CM Flannigan
April 24, 2019 Council Meeting
Item No. 11

MOTION SHEET

I move to amend the Land Development Code Revision Policy Guidance Document as follows:

1) **Amend Question 1, Section "*1. Overall Scope*" as follows:**

   1. Overall Scope. The code revision process should [~~use the staff-recommended Draft 3 (text and map) as a baseline, with revisions made to~~] implement policy direction provided below and in response to Questions 2-5. The code revision process should leverage the community engagement and feedback from the prior process to rewrite the Land Development Code and include elements that are consistent with the policy direction provided below and in response to Questions 2-5. The Manager should work to deliver a new code that is simplified, can be applied consistently, and furthers the goals of the City.

2) **Amend Question 1, Section "*2. Timeline*" as follows:**

   2. Timeline. The manager should have a [~~revised~~] new Land Development Code (text) and Zoning Map ready for Council action on First Reading in October of this year (the Planning Commission having already issued its report on the new Code and Map).

3) **Amend Question 1, Section "*3. Communication*" as follows:**

   3. Communication. The Manager should establish and communicate clearly the public input process for Council's adoption of the [~~revised~~] new Land Development Code, including timelines and opportunities for public input. Include a transparent and educational public process under which stakeholders are informed how their input has been received and is being evaluated.

Note:
Language in Red indicates language proposed by CM Flannigan
Language in Blue indicates language pulled from CM Kitchen's Message Board document

4) **Amend Question 1, Section "*4. Code Text*" as follows:**

4. <u>Code Text.</u> The [~~revised~~] <u>new</u> Land Development Code should be sufficiently clear and unambiguous <u>so</u> that administrative criteria manuals are not relied upon to establish policy, except in circumstances where Council has directed that particular requirements be established administratively. <u>Simplicity should be a priority when developing the new Land Development Code.</u>

   a. <u>Age Friendly Policies. Propose options for provisions in the LDC to carry out the land use recommendations from the Age Friendly Action Plan, including supports for multigenerational housing, visitability, and other provisions. Additionally, there should be provisions that enable day cares and senior living centers in all parts of the City, at a scale commensurate with its surroundings.</u>

   b. <u>Land Use and Zoning Categories.</u>

      i. <u>The new LDC should focus on the size and scale of the built environment and regulate uses through context-sensitive policies that are clearly identified in the code and apply equitably throughout the City instead of through by-lot zoning regulations. Use restrictions should continue and be improved through a framework that identifies a range of incompatible uses among zoning categories, such as to avoid adult entertainment, hazardous industrial, or other activities that aren't supportive to surrounding residential or civic uses. Simple, clear requirements of conditions should be established, such as distance requirements and hours of operation.</u>

      ii. <u>Propose options for prohibiting uses along corridors that displace potential housing opportunities, such as self-storage facilities or other uses that do not contribute to overall policy goals.</u>

   c. <u>Transportation and VMT. Developments should be able to use a predetermined set of transportation demand management tools such as building additional bike lanes or sidewalks, providing bike storage, public transit stops and other mechanisms.</u>

Note:
Language in <u>Red</u> indicates language proposed by CM Flannigan
Language in <u>Blue</u> indicates language pulled from CM Kitchen's Message Board document

Page **2** of **8**

5) **Amend Question 1, Section "*5. Zoning Map*" as follows:**

5. Zoning Map. The [revised] new zoning map should [limit the] contain no "Former Title 25" (F25) zoning classification. Specialized zoning districts, such as Planned Unit Developments and regulating plans, which exist today and are of a type contained in the new Code should be carried over. Unique zoning districts (e.g., NCCDs) should be reevaluated in the current context of Austin's housing and transportation needs, and any tools that are beneficial to said needs should be codified Citywide. Unique zoning districts should be mapped using the same planning principles as the rest of the City. [to unique zoning districts (e.g., NCCDs and PDAs) for which no similar district exists under the revised Land Development Code. Specialized zoning districts that exist today and are of a type contained in the new Code, such as Planned Unit Developments and regulating plans, should be carried over and not be classified as F25.]

6) **Amend Question 2, Section "*1. Objective*" as follows:**

1. Objective. The revised Land Development Code should provide a greater level of housing capacity than Draft 3, and the City Manager should consider this goal in developing proposed revisions to the Code text and zoning map.

   a. The new code and map should allow at a minimum three units for all residential zoning categories in activity centers and within ½ mile of the Transit Priority Network outlined in the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP).

   [a] b. The new code and map should achieve a minimum yield of 135,000 new housing units as desired in the 10-year Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint (ASHB). As a result, the new code and map should at a minimum allow for housing capacity equivalent to two three to three four times the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint (ASHB) 10-year goal of 135,000 new housing units, as well as for ASHB goals of 60,000 affordable housing units, preservation of 10,000 affordable housing units, and 30% Missing Middle Housing, and be achieved in a manner consistent with direction provided throughout this document.

   b. In general, additional by-right entitlements achieved through mapping and code revisions should be provided only with the intent to increase the supply of missing middle housing and income-

Note:
Language in Red indicates language proposed by CM Flannigan
Language in Blue indicates language pulled from CM Kitchen's Message Board document

Page 3 of 8

~~restricted affordable housing alongside market-rate units in activity centers, along activity corridors, and in transition areas.~~

    ~~i. By-right entitlements should only be granted where that entitlement carries with it the requirement to provide additional income-restricted affordable housing units or missing middle housing.~~

    ~~ii. [Option: By-right entitlements should be granted where it provides for additional affordable housing bonus opportunities.]~~

    ~~iii. The granting of new entitlements in areas currently or susceptible to gentrification should be limited so as to reduce displacement and dis-incentivize the redevelopment of older, multi-family residential development, unless substantial increases in long-term affordable housing will be otherwise achieved.~~

c. <u>In general, housing affordability should be the primary policy driver of code and mapping revisions and the Manager should explore:</u>

    i. <u>how to ensure that in areas currently experiencing or susceptible to gentrification additional by-right entitlements should only be granted where that entitlement carries with it the requirement to provide additional income restricted affordable housing units or missing middle housing so as to reduce displacement and dis-incentivize the redevelopment of older, multi-family residential development. The granting of additional by-right entitlements in these areas should be limited unless substantial increases in long-term affordable housing or in the number of affordable workforce market rate housing will be otherwise achieved;</u>

    ii. <u>how policies proposed in the "Affordability Unlocked" proposal can be applied to developments near shared community assets – such as schools, transit, grocery stores, job centers, medical facilities, parks, and walkable commercial areas – to increase housing supply and further expand the density bonus programs;</u>

    iii. <u>options to allow some level of administrative variances for some building form regulations (setbacks, height, building cover, etc.) to help maximize the shared community values of housing, tree preservation, parks, and mitigating flood risk;</u>

       iv. the feasibility of how regulations can overlap (e.g., how a drainage field can also safely serve as open space); and

       v. options near shared community assets that provide flexibility in impervious cover regulations when additional drainage infrastructure is provided in order to address both our housing and flood mitigation goals.

7) **Amend Question 2, Section "*2. Code Text*" as follows:**

2. Code Text. Code revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include:

    a. Options for eliminating minimum lot size and lot width.

    [a] b. Non-zoning regulations will be applied so as to allow for higher unit yields for parcels within activity centers and ~~fronting~~ activity corridors. ~~Subject thereto, the prioritization of non-zoning regulations will be for transportation [Option: and utility] right-of-way acquisition, traffic mitigation and transportation demand management, drainage, water quality, [Option: Parkland dedication, heritage tree preservation];~~

    [b] c. A city-led testing process to assess the impact of revised regulations which includes participation by design and technical professionals. The testing should examine how the proposed zoning and non-zoning code provisions perform when applied to various types and scales of development.

    [c] d. Measures to dis-incentivize the demolition and replacement of an existing housing unit(s) with a single, larger housing unit.

8) **Amend Question 2, Section "*3. Zoning Map*" as follows:**

3. Zoning Map. The revised zoning map should advance the policies and goals in the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan including promoting walkable communities and transit-supportive densities to support a robust transit system. Map revisions that [to] provide additional housing capacity should include broader use of zones that allow for affordable housing density bonuses than in Draft 3. The revised zoning map should reflect that areas near transit, parks, or other shared community assets are appropriate for denser housing styles.

9) **Amend Question 3, Section "***1. Code Text***" as follows:**

1. Code Text. Code revisions to increase the supply of missing middle housing should include:
    a. Allowing residential house-scale buildings, including single family, duplex, triplex, fourplex, and accessory dwelling units (ADUs), both external and internal/attached, to be permitted and more easily developed in [~~all residential zones~~] areas where allowed;
    b. [~~Where appropriate, allowing~~] Allow [~~new~~] additional housing types to qualify as ADUs, including existing homes being preserved, tiny homes on wheels, Airstream-style trailers, modular homes, mobile and manufactured homes, and 3D-printed homes; and
    c. Substantially [~~R~~]reduced site development standards for missing middle housing options such as duplexes, multiplexes, townhomes, and cottage courts in order to facilitate development of additional units.
    d. Revisions to McMansion regulations to preserve smaller more affordable homes and enable more units per lot within the house-scale form of the neighborhood.

10) **Amend Question 4, Section "***1. Objective***" as follows:**

1. Objective. The code revision should [~~reduce the impact of~~] redefine compatibility standards to fully capture the entitlements of properties near shared community assets (e.g., transit, parks, and libraries). Compatibility should start with the maximum entitlements for properties along activity corridors and in activity centers and then step down from there. [~~on development within activity centers and activity corridors to a greater extent than Draft 3~~]

11) Amend Question 4, Section "*2. Code Text*" as follows:

2. Code Text. [~~Maintain Draft 3's no-build and vegetative buffers between residential and commercial uses, as well as compatibility triggers and standards for properties adjacent to a Residential House-Scale zone.~~] The code revision should go further than Draft 3 in reducing the impact of compatibility standards on development by redefining the regulations. In redefining compatibility standards the code revisions should:
    a. First define the maximum height allowed by-right along activity corridors and in activity centers and then establish regulations that create a step down effect in the transition zones;

12) Amend Question 4, Section "*3. Zoning Map*" as follows:

3. Zoning Map. Compatibility standards and initial mapping should work together in a way that maximizes housing capacity on parcels fronting activity corridors and within activity centers, consistent with applicable base zoning regulations and with any Affordable Housing Bonus otherwise available. Employment and other uses to create "complete communities" along transit and Imagine Austin corridors and centers should also be allowed in a way that is context-sensitive. In addition, regulations should still allow "village center" type low-density mixed-use and commercial use in neighborhoods to create "complete communities" as seen in places like Clarksville, Hyde Park, North Loop, and Tarrytown.
    a. [~~The revised zoning map should include a transition zone that will eliminate the impact of compatibility for parcels along all activity corridors and within activity centers.~~
        i. ~~Lot(s) adjacent to parcels fronting an activity corridor will be mapped with a zone (RM1 and above) that does not trigger compatibility and is in scale with any adjacent residential house-scale zones.~~
            1. ~~Such mapping of this minimal transition zone may not occur in some situations, if Council can craft specific, context-sensitive general criteria that provide staff with sufficient mapping direction. [Such criteria, if any, would need to be provided by Council.]~~
            2. ~~The revised zoning map may include additional transition depth, if Council can craft specific, context-~~

sensitive general criteria that provide staff with
sufficient mapping direction. [Such criteria, if any,
would need to be provided by Council.]
b. Employment and other uses to create "complete communities"
along transit and Imagine Austin corridors and centers should also
be allowed in a way that is context-sensitive.]

13) Amend Question 5, Section "*1. Objective*" as follows:

1. Objective.   The code revision should [seek to reduce the impact of]
   eliminate minimum parking requirements [on development to a greater
   degree than Draft 3]. The Manager should:
   a. Explore options for adopting parking maximums or minimum unit-
      yield in areas necessary to ensure sufficient transit-supportive
      development (e.g., TODs);
   b. Determine if parking in certain areas should be counted against FAR;
   c. Explore the feasibility of decoupling parking from leases; and
   d. Explore options for utilizing public parking and ROW to provide more
      ADA-compliant parking across the City.

14) Amend Question 5, Section "*2. Code Text*" as follows:

2. Code Text.
   a. Minimum parking requirements should be eliminated [in areas that
      are within the ¼ mile of activity centers, activity corridors, and transit
      stations with high-frequency service, except for areas where
      reductions in parking would be particularly disruptive (e.g.,
      neighborhoods with narrow streets and no sidewalks, areas near
      urban schools)].
   b. ADA-compliant parking should be required for certain larger scale
      developments, even if no minimum parking is otherwise required.
   c. Code revisions should provide that parking structures are able to
      evolve over time as transportation patterns change, including design
      standards for structured parking that will facilitate eventual
      conversion to residential or commercial uses.