed-Use** Zones", not "Commercial Zones".	198	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
203	6243	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	204	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
204	6244	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	210	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
205	6245	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	216	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
206	6246	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	222	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
207	6379	Building Form or Design Standards	CittaLente	1. Mandate that no more than 150' of building frontage may appear to have been designed by a single architect. 2. Enact active facade requirements (regular doors, windows, and awnings; facade relief; etc). These will save the street from the dullness that arise from large buildings and/or blank walls.	265	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
208	6274	Reference	chris allen	All references to 23-3M (Definitions and Measurements) need to be updated to show correct chapter.	270	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
209	6275	Uses	chris allen	Level 1 definition appears to allow for outdoor play area (as at "doggy daycare" facilities. Is this universally compatible with adjacent SF residential?	271	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
210	6377	Parking	CittaLente	Eliminate or reduce parking requirements, as many cities have. Alternatively, implement an in-lieu payment system (businesses don't have to provide parking but must pay to provide it somewhere else - see "Walkable City", Speck, p126). There is no scientific evidence for the suggested requirements (eg. 1 parking space per hospital bed). Minimum parking requirements pass on the costs of parking to everyone, whether or not they drive, and replace rational market-based behavior with irrational behavior since the true costs of parking are hidden.	275	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
211	6378	Parking	CittaLente	Add bicycle parking requirements	275	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
212	6276	Parking Uses	chris allen	Question applies to all <2,500 s.f. exemptions: How many can 2,500 s.f. uses can I stack on a given site? Can I have a restaurant, a bar, and an office in the same building with zero parking spaces?	276	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
213	6321	Site Development Standards	chris allen	Exempt? From ALL building placement standards (front/rear/side setbacks)? This needs to be footnoted in ALL applicable districts, right in the "Building Placement" tables.	277	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
214	6305	Building Form or Design Standards	Jolinda Marshall	suggest listing compatibility effects to be considered to focus options.	279	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
215	6306	Building Form or Design Standards	Jolinda Marshall	suggest reducing required articulation, 1-2 sides.	281	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
216	6376	Site Development Standards	CittaLente	Reduce front setbacks to 0'. 0' setbacks, a worldwide standard on commercial streets, define the street and provide the most engaging shopping experience.	281	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
217	6187	Building Form or Design Standards	Farmer	45' does not make sense. At 50' (which is current code for many of these lots) we can build 4 stories. 45' limits us to three stories. Surely 5' more height would not ruin the character of these transit corridors. Really they should allow for 5 or 6 stories given that they are along the Imagine Austin transit corridors where the stated goal is to increase density, not decrease it!	300	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
218	6495	Site Development Standards	Toddington	Height limits for main corridors like this should be increased to promote density.	300	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
219	6496	Site Development Standards	Toddington	Height limits for main corridors like this should be increased to promote density.	306	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
220	6339	Building Form or Design Standards Zones (Generally)	chris allen	Seems like this district allows "dooryard" frontage, which implies that residential use is permitted on the ground floor. The Purpose paragraph may be switched with the one from MS3B, which describes active and residential frontages. FWIW, it's really challenging to identify the differences between the districts; a more descriptive sub-title would likely help in this regard.	309	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
221	6494	Parking	jboardman	This mentions "Side Street." Does that mean it does not apply to the rear side of the building (which is what usually faces the houses in the neighborhood)? And does "maintains a pattern of fenestration that is consistent with that of the primary building" mean the parking garage cannot be exposed but rather must appear visually similar to the rest of the building? Not having a bare parking garage facing the neighborhood is a key issue for many people.	313	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
222	6494	Site Development Standards	jboardman	This mentions "Side Street." Does that mean it does not apply to the rear side of the building (which is what usually faces the houses in the neighborhood)? And does "maintains a pattern of fenestration that is consistent with that of the primary building" mean the parking garage cannot be exposed but rather must appear visually similar to the rest of the building? Not having a bare parking garage facing the neighborhood is a key issue for many people.	313	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
223	6322	Site Development Standards	chris allen	Note that 23-4d-5050 EXEMPTS small interior lots from these standards. This should be noted in this table for ALL applicable districts. My neighborhood has a large number of lots mapped with MS zoning that are only 50' wide that would be eligible for this exemption.	317	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
224	6330	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	chris allen	This section needs illustration (for all chapters). Hard to understand what this is about.	317	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
225	6301	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Building Form or Design Standards	chris allen	Is this diagram (and all others illustrating Height) misleading? In each of the diagrams, they show the max height line at the top of a parapet. Under 23-4E-7050 (Encroachments Above Maximum Height), parapets are permitted to exceed the max. ht. by 15%. At 85', that's 12'-9" of parapet or nearly 98 feet overall height.	318	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
226	6323	Error	Tstowell	This should say additional "Height", not "FAR".	333	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-6
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
227	6324	Error Reference	Tstowell	Incorrect reference. Downtown Plan Overlay Zone is 23-4D-9080.	335	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-6
228	6526	Other	Catlin Whittington	This conflicts with existing city code chapter 9-2 and has no place in the land use code.	364	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-7
229	6374	Other Environment (Generally)	RioGTomlin	Thank you for not restricting building a single-family, duplex, or ADU on a privately owned lot within the waterfront districts. I believe the original intent of these overlays was to restrict commercial and industrial development along the waterfront, and this provision is in line with that vision.	38	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 9	23-4D-9
230	6309	Site Development Standards Parking	aaroncleav@gmail.com	In cases where a single or two car carport or garage is not available on-site and parking areas are in the front, rear, or side setback: An exemption should be granted to construct a carport with no side walls with the approval of 80% of property owners on the same street within 300' of the property.	3	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-TOC
231	6263	Uses	gmaksym	I do Not understand. You have removed the limitation on the number of vehicular visits for a Home Occupation. Do you not think people will abuse this. We had a neighbor who had over 20 vehicular visits and 14 parked at the same time!!! Reinstate the vehicular limits at 3 per day!!	3	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-TOC
232	6309	Site Development Standards Parking	aaroncleav@gmail.com	In cases where a single or two car carport or garage is not available on-site and parking areas are in the front, rear, or side setback: An exemption should be granted to construct a carport with no side walls with the approval of 80% of property owners on the same street within 300' of the property.	3	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-TOC
233	6195	Reference	Tstowell	Incorrect reference. TDM is 23-9C-2030.	24	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-3
234	6425	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Janis Smith	How about you put everything for boat docks/shoreline mods in one place. I think that I've covered everything to do with boat dock permitting (?), and I had to look up this section along with 23-4D-2060, 23-4D-9110, 23-3D-8120, 23-4E-6050, 23-6A-2010, and 23-2G. And I still can't find the replacement for the current 25-2-964 section. Thanks.	47	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-5
235	6277	Building Form or Design Standards	chris allen	6' separation triggers issues with IRC (building code) R302.1, relating to fire protection for buildings that are build in close proximity. Design and construction get complicated and costly at this separation distance. Has this been vetted by Permit/Inspection team or architects/builders? At a minimum, it may merit adding a note to this section that points out that buildings closer than 10 will have to comply with local amendments to IRC R302.1.	57	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
236	6530	ADU	campsc18	Reference to second floor leaves open the question of what about a first floor. Surely ADUs are not just on second floors.	57	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
237	6450	Parking Uses	gmaksym	So does this provision mean a Home Occupation in a Residential neighborhood can generate up to 10 vehicle trips per day?? I have 6 neighbors running a home occupations out of their houses within on block. if they each generate 10 trips a day, that generates 60 trips more on our small streets each day. It also means that those 60 vehicles could park on those streets all day. How does that work??	59	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
238	6264	Uses	gmaksym	23-4E-6200 Home Occupations Why did you remove the limbs on Vehicular visits prepay. The existing Ordinance limits vehicular traffic related to the business to 3 trip per day. Yet, you have removed this from the Code Next 3.. Why!! Do you intend to allow 20 car trips, 100 car trips. How about if they come and stay all day. wE had a neighbor who had 20+ trips per day related to her business and at time 14-16 cars where parked on the residential street for hours. Reinstate the limits to Home Occupations for vehicular trips to 3 a day!!!!	77	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
239	6447	Uses	gmaksym	Confused. Why do you allow a medical service here but under 23-4E-6200 (K12), you specifically prohibit "Medical Services".	77	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
240	6449	Parking Uses	gmaksym	Do you really intend to allow a 14,000 lb gross weight truck to park in my neighbor's residence yard. Also, you state that it needs to be screened from the street but not from neighbors - that terrible. Please reduce this provision or remove it.	77	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
241	6448	Uses Signs	gmaksym	Under section 23-8 (Signage), section 23-8B-2020 C1c, you suggest that a Home Occupation in a Residence can have a 36 Sq Ft. Sign. This appears to be over 3 times bigger sign than previous Code. That's huge for a residence - even bigger than a restaurant. Please reduce this to a more reasonable size like maybe 12 sq ft. like the existing code.	77	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
242	6451	Definition or Measurement Uses	gmaksym	I'm confused. Under section 23-4D-2030(B), R2C Properties and all R2 Properties are listed under (7) Retail states that "No Retail uses allowed". There is no indication that a Minor Use Permit can raise that prohibition. Yet here in 23-4E-6200(F), it suggests a Minor Use Permit can allow "limited sales of merchandise". Also, what do you mean by "limited sales"?? What limits are placed on the sales?? Who decides what the limits are??	77	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
243	6527	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Catlin Whittington	remove "or play musical instrument" and the same objective is achieved without being so pointedly anti-musician.	98	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
244	6528	Other	Catlin Whittington	conflicts with existing code 9-2 and has no place in the land use code.	101	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
245	6529	Other	Catlin Whittington	Strike section (C) as it is in conflict with chapter 9-2 of existing code.	101	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
246	6255	Site Development Standards	dfores1	This should be front "and SIDE" yards for corner lots. Were side yards left off of this on purpose? "Side" was included in draft 2 for corner lots. It seemed to make a lot of sense. Thank you	113	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-7
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
247	6258	Site Development Standards	JPRatx	Where is the setback of the existing building measured to? Lot line to porch? Lot line to vertical support? Lot line to front door?	113	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-7
248	6410	Error	David Carroll	It should read 5:12 slope	120	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-8
249	6256	Subdivision or Flag Lots	juan	Only Registered Professional Land Surveyors, not engineers, may set boundary monuments in the State of Texas.	35	Chapter-23-5--Subdivision.pdf	23-5B-4
250	6355	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	Why were these values changed? And why are they not highlighted in color?	45	Chapter-23-5--Subdivision.pdf	23-5C-2
251	6215	Site Development Standards	Tstowell	Doesn't this basically mean the same thing as the exemption for SF, duplex, and ADU listed above? Why not just combine them? Do the floodplain requirements not apply to 3-6 unit projects?	11	Chapter-23-6--Site-Plan.pdf	23-6A-2
252	6214	Site Development Standards	Tstowell	This site plan exemption should increase to 8 units at least, as there are currently zones that allow a 4-plex to be doubled into an 8-plex with an Affordable Housing density bonus. Triggering a full site plan review is a huge disincentive to taking that bonus. If there are other examples of bonuses allowing 9-10 units, the site plan exemption should extend to those as well.	11	Chapter-23-6--Site-Plan.pdf	23-6A-2
253	6356	Error	Joyce Statz	typo - "wave" should be "waive"	19	Chapter-23-6--Site-Plan.pdf	23-6B-2
254	6357	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Error	Joyce Statz	Is it 45 years or 50 years that will be used throughout? Intro section speaks to 45	10	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7A-1
255	6311	Preservation	chris allen	What's the thinking behind 45 years? That's 1973 for today's date. The Historic Landmark bureaucracy is struggling (or failing) to keep up with demolition cases for 50 year old structures right now, with few that are genuinely historic. Why not set the timeline to something more realistic (75 years?) so we can limit the charade to a set of buildings that might actually be historic?	31	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-1
256	6415	Error	leesimmons	Delete semicolon, add colon.	31	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-1
257	6416	Preservation Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	leesimmons	Add subsection (B) Unless the building or structure is 45 or more years old, this article does not apply to: (1) Non-contributing properties in local historic districts; and (2) Non-contributing properties in National Register historic districts.	31	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-1
258	6420	Demolition Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	what would this mean for the 9th street redevelopment caught in the quagmire of requiring a demolition permit on all properties to avoid the expense of a building permit application requirement for partial demolition expressly sought but in an area of recent historic district application as it comes before the Historic Commission?. How would this or other areas of CodeNext fix the problem and provide protection for historic areas?	41	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-3
259	6417	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	leesimmons	This makes no sense.	43	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-4
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
260	6418	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	leesimmons	Remove tolling from contents.	45	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-5
261	6419	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	leesimmons	Delete 4-7.	49	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7E-1
262	6499	Signs	M. King	The distinction between ♦On-Premise♦ and ♦Off-Premise♦ signs in CodeNEXT continues the failure of the existing Sign Code to account for online-only or online-centric businesses. Since some items or services are not tied to a physical location ♦ or ♦premises♦ ♦ whatsoever, under CodeNEXT the advertisement of those items or services would always be ♦off-premise,♦ and therefore the advertisement of them would be unfairly and unlawfully singled out and impaired.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
263	6498	Signs Process (Code Development)	M. King	The adoption of a Signage chapter at this time would go against the most important of our City government♦s core principles, including a transparent policy-making process, the opportunity for (and inclusion of) public engagement on matters of public concern and impact, and responsiveness to and serious consideration of stakeholders♦ input and participation.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
264	6497	Signs Process (Code Development)	M. King	Due to the complete lack of public process, conflict with prior direction by City Council, and numerous policy changes that have been inserted at the last minute in the CodeNEXT process without any stakeholder input, the entire Signage chapter should be removed from CodeNEXT. The staff report regarding the changes proposed by the chapter grossly understates and glosses over significant changes to numerous policies that City Council adopted.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
265	6502	Signs Process (Code Development)	M. King	The Signage chapter fails to include a permitting process for digital signage, even though a majority of stakeholders support digital signage, as reported in the memorandum dated June 10, 2016, from Development Services Director Rodney Gonzales to the Mayor City and Council, which was made in response to Resolution No. 20160128-070.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
266	6501	Signs	M. King	The Signage chapter should not eliminate the relocation policy and procedures that are in the existing Sign Code. As indicated in the memorandum dated June 10, 2016, from Development Services Director Rodney Gonzales to the Mayor and Council, sixty-four percent of stakeholders supported ♦loosening existing billboard policy, which allows for relocating existing billboards from one location to another.♦ City Council adopted the relocation provision following an extensive public input and review process, and the elimination of the relocation provision would directly conflict with City Council direction. In addition, the relocation provision has proven to be the most effective policy for the removal of signs from neighborhood and residential streets and Scenic Roadways to commercial roadways and other major transit corridors.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
267	6503	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	The Signage chapter should not eliminate the existing right to appeal to the City Council a Board of Adjustment (Board) action on a variance or appeal, as is currently provided by LDC 25-10-44.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
268	6500	Signs	M. King	The changes that the Signage chapter in CodeNEXT proposed are often in direct conflict with City Council findings and established public policy. For example, the proposed elimination of the sign relocation provision is in direct conflict with Council Resolution No. 20091022-041, which includes the finding that billboard relocation furthers the goal of removing billboards from scenic roadways.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
269	6358	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	Since this section is almost entirely new text, it should be shown in colored font.	3	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
270	6359	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Error	Joyce Statz	need to indent here... sub-bullets follow	9	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-1
271	6516	Signs	M. King	CodeNEXT should not remove changing the cabinet structure of a sign from the definition of Maintenance, as called for by 23-8A-1070 (Definitions).	16	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-1
272	6360	Error	Joyce Statz	typo for "gases"	17	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-1
273	6361	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	this and the next bullet should be indented	19	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-1
274	6362	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	This sentence is redundant and can be removed.	21	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-2
275	6364	Error	Joyce Statz	missing word "to" or "with"	22	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-2
276	6363	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	This seems to be redundant; the prior bullet covers this case.	22	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-2
277	6514	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	CodeNEXT should not transfer the authority to suspend or revoke a contractor's registration from the Board of Adjustment to the director or building official. Compare LDC 25-10-236(A) to 23-8A-2020(E).	23	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-2
278	6365	Error	Joyce Statz	should be singular "sign"	27	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-1
279	6366	Error	Joyce Statz	'the' isn't correct here... do you mean "that?"	27	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-1

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
280	6511	Signs	M. King	CodeNEXT should not include the requirement that ♦Signs that have been physically damaged by weather or physical impact must be reviewed by a competent structural engineer or qualified building inspector, contractor, or sign professional within 24 hours after the damage occurs.♦ This requirement fails to take into account whether the sign owner had notice or had any reasonable opportunity to have notice of the damage, and it also fails to provide for additional time to repair in case of extraneous conditions, such as catastrophic weather events or other situations in which a qualified building inspector, contractor, or sign professional might not be available to review the sign within 24 hours of the damage. In fact, a weather event such as a major hurricane may still present too hazardous of a situation to review the sign safely within 24 hours of the initial damage to the sign, and the Signage chapter should not incentivize unsafe sign review procedures.	31	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-1
281	6510	Signs	M. King	CodeNEXT should not include the requirement that ♦any repair to a sign must be of the same materials as the original sign.♦ It might be impossible to comply with this provision due to the unavailability of materials, and it would also preclude replacing materials with ones that are more environmentally preferable or which would have superior engineering integrity.	31	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-1
282	6367	Signs Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	the rest of this sentence needs rework - can't understand what it's saying	38	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-3
283	6368	Reference Error	Joyce Statz	reference needs to be updated?	38	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-3
284	6509	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	CodeNEXT should not add the unnecessary requirement that there must be an application and director or building official approval for changes to nonconforming signs, even if the changes would not increase the degree of nonconformity. This change would add unnecessary administrative burdens to target nonconforming signs and to accelerate their dismantling.	41	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-4
285	6508	Signs	M. King	CodeNEXT should not eliminate the existing provision that ♦the face♦ of the sign may be changed. In addition, CodeNEXT should not replace that provision with one that provides that only the ♦advertising copy♦ may be changed. Compare ♦ 25-10-152(B)(1) to 23-8B-4010(B)(3). This change is unnecessary and overly restrictive.	41	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-4
286	6515	Signs	M. King	CodeNEXT should not add the onerous and unnecessary requirement for an independent third-party appraisal to determine the estimated cost to repair a damaged sign, per 23-8B-4010(E)(1). In addition, the provision fails to specify who would select and pay for an independent third party appraiser, or the criteria by which the appraiser would be selected. If the City paid for the appraisal, this could improperly influence the findings of the appraiser, and so the City should not pay for the appraisal, nor should the sign owner have to bear the cost of additional, unnecessary, and cumbersome regulations.	41	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-4
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
287	6369	Signs	Joyce Statz	This seems like a strange condition for allowing the sign to remain. is there ample justification for keeping this in the code?	42	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-4
288	6506	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	CodeNEXT fails to carry forward the current right to appeal to City Council a decision by the Historic Landmark Commission. Compare LDC ♦ 25-10-122(H) to 23-8C-1030. This is important because, per 23-8A(1050)(D)(2), when a sign is in more than one district, a sign application would be reviewed under the Historic Sign District Regulations.	46	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-1
289	6370	Error	Joyce Statz	throughout this section, replace "lessor" by "lesser" ["lessor" refers to someone who leases a property, while "lesser" is used for comparisons	48	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-1
290	6507	Signs	M. King	The Signage chapter should not create the ♦Pedestrian Oriented Sign Overlay,♦ as proposed by Section 23-8C-1110. The Pedestrian Overlay, in which freestanding signs would be prohibited, would problematically and broadly apply to many roadways to which relocation would be appropriate, including on parts of the I-35 frontage road. In addition, it is important to note that even if the relocation provision were in the Signage chapter, the Pedestrian Overlay would greatly undermine the relocation policy.	54	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-1
291	6371	Error	Joyce Statz	remove "less than"	57	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-2
292	6372	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Signs	Joyce Statz	What is this saying? clarify the wording Note: this phrasing appears in other sign types, as well - fix there, too, please	58	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-2
293	6373	Error	Joyce Statz	missing word "department"	70	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-3
294	6505	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	CodeNEXT should not eliminate the Board of Adjustment♦s power to approve variances for off-premise signs, as indicated by Section 23-8D-2010(A).	79	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8D-2
295	6386	Error	Joyce Statz	typo that appears in several parts of this chapter - fix..	7	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-TOC
296	6342	Error	mariochampion	minor typo -- "transporatation"	10	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-1
297	6341	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	mariochampion	the meaning 23-9A-1020 is not clear. it sounds like ATD director is in charge of implementation no matter what, altho the city manager can "delegate" functions to other departments, which can then... um, delegate some more? or is it that the other depts, once delegated by the city manager, can IMPLEMENT the functions in this delegated subsection?	10	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-1
298	6387	Error	Joyce Statz	typo - improvelments	11	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-1
299	6388	Error	Joyce Statz	grammar issue - "mitigate" should be "mitigates"	11	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-1
300	6389	Definition or Measurement	Joyce Statz	the terms "arterial" and "collector" need to be defined	11	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-1
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
301	6344	Process (Administrative) Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	mariochampion	it would be great if the reason(s) for granting a variance were a required disclosure, not just "ATD has approved a variance...", as challenges to the variance being granted (or not being granted) would be more efficient.	18	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9B-1
302	6345	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Transportation and Mobility	mariochampion	<p>there is a mismatch between "proposed" development plans and "approved" transportation, collector, capital improvement plans.</p> <p>specifically, there are several plans which are just shy of approved, such as project connect, asmp, and 2016 mobility bond programs/projects which depend on dedicated right of way for meaningful success.</p> <p>if these plans are not approved YET, and a development gets a variance to NOT dedicate ROW, thus hobbling if not crippling nascent hi-cap transit plans, there is a mismatch between the value and priority of private developer plans over voter and city-led plans.</p> <p>i suggest working language into this section which values and prioritizes city transit plans which are in full development and realistic. city plans shouldnt have be in final detailed punchlists to be an equal partners in shaping the city.</p>	21	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9B-2
303	6390	Transportation and Mobility	Joyce Statz	Why should these conditions be different than the criteria for Comprehensive Transportation Review (1000 trips)? This creates loopholes we don't need! Change this 2000 to 1000	32	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9C-1
304	6343	Transportation and Mobility	mariochampion	<p>i very much like the integration of TDM into TIA, especially with concern to "active modes analysis."</p> <p>and in fact i would love to see a cultural shift at ATD and planning that replaces TIAs and their single occupancy vehicle level of service concerns as the primary measure of transit impact.</p> <p>walkability, contribution to compact and connectedness, safe biking routes lead to grocery stores and corner bodegas that reduce SOV traffic because folks can walk or bike for bananas and milk, etc... those are measures we leave behind now, but will get us closer to imagine austin goals.</p>	33	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9C-2
305	6391	Transportation and Mobility	Joyce Statz	What was the source of this? Are we ever going to see TIA's for the really intensive developments - and will we see improvements? This looks totally wrong.	35	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9C-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
306	6346	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling AHBP Transportation and Mobility	mariochampion	1. these staggered tiers of reduction seem odd. why 10-20%, or 50%, or 100% reduction, and not just percentage reduction equal to percentage "reasonably-priced" ? the leap from 20 to 50 will reward and incentivize developers to get as close to 21% as possible -- unless i am misunderstanding this. 2. where is the definition of "reasonably priced"? why not use affordable as relates to MFI (or some other standard measure?)	45	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9D-2
307	6392	Error	Joyce Statz	Do you really mean "each end" or just "one end?" For a block that's 800 feet long for example, are there two trail easements required, so there's one within 300 feet of "each end?"	75	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9F-3
308	6393	Error	Joyce Statz	incorrect word - "justify" should be "justifies"	76	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9F-3
309	6384	Process (Administrative) Flooding, Stormwater, Water Quality	k2018	Why are residents in new neighborhoods with vested rights paying drainage fees to improve other parts of the City? If residents are not protected or benefiting from these programs then they do not need to be paying additional fees. These fees are ridiculous anyways because tax dollars should be used to clean the city and protect waterways. Developers are able to build however they like and damage the environment. Austin just turns around and charges residents while calling the area affordable housing.	6	Chapter-23-10--Infrastructure.pdf	23-10-TOC
310	4164	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Erin Wood	These standards were included under "Applicability" in 23-3D. Make consistent?	77	Chapter-23-10--Infrastructure.pdf	23-10E-1
311	4163	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Erin Wood	Omission. Staff from WPD, ATD, and PWD agreed to add an exception for roadway projects. Please insert this language included in Law's draft: (C) Impervious cover associated with City roadway projects is not considered in determining compliance with Subsection (A)(5)(b)	81	Chapter-23-10--Infrastructure.pdf	23-10E-3
312	6257	Definition or Measurement	JPRatx	There is not a definition of "Attic" . There is much confusion with plan reviewers as to what constitutes an "Attic"	7	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
313	6349	Definition or Measurement Error	Joyce Statz	typo on Hays County - fix	9	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
314	6313	Definition or Measurement Site Development Standards	achen	If someone is making a natural surface trail is that development or not? It is disturbing the surface/subsurface, but not in preparation for any of the listed activities. Is making a natural surface trail landscaping?	14	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
315	6307	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Building Form or Design Standards	schorre	It would be beneficial here to add a second diagram showing a structure on a slope to clarify how height is measured	21	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
316	6254	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	chris allen	The "Top Plate" in this illustration appears to be a piece of window trim. Even when illustrated correctly, Top Plate in general may lead us to the same sort of loophole/ambiguity issues we have with our current code. There are lots of ways to not have a "top plate" in a building wall, for instance...	21	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
317	6314	Impervious or Building Cover	achen	city departments have been ruling natural surface trails to be impervious cover(which is a stretch) are natural surface trails impervious cover? Can they be explicitly excluded?	22	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
318	6268	ADU Preservation Definition or Measurement	chris allen	Need a definition of "Preservation" or "Preserved" here for ADU preservation incentive to limit abuse.	30	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
319	6302	Building Form or Design Standards Definition or Measurement	chris allen	Definition of "Spire" here. (Spires are allowed a 30 percent increase in height over the Max. allowable.	35	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
320	6318	Definition or Measurement	achen	what is the definition of an improvement? What is the definition of attached? Are multi use trails structures?	36	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
321	6351	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Definition or Measurement	Joyce Statz	item needs to be moved; out of alpha order	37	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
322	6350	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Definition or Measurement	Joyce Statz	Term is out of alpha order - needs to be moved	38	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
(Empty) OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
1	6452		Allandale Neighbor Comments		31	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-1
ADU OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
2	6220	ADU	matthews789	CodeNext needs to address ADU garage space (unfinished space) vs. livable space. Since an ADU garage is most likely used by the single-family home in this zone, it shouldn't count towards max ADU sf. What difference does it make if the garage is attached to the single-family vs. the ADU? It's still taking up the same amount of space.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
3	6217	ADU	Tstowell	This tiered ADU sizing is totally uncalled for and moving in the WRONG direction, overriding what council enacted only a couple years ago allowing 1,100sf. Why make it more difficult? Why jeopardize more family-friendly ADU construction? Especially if someone preserves a small old front house, why not allow a full 1,100sf in the back? ADU's are difficult enough to make pencil out already, we need to be increasing flexibility and viability, not restricting and constraining.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
4	6219	ADU	matthews789	Does garage space counts towards the max ADU sf? For example, my neighborhood has alleys, so most garages are detached and off of the alley. If garage space counts toward max ADU sf, then the ADU is effectively useless considering a 2 car garage is ~550 square feet.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
5	6310	ADU	wayne	Why not include ADUs in an overall FAR calculation? Why separate it out? This seems overly prescriptive.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
6	6202	ADU	sc1366	Why would the code decrease the average home owners ability to build an ADU already allowed under the current code. This is moving the wrong direction. Should be increased to 1200 SF	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
7	6189	ADU	Farmer	Is this really necessary? Let the ADU's act as detached duplexes if they want to.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
8	6205	ADU	Pete	There should be an option to put two units in the ADU and have the primary structure a single family structure. Some people may want to live in a single family home instead of a duplex. It would also allow for smaller units in the ADU that would be more affordable. Again, all forms of 3 units should be allowed in the 3 unit zone.	94	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
9	6530	ADU	campsc18	Reference to second floor leaves open the question of what about a first floor. Surely ADUs are not just on second floors.	57	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
ADU Definition or M OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
10	6268	ADU Preservation Definition or Measurement	chris allen	Need a definition of "Preservation" or "Preserved" here for ADU preservation incentive to limit abuse.	30	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
ADU Impervious or.. TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
11	6433	Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ZATX	If this is on an alley, why should it matter whether this is a duplex or ADU and why limit height? People can get creative and use less impervious coverage to retain green space. This seems at odds with good design.	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
ADU Impervious or.. TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
12	6238	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	112	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
13	6239	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	118	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
14	6240	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	138	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
15	6241	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	150	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
16	6242	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	156	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
17	6243	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	204	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
18	6244	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	210	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
19	6245	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	216	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
20	6246	Preservation Impervious or Building Cover ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	222	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
ADU Lot Size and In TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
21	6222	Lot Size and Intensity ADU	Pete	You can't have an ADU on lots less than 3,500 and so, you couldn't split a standard lot under 7,000 sqft into 2 and also have ADUs.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
22	6203	Lot Size and Intensity ADU	Pete	The minimum lot size to build an ADU should be brought down to 2500 sqft.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
23	6216	Lot Size and Intensity ADU	Tstowell	Reduce this down to 2,500sf to match the SF-attached allowed use. No reason to disallow ADU's on lots between 2,500<3,500sf if they with FAR, imp. cover, setbacks, etc.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
24	6261	Lot Size and Intensity ADU	Matthew McEvoy	Overall, this rewrite really keeps the water muddy. Just standardize everything (ADU size) and let impervious coverage and FAR limits act as the backstop on overbuilding. Example, small older house on front of lot on alley. Let owner build up to max SFR size in back. Front house is 'ADU.' Back house is main. Preserving the bungalow, street character.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
ADU Lot Size and In		OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
25	6333	Zones (Generally) Lot Size and Intensity ADU	ssimpson	Failure to address needs for incrementally added density. Accessory dwelling units should be allowed by right on ALL properties, regardless of primary building type.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
ADU Neighborhood.		OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
26	6272	Neighborhood Plans, Character ADU	pilivelez	Do you still have to comply with Neighborhood Plans? Travis Heights does not allow for ADU in the front on the lot. They City will require a variance(fee of \$1,700) to "leave" our 85 year old house . Basically, encoring us to demolish it.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
ADU Parking		OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
27	6486	ADU Parking	Allandale Neighbor Comments	ADUs allow 3 unrelated adults and it is incomprehensible that none of these adults would require parking.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
28	6531	Parking ADU	ernest	Accessory Dwelling Units must have at least one parking space on the property.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
ADU Preservation		OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
29	6229	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	46	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
30	6230	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	52	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
31	6231	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
32	6434	ADU Preservation	ZATX	Does this prohibit additions to the preserved structure? Why limit this to ADU? If someone has a 1200 front house and decides to preserve it they could still build in rear with duplex use, does electing the preserved house as ADU limit its size increases? Say there is an existing 600 sqft front bungalow and someone wanted to add to it as a duplex why should it count against FAR? Just pick an FAR and stick with it. If people will be building up to on average (1200 preserved + 2300 new) 3500 sq ft then just set the new max to .7 FAR and let people do what they please. If there is an incentive to keep a house built in 2008 and allow someone to build an additional 2300 sq ft this is a silly way to right a code.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
33	6232	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	76	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
34	6233	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	82	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
35	6234	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	88	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
36	6235	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	94	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
37	6236	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	100	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
38	6237	Preservation ADU	ijboomtube@gmail.com	To make this work as a preservation incentive, the ADU should also not count against impervious or building coverage.	106	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
ADU Site Development TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
39	6298	Site Development Standards ADU	schorre	I believe this should be reduced to 20' to allow more room for the addition of ADUs in back yard. 5' may not seem like much, but it makes a big difference on smaller city lots. More room for back yard ADUs = more affordable housing.	107	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
ADU Site Development TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
40	6380	Zones (Generally) Site Development Standards ADU	schorre	Why make this more complicated than it needs to be? Just set the max size of an ADU to 0.15 FAR with a max size of 1,100 SF?	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
ADU Uses OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
41	6319	Uses ADU	ChrisBBradford	What does "Single-Family Attached" mean? It needs to be a defined use. Does it mean a SF home with an attached accessory dwelling unit? If so, does this mean an attached ADU is allowed on lots with 2,500 sf but a detached ADU requires a 3,500 sf lot? We shouldn't have to guess about these things.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
42	6320	ADU Uses	ChrisBBradford	If this isn't a reference to an ADU, what's the difference between Single Family Attached and Duplex?	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
ADU Uses Zones.(f OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
43	6478	Uses ADU Zones (Generally)	Allandale Neighbor Comments	R1 zones only allow ADU when density bonus included so this should not show as permitted outright.	9	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Affordable Housing (C OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
44	6414	Affordable Housing (Generally)	zoethecat	This category only allows single family homes so how can there be a density bonus program?	28	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Affordable Housing (C OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
45	6262	Building Form or Design Standards Site Development Standards Affordable Housing (Generally)	BeeGee	Is there an affordable housing height bonus >35' allowing a fourth story in this zoning? If not, it is difficult to take advantage of the affordable bonus units/FAR on infill properties because of setbacks.	140	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
Affordable Housing (C OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
46	6291	Affordable Housing (Generally) Other	robertmfostr	Great move!	143	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-5
Affordable Housing (C OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
47	6354	Site Development Standards Affordable Housing (Generally)	chris allen	This would add a significant new cost for small projects. It also appears to apply to remodels that are >300 s.f., even if they are interior-only, or not on the ground level- meaning no impact on existing drainage. The Intentions behind this provision are good, but this is just making small projects for homeowners more expensive. This might be more reasonable if the square footage was raised to 500-800 s.f. of NEW space on the ground floor.	20	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2A-3
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
AHBP							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
48	6281	AHBP	robertmfostr	Wait, should this not say 30,000 SF? If we are getting the 10k bonus SF with the additional units, I don't know why it would still be 20k?	109	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-1
AHBP Other							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
49	6280	AHBP Other	robertmfostr	Thanks! This is a national best practice, glad to see it in the code	106	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-1
AHBP Phrasing, Plac							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
50	6279	AHBP Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	robertmfostr	This chart 100% needs to be here. Or at least in the document at all.	106	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-1
51	6278	AHBP Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	robertmfostr	Unless there is an existing affordability program that we do not want to effect, I see no reason to have this provision. It would be difficult to implement with all the other conditions of F25 but we are not paying y'all to do easy tasks.	106	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-1
AHBP Phrasing, Plac							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
52	6346	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling AHBP Transportation and Mobility	mariochampion	1. these staggered tiers of reduction seem odd. why 10-20%, or 50%, or 100% reduction, and not just percentage reduction equal to percentage "reasonably-priced" ? the leap from 20 to 50 will reward and incentivize developers to get as close to 21% as possible -- unless i am misunderstanding this. 2. where is the definition of "reasonably priced"? why not use affordable as relates to MFI (or some other standard measure?)	45	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9D-2
Building Form or Desi							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
53	6300	Building Form or Design Standards	chris allen	If this is correct (see comment above)- it would appear that "Snout houses" are discouraged, unless a small lot is created from a larger one. That's adding insult to injury, IMHO...	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
54	6413	Building Form or Design Standards	zoethecat	This clause and the previous clause start with "If the parking structure is less than 20 feet behind the building facade." One of the two must be wrong.	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
55	6208	Building Form or Design Standards	Witt Featherston	Ugly and dumb. McMansion ordinance is a complete failure. We should retire these "articulations", and let the ones that do exist serve as reminders of how ridiculous and counter productive a form-based code can be. A form-based code can work, but not like this.	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
56	6337			There is no need to define a top plate height. One maximum building height would suffice. By defining both you are dictating design style.			23-4D-2
57	6297	Building Form or Design Standards	schorre	This is an excellent change but needs to be clarified as driveways get closer to garages.	109	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
58	6379	Building Form or Design Standards	CittaLente	1. Mandate that no more than 150' of building frontage may appear to have been designed by a single architect. 2. Enact active facade requirements (regular doors, windows, and awnings; facade relief; etc). These will save the street from the dullness that arise from large buildings and/or blank walls.	265	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
59	6305	Building Form or Design Standards	Jolinda Marshall	suggest listing compatibility effects to be considered to focus options.	279	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
60	6306	Building Form or Design Standards	Jolinda Marshall	suggest reducing required articulation, 1-2 sides.	281	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
61	6187	Building Form or Design Standards	Farmer	45' does not make sense. At 50' (which is current code for many of these lots) we can build 4 stories. 45' limits us to three stories. Surely 5' more height would not ruin the character of these transit corridors. Really they should allow for 5 or 6 stories given that they are along the Imagine Austin transit corridors where the stated goal is to increase density, not decrease it!	300	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
62	6277	Building Form or Design Standards	chris allen	6' separation triggers issues with IRC (building code) R302.1, relating to fire protection for buildings that are build in close proximity. Design and construction get complicated and costly at this separation distance. Has this been vetted by Permit/Inspection team or architects/builders? At a minimum, it may merit adding a note to this section that points out that buildings closer than 10 will have to comply with local amendments to IRC R302.1.	57	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
Building Form or Design Standards		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
63	6492	Definition or Measurement Building Form or Design Standards	lpodgore	Fully agree, code needs details and specifics. Code needs specifics to avoid loopholes.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
64	6302	Building Form or Design Standards Definition or Measurement	chris allen	Definition of "Spire" here. (Spires are allowed a 30 percent increase in height over the Max. allowable.	35	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
Building Form or Design Standards		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
65	6301	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Building Form or Design Standards	chris allen	Is this diagram (and all others illustrating Height) misleading? In each of the diagrams, they show the max height line at the top of a parapet. Under 23-4E-7050 (Encroachments Above Maximum Height), parapets are permitted to exceed the max. ht. by 15%. At 85', that's 12'-9" of parapet or nearly 98 feet overall height.	318	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
66	6307	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Building Form or Design Standards	schorre	It would be beneficial here to add a second diagram showing a structure on a slope to clarify how height is measured	21	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements	23-13A-1
Building Form or Design Standards TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
67	6382	Building Form or Design Standards Site Development Standards	schorre	This seems crazy. There are many sloping lots that necessitate the placement of a porch that may be more than 3' above grade. Is this a solution in search of a problem?	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Building Form or Design Standards TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
68	6339	Building Form or Design Standards Zones (Generally)	chris allen	Seems like this district allows "dooryard" frontage, which implies that residential use is permitted on the ground floor. The Purpose paragraph may be switched with the one from MS3B, which describes active and residential frontages. FWIW, it's really challenging to identify the differences between the districts; a more descriptive sub-title would likely help in this regard.	309	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
Definition or Measurement TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
69	6429	Definition or Measurement	Allan McMurtry	F-1-d A reapplication should be at least 2 years	61	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
70	6432	Definition or Measurement	Allan McMurtry	Define affordable	61	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
71	6284	Definition or Measurement	BradP	Where is the definition of Single Family Attached. Also, your search box above will not accept Single Family Attached. Also when search terms are entered, it is not readily apparent how to scroll through multiple results to the search term. All of this seems intention to make it hard to find things in this code.	72	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2F-2
72	6247	Definition or Measurement	alandalehalter@gmail.com	Where is keystone tree defined? Is it just defined by its size or does this mean more? Would be nice to have a clear definition in the glossary of terms for more clarification.	30	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3C-1
73	6456	Definition or Measurement	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Large sites is a new term and needs to be defined in 23-2M-1030 Terms.	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
74	6273	Definition or Measurement	chris allen	"Front Yard" needs a definition	67	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
75	6295			How will overall height be measured on homes on sloping lots? Averaging low and high points?			23-4D-2
76	6389	Definition or Measurement	Joyce Statz	the terms "arterial" and "collector" need to be defined	11	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-1
77	6257	Definition or Measurement	JPRatx	There is not a definition of "Attic" . There is much confusion with plan reviewers as to what constitutes an "Attic"	7	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurement	23-13A-1
78	6318	Definition or Measurement	achen	what is the definition of an improvement? What is the definition of attached? Are multi use trails structures?	36	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurement	23-13A-1
Definition or Measurement		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
79	6349	Definition or Measurement Error	Joyce Statz	typo on Hays County - fix	9	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurement	23-13A-1
Definition or Measurement		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
80	6351	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Definition or Measurement	Joyce Statz	item needs to be moved; out of alpha order	37	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurement	23-13A-1
81	6350	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Definition or Measurement	Joyce Statz	Term is out of alpha order - needs to be moved	38	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurement	23-13A-1
Definition or Measurement		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
82	6271	Definition or Measurement Height	chris allen	What exactly is a "top plate"? It's not defined in the code, and this could open up some interesting workarounds with walls that have no plate at all.	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Definition or Measurement		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
83	6270	Lot Size and Intensity Definition or Measurement	chris allen	Single-Family Attached needs clarification. Under current LDC, it's a little-used and confusing use. We need to understand how widespread this use might become and how many demolitions it will trigger. This contradicts the consultant/staff's pitch that the district names tell you how many units are permitted on a given lot (R2 = 2 units, for instance).	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
84	6287	Lot Size and Intensity Definition or Measurement	BradP	Single Family Attached needs to be better explained. It was hard to search for and find the basic definition of it, which does not fully explain it. Does this mean R2A, R2B, R2C lots could be subdivided down to 2,500 sf lots if Single Family Attached structures are used?	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Definition or Measure TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
85	6285	Lot Size and Intensity Zones (Generally) Definition or Measurement	BradP	Single Family Attached needs to be better explained. It was hard to search for and find the basic definition of it, which does not fully explain it. Does this mean R2A, R2B, R2C lots could be subdivided down to 2,500 sf lots if Single Family Attached structures are used?	52	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
86	6286	Definition or Measurement Zones (Generally) Lot Size and Intensity	BradP	Single Family Attached needs to be better explained. It was hard to search for and find the basic definition of it, which does not fully explain it. Does this mean R2A, R2B, R2C lots could be subdivided down to 2,500 sf lots if Single Family Attached structures are used?	58	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Definition or Measure TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
87	6459	Definition or Measurement Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	COMMON OPEN SPACE is defined in 23-13A-1 pg. 21as A privately-owned outdoor or unenclosed area intended for use by the residents, employees, or visitors to a development. This means Common Open Space is not for public use but rather restricted to use of those within development or their visitors. However, this section has design criteria seem to provide for public use. Is definition accurate?	58	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
88	6461	Definition or Measurement Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	States that site partially complies when site provides Civic Open Space or Dedicated Parkland. What does partially comply mean?	58	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
Definition or Measure TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
89	6294	Definition or Measurement Preservation	schorre	This seems silly. Who is going to tear down a house less than 10 years old? This "at least 10 years old" language is not needed. Also, is "preserved" clarified somewhere? I've seen many "remodels" where one wall is left standing and rest of structure is torn down and rebuilt.	106	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Definition or Measure TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
90	6421	Site Development Standards Definition or Measurement	chris allen	FAR is defined as Gross Floor Area / Lot area. Gross Floor Area exempts Attic, Basement, Porch, Stoop, Stories below grade, parking facilities. None of the above is defined in the code, so the effective FAR could be massive. On a 7,000 s.f. lot, Building Cover would be appear to be the de facto limiting factor, resulting in homes ranging from 8,400 s.f. to 11,200 s.f. Under the current McMansion rules, the max square footage on a 7,000 s.f. lot would be roughly 3,500 s.f., using the exemptions built into the code. Suggest that this needs a lot of work before it's released into the wild.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
91	6313	Definition or Measurement Site Development Standards	achen	If someone is making a natural surface trail is that development or not? It is disturbing the surface/subsurface, but not in preparation for any of the listed activities. Is making a natural surface trail landscaping?	14	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurement	23-13A-1
Definition or Measure TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
92	6451	Definition or Measurement Uses	gmaksym	I'm confused. Under section 23-4D-2030(B), R2C Properties and all R2 Properties are listed under (7) Retail states that "No Retail uses allowed". There is no indication that a Minor Use Permit can raise that prohibition. Yet here in 23-4E-6200(F), it suggests a Minor Use Permit can allow "limited sales of merchandise". Also, what do you mean by "limited sales"? What limits are placed on the sales?? Who decides what the limits are??	77	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
Demolition Process TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
93	6420	Demolition Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	what would this mean for the 9th street redevelopment caught in the quagmire of requiring a demolition permit on all properties to avoid the expense of a building permit application requirement for partial demolition expressly sought but in an area of recent historic district application as it comes before the Historic Commission?. How would this or other areas of CodeNext fix the problem and provide protection for historic areas?	41	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-3
Environment (Genera TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
94	6374	Other Environment (Generally)	RioGTomlin	Thank you for not restricting building a single-family, duplex, or ADU on a privately owned lot within the waterfront districts. I believe the original intent of these overlays was to restrict commercial and industrial development along the waterfront, and this provision is in line with that vision.	38	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 9	23-4D-9
Environment (Genera TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
95	6442	Review Authority Environment (Generally) Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	Seems odd that somebody other than Parks would be in charge of Parks. The City Manager can personally intervene, under his name, but delegating Parks jurisdiction to say transportation of public Works doesn't make sense. Eliminate the delegation.	16	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
Error		OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
96	6395	Error	Joyce Statz	typo - "side" should be "site"	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
97	6400	Error	Joyce Statz	"om?" something missing here	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
98	6403	Error	Joyce Statz	extra "the" here	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
99	6484	Error	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Subsection (2) includes only definitions - not sure does not apply to lots 30 ft. or less.	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
100	6336	Error	David Carroll	These are mixed up	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
101	6407	Error	Joyce Statz	extra "the"	128	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
102	6408	Error	Joyce Statz	drop the "shall"	177	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-3
103	6323	Error	Tstowell	This should say additional "Height", not "FAR".	333	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-6
104	6410	Error	David Carroll	It should read 5:12 slope	120	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-8
105	6356	Error	Joyce Statz	typo - "wave" should be "waive"	19	Chapter-23-6--Site-Plan.pdf	23-6B-2
106	6415	Error	leesimmons	Delete semicolon, add colon.	31	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-1
107	6360	Error	Joyce Statz	typo for "gases"	17	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-1
108	6364	Error	Joyce Statz	missing word "to" or "with"	22	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-2
109	6365	Error	Joyce Statz	should be singular "sign"	27	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-1
110	6366	Error	Joyce Statz	'the' isn't correct here... do you mean "that?"	27	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-1
111	6370	Error	Joyce Statz	throughout this section, replace "lessor" by "lesser" ["lessor" refers to someone who leases a property, while "lesser" is used for comparisons	48	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-1
112	6371	Error	Joyce Statz	remove "less than"	57	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-2
113	6373	Error	Joyce Statz	missing word "department"	70	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-3
114	6386	Error	Joyce Statz	typo that appears in several parts of this chapter - fix..	7	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-TOC
115	6342	Error	mariochampion	minor typo -- "transporatation"	10	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-1
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
116	6387			typo - improvelments			23-9A-1
117	6388	Error	Joyce Statz	grammar issue - "mitigate" should be "mitigates"	11	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-1
118	6392	Error	Joyce Statz	Do you really mean "each end" or just "one end?" For a block that's 800 feet long for example, are there two trail easements required, so there's one within 300 feet of "each end?"	75	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9F-3
119	6393	Error	Joyce Statz	incorrect word - "justify" should be "justifies"	76	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9F-3
Error Other							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
120	6399	Other Error	Joyce Statz	a quarter of what?	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
Error Parks, Open.S							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
121	6491	Error Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	23-4C-1030 states that it is for sites 1 acre or larger. Change through code.	56	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Error Phrasing, Plac							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
122	6308	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	typo... missing "and" with "Zoning Platting Commission"	28	Chapter-23-1--Introduction.pdf	23-1B-2
123	6292	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	dkfoster	Add, "is required."	21	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2A-3
124	6398	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Error	Joyce Statz	fix "measures" to "measure"	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
125	6402	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	This table has no label, and it has no legend. Add those.	9	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
126	6299	Error Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	chris allen	Looks like there are some editing issues with this section. It's not clear what the writers were trying to say. (c) ends with "or", but there's no following text, for example.	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
127	6357	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Error	Joyce Statz	Is it 45 years or 50 years that will be used throughout? Intro section speaks to 45	10	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7A-1
128	6359	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Error	Joyce Statz	need to indent here... sub-bullets follow	9	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-1
Error Reference							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
129	6352	Reference Error	Joyce Statz	section title has changed; need to fix this reference	35	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3C-3
130	6353	Error Reference	Joyce Statz	Renumbering needed? several sections appear to have been removed	36	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3C-3
131	6324	Error Reference	Tstowell	Incorrect reference. Downtown Plan Overlay Zone is 23-4D-9080.	335	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-6
132	6368	Reference Error	Joyce Statz	reference needs to be updated?	38	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-3
Flooding, Stormwater TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
133	6312	Flooding, Stormwater, Water Quality	Icoker	I second this. At my address corner of Springfield Dr and Colton Bluff Springs there is nearly a quarter on an acre of compacted rock directly in the floodplain and leading into Marble Creek Greenbelt. This area floods many times a year and these rocks will definitely do some damage. There has been no permit issued or even a review.	56	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-3
Flooding, Stormwater TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
134	6198	Flooding, Stormwater, Water Quality Impervious or Building Cover	Farmer	Impervious cover is a blunt tool. There are plenty of developments that cover entire yards with compacted gravel and have much runoff. I propose an alternative compliance method: If a licensed engineer provides drawings showing that the surface flow of a given rain event, say a 50 year storm or whatever threshold you deem worthy, is decreased by at least 10 % (or again whatever threshold you deem worthy) beyond the runoff of the max impervious cover allowed by zoning, then the property can go over the impervious cover limit. This would be accomplished through rainwater harvesting, raingardens, etc. It would encourage creative and progressive water control methods and decrease runoff/storm water infrastructure needs while increasing percolation and allowing for more density.	56	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-3
Flooding, Stormwater TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
135	6384	Process (Administrative) Flooding, Stormwater, Water Quality	k2018	Why are residents in new neighborhoods with vested rights paying drainage fees to improve other parts of the City? If residents are not protected or benefiting from these programs then they do not need to be paying additional fees. These fees are ridiculous anyways because tax dollars should be used to clean the city and protect waterways. Developers are able to build however they like and damage the environment. Austin just turns around and charges residents while calling the area affordable housing.	6	Chapter-23-10--Infrastructure.pdf	23-10-TOC
Impervious or Buildin TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
136	6193	Impervious or Building Cover	Farmer	Building Coverage in unnecessary. FAR and Impervious cover already limit development, get rid of one of the three and let the other two control.	67	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
137	6314	Impervious or Building Cover	achen	city departments have been ruling natural surface trails to be impervious cover(which is a stretch) are natural surface trails impervious cover? Can they be explicitly excluded?	22	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements.pdf D 1-8	23-13A-1
Impervious or Building Cover		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
138	6211	Lot Size and Intensity Impervious or Building Cover	Witt Featherston	Why is this a metric? Aren't you trying to simplify the code? You already have FAR and impervious, so why is this a thing?	67	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Impervious or Building Cover		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
139	6296	Impervious or Building Cover Site Development Standards Zones (Generally)	schorre	It will be very difficult to built multi-family uses with an allowable FAR of 0.6 with impervious cover limits of only 45%. Under MF-4 zoning, this limit was much higher. I believe an acceptable compromise for multifamily impervious should be around 55% to find a balance between greenery preservation and density. Otherwise, all structures built on R4A zoned lots are nearly guaranteed to be three stories.	109	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Lot Size and Intensity		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
140	6218	Lot Size and Intensity	matthews789	Single-Family Attached is defined as a 25' lot 2,500 sq ft min. Since most lots in R2C are at least 50' wide, does this mean a developer could legally split the lot into two lots and build two Single-Family Attached - each with an ADU? They would effectively be squeezing four units onto one lot (split into two lots)? If so, seems sneaky...	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
141	6225	Lot Size and Intensity	matthews789	Lots in my neighborhood are 50x140 = 7,000 sf, which is why I'm asking. So is that a yes then?	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
142	6260	Lot Size and Intensity	Matthew McEvoy	Legit question. Yes, looks like on a 7,000sf lot you could have duplex (aka single family attached) and ADU for each side of duplex..	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
143	6223	Lot Size and Intensity	Pete	"Single Family" use should be reduced to 25' width and 2,500 sqft minimum lot size. Or a new form should be added with a 25' width and 2,500 sqft minimum lot size called "Single-Family Small Lot." If the ADU min lot size is kept at 3,500 sqft, that would still prevent current lots from having more than 2 units. If you can have two units attached, why not unattached on separate lots? Both attached and detached forms should be allowed.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
144	6259	Lot Size and Intensity	Matthew McEvoy	Where is the provision to codify standards for small lots? People have been paying property taxes for decades on legal long platted lots that only through the stroke of a pen at city hall (McMansion) have now made modifications or rebuilding on the lots extremely tedious, expensive or impossible. The last code next draft let smaller then 5,000sf lots use 'cottage' standards. Please codify zoning for all legal platted lots regardless of size in entire city.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
145	6252	Lot Size and Intensity	Witt Featherston	Your comment bubble makes it look like minimum area is now 15,000SF, which given how wrongheaded draft3 is, didn't actually surprise me. Glad to figure out it's actually 5k	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
146	6209	Lot Size and Intensity	Witt Featherston	You have to have depth and length switched, right???	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
147	6213	Lot Size and Intensity	Witt Featherston	Why?? There are already plenty of other metrics dictating intensity of development (FAR, Impervious Cover, AND Building Coverage. Why not let them do their job without getting down to this level of oppression? Wasn't CodeNext supposed to be simpler??	70	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Mapping OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
148	6347	Mapping	k2018	Why is affordable housing only being pushed for East Austin? Particularly South East Austin (the un trendy East Austin) West Austin gets big yards, maintained roads, and water ways. East gets developers operating on regulations from the 80s because they paid off politicians. Code next is a joke.	121	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3E-2
149	6331	Mapping	dendres1	901 W 31ST ST. IS A HISTORIC LANDMARK RESIDENCE IN THE MIDDLE OF A HISTORIC DISTRICT NEIGHBORHOOD AND YOU HAVE A PROPOSED ZONING OF MAIN STREET 3B. COULD IT BE ANY MORE WRONG?!	6	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4-TOC
150	6210	Mapping	Tstowell	CC and DC cover downtown, but UC-Urban Center is not found in any of the other Imagine Austin Regional Centers that aren't already covered with a unique regulating plan (F-25). Extend UC to other Regional Centers (Highland, et al).	5	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-1
Neighborhood Plans,. OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
151	6338	Parking Neighborhood Plans, Character	David Carroll	This violates neighborhood plans.	67	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Neighborhood Plans,. OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

	#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
	152	6446	Neighborhood Plans, Character Zones (Generally)	Allan McMurtry	This is dead wrong. Character includes lots sizes, deed restrictions, State Statutes, housing types, sizes, and styles, density, street and sidewalk widths, type of and amount of canopy, location of schools, and retail services. These zones do not meet any of these characteristics but are stand alone overlay smeant in whole to terminate the current characteristics in violation of Imagine Austin the comprehensive plan. Saying they will does not make it so.	17	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4A-2
	Nonconforming							
	OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
	153	6412	Nonconforming	zoethecat	<p>This clause appears to make houses in which the front of the garage is forward of the front of the house. This will make a very large number of existing houses non-conforming.</p> <p>In any case, it's a bad idea. Garages close to the street minimize the impervious cover for driveways.</p>	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
	Nonconforming Proc							
	OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
	154	6251	Nonconforming Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	please be specific regarding applicable non-conforming uses to be abandoned by non-conforming parking	92	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2G-2
	Other							
	OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
	155	6317	Other	achen	there is no environmental criteria manual. Is it section 3d?	77	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-5
	156	6424	Other	Janis Smith	I'm trying to navigate to the boat dock section, and when I click on the section, it pops me back to this page. This is incredibly difficult to navigate.	9	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4-TOC
	157	6533	Other	austinscott	Can you add page numbers to the table of contents and a link to the text?	2	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-TOC
	158	6194	Other	Farmer	Yay!	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
	159	6207	Other	Witt Featherston	Complete failure of leadership among staff and consultants. Kowtowing to the gentry fearmongers.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
	160	6191	Other	Farmer	This is good.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
	161	6190	Other	Farmer	Spineless.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
	162	6188	Other	Farmer	Woohoo the one paltry change to SF3 zoning (other than the name). Good thing we spent millions and heaps of time to have one tiny change to our suburban land use code that most downtown neighborhoods are made of.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
	SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
163	6288	Other	BradP	Why are you using new terms that have not been defined. This is not the only such term. This really seems intentionally opaque and like you are trying to hide things. This is Austin, we have months, we will find everything. DO NOT EVEN TRY TO HIDE THINGS.	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
164	6192	Other	Farmer	This note is unnecessary.	67	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
165	6526	Other	Catlin Whittington	This conflicts with existing city code chapter 9-2 and has no place in the land use code.	364	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-7
166	6528	Other	Catlin Whittington	conflicts with existing code 9-2 and has no place in the land use code.	101	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
167	6529	Other	Catlin Whittington	Strike section (C) as it is in conflict with chapter 9-2 of existing code.	101	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
Other	Process (Adm						
TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
168	6249	Process (Administrative) Other	Codecatching	This error might be acceptable but there should be a stiff penalty for errors or they risk becoming standard of practice....another case of "Giving it away!!!"	72	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2F-2
Other	Zones (Gener						
TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
169	6334	Zones (Generally) Other	ssimpson	More building types should be allowed, particularly townhouses.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Parking							
TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
170	6481	Parking	Allandale Neighbor Comments	This conflicts with statements from Planning and Zoning Department that the "market" will determine number of parking spaces and even though minimums are established, developers are allowed to put in as many parking spots as they want.	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
171	6196	Parking	Farmer	Moving in the right direction. How about 1 per unit if no street parking is available within one block. If there is RPP then 0, if within 1/2 mile of Imagine Austin corridor then 0, if corner lot with available street parking, 0.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
172	6483	Parking	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Residential units should maintain 2 parking spot per unit at a minimum in single family residences that do not connect to corridors. Many neighborhoods without connectivity are safe walkable areas where there are not sidewalks. Increased on-street parking in these types of neighborhoods will change the character in that they will no longer be safe walkable streets.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
173	6377	Parking	CittaLente	Eliminate or reduce parking requirements, as many cities have. Alternatively, implement an in-lieu payment system (businesses don't have to provide parking but must pay to provide it somewhere else - see "Walkable City", Speck, p126). There is no scientific evidence for the suggested requirements (eg. 1 parking space per hospital bed). Minimum parking requirements pass on the costs of parking to everyone, whether or not they drive, and replace rational market-based behavior with irrational behavior since the true costs of parking are hidden.	275	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
174	6378	Parking	CittaLente	Add bicycle parking requirements	275	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
175	6494	Parking	jboardman	<p>This mentions "Side Street." Does that mean it does not apply to the rear side of the building (which is what usually faces the houses in the neighborhood)?</p> <p>And does "maintains a pattern of fenestration that is consistent with that of the primary building" mean the parking garage cannot be exposed but rather must appear visually similar to the rest of the building? Not having a bare parking garage facing the neighborhood is a key issue for many people.</p>	313	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
Parking Phrasing, Pl		OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
176	6348	Parking Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	This portion (section B) doesn't make sense as written. Is it trying to say that the parking requirements must be met under conditions 1 and 2 below? That is, the modification to the parking requirements would be denied? The next section (c) speaks to when the parking requirements can be modified.	92	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2G-2
Parking Site Develop		OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
177	6404	Site Development Standards Parking	Joyce Statz	this constraint makes a whole lot of Austin homes non-compliant - what's the point?	18	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
178	6309	Site Development Standards Parking	aaroncleav@gmail.com	In cases where a single or two car carport or garage is not available on-site and parking areas are in the front, rear, or side setback: An exemption should be granted to construct a carport with no side walls with the approval of 80% of property owners on the same street within 300' of the property.	3	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-TOC
179	6309	Site Development Standards Parking	aaroncleav@gmail.com	In cases where a single or two car carport or garage is not available on-site and parking areas are in the front, rear, or side setback: An exemption should be granted to construct a carport with no side walls with the approval of 80% of property owners on the same street within 300' of the property.	3	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-TOC
Parking Uses		OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
180	6485	Uses Parking	Allandale Neighbor Comments	The occupancy limits for residential dwelling units can be from 4-6 unrelated adults. Furthermore, most families have a minimum of two cars. One parking spot per unit is unrealistic and given the limited mass transit options available to most Austinites, it is not the right time to reduce parking requirements, At a minimum, R3and R4 Zones are the only zones that should be allowed reduced parking as they are meant for areas with access to mixed-use and main street zones within walking or biking distance. R1 and R2 Zones are not.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
181	6493	Uses Parking	Tstowell	Have you seen all the R2 that is literally backing up to all the mixed use corridors like Burnet, Lamar, S. 1st, Congress, etc.? Also just because parking isn't required doesn't mean it won't get built - just that it gives folks options.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
182	6276	Parking Uses	chris allen	Question applies to all <2,500 s.f. exemptions: How many can 2,500 s.f. uses can I stack on a given site? Can I have a restaurant, a bar, and an office in the same building with zero parking spaces?	276	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
183	6450	Parking Uses	gmaksym	So does this provision mean a Home Occupation in a Residential neighborhood can generate up to 10 vehicle trips per day?? I have 6 neighbors running a home occupations out of their houses within on block. if they each generate 10 trips a day, that generates 60 trips more on our small streets each day. It also means that those 60 vehicles could park on those streets all day. How does that work??	59	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
184	6449	Parking Uses	gmaksym	Do you really intend to allow a 14,000 lb gross weight truck to park in my neighbor's residence yard. Also, you state that it needs to be screened from the street but not from neighbors - that terrible. Please reduce this provision or remove it.	77	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
Parks, Open Space,.I		OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
185	6439	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	Within 1/5 of a mile. That puts parks where new people are. Assuming Austin took care of past citizens as well as it wants to take care of new citizens, then the park areas need to be accessible and need to originate from the developments themselves.	15	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
186	6440	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	How about putting parks where the new people are? Fails to meet public health and welfare standards	15	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
187	6441	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	People of less means don't deserve parks. What does Fair Housing Standards Act have to say about that? Seems prejudiced to me. Does it to the City? It should, shouldn't it.	15	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
188	6443	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	One or more. Say 15? This is Parks, right? Parks should control Parks. Take out delegation	16	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
189	6315	Parks, Open Space, Trails	achen	all multi use trails should be excluded. why only ones open to the public and located on public land?	56	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-3
190	6316	Parks, Open Space, Trails	achen	hiking trail is not defined anywhere else. This should be natural surface multi-use trail.	77	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-5
191	6457	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	The change from 2 acres to 1 acre trigger will assure we have open spaces as the density increases. However, there may be some confusion as threshold requirements vary for each zone in Article 23-4D: Specific to Zones using Table J-Open Space.	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
192	6458	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	(D) Civic Open Space required for sites > 4 acres. These large thresholds for the addition of open space combined with the lack of large undeveloped tracks of land within the urban core make the thresholds unreasonable and ineffective for meeting the Imagine Austin goals for open space. Recommend that these thresholds be removed and the requirements be established for each zone in Article 23-4D: Specific to Zones using Table J-Open Space. Recommend reducing threshold to 2 acres or more.	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
193	6462	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	If Common Open Space is restricted to residence of a development and their visitors per the definition, it serves a different purpose than those shared by the public (civic and parkland) and should not be used interchangeably.	58	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
194	6460	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	B) Needs to be the same as Section 1010 and specify the range of one to four acres for compliance.	58	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
195	6464	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	What and Where are the requirements for DC Zones?	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
196	6463	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	(C)(5) This is the only section that specified quantity of open space and is poorly written. This needs to be moved to its own section as it does not fit under Location Criteria. Table 23-4D-2130(G) Open Space also includes Common Open Space Requirements. Which requirement takes precedent?	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
197	6487	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Should state "Common open space" so as to not confuse civic open Space requirements.	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
198	6465	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	B)2) Site Plans must include 10% of net developed area (subtract street area) set aside as civic open space. What is the basis for this percentage? 23-3B Parkland Dedication levels are based on number of residence and caps at 15% of gross site area.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
199	6467	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	B)3) exempt sites less than 8 acre and 1/4 mile from existing park. The threshold is too large and will not allow for the code to meet the intent of this section which is to increase the amount of parks and open space from non-residential development. This needs to take into consideration park deficient areas. To align with 4)a) should be worded "and each residential lot is within 1/4 mile" Need to change "park" to "dedicated parkland." How to measure distance of 1/4 mile? The basis for 1/4 mile must defined in terms of connectivity and be safe and walkable. Refer to section Division 23-4E-6: Specific to Use/6240- Multi-Family. If there is not a safe route to the Civic Space, then the exemption should not be allowed.Recommend reducing this to 2 acres.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
200	6466	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	B)3) exempt sites less than 8 acre and 1/4 mile from existing park. The threshold is too large and will not allow for the code to meet the intent of this section which is to increase the amount of parks and open space from non-residential development. This needs to take into consideration park deficient areas. To align with 4)a) should be worded "and each residential lot is within 1/4 mile" Need to change "park" to "dedicated parkland." How to measure distance of 1/4 mile? The basis for 1/4 mile must defined in terms of connectivity and be safe and walkable. Refer to section Division 23-4E-6: Specific to Use/6240- Multi-Family. If there is not a safe route to the Civic Space, then the exemption should not be allowed.Recommend reducing this to 2 acres.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
201	6468	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	The basis for 1/4 mile must defined in terms of connectivity and be safe and walkable. Refer to section Division 23-4E-6: Specific to Use/6240- Multi-Family for example of how to measure 1/4 mile. If there is not a safe route to the Civic Space, then the exemption should not be allowed.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
202	6469	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	The basis for 1/2 mile must defined in terms of connectivity and be safe and walkable. Refer to section Division 23-4E-6: Specific to Use/6240- Multi-Family for example of how to measure 1/2 mile. If there is not a safe route to the Civic Space, then the exemption should not be allowed.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
203	6470	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Reduce threshold from 8 acres to 4 acres.	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
204	6471	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	This would effectively exclude the larger civic open space types, such as much needed Nieghborhood Parks. Also, missing unit of acres after "quarter."	62	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
205	6473	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	C) This section is not clear. Does development have to comply with both and provide separate amounts of land or can one be used for the other. If one can be used to satisfy the other, does one regulation take precedent? Need to be clear when if there are conflicts between the two?	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
206	6474	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	This should be the other way around as Civic Open Space by definition is accessible to the public and common space is not.	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
207	6472	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	The Purpose section must clearly explain why the new land development code includes the two new open space/park requirements, Common and Civic Open Space. In discussions with PARD, Civic Open Space was added to supplement the Parkland Dedication Ordinance in 23-3B required for residential development to increase open space and parkland needed to support non-residential uses. The Common Open Space and Civic Open Space sections of Draft 3 of CodeNext needs to rewritten to clearly explain the purpose and relationship between them and the Parkland Dedication requirements.	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
208	6475	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	This still exempts parking for Civic Open Space for significantly sized public parks up to 5 acres. Should require parking and adopt PARD standards for parking. The parking should only be exempted when there is other public parking included in the development.	69	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
209	6476	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	PARD should have authority to specify type of civic open space within a development based on their data of parkland needs in area?	69	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
210	6477	Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Why were Metropolitan and District Parks were removed from the list types.	70	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
Parks, Open Space,.I TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
211	6444	Process (Administrative) Parks, Open Space, Trails	Allan McMurtry	This reads so much like reverse payola. One pays money not to put in a park. How does that possibly serve the people along a corridor where folks are massing? It DOES NOT.	16	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3B-1
Parks, Open Space,.I TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
212	6282	Transportation and Mobility Parks, Open Space, Trails	Jolinda Marshall	Recommend transit plaza requirement on private property be eliminated. Open space as a default at transit stops separates services, amenities, and people from people riding or waiting for transit. Transit service is dynamic and this requirement does not appropriately serve people accessing transit.	59	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
Phrasing, Placement,.I TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
213	6248	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Codecatching	H2....I am confused...shouldn't it be " the denial of the proposed amendment would xxx (omit "not") jeopardize..."	62	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
214	6438	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Allan McMurtry	Let's put in health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Austin	11	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3A-1
215	6224	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	scott.hiers@austintexas.gov	Delete Drinking Water Protection Zone, Contributing Zone and Water Quality Transitions zone, since CEFs are not likely to occur in these areas or the area within these zone are covered by the remaining triggers; CWQZ, Floodplain, Edwards Aquifer, or 15% slopes	75	Chapter-23-3--General-Planning-Requirements	23-3D-5
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
216	6445	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Allan McMurtry	I think you meant it violates the Comprehensive Plan. If you would, insert that. Thanks.	15	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4A-1
217	6266	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Bobby Levinski	Based on the chart in 23-2I, I believe this provision is meant to say "Land Use Commission" instead of the PC. It would make sense for MUPs to be considered by the LUC with experience approving projects within their delegated areas.	33	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-1
218	6397	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	?? "may not to exceed" - what is intended? "may not be required to exceed" perhaps?	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
219	6401	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	nothing below relates to "and Conflict" so that can be removed	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-2
220	6330	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	chris allen	This section needs illustration (for all chapters). Hard to understand what this is about.	317	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
221	6425	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Janis Smith	How about you put everything for boat docks/shoreline mods in one place. I think that I've covered everything to do with boat dock permitting (?), and I had to look up this section along with 23-4D-2060, 23-4D-9110, 23-3D-8120, 23-4E-6050, 23-6A-2010, and 23-2G. And I still can't find the replacement for the current 25-2-964 section. Thanks.	47	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-5
222	6527	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Catlin Whittington	remove "or play musical instrument" and the same objective is achieved without being so pointedly anti-musician.	98	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
223	6355	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	Why were these values changed? And why are they not highlighted in color?	45	Chapter-23-5--Subdivision.pdf	23-5C-2
224	6417	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	leesimmons	This makes no sense.	43	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-4
225	6418	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	leesimmons	Remove tolling from contents.	45	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-5
226	6419	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	leesimmons	Delete 4-7.	49	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7E-1
227	6358	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	Since this section is almost entirely new text, it should be shown in colored font.	3	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
228	6361	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	this and the next bullet should be indented	19	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-1
229	6362	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	This sentence is redundant and can be removed.	21	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-2
230	6363	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	This seems to be redundant; the prior bullet covers this case.	22	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-2
231	6341	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	mariochampion	the meaning 23-9A-1020 is not clear. it sounds like ATD director is in charge of implementation no matter what, altho the city manager can "delegate" functions to other departments, which can then... um, delegate some more? or is it that the other depts, once delegated by the city manager, can IMPLEMENT the functions in this delegated subsection?	10	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9A-1

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
232	4164	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Erin Wood	These standards were included under "Applicability" in 23-3D. Make consistent?	77	Chapter-23-10--Infrastructure.pdf	23-10E-1
233	4163	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Erin Wood	Omission. Staff from WPD, ATD, and PWD agreed to add an exception for roadway projects. Please insert this language included in Law's draft: (C) Impervious cover associated with City roadway projects is not considered in determining compliance with Subsection (A)(5)(b)	81	Chapter-23-10--Infrastructure.pdf	23-10E-3
234	6254	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	chris allen	The "Top Plate" in this illustration appears to be a piece of window trim. Even when illustrated correctly, Top Plate in general may lead us to the same sort of loophole/ambiguity issues we have with our current code. There are lots of ways to not have a "top plate" in a building wall, for instance...	21	Chapter-23-13--Definitions-and-Measurements.pdf	23-13A-1
Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
235	6416	Preservation Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	leesimmons	Add subsection (B) Unless the building or structure is 45 or more years old, this article does not apply to: (1) Non-contributing properties in local historic districts; and (2) Non-contributing properties in National Register historic districts.	31	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Relocation.pdf	23-7D-1
Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
236	6437	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Process (Administrative)	Allan McMurtry	Strange. Implies that the Code does not consider health, safety, and welfare on a regular basis. One has to ask why only the Director can make this determination when that is the role of the Commissions and Council	74	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures.pdf	23-2F-2
237	6423	Process (Administrative) Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Janis Smith	Where is the section that is now LDC 25-2-964 that covers repairing/rebuilding structures that are damaged? I thought that this document was supposed to have all regulations for certain kinds of structures in one place. The boat dock rules are spread out all over the place, and the search mechanism is cumbersome and inefficient. I look up code multiple times a week, and this document is much more unwieldy and complicated than what we have today.	93	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures.pdf	23-2G-2
238	6385	Process (Administrative) Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Bobby Levinski	Given the history with letters of accommodation, it may be more clear to say, "Except as otherwise provided by the [Land Development Code], the director may not waive or modify applicable regulations or provide relief not required by Chapter 245 . . ."	143	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures.pdf	23-2K-2
239	6344	Process (Administrative) Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	mariochampion	it would be great if the reason(s) for granting a variance were a required disclosure, not just "ATD has approved a variance...", as challenges to the variance being granted (or not being granted) would be more efficient.	18	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9B-1
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
Phrasing, Placement, OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
240	6367	Signs Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling	Joyce Statz	the rest of this sentence needs rework - can't understand what it's saying	38	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-3
241	6372	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Signs	Joyce Statz	What is this saying? clarify the wording Note: this phrasing appears in other sign types, as well - fix there, too, please	58	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-2
Phrasing, Placement, OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
242	6345	Phrasing, Placement, or Labeling Transportation and Mobility	mariochampion	there is a mismatch between "proposed" development plans and "approved" transportation, collector, capital improvement plans. specifically, there are several plans which are just shy of approved, such as project connect, asmp, and 2016 mobility bond programs/projects which depend on dedicated right of way for meaningful success. if these plans are not approved YET, and a development gets a variance to NOT dedicate ROW, thus hobbling if not crippling nascent hi-cap transit plans, there is a mismatch between the value and priority of private developer plans over voter and city-led plans. i suggest working language into this section which values and prioritizes city transit plans which are in full development and realistic. city plans shouldnt have be in final detailed punchlists to be an equal partners in shaping the city.	21	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9B-2
Preservation OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
243	6311	Preservation	chris allen	What's the thinking behind 45 years? That's 1973 for today's date. The Historic Landmark bureaucracy is struggling (or failing) to keep up with demolition cases for 50 year old structures right now, with few that are genuinely historic. Why not set the timeline to something more realistic (75 years?) so we can limit the charade to a set of buildings that might actually be historic?	31	Chapter-23-7--Building-Demolition-and-Reloca	23-7D-1
Process (Administrati OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
244	6303	Process (Administrative)	Jolinda Marshall	suggest the letter to the director from the Neighborhood Plan Contact Team be supported by a representative from each interest area (1-4)	37	Chapter-23-1--Introduction.pdf	23-1B-4
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
245	6426	Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	consider the input from the Board of Adjustments to recognize their state rights to decide cases and set times for appeal with proper notification.	15	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2A-1
246	6227	Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	application requirements B1bii Why does the clock stop if payment has NOT been made?	27	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2B-1
247	6228	Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	E) where does it say that all new Plats must have an expiration date to eliminate the long term problems of vested rights- (for example, old inadequate storm water regulations) ? There should be an advantage to development in a timely manner which ultimately benefits the existing residents. Isn't it factual that the expiration date requirement of plats (and other applications) is under the authority of Council despite the fact that plats are protected by state law?	31	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2B-2
248	6428	Process (Administrative)	Allan McMurtry	Where under D-2 shall the meeting be held?	60	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
249	6265	Process (Administrative)	Bobby Levinski	Because the comment period would be closed by the time the director would issue a disapproval of the application, there would be no opportunity for interested parties to provide input on an update submitted after such denial. I would suggest that the update trigger a notice to interested parties and an additional comment period (perhaps shorter in length).	32	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-1
250	6455	Process (Administrative)	Allandale Neighbor Comments	(A)(2) is the recent Council decision to require disapproval by 3/4 of the Land Use Commission to trigger requirement for approval by 3/4 of Council for PUDs on unzoned property which is a higher bar than PUDs on zoned properties. This was a rule created by Council during the Grove at Shoal Creek PUD hearings and needs to be reconsidered. There is no justification for PUD's related to unzoned properties to be handled any differently than zoned properties. Suggest that this section be deleted so that requirements for all PUDs are equal.	47	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-2
Process (Administrative)		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
251	6504	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	CodeNEXT should not eliminate the right to appeal an administrative decision on a sign permit application. Table 23-2A-1030(A) (◆Overview of Legislative and Administrative Approvals◆) fails to indicate any right to appeal an administrative decision on a sign permit application.	16	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2A-1
252	6503	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	The Signage chapter should not eliminate the existing right to appeal to the City Council a Board of Adjustment (◆Board◆) action on a variance or appeal, as is currently provided by LDC ◆ 25-10-44.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
253	6514	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	CodeNEXT should not transfer the authority to suspend or revoke a contractor◆s registration from the Board of Adjustment to the director or building official. Compare LDC ◆ 25-10-236(A) to 23-8A-2020(E).	23	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
254	6509	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	CodeNEXT should not add the unnecessary requirement that there must be an application and director or building official approval for changes to nonconforming signs, even if the changes would not increase the degree of nonconformity. This change would add unnecessary administrative burdens to target nonconforming signs and to accelerate their dismantling.	41	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-4
255	6506	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	CodeNEXT fails to carry forward the current right to appeal to City Council a decision by the Historic Landmark Commission. Compare LDC 25-10-122(H) to 23-8C-1030. This is important because, per 23-8A(1050)(D)(2), when a sign is in more than one district, a sign application would be reviewed under the Historic Sign District Regulations.	46	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-1
256	6505	Signs Process (Administrative)	M. King	CodeNEXT should not eliminate the Board of Adjustment's power to approve variances for off-premise signs, as indicated by Section 23-8D-2010(A).	79	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8D-2
Process (Administrative)		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
257	6454	Site Development Standards Process (Administrative)	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Land Use Commission may impose conditions such as limits on FAR, setbacks etc. This seems to perpetuating zones with additional conditions like we have now. Aren't we trying to avoid conditional overlays or something similar?	31	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-1
258	6453	Site Development Standards Process (Administrative)	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Director may impose conditions such as limits on FAR, setbacks etc. This seems to perpetuating zones with additional conditions like we have now. Aren't we trying to avoid conditional overlays or something similar?	33	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4B-1
Process (Administrative)		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
259	6226	Subdivision or Flag Lots Process (Administrative)	Codecatching	The safety of the public and environment would be better served if subdivision variances preceded environmental variances wherein the subdivision impact would be more evident....is there some reason these variances cannot be considered together since the impact is mutual?	17	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2A-2
Process (Code Development)		TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY					
260	6498	Signs Process (Code Development)	M. King	The adoption of a Signage chapter at this time would go against the most important of our City government's core principles, including a transparent policy-making process, the opportunity for (and inclusion of) public engagement on matters of public concern and impact, and responsiveness to and serious consideration of stakeholders' input and participation.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
261	6497	Signs Process (Code Development)	M. King	Due to the complete lack of public process, conflict with prior direction by City Council, and numerous policy changes that have been inserted at the last minute in the CodeNEXT process without any stakeholder input, the entire Signage chapter should be removed from CodeNEXT. The staff report regarding the changes proposed by the chapter grossly understates and glosses over significant changes to numerous policies that City Council adopted.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
262	6502	Signs Process (Code Development)	M. King	The Signage chapter fails to include a permitting process for digital signage, even though a majority of stakeholders support digital signage, as reported in the memorandum dated June 10, 2016, from Development Services Director Rodney Gonzales to the Mayor City and Council, which was made in response to Resolution No. 20160128-070.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
Process (Code Development)							
263	6436	Process (Code Development) Zones (Generally)	ZATX	This code next debacle was meant to introduce a fair and straight forward, form based code where there were minimums, maximums, and proportionate allowances based on lot size and base zoning. What this has become is a complete and utter mess. Sad we had to spend so much money to get an equally restrictive, complex, and confusing code. Reflects poorly on our ability as a city to work together to come up with a common sense plan to move forward while taking into account best practices in urban planning.	63	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Reference							
264	6267	Reference	Tstowell	Incorrect reference. Table is "Off-Street Parking Requirements for **Mixed-Use** Zones", not "Commercial Zones".	198	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-4
265	6274	Reference	chris allen	All references to 23-3M (Definitions and Measurements) need to be updated to show correct chapter.	270	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
266	6195	Reference	Tstowell	Incorrect reference. TDM is 23-9C-2030.	24	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-3
Review Authority							
267	6430	Review Authority	Allan McMurtry	Why is the applicant only considered in a hardship ruling? The neighborhood should be considered as well. The whole idea is to create a plan during specified times only due to the hardship on neighborhoods of having to go to meetings any day of the year. Too much arbitrary power. Shift to PC.	61	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
268	6431	Review Authority	Allan McMurtry	Should shift this up to PC. Neighbors should be considered.	61	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2E-2
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
Signs							
TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
269	6499	Signs	M. King	The distinction between ♦On-Premise♦ and ♦Off-Premise♦ signs in CodeNEXT continues the failure of the existing Sign Code to account for online-only or online-centric businesses. Since some items or services are not tied to a physical location ♦ or ♦premises♦ ♦ whatsoever, under CodeNEXT the advertisement of those items or services would always be ♦off-premise,♦ and therefore the advertisement of them would be unfairly and unlawfully singled out and impaired.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
270	6501	Signs	M. King	The Signage chapter should not eliminate the relocation policy and procedures that are in the existing Sign Code. As indicated in the memorandum dated June 10, 2016, from Development Services Director Rodney Gonzales to the Mayor and Council, sixty-four percent of stakeholders supported ♦loosening existing billboard policy, which allows for relocating existing billboards from one location to another.♦ City Council adopted the relocation provision following an extensive public input and review process, and the elimination of the relocation provision would directly conflict with City Council direction. In addition, the relocation provision has proven to be the most effective policy for the removal of signs from neighborhood and residential streets and Scenic Roadways to commercial roadways and other major transit corridors.	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
271	6500	Signs	M. King	The changes that the Signage chapter in CodeNEXT proposed are often in direct conflict with City Council findings and established public policy. For example, the proposed elimination of the sign relocation provision is in direct conflict with Council Resolution No. 20091022-041, which includes the finding that ♦billboard relocation furthers the goal of removing billboards from scenic roadways.♦	1	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8-TOC
272	6516	Signs	M. King	CodeNEXT should not remove changing the ♦cabinet structure♦ of a sign from the definition of ♦Maintenance,♦ as called for by 23-8A-1070 (♦Definitions♦).	16	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8A-1
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
273	6511	Signs	M. King	CodeNEXT should not include the requirement that ♦Signs that have been physically damaged by weather or physical impact must be reviewed by a competent structural engineer or qualified building inspector, contractor, or sign professional within 24 hours after the damage occurs.♦ This requirement fails to take into account whether the sign owner had notice or had any reasonable opportunity to have notice of the damage, and it also fails to provide for additional time to repair in case of extraneous conditions, such as catastrophic weather events or other situations in which a qualified building inspector, contractor, or sign professional might not be available to review the sign within 24 hours of the damage. In fact, a weather event such as a major hurricane may still present too hazardous of a situation to review the sign safely within 24 hours of the initial damage to the sign, and the Signage chapter should not incentivize unsafe sign review procedures.	31	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-1
274	6510	Signs	M. King	CodeNEXT should not include the requirement that ♦any repair to a sign must be of the same materials as the original sign.♦ It might be impossible to comply with this provision due to the unavailability of materials, and it would also preclude replacing materials with ones that are more environmentally preferable or which would have superior engineering integrity.	31	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-1
275	6508	Signs	M. King	CodeNEXT should not eliminate the existing provision that ♦the face♦ of the sign may be changed. In addition, CodeNEXT should not replace that provision with one that provides that only the ♦advertising copy♦ may be changed. Compare ♦ 25-10-152(B)(1) to 23-8B-4010(B)(3). This change is unnecessary and overly restrictive.	41	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-4
276	6515	Signs	M. King	CodeNEXT should not add the onerous and unnecessary requirement for an independent third-party appraisal to determine the estimated cost to repair a damaged sign, per 23-8B-4010(E)(1). In addition, the provision fails to specify who would select and pay for an independent third party appraiser, or the criteria by which the appraiser would be selected. If the City paid for the appraisal, this could improperly influence the findings of the appraiser, and so the City should not pay for the appraisal, nor should the sign owner have to bear the cost of additional, unnecessary, and cumbersome regulations.	41	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-4
277	6369	Signs	Joyce Statz	This seems like a strange condition for allowing the sign to remain. is there ample justification for keeping this in the code?	42	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8B-4
278	6507	Signs	M. King	The Signage chapter should not create the ♦Pedestrian Oriented Sign Overlay,♦ as proposed by Section 23-8C-1110. The Pedestrian Overlay, in which freestanding signs would be prohibited, would problematically and broadly apply to many roadways to which relocation would be appropriate, including on parts of the I-35 frontage road. In addition, it is important to note that even if the relocation provision were in the Signage chapter, the Pedestrian Overlay would greatly undermine the relocation policy.	54	Chapter-23-8--Signage.pdf	23-8C-1
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
Signs Uses							
TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
279	6448	Uses Signs	gmaksym	Under section 23-8 (Signage), section 23-8B-2020 C1c, you suggest that a Home Occupation in a Residence can have a 36 Sq Ft. Sign. This appears to be over 3 times bigger sign than previous Code. That's huge for a residence - even bigger than a restaurant. Please reduce this to a more reasonable size like maybe 12 sq ft. like the existing code.	77	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
Site Development Sta							
TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
280	6488	Site Development Standards	Allandale Neighbor Comments	R2 Zones have already been reduced from 7000 s.f. to 5,750 s.f. and now with draft 3 to 5,000 s.f. with an option to subdivide every lot to 2,500 s.f. Then there is the option to add ADUs. This will dramatically change the number of units allowed an negatively alter most single family neighborhoods.	52	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
281	6293	Site Development Standards	schorre	Why no pools in front yards? Many urban homes have larger front yards than rear yards.	102	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
282	6321	Site Development Standards	chris allen	Exempt? From ALL building placement standards (front/rear/side setbacks)? This needs to be footnoted in ALL applicable districts, right in the "Building Placement" tables.	277	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
283	6376	Site Development Standards	CittaLente	Reduce front setbacks to 0'. 0' setbacks, a worldwide standard on commercial streets, define the street and provide the most engaging shopping experience.	281	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
284	6495	Site Development Standards	Toddington	Height limits for main corridors like this should be increased to promote density.	300	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
285	6496	Site Development Standards	Toddington	Height limits for main corridors like this should be increased to promote density.	306	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
286	6494	Site Development Standards	jboardman	This mentions "Side Street." Does that mean it does not apply to the rear side of the building (which is what usually faces the houses in the neighborhood)? And does "maintains a pattern of fenestration that is consistent with that of the primary building" mean the parking garage cannot be exposed but rather must appear visually similar to the rest of the building? Not having a bare parking garage facing the neighborhood is a key issue for many people.	313	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
287	6322	Site Development Standards	chris allen	Note that 23-4d-5050 EXEMPTS small interior lots from these standards. This should be noted in this table for ALL applicable districts. My neighborhood has a large number of lots mapped with MS zoning that are only 50' wide that would be eligible for this exemption.	317	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
288	6255	Site Development Standards	dfores1	This should be front "and SIDE" yards for corner lots. Were side yards left off of this on purpose? "Side" was included in draft 2 for corner lots. It seemed to make a lot of sense. Thank you	113	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-7
289		Site Development Standards	JPRatx		113	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	
290	6215	Site Development Standards	Tstowell	Doesn't this basically mean the same thing as the exemption for SF, duplex, and ADU listed above? Why not just combine them? Do the floodplain requirements not apply to 3-6 unit projects?	11	Chapter-23-6--Site-Plan.pdf	23-6A-2
291	6214	Site Development Standards	Tstowell	This site plan exemption should increase to 8 units at least, as there are currently zones that allow a 4-plex to be doubled into an 8-plex with an Affordable Housing density bonus. Triggering a full site plan review is a huge disincentive to taking that bonus. If there are other examples of bonuses allowing 9-10 units, the site plan exemption should extend to those as well.	11	Chapter-23-6--Site-Plan.pdf	23-6A-2
Site Development Sta TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
292	6335	Site Development Standards Zones (Generally)	krayon516	This is confusing. Do you mean 40% or 50% of the overall site impervious coverage cannot be in the front yard?	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
293	6381	Zones (Generally) Site Development Standards	schorre	Presumably the intention of limiting the top plate height is to prevent three story boxes and force the design of gabled roofs.	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
Subdivision or Flag Lo TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
294	6256	Subdivision or Flag Lots	juan	Only Registered Professional Land Surveyors, not engineers, may set boundary monuments in the State of Texas.	35	Chapter-23-5--Subdivision.pdf	23-5B-4
Transportation and M TOPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
295	6283	Transportation and Mobility	Jolinda Marshall	The intent is good but the requirement does not serve the transit user as it does not speak to safe design - pedestrian scale lighting, low/high landscape, visibility. Nor does it speak to alternate modes now or in the future, Rapid, BRT, Light Rail, Express, etc. Please address	60	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
296	6221	Transportation and Mobility	matthews789	R2C contains some of the few alleys in the city, yet there is no mention of altered code for lots with alleys? The increased accessibility should allow for additional ADU sf allowances.	64	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
297	6390	Transportation and Mobility	Joyce Statz	Why should these conditions be different than the criteria for Comprehensive Transportation Review (1000 trips)? This creates loopholes we don't need! Change this 2000 to 1000	32	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9C-1
298	6343	Transportation and Mobility	mariochampion	<p>i very much like the integration of TDM into TIA, especially with concern to "active modes analysis."</p> <p>and in fact i would love to see a cultural shift at ATD and planning that replaces TIAs and their single occupancy vehicle level of service concerns as the primary measure of transit impact.</p> <p>walkability, contribution to compact and connectedness, safe biking routes lead to grocery stores and corner bodegas that reduce SOV traffic because folks can walk or bike for bananas and milk, etc... those are measures we leave behind now, but will get us closer to imagine austin goals.</p>	33	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9C-2
299	6391	Transportation and Mobility	Joyce Statz	What was the source of this? Are we ever going to see TIA's for the really intensive developments - and will we see improvements? This looks totally wrong.	35	Chapter-23-9--Transportation.pdf	23-9C-2
Uses							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
300	6422	Uses	Codecatching	Is senior retirement housing indicated to be allowed < =12 in all zoning by minor use permit in R1-b or c? How is this possible when limited to 2 units?	9	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
301	6479	Uses	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Coop housing should not be permitted in R2 zones as will introduce issues with occupancy limits and surely result in parking issues in single family neighborhoods that are currently safe and walkable.	12	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
302	6480	Uses	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Single Family Attached requires Specific to Use Requirements to assure that house form is not abused. This use should not be allowed in single family neighborhoods except close to corridors. Also, if this is it supposed to be an option to duplexes allowing ownership of property for both sides, then it should be restricted to only lots where duplexes are allowed.	12	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
303	6482	Uses	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Single Family Attached requires Specific to Use Requirements to assure that house form is not abused. This use should not be allowed in single family neighborhoods except close to corridors. Also, if this is it supposed to be an option to duplexes allowing ownership of property for both sides, then it should be restricted to only lots where duplexes are allowed.	15	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2

SUM 2042473						
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
304	6206	Uses	Witt Featherston	Why not?!? Increase a small, locally owned businesses overhead by requiring them to get office space outside of their home, and log vehicle miles getting there? For what??	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
305	6201	Uses	sc1366	We should encourage small business owners to use their home office so they can nurture their enterprises.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
306	6532	Uses	ernest	That would depend on the flow of customers into the home office. I would not want a small business in my neighborhood that had a lot of people coming and going.	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
307	6489	Uses	Allandale Neighbor Comments	Single family attached should not be in R2 zones. There are also no design criteria for this house form which will lead to abuse.	52	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
308	6490	Uses	Allandale Neighbor Comments	If Single Family Attached remains as option for R2, ADUs should not be allowed on these smaller subdivided lots.	52	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
309	6435	Uses	ZATX	Let the market figure this out. You can stick a manufactured home on most lots in town and people are wringing there hands over architectural choices.	65	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
310	6204	Uses	Pete	Triplexes should be an allowed use. This type of missing middle is still missing within the land code. If 3 units are allowed, then all forms of 3 units should be allowed.	94	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
311	6253	Uses	Witt Featherston	Why not triplexes?? This zone is for 3 units, so what's the deal? There are still FAR, impervious cover, and building cover metrics that control intensity of development, so who cares if the 3 units are attached to eachother, or if 2 are attached and one is separate. Pointless regulations.	94	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
312	6275	Uses	chris allen	Level 1 definition appears to allow for outdoor play area (as at "doggy daycare" facilities. Is this universally compatible with adjacent SF residential?	271	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-5
313	6263	Uses	gmaksym	I do Not understand. You have removed the limitation on the number of vehicular visits for a Home Occupation. Do you not think people will abuse this. We had a neighbor who had over 20 vehicular visits and 14 parked at the same time!!! Reinstate the vehicular limits at 3 per day!!	3	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-TOC
314	6264	Uses	gmaksym	23-4E-6200 Home Occupations Why did you remove the limbs on Vehicular visits prepay. The existing Ordinance limits vehicular traffic related to the business to 3 trip per day. Yet, you have removed this from the Code Next 3.. Why!! Do you intend to allow 20 car trips, 100 car trips. How about if they come and stay all day. wE had a neighbor who had 20+ trips per day related to her business and at time 14-16 cars where parked on the residential street for hours. Reinstate the limits to Home Occupations for vehicular trips to 3 a day!!!!	77	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
315	6447	Uses	gmaksym	Confused. Why do you allow a medical service here but under 23-4E-6200 (K12), you specifically prohibit "Medical Services".	77	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf E	23-4E-6
SUM 2042473							

#	Comment #	Topic/Issue/Category	User	Original Comment	Page #	Document	Division
Vested Rights							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
316	6411	Vested Rights	k2018	How do you petition for developers to NOT have vested rights? A new "energy efficient" neighborhood should not be building off regulations from the '80s. Shame on anyone approving such.	145	Chapter-23-2--Administration-and-Procedures	23-2K-2
Zones (Generally)							
OPIC/ISSUE/CATEGORY							
317	6250	Zones (Generally)	paul strange	Where is detail on R2C. Setbacks, impervious cover, minimum lot size for an ADU, etc.? Want to look a specifics.	17	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4A-2
318	6396	Zones (Generally)	Joyce Statz	Since not all the applicability requirements are listed here, is this really helpful. The individual portions that follow provide more details.	55	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf A-C	23-4C-1
319	6197	Zones (Generally)	Farmer	So much for form based zoning...	19	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
320	6427	Zones (Generally)	wtravisl	I agree that this has an unintended effect of dictating style. Get ready for mansard and barrel roofs, because that's the workaround for this provision - 3rd floor behind roof-like material above the 'top plate'. Why not limit the highest occupied floor, and the overall structure? Also, 22' is tight for 2 stories on pier & beam. 1st floor @ 2' + 10' ceiling + 18" structure = 2nd floor limited to 8'-6" ceiling.	66	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
321	6289	Zones (Generally)	BradP	This zone seems unnecessary. Appropriately not used much in the map. Are you saving this for upzoning later? Delete this zone from the code and map.	69	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
322	6290	Zones (Generally)	BradP	This zone seems unnecessary. Appropriately not used much in the map. Are you saving this for upzoning later? Delete this zone from the code and map.	75	Chapter-23-4--Zoning.pdf D 1-8	23-4D-2
SUM 2042473							