



Public Comments 3/29/24-4/18/24 – Transit and EV-Supportive Code Amendments

Stats	
Total	323
Compatibility	33
HOME 2	68
ETOD	96
EV Charging	11
General/Multiple	115

\*Stats include phone calls

Topic	Date	Source	Comment
Compatibility	4/1/2024	Public Input	Que pasará con nuestra propiedad ? = Translated: What will happen to our property?
Compatibility	4/2/2024	Public Input	Please do not allow more residences on the same lot. This idea of cramming more people into a small space is ridiculous. The city roads are already crammed. You want to add more density but you aren't adding any more capacity to the roads.
Compatibility	4/2/2024	Public Input	Nope. Nope. Nope. Adds to crowding, congested streets and too many cars in too small a space.
Compatibility	4/2/2024	Public Input	I am very concerned about (1) relaxation of compatibility standards, (2) relaxation of standards for the protection of trees, and (3) essentially bogus claims about increasing availability of lower priced housing in Central Austin. Turning to (1), I live in a single family home in Hyde Park, one block away from Guadalupe. I recognize that there are several properties along Guadalupe in the vicinity of my house that are ripe for redevelopment, even putting aside the structures of historical significance. While I would not object to eg two to three storey buildings along Guadalupe, I would strongly object to allowing significantly higher buildings adjacent to my neighborhood. Buildings higher than three storeys would be incompatible with my neighborhood. (2) Increasing building footprints will necessarily remove tree cover. I object to this. (3) I own two rental properties that rent at fairly low prices. Redeveloping this into new houses would likely preclude my current renters.
Compatibility	4/3/2024	Public Input	This is so wrong and leading. Effectively the city is looking to build higher structures closer to existing sf homes without consideration of neighborhoods.
Compatibility	4/3/2024	Public Input	There are proposed changes that apply to houses next to my property [REDACTED] as explained in a letter I received. Can you help me understand what those proposed changes mean? I am trying to understand the implications but it is not easy to figure out. Many thanks.

Compatibility	4/3/2024	Public Input	Seventy-five feet trigger distance in excessive. It is out of the norm of peer cities. Fifty feet is plenty.
Compatibility	4/3/2024	Public Input	I oppose the proposed amendments. These changes threaten to erode the unique character & heritage of our city by favoring developments that could push out long-term residents in pursuit of profit, fundamentally altering the fabric of our communities. Increasing height limits near residential areas disregards the importance of maintaining the aesthetic & historical integrity of our neighborhoods. Moreover, granting City Council the power to adjust these limits on a case-by-case basis opens the door to inconsistent decision-making, potentially influenced by developers' interests over those of the community. This approach undermines democratic principles, replacing clear, equitable rules with discretionary judgments. As Austin continues to grow, it's crucial that development policies prioritize preserving our city, protecting its residents, & ensuring that progress benefits the whole community equitably. We must demand transparency & fairness in our city's planning processes.
Compatibility	4/3/2024	Email	<p>Hello, I have a question on the side-by-side comparison table between the current compatibilty code and the proposed changes. For height limits it sets 0 height for 25ft or less, which it also calls a compatibility buffer. But under the compaitibility buffer section, it says not required for certain cases (townhomes, small condo, and particularly residential-scale commercial). Just to be certain - does that exemption cancel out the 0ft height requirement within 25 feet? And if it does, what height requirement goes there instead.</p> <p></p>
Compatibility	4/3/2024	Public Input	<p>Hello, I have a comment on the compatibility code changes for noise from mechanical equipment. The 70dB of the current code is huge for today's standards. A new standard needs to be set - along the lines of "barely audible by a reasonable person at the triggering property". Or a number like like 50dB. Or even like "whichever satisfies" for the two! Somewhere along those lines. Also, much more needs to be said about rooftop machinery. That machinery should definitely be barely or non-audible. And solid screening that acts as an effective outward noise deflector should be specified for it. Also for rooftop machinery, it should be clarified if it's part of the building for max height requirement, or if it's on top the max height requirement (like an additional 5 foot allowance for instance). That's because the screening for it is "structure" too to take into account for any max height considerations.</p>
Compatibility	4/3/2024	Email	<p>Hello, I have a comment on the side-by-side comparison table between the current compatibilty code and the proposed changes.</p> <p>In the screening and noise section, for machinery sound levels, does the current 70dB still apply. There's a mention in change column that noise limits are retained, but it also says in the same paragraph that outdoor noise requirement is removed.</p> <p></p>

Compatibility	4/4/2024	Public Input	<p>Hello, the compatibility today limits invasive lighting and screening dumpsters and such. I'd like to recommend a new item to add to that - invasive security cameras to backyard and side yards of triggering property. I have a restaurant behind me, and they for instance have a dome camera mounted flush against their back wall about 18 feet up that points directly at my house and backyard! (I hope to work with them on it but haven't had time yet!). No amount of screening can handle that! Or as more general statement to this, the compatibility design standards should respect the privacy expectations of the backyard and side yards of a triggering property within reason.</p>
Compatibility	4/4/2024	Public Input	<p>Hello, my house is affected by compatibility on side and rear. Our lots are 50ft wide in my area (133 long). The 75ft zone is too small. That's just a 1-house buffer to the sides basically. My kitchen sink window is just 5 feet from the side property line! Buildings that trigger comp are more likely to be flat-roof structions that fully "fill the envelope" compared to slope-roof residential houses. Plus they're also much more likely to have rooftop machinery. Which all could be right next to my side-house windows! I'd much prefer around 125ft instead. For 50ft wide lots, that's a 2-property buffer to the sides before the buildings "fill the envelope" so dramatically next to residential houses. I also feel the 40ft height limit so close to residential is also too much - because of the "fill the envelope" nature of these buildings and likely rooftop machinery. I'd much prefer it stay 35ft in the very close-in section of the height requirements.</p>
Compatibility	4/4/2024	Public Input	<p>Hello, I live in [REDACTED] and am generally very supportive of these proposed changes. I do have some specific comments and concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The requirement that exterior lights be hooded &amp; shielded from the triggering property is key, both for direct nuisance lighting onto the triggering property as well as upward-facing light polution.</li> <li>2. Similarly, the noise requirement is crucial. How does the 70db max at the triggering property line compare to peer cities. 70db seems comfortable for intermittent daytime noise, but I would support lower minimums for continuous noice sources as well as for 8pm-8am.</li> <li>3. The 10' screening zone requirements are fantastic - I strongly support the requirement. Is it required for the screening zone to be maintained (i.e. watered for establishment &amp; replaced if plants fail) or just for planting?</li> <li>4. Some areas of Austin are quite hilly. How is this addressed? Are the max heights measured from the triggering property line or elsewhere?</li> </ol> <p>Thank you.</p>
Compatibility	4/4/2024	Public Input	<p>Hello, I have a comment on the compatibility codes. A statement is needed on "when" the design standards of it are applicable. For instance, a restaurant behind me moved in long time ago and did a big overhaul of the property. But it wasn't required to get a site plan. It's parking lot has never been fenced from our houses. The city told me at the time because it didn't require a site plan, they wouldn't enforce that standard. (They actually told me well you can build a fence in your yard instead!) Another example. A convenience store accross the way from the restaurant has 3 massively bright floodlights pointing out from their rooftop. It's so outwardly bright that I'm blinded looking out</p>

			into my backyard in certain spots. I filed a complaint once and it was immediately dismissed. Compatibility design standards that don't amount to a "taking" should be applicable at any time by the triggering property.
Compatibility	4/4/2024	Public Input	Hello, I have a comment on the compatibility changes. The 25ft buffer zone is nice, but the "not required" exemption for it is so broad as to render the exemption almost always taken. The part of the exemption I'm concerned most about is the phrase "neighborhood-scale commercial and office uses". It could be very broadly interpreted. For this case, I would prefer reducing to 10 feet maybe, still having that part of the buffer there.
Compatibility	4/5/2024	Public Input	What is landscape between single family home and larger buildings?
Compatibility	4/5/2024	Public Input	I vehemently oppose the proposed change in compatibility standards. This alteration would strip away the protections we relied upon when purchasing our homes, particularly for those situated adjacent to major roadways. These protections were designed to ensure a gradual increase in elevation, providing a buffer between our backyard and any looming structures. However, if this change is implemented, our homes would be thrust into the shadows of towering buildings, encroaching uncomfortably close to our yards. This jeopardizes the very essence of what we invested in when choosing our homes—a sense of space, privacy, and tranquility. Uphold the integrity of our residential environments.
Compatibility	4/6/2024	Public Input	██████████ is this property included in your project?
Compatibility	4/7/2024	Public Input	Hello, My house is very affected by compatibility both directly behind me (restaurant) and directly on my side property (LR zoning). For both of those properties today, I'm terribly affected by rooftop commercial machinery noise. I propose the following addition to the design regulations for the new comp code - "no rooftop commercial machinery (or no commercial machinery at all?) be allowed within the 20ft buffer zone regardless of the no-buffer exemption." Normally because of the 20ft buffer there's no rooftop to begin with! But on my side property, we're just 50ft wide lots, and that property is guaranteed to get the no-buffer exemption. Today's compatibility limits structures no closer than 15 feet. But under this new code, his structures can now be just 5 feet from my backyard and side windows. No commercial rooftop machinery (or any commercial machinery?) should be allowed so close to somebody's house. Also I propose the noise be "barely audible" for such (see prior comment).
Compatibility	4/7/2024	Public Input	I am in support of the proposed changes. It is good to see the impact of compatibility reduced while maintaining or even increasing privacy (with the required landscape buffer).
Compatibility	4/10/2024	Public Input	Thank you for making changes to increase housing supply in Austin. These all sound reasonable to me.

Compatibility	4/11/2024	Public Input	I realize that the concerns of a 90 year old Austin citizen will have little any impact on the city council, and Joint Planning Comm., but did want to go on record as being opposed to the proposed city zoning changes to Austin neighborhoods.
Compatibility	4/11/2024	Public Input	And to be clear, I don't think these changes go far enough, but they are a huge improvement. I would support ending compatibility closer than 75' (perhaps something like 25')
Compatibility	4/11/2024	Public Input	I own a home in [REDACTED] I am strongly in favor of this - but I believe it should be expanded to also equally apply to existing Redline stations (if it isn't already) as well as all stops on MetroRapid lines (both existing + proposed, such as the Expo + Pleasant Valley lines).
Compatibility	4/11/2024	Public Input	Hello, I have a question about the wording of the proposed compatibility ordinance itself that was linked for yesterday's council meeting. I believe there's a wording error in it. There's 2 sections that have exemptions in it (buffer and height exemptions) that use the wording "maximum height of less than 40 feet" AND zonings NO LO and LR. But the maximum height limit of LO/LR *is* 40ft (and that wording uses *less-than* 40ft). So that section can't be met anyway for those two zonings, right? Was that wording meant to be "maximum height of 40ft or less". If not, what am I missing, and how would LR in particular get triggered for that exemption??? Please email back asap! [REDACTED]
Compatibility	4/12/2024	Public Input	This is so wrong for single family homes!
Compatibility	4/14/2024	Public Input	I am in support of these amendments
Compatibility	4/16/2024	Public Input	I would like to file a written protest against this.
Compatibility	4/16/2024	Public Input	Hi, On the compatibility changes, I want to express that I'm very much against LR getting a buffer exemption. I don't feel any commercial should get that. If anything, let some of the buffer be used for the associated things like parking, bike, scooter and other requirements the commercial will most likely need to locate somewhere on its lot. I'm not so sure I support the office exemption for the buffer either. They too have similar (but to lesser degree?) customer visit requirements that the buffer could help support. Mainly, I think buffer exemption should be for the MF uses only that the new compatibility focus is really on trying to improve. As a thought - An alternative to the buffer exemption for commercial and office could possibly be exempting the 15ft part of it, and always retaining the 1st 10ft part of it? (I admit too, I am somewhat biased too! I have LR right to the side of my house.)
Compatibility	4/16/2024	Public Input	Hi, on the new compatibility ordinance proposal itself, I think something is missing in the buffer exemption section. In the current proposal, LR gets the buffer exemption, and with it a new minimum side setback of 5ft. That's obviously because LR has a 0ft setback allowance by default. BUT, LR also has a 0ft *rear* setback allowance by default too. Was that overlooked? Shouldn't there also be a 5ft or 10ft rear setback added for the LR exemption too? This is setback to the triggering property, so there should be something there! Especially since all your example

			drawings are on the abutting rear case for compatibility. As my suggestion there too, I would choose 10ft, since 5ft/10ft for side/rear matches all the housing zonings across the board.
Compatibility	4/17/2024	Public Input	Townhome residential use and condominium residential uses are currently way too narrow in the code. Exempting them from compatibility buffers without broadening townhome and condo uses in the code will have limited impact. I'm not a developer, just an average W-2 worker, but I'm trying to build a 5 unit townhome cottage court, but the property is only around 50ft wide next to a single family home. Townhome use and condo uses wouldn't be possible on this lot under current or proposed code, even though it would be really nice and fitting in with the neighborhood.
Compatibility	4/17/2024	Public Input	Add "multifamily residential use with less than 10 dwelling units" as an excluded use to proposed 25-2-1062. This would be in the same spirit of eliminating compatibility from MF-3 and more restrictive, and bring use restrictions more in line with zoning.
ETOD	4/2/2024	Public Input	<p>Please consider the needs of seniors, especially those who are elder orphans, and those living with disabilities in plans for housing development within ETODs. Affordable senior housing where seniors can age in place in community with others is greatly needed throughout all American cities. (See the Harvard Joint Center for Housing Studies report, Housing Americas Older Adults.) Wherever there is public land available for mixed-use redevelopment, please consider percentage set-asides based on census tract data to meet their housing and public transit needs.</p> <p>Shared housing options should also be available within ETODs.</p>
ETOD	4/3/2024	Public Input	While I'm in favor of transit oriented development, this proposal is extremely unfair to the commercial properties along Koenig Lane West of Lamar. Many of these commercial properties are already in the flood plain, and suffering from the rapid increase in approved impervious cover upstream. Further limiting uses renders some of these properties extremely difficult and expensive to develop into the pro-transit paradigm. And it feels discriminatory/overly-selective! Why would a person seeking transit to funeral services, equipment sales, or their job at an electronic testing facility be prohibited a half mile from a transit station? I believe that land use eventually follows public infrastructure - as do land values. Businesses that support transit will naturally migrate towards it. This is all stick and no carrot for commercial properties - especially small mom and pop type businesses that depend on older, existing development and structures. I am firmly opposed the propos ETOD
ETOD	4/3/2024	Email	<p>I own [REDACTED] and received a letter in the mail on the zone changes proposed</p> <p>I'm trying to understand what my new zone would be ... and how it affects the current use and more importantly what it enables or prevents me from doing in the future on the land.</p> <p>Thank you [REDACTED]</p>

ETOD	4/3/2024	Public Input	I love that Austin is finally starting to use good transit-oriented city planning to grow in a smarter way with more focus on walkability and people friendly neighborhood resources. Please don't let the NIMBY neighborhood groups derail these plans like they have so often in the past.
ETOD	4/3/2024	Public Input	Hi,  I'm trying to determine how this would impact the property at [REDACTED] Its marked as a subject tract but I don't understand what the new zoning would be.
ETOD	4/3/2024	Email	Hi Lauren and team,  Regarding LDC Case C20-2023-004:  I own a residential duplex at [REDACTED] 8800 sq ft parcel, zoned SF-3-NP. Given my 0.15-mi proximity to the N Lamar Light Rail Phase I corridor and North Loop Blvd/Guadalupe frontages, the parcel would best serve transit/density goals of -ETOD-DBETOD zoning. How can I get this parcel included in this case?  I see several parcels with residential duplexes and fourplexes around the Lamar and North Loop already slated to change MF-3-NP--> MF-3-ETOD-DBETOD-NP.  Thank you, [REDACTED]
ETOD	4/3/2024	Public Input	Hello. I support city growth with conservation. I support more housing and business with sufficient sidewalks, bicycle lanes and vehicle parking. Roads should be safe for all. Congestion makes it unsafe for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians, including those using mass transit. No plan can reduce car use. We should blend zoning with all transportation. Good transport and housing plans will make our city cleaner and safer. Thank you.
ETOD	4/3/2024	Public Input	ETOD should also apply to proposed and existing MetroRapid and RedLine urban rail stations
ETOD	4/4/2024	Public Input	Does the ETOD overlay allow for any accommodation on traffic impact, particularly on narrower, residential streets, noise abatement regulations (and enforcement), privacy (e.g., taller fences), lighting restrictions to accommodate schedules and accommodation for construction impact on existing residents.
ETOD	4/4/2024	Email	Dear Ms. Middleton-Pratt,  I object to the above-referenced case number scheduled for a joint meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission on April 11 with subsequent meetings of Planning Commission and then City Council.  I object to the 1/2 mile distance to light rail. That figure is deceptive because it tells us nothing about how far someone must walk to a light rail STATION. If one can't board at 1/2 mile, that distance has no meaning.

I am also appalled about the building height that would be allowed when near existing housing that is of a smaller scale and footprint. This is especially true with historic Austin structures that will be overshadowed and overwhelmed by huge buildings.

[REDACTED]

ETOD 4/5/2024 Email See attached image

ETOD 4/5/2024 Public Input Only implement if you keep the existing compatibility standards. The maximum allowed height without the protections of the compatibility standards would alter the residential environment the ETOD's abut up against. This alteration would strip away the protections we relied upon when purchasing our homes, particularly for those situated adjacent to major roadways. These protections were designed to ensure a gradual increase in elevation, providing a buffer between our backyard and any looming structures. However, if this change is implemented, our homes would be thrust into the shadows of towering buildings, encroaching uncomfortably close to our yards. This jeopardizes the very essence of what we invested in when choosing our homes—a sense of space, privacy, and tranquility. Uphold the integrity of our residential environments and only implement the ETOD if the existing compatibility standards remain in effect.

ETOD 4/5/2024 Email

[REDACTED]

I am completely against rezoning my property to CS-ETOD-DBETOD-NCCD-NP.

The City of Austin wants the public's opinion and comments yet there is ZERO way to research what the above code means.

If this zoning goes through my property taxes will go up and the City of Austin can choose to rezone the businesses allowed in the district eliminating my income and forcing me to sell my family property which has been in my family for close to 100 years.

And how does it make it affordable for anyone other than the developers!

I OBJECT!

[REDACTED]

ETOD 4/5/2024 Email My name is [REDACTED] and I live at [REDACTED]. A neighbor down the street informed me this morning that my house was being rezoned. I am wholly objected to this matter.



Firstly, I didn't receive any notice of these hearings and am so thankful to my neighbor down the street for sharing it with me. Why wasn't I informed? Or my next door neighbors? Why are the people who are affected by this being kept in the dark?

Secondly, 37th street is a historic street. Rezoning 37th street guarantees that 37th street lights won't happen again. Rezoning this little patch of street in favor of sky rises will decimate a decades old community that treats tens of thousands of Austin families for a full month every year. 37th street lights will not survive redevelopment and I am begging you to please consider the hard work neighbors have been doing for decades to keep old Austin alive. We are one of the very last remaining old Austin traditions and we simply can't survive without houses.

I also noticed that none of the high value properties are being rezoned-it makes it seem like the only people who are being rezoned are the ones who currently have affordable housing. Displacing low income people but not high income people? What the hell is that? Austin has a disgusting history of pushing poor people out and the current plan on 37th does just that.

Combine all this with the knowledge that 37th street properties are already multi unit-four plexus, triplexes, etc, we have density and it's working. This is just a plan to decimate old Austin once again and push poor people out. I'm personally insulted you would consider taking a piece of 37th street and ruining a decades old tradition in favor of gentrification and soulless towers that cost \$2000 a month. I am the most pissed off that I didn't receive any notice of this.

I fully object to this measure on 37th.

ETOD	4/5/2024	Email	I am concerned with the ways in which Austin's city council and various civic departments, are continuing to divest communities of living and commercial space. This particular rezoning amendment is, as most are to the layperson, opaque. What does this actually mean for the communities in and around the proposed Austin Light Rail project along North Lamar Boulevard, Guadalupe Street, and elsewhere? Will the businesses, community spaces, and residential neighborhoods be displaced? If so, this is yet another city-led displacement effort in a long history of institutional disregard for the people who make Austin what it is. I live and work along Guadalupe Street, from 38th to the University of Texas. Will that zone be displaced and its renters turned out of their shops and home? What recompense for this will the people whose livelihoods depend on this particular corridor receive? Why is Austin building another pipeline to Downtown? Will this project turn these neighborhoods into a block of high-rise condos, i.e. further destroying the nature and life of Austin?
ETOD	4/7/2024	Public Input	I live within 1/2 mile of the Project Connect - I am IN FAVOR of this land use amendment - thank you!!! [REDACTED]
ETOD	4/7/2024	Public Input	I am in support of the proposed changes. The reductions in FAR, building coverage and compatibility are great for housing production and affordability. I would have liked to see parking maximums (maybe in the future) and streetscape improvements as part of the changes (since ETOD areas should be walkable and bikable). I would like to

			see this overlay applied to the red line station areas (if they don't already have a similar overlay) and within a quarter mile of new bus rapid transit line stations.
ETOD	4/8/2024	Public Input	<p>I am writing as a real estate professional working in ETOD in major cities across the country. I'm also writing as a neighbor concerned about the homes of my son's two best friends. As a concerned neighbor, I see this upzone putting my immediate neighbors at risk. The [REDACTED] offers project-based section 8 1, 2 and 3 BR units to 199 families. The density bonus on this property would likely serve its intended function and make redevelopment of the 13-acre site attractive and lucrative. Replacing the 199 units with AMI restricted units (even lower than 60%) would eliminate the federal subsidy that allows those families a stable home with their incomes are very low or unstable.</p> <p>My request is to have [REDACTED] and other larger project-based section 8 apartments recognized as a rare and valuable existing affordable housing, and omitted from the upzone in the same way that mobile home parks have been excluded.</p>
ETOD	4/8/2024	Email	<p>I am looking through all the maps provided to show the areas in Austin subject to the new land development code. I have found 3 neighborhoods that are of personal interest to me, but I can't find a section of Pemberton Heights, Windsor Rd on the south intersecting with Harris Blvd and Hartford Rd running north from Windsor. Can you tell me on which map I can find this section? Thank you for your help,</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
ETOD	4/8/2024	Public Input	<p>Hi, this ETOD expansion before the Green Line community engagement process has begun seems like we are doing things out of order. I have attended and asked questions at several Cap Metro Project Connect sessions, and they assured me in 2022 that there were several years before the Green Line planning &amp; community engagement sessions would begin. This seems rushed.</p>
ETOD	4/8/2024	Public Input	<p>For the ETOD Overlay, it states that "the proposal would not prohibit single-family housing and would not require the discontinuation of existing businesses.". Does that mean it only applies to new businesses? If I have an existing business that is on the commercial uses prohibited list, will I still be able to continue my existing business?</p>
ETOD	4/9/2024	Email	<p>To the Planning Commission:</p> <p>This email regards prospective rezoning of 37th Street in Austin.</p> <p>As an Austin resident, I oppose this rezoning as it would have a direct impact on the existing affordable housing on the street. Should the rezoning take place, current residents would not be able to afford their homes and would be forced out.</p>

If that alone weren't concern enough, it would also cause the imminent demise of the annual 37th Street Lights, arguably Austin's most Austin holiday community tradition still in existence. For my family, 37th Street Lights is the cornerstone of our annual holiday observance, and I know we're far from alone. It's a truly magical event, and the city should do everything in its power to support its continued success.

Please don't put 37th Street residents and a magical Austin community tradition out in the cold by rezoning.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

ETOD	4/9/2024	Public Input	<p>My earlier comment was answered with a different question. ETOD overlay and the density incentives look great - but only for large developments that can capitalize on "density bonus", etc. These additional opportunities mean nothing to small properties - especially those in the flood plain who have very limited ability to develop their land and existing buildings. Before I can support it, I'd like to see some incentives for smaller properties. As it stands now, ETOD is just putting more limitations on smaller properties that may need the flexibility for FUTURE land use (not existing businesses). Smaller properties dominate Koenig Ln (with a few obvious exceptions). I hope in a final revision, COA offers some incentive for the existing small commercial lots in the Koenig Ln. area. "120ft building height" means nothing to these existing lots.</p>
ETOD	4/9/2024	Email	<p>In reference to Case Number c20-2023-7220, I'd like to express what the 37th street lights mean to me and my growing family.</p> <p>The 37th street lights are one of my favorite activities for the holidays. It is an example of what can happen when a community comes together to create something unique, interesting, and purely DIY. It's what the original Austin was all about and losing this would not only remove a great holiday tradition for Austinites, but also remove some of the last affordable housing in the area. It's not news that Austin is increasingly less and less affordable — but the impact of the affordability crisis is just starting to be felt. We are pushing out artists, musicians, and creatives that made our city great. I ask the planning commission to please consider this when reviewing rezoning. Additionally, the only homes up for rezoning on 37th street are already multi-family. None of the single family homes were included in the rezoning on 37th street.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, I hope you'll reconsider this.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Austin Resident Since 2011</p>
ETOD	4/9/2024	Email	<p>Howdy,</p> <p>We the neighbors of 37th Street are writing in opposition to the proposed zoning changes on 37th street. Specifically for properties [REDACTED]</p>

We understand that the Planning Commission is interested in increasing density surrounding Project Connect's route. We agree with increased density. However, the proposed zoning changes on 37th Street only affect properties which are already dense. [REDACTED] is a triplex. [REDACTED] is an apartment complex. [REDACTED] is a fourplex. [REDACTED] is a six bedroom duplex. [REDACTED] is a triplex. And [REDACTED] is an apartment complex. We also noticed how none of the single family homes on 37th are included in the proposed zoning changes. We are confused why the Planning Commission is interested in rezoning properties which are already providing density and omitting properties that are not providing density.

Additionally, the proposed properties included in rezoning are affordable. While the single family homes down the street are on the market for more than a million dollars, and the two houses that were turned into AirBnb's are charging hundreds of dollars a night, and the tenants on that side of the street are paying around \$1500 for a room in a multi-bedroom house, the properties being rezoned are significantly more affordable, ranging from \$500-\$860/room. Why would the Planning Commission want to develop affordable multi-family homes instead of unaffordable single family homes?

This affordability is why 37th Street Lights can survive. The main organizers of 37th Street lights live in the proposed rezoning properties. We have people who have been here for more than 20 years. If you've ever been to the lights, you can see this as there's a stark drop in "lights" as you move to the expensive, single family home side of the street. We need to live here to continue this decades old tradition. The reason the lights have died in the past was due to the city's (and our landlord's) negligence in preserving tradition. Developing 37th Street, leaving only unaffordable single family homes, will decimate 37th Street Lights and ensure it will not continue into the future. Rezoning our houses is another step in pushing local artists and community organizers out of the city in favor of developers.

We, the neighbors of 37th Street, implore you to reconsider zoning changes for properties [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on 37th street. Please choose old Austin tradition, please choose low income artists, please choose affordability and density that is already present on 37th. If you need more density, please consider single family homes.

Cheerfully yours,  
37th Street Lights

ETOD 4/9/2024 Email Hello,

I'm emailing in to say that rezoning 37th street would be a mistake and take away an important community and family friendly seasonal activity that brings people together here in Austin. This street has hosted a beautiful tradition and future Austinites and those who haven't missed a single one should get the opportunity to enjoy the 37th Street Lights!

Thank you for your consideration,

[REDACTED]

ETOD	4/9/2024	Email	<p>Hello, this is about:</p> <p>Case number: c20-2023-7220 commission name: planning commission public hearing date: April 11 2024</p> <p>I've lived (and continue to live in) Austin for several decades, and I was overjoyed when the lights returned to 37th street. I am in general in favor of higher density, and more affordable housing, in Austin, but I wanted to right in opposition to this measure, and in support of making it possible for the current folks on 37th street to continue living there and providing this really amazing piece of Austin's culture.</p> <p>Many thanks for your consideration,</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
ETOD	4/9/2024	Email	<p>Good morning, I left a voicemail for Lauren this morning. I am reaching out regarding the impact this will have on my business as we are an established automotive repair and sales shop and have been here since 1987. This place is our family's livelihood so I want to know if we are grandfathered in and exempt from the prohibition. Please advise so we can ensure there is a solution to this situation.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
ETOD	4/9/2024	Public Input	<p>For ETOD Overlay proposal, existing businesses on the prohibited list would not be impacted and allowed to continue operation. The property has been in operation for 40+ years, but tenant can change. Can you clarify if the property can continue operation, regardless of tenant turn-over.</p>
ETOD	4/9/2024	Email	<p>Dear Lauren,</p> <p>I write to express my opposition to the proposed rezoning of 37th Street.</p> <p>I have lived on this street for 7 years.</p> <p>My concerns are twofold: the preservation of our community's character and the affordability of housing. The current plan, by prioritizing multi-family homes over single-family ones, threatens both the historical fabric of 37th</p>

Street and the availability of affordable housing. It overlooks the existing density and affordability provided by the current homes. It is crucial that we protect this unique area without compromising its integrity or excluding its current residents. I believe there are alternatives that can achieve density without the need to demolish or fundamentally change what makes 37th Street valuable to our community.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

ETOD	4/10/2024	Public Input	Increasing building height to up to 120 feet and eliminating compatibility standards on the west side of Lamar from 6th to past 9th streets will kill the residential character of this historic district; 120 ft buildings will loom over what are currently duplex, triplex, and single family homes. It won't provide affordable housing; in fact it will destroy a historic middle class residential neighborhood. Existing height and comparability standards would already allow 300-400% increases in density and are more than enough; the huge increases proposed in this plan will vastly increase traffic in some of the most dangerous and heavily trafficked intersections in Austin at 5th and 6th and Lamar. If the city wants to provide for more affordable housing and increase density, it needs to drastically limit short term rentals and enforce the regulations; these have taken away housing that was formerly filled with actual residents and vastly decreased the density of this neighborhood.
------	-----------	--------------	--

ETOD	4/10/2024	Email	I object.
------	-----------	-------	-----------

Form attached.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

ETOD	4/10/2024	Email	I object to C20-2023-004.
------	-----------	-------	---------------------------

It literally does not make sense to eminent domain multi-family housing to make make way for a light rail.

For one, multi-family housing creates density and you absolutely need density to have a successful transit system.

Second, specifically exempting single-family housing from this process is absolutely shameful. You're basically saying that only people with multi-generational wealth and million dollar houses deserve to have access to the city and access to the transit it provides.

Third, who do you think uses public transit? People with multi-generational wealth and multi million dollar houses or people who live in multi-family housing? I'd bet on the folks in the multi-family housing.

Why are you putting multi-family housing at risk when those are the people who need public transit the most? Why are you destroying (somewhat) affordable housing in the name of progress? By doing this, you are allowing a publicly funded project to only benefit people who are already wealthy.

A simpler, cheaper solution would be to give the buses a full lane to themselves and to have more frequent service with possibly smaller buses. The City of Austin already is converting to an electric fleet so sustainability is not the issue.

Mexico City does this and those buses are filled to the brim; they have A/B/C versions of routes and have service every 3-10 minutes. Because the buses have their own lanes, they are not subject to traffic and can fly through. We have the infrastructure to do something like this instead of spending all this money destroying multi-family housing and giving the wealthy advantages they don't need.

The longer this goes on, the longer it reeks of a vanity project so that the city can tout itself as progressive and modern instead of actually taking care of its people.



ETOD	4/10/2024	Public Input	I feel this is a rush to push through MU Combining District without full disclosure and explanation to what it means to the residence behind that property. The one sentence explanation on the city notice (C20-2023-004) does not give details. I oppose the "H.O.M.E." initiative and the evisceration of compatibility standards that will destabilize our neighborhoods. I especially don't support the random mass upzoning of property all at once in the ETOD zones because that zone encompasses our entire neighborhood. This initiative does nothing to increase green space with trees or water runoff. Council says the main goal is to create affordable housing--but it is REIT type investors and developers that profit from Council and Planning Commission plan. Short term rentals impact affordability in Austin. This is much, much harder on neighborhoods than Code Next proposed. I do approve of 2-3 residences for each residential lot, but only with extra parks/green space to accommodate residents.
ETOD	4/10/2024	Public Input	I am completely opposed to the increased height proposals for the west side of Lamar by 6th and 9th backing up to single and multi family houses on Baylor Street, where my husband and I have lived for 40+ years. While I support improved and increased public transportation, I don't believe allowing buildings up to 90 and 120 feet tall that

would about a long- standing neighborhood is necessary. The proposals we have seen do NOT provide density or affordable housing; they are for commercial projects with a few expensive living units. In fact, our neighborhood WAS dense before the onslaught of short term rentals. Now scores of formerly occupied apartment and condo units have been bought by investors and garage apartments have transitioned from affordable living units to short term rentals. Allowing downtown sized buildings to encroach across Lamar onto this family friendly, formerly dense neighborhood is unnecessary and slowly kills the historic character of this area of town .

ETOD 4/10/2024 Email

Hi Werner,

I am looking at rezoning several tracts located at [REDACTED] which are all located within the proposed overlay. We were originally considering a DB90 rezoning, but the zoning staff recommended that we reach out to you to consider developing under ETOD instead. I was hoping you could answer some questions so we could better understand the details:

1. Does a site need to be rezoned to allow for a DBETOD development? Or will this be more of an overlay which automatically applies to these sites?
2. If a rezoning is necessary, can the DBETOD combining district be combined with an LI base zoning district?
3. When do you expect this ordinance to be approved at Council?

Thank you so much for your time and let me know if you need any additional information.

ETOD 4/10/2024 Email

Hello,

I am writing today to speak about my opposition to the city's possible plan to rezone 37th street. I am current Austin resident living less than 1 mile away from the 37th start homes. Visiting the 37th streets lights tradition during the holiday season is one of my favorite things to because it is so unique to Austin. Whenever I visit, the street is packed full of friends and families basking in the fun, quirky lights unlike anywhere else. Not to mention, it is one of the few nearby light shows that is free of charge to enjoy. As a Christmas light fanatic, 37th street stands out amidst an array of what-feels-to-be overly commercialized and soulless Christmas traditions 37th street is integral to maintaining community in a city many feel is changing so much so fast. If you truly care about keeping the charm that draws people into Austin, I implore you to reconsider rezoning 37th street. Otherwise the city of Austin runs the risk of ruining itself.



Sincerely,

██████████

ETOD 4/10/2024 Email

Hello! I am unable to speak at City Hall this week because I'll be out of town but I wanted to send a message regarding the question of rezoning 37th street. A good friend of mine, ██████████, lives on 37th street. Every year she and her neighbors put in a lot of work to make 37th street a fun and welcoming place around Christmas time, filling the whole street with lights and Christmas decorations, and they invite the public to come walk around to enjoy the lights and the atmosphere. It is my understanding that this rezoning would mean that the 37th Street Lights would no longer be able to continue and Austin would lose one of the best annual holiday events in the city. It is also my understanding that the residents who organize the lights every year would potentially be facing eviction if this rezoning process goes through. For these reasons I am strongly opposed to the rezoning of 37th street and I urge the city council to vote against it. No one works harder than the residents of 37th street to maintain Austin's character and to bring a warm and welcoming atmosphere to their block and to the city as a whole. I am tearing up writing this because this would be such a massive loss if this rezoning effort moves forward. I understand that the reasons for the rezoning effort are relating to density and wanting to build greater density residential areas; however, the area slated for rezoning is already full of multi-family homes such as duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and apartments. These homes are the only affordable housing options on the street and I am concerned that the rezoning would only further contribute to the already-existing problem of the lack of affordable housing in Austin. The residents of 37th street work hard not only to afford their rent to be able to live there, but they put in extra work throughout the year to make 37th street a warm and inviting place. It would be a shame to see all of that have to go away. Thank you.

██████████

District 9 resident

ETOD 4/10/2024 Email

City Council and Planning Commission Members:

I support the proposed land use code amendments before you, and want to offer a few suggestions regarding potential provisions of the ETOD Overlay. I believe these measures would be appropriate for any ETOD area, but they would be especially helpful in Downtown's Northwest District, where I have lived since 1990.

Bringing residents back to this area has been a longtime neighborhood goal, so I'm excited about the prospect of enabling more people to live here. This area is well-served by transit and is both walkable and bikeable, so it's particularly well-suited for those interested in car-free or car-light lifestyles. I haven't owned a car for the past fifteen years or so.

Unfortunately, Austin's current regulations tend to encourage the development of large, above-grade parking podiums in connection with multi-family projects. In addition to consuming valuable space and being a visual blight, podiums like these tend to encourage more driving, undermining our efforts to promote transit through Project

Connect.

To maximize the potential for transit-supportive residential development, I would suggest the following:

Remove the FAR exemption for above-grade parking structures (City Code §25-1-21(46)), as recently recommended by a Technical Advisory Panel of the Urban Land Institute;

Require that any above-grade structured parking have horizontal floors and ceilings, at least on larger lots; and

Require that all parking spaces be leased separately from dwelling units, as already required by the University Neighborhood Overlay (City Code §25-2-754(C)(6)).

These measures, taken together, would result in a better alignment between our housing and transit strategies, and would help mitigate the risk that development enabled by the ETOD overlay could have negative effects.

As always, thank you for your service, and for your consideration of this input.

Best regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

ETOD	4/10/2024	Email	<p>(1) Why has the City "not" excluded short-term B&amp;Bs in its MU Combining district? Lower-income "owner-occupied" new construction and "long-term" student rental housing has nothing to do with short-term B&amp;Bs. In fact, short-term B&amp;Bs make long-term rentals more expensive. NYC and several other large U.S cities have already done much to overcome this affordability constraint which Austin has not.</p> <p>(2) How have City building codes already been changed to accelerate development of lower-cost housing in the MU Combining area? Please cite specific examples that can be referenced where new codes were used to reduce costs and accelerate construction and housing in the MU Combining district.</p> <p>Until these two steps are taken, the MU Combining District is only a fictional academic model for profiling Austin as a progressive city for middle-income families.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>[Redacted]</p>
------	-----------	-------	--

ETOD	4/10/2024	Email	<p>Hello,</p>
------	-----------	-------	---------------

I'm a local business owner and a resident of North Central Austin. I want to add my voice of support for the community on 37th Street and ask the city to not rezone that street. Rezoning 37th street will negatively impact Austin. The people living on 37th Street annually dedicate their time and energy to building a magical, homemade community event. It's free for all to enjoy and is truly a labor of love. On the night I visited last December, there were hundreds of people there ranging from families, date night couples, and groups of friends. Everyone was entranced and delighted by the incredible display. It was interactive, creative, and it didn't cost the guests a dime. This generosity and the spirit of art is what gives Austin its charm. It makes Austin accessible, welcoming, and unique.

No one moves to Austin for access to Alo Yoga... you can get that in any big city. People move to Austin to be inspired by art, personality, expression, and creativity. Some people have called this "weird" but really, it's just personality. 37th street is one of the few preserved enclaves of this spirit. To change that street will be one more of the thousand cuts that is slowly killing Austin's magic. Please preserve this space for artists to exist -- where they aren't subject to an HOA or national apartment etiquette standards.

We need places like 37th Street. Please protect it.

case number: c20-2023-7220

Sincerely,

██████████

ETOD	4/11/2024	Public Input	<p>There is plenty of land on the main corridors to develop. Some of these Subject Tracts are smack dab in the middle of neighborhoods like the property at ██████████ An egregious use of power to even consider developing this as a mult-unit complex. There is literally acres of land just north near the Domain/Q2, which is also on the rail line.</p> <p>In addition, the letter that was sent out doesn't even direct you to this page specifically. You're left to search the speakupaustin.org site for this form and the RSVP for the public hearings. At least make a semblance of an effort to direct recipients to the right page. Never mind the incoherent city jargon on the letter itself. I can't imagine how anyone over the age of 40 will remotely understand how to "Speak Up" given the quality and clarity of these communications.</p>
ETOD	4/11/2024	Email	<p>I just opened and reviewed information directly affecting my property - I want this correspondence formally registered as an objection to the zoning change. I have no idea what kind of thought process is behind labeling my cud-de-sac'd street off of Oltorf into this transit zone.</p> <p>I am opposed and want to be notified directly of any additional public hearings and information as to WHY and what timeline the city intends for this and what POLICY the city believes it is furthering through creation of this zone.</p>

Thank you,

█

ETOD 4/11/2024 Email Lauren,

I am sure you are getting a ton of email so thank you in advance for your time.

I own █ We have been in Austin since 1999 and have been at █ for the last 15 or so years. It looks like we are caught up in this latest rezoning case so I hope that you can clarify something for me.

We watched the meeting on this case today and it seems like we may be OK but I wanted to confirm.

Question is:

Can I continue to do computer repair and support from █ going forward?

Thank you again for your time, I look forward to your answer.

█

█

█

ETOD 4/11/2024 Public Input Related to the restricted uses, of which "Recreational Equipment Sales" is one - will that apply to bike shops? We should be \*incentivizing\* businesses that provide this service near transit, as it helps solve first/last mile concerns.

ETOD 4/11/2024 Public Input I own a home in █ and I strongly support this proposal.

ETOD 4/12/2024 Public Input Your proposals are making an already complex system even more complicated. Your confusing "web" of website links and graphics do not do an effective job of sharing information. A quote from above, "An overlay is a zoning tool that applies additional requirements to a specific area on top of those that already exist. The ETOD Overlay

			<p>consists of two combining districts. Combining districts are zoning districts that provide additional regulations that combine with the base zone regulations" tells the story. Regulations upon regulations. Your overly complex regulations result in prohibitive costs for small projects. The "entitlement" process requires the same number of professionals (architects, engineers, "permit consultants", lawyers, engineers, etc.) for both small and large projects. The "price per door" of the entitlement process adds a significant hurdle for small projects because the costs can't be spread out over a large number of units.</p>
ETOD	4/12/2024	Public Input	<p>Love it. My comment is that this should not be limited only to the Light Rail and Priority Extensions. If possible, it should apply to the Metro Rapid routes as well (maybe a 1/4 mile radius, given the broader area covered). I live on the Expo line, love seeing the new and improved bus stops, love having all the new neighbors thanks to the MLK Red Line stop, and think it's insane not to allow that on Manor Rd and nearby streets.</p>
ETOD	4/12/2024	Email	<p>Hi, I am a property owner at [REDACTED]. I notice that my property is affected by the proposed amendments to the LDC. My building is currently being used for rental residential (upstairs) and medical office downstairs. I do not see any medical listed as prohibited use. Can you please confirm that is the case?</p> <p>Thank you for the clarification, [REDACTED]</p>
ETOD	4/12/2024	Email	<p>I am writing this today to add myself to the list of people who don't want 37th St. in Austin rezoned. I've been going down there to see the Christmas lights since I was a kid. I took my kids when they were little and now my grandkids. Several of my friends and their kids and grandkids meet every year at Chicas Sports Bar, have some food and then go walking down the street. One of the friends of mine that has gone every year was killed by a hit and run in November so meeting up this year was hard but that is what all of us do. Please don't get rid of this tradition for the future of Austin. It's one of the few things we born and raised Austinites have left of Austin.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, [REDACTED]</p>
ETOD	4/12/2024	Email	<p>Thank you for this reply.</p> <p>So I think this sets up a program where 90' of height may be allowed in the LHD, but if the HLC refuses to grant that in a Certificate of Appropriateness and only allows 30' of height, an applicant can appeal to the city council and get that CoA thrown out so the 90' building can go up between houses on a block in the LHD. Is this correct?</p> <p>If so, then why promote this height of buildings on (likely previously spot zoned MF lots) mid-block whether in an NCCD or LHD? It just sets up a controversy and takes up a lot of time and energy by the community to fight off inappropriate mid-block development.</p> <p>Did any one actually look at where these lots exist? No one came to meet with folks in Hyde Park or North University to explain and discuss this.</p>

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

ETOD	4/13/2024	Public Input	I am in favor of more ETOD areas
ETOD	4/14/2024	Public Input	I am on support of these code changes
ETOD	4/15/2024	Email	How do I find a map of the ETOD "future core-transit corridor"? Is it the same as the priority extension? Thank You, [REDACTED]
ETOD	4/15/2024	Email	Hello,  Our company owns a commercial property at [REDACTED], and upon review of the ETOD notice, I realized it's not included in the recommended overlay (see attached for reference). What is the process to get the parcel included in the ETOD overlay rezone? It seems to fit all the criteria, especially with Lamar frontage and being a commercial lot. We're considering a residential project which would require a rezone. It sure makes a lot of sense to include it in this process to save time and money, should we pursue a residential project. Please advise how we can formally request this property to be included?  Please advise as soon as possible. We don't want to miss this window. Thank you.
ETOD	4/15/2024	Email	Lauren,  Hope this email finds you well - while neighbors and friends through our kiddos at THES - I did want to submit some questions I had on the Notice that was mailed to our home and hope to get some insight in your official capacity in the Planning Department.

I appreciate you and/or your team's time in helping me to better understand the proposed changes and how it does/not impact our neighborhood and specifically our home property.

1. The mailed notice states "Modifies development regulations to increase maximum height (up to 120 feet)..." but when I read earlier City Council meeting notes on ETOD prior to the notice being mailed, I found some mention of allowing "up to 120 feet of height, with an exploration of additional height above 120 feet, for non-single family priorities w/in half mile of the Project Connect Phase 1..."

1. QUESTION: Does the ETOD/DBETOD zone allow for maximum 120' height as stated in the notice, or possibly even higher than that?

2. I reviewed the current and proposed Compatibility regulations keeping ETOD/DBETOD in mind; the website's page on current Compatibility regulations states "Compatibility height limits are in addition to height limits set by a property's zoning district, and the shorter limit applies."

1. QUESTION: Are ETOD/DBETOD properties subject to the same height restrictions relative to Compatibility, where the "shorter limit applies"? Or are ETOD/DBETOD properties exempt from Compatibility altogether? Is there a difference in applicability of ETOD/DBETOD building heights (shorter limit applies) whether the current Compatibility regulations remain intact or the new proposed changes are adopted?

Ultimately our home is very close to some of the sites listed in the ETOD and I'm trying to get all the information I feel is important to us to determine if we are supportive or not of the proposed changes ahead of the Public Hearings with the Planning Commission as well as City Council.

ETOD	4/15/2024	Public Input	We received notice and [REDACTED] owns a commercial site at [REDACTED]. For some reason, it's not shown as included in the proposed zoning overlay. We'd like to request you re-consider and add the parcel into the overlay? Please respond via email [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]
------	-----------	--------------	---

ETOD	4/15/2024	Public Input	The City's density bonus programs have largely been unsuccessful at creating deeply affordable housing since developers can make more money off of selling market-rate units than from relaxed compatibility or added height, or they can just pay the fee-in-lieu and still get the additional units. Will the ETOD density bonus allow for a fee-in-lieu and how will you ensure that developers are financially incentivized to provide deeply affordable housing?
------	-----------	--------------	---

ETOD	4/15/2024	Email	Dear Ms Middleton-Pratt,
------	-----------	-------	--------------------------

Please include the attached comment in the hearing records.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Attached Handwritten Comment:

I object to permissible height changes accounting as much as 120' in height within the Heivnt of single-family, 1 + 2 story neighborhoods + parks without any conserdation for incompatibility MTH the scare of the local community. Density should instead be focused on corridors - Lamar, Congress, Etc. Thank you.

ETOD 4/16/2024 Email Oppose zoning changes to subject tracts along South Congress Avenue and East Riverside Drive within the boundaries of the Greater South River Combined Neighborhood Planning Area.



ETOD 4/16/2024 Public Input How will this benefit Austinites that don't live close by?

ETOD 4/16/2024 Public Input How will this benefit Austinites that don't live close by?

ETOD 4/16/2024 Public Input Hi there, I believe it's good City planning to increase density around the new proposed train line. A couple of exceptions that I believe should be considered: \*The ETOD boundary should be within 0.5 miles from each train station, not from the entire train line. \*Regarding compatibility within ETOD. If the triggering property is also within a Historic District, compatibility should apply as normal (ie, not relaxed). Thank you!


ETOD 4/16/2024 Email Kalan,

I hope you are doing well. My family owns the historic [REDACTED] and I work with the team that's renovating & restoring the AO Watson House at [REDACTED], but I want to email you about a separate topic today.

As you may be aware, the City is considering an ETOD Overlay. In general, I believe increasing density around the future rail system is good City planning. However, compatibility is proposed to be relaxed or even eliminated within the ETOD Overlay. I'm not sure if you have any say or want to provide any feedback to the City staff working on this case, but it seems to me that compatibility should apply if the triggering property is also within a historic district.



			<p>I should disclose that my family lives at [REDACTED] which is zoned SF-3-HD-NP and borders the edge of the proposed ETOD Overlay. I have provided comments through the Speak Up Austin portal, and have also been in communication with our neighborhood association.</p> <p>Thank you!</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
ETOD	4/17/2024	Email	<p>Can someone please call me and help me decipher how this case applies to us?</p> <p>It looks like this is mostly about building heights. Does it affect our parking?</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
EV Charging	3/29/2024	Public Input	<p>There are EVGo stations in parking lots around town. How are they classified and why is this use needed if those were able to be built?</p>
EV Charging	3/29/2024	Public Input	<p>Hello! I work for a multifamily developer and I am curious to know if there will be requirements for access to charging stations within multifamily buildings. Will any of the cost of infrastructure be placed on the developer in the form of fees? Thank you for your time and appreciate any insight.</p>
EV Charging	4/1/2024	Public Input	<p>Could you please let me know what area are you proposing to add EV charging station?</p>
EV Charging	4/3/2024	Public Input	<p>Please consider an "uptime" or availability expectation for electric vehicle charging stations, plugs, and related systems in order to further promote reliability and dependability for electric vehicle owners and users. As part of an uptime expectation, there should also be a set expectation for fixing downtime issues in a timely manner so as to minimize unexpected interruption to electric vehicle owners' and users' commutes.</p>
EV Charging	4/3/2024	Public Input	<p>Hello. I support city growth with conservation. I support more housing with sufficient sidewalks, bicycle lanes and vehicle parking., and space for those using mass transit. Good electric vehicle plans will make our city cleaner and safer. Thank you.</p>

EV Charging	4/3/2024	Public Input	Do you honestly believe that by 2030 (in 6 years) that 40% of the vehicles in Austin will be electric? What will this do to the current electric grid? We don't have enough electric power currently with blackouts and reduced power/outages to sustain and support the current population.
EV Charging	4/9/2024	Email	<p>Eric,</p> <p>If a proposed EV charging station is an accessory use to a LI zoned property/use and not the primary use, would it be subject to the accessory use provisions of the LDC Section 25-2-896 and be considered a parking facility?</p> <p>Since the EV charging station use will be a permitted use in the LI zoning district with the code amendment, it should not be restricted to the 25% site area provision, correct?</p> <p>It would be helpful if the code amendment addressed the EV charging station as an accessory use as well as a primary use. We are getting a lot of inquiries about this issue.</p> <p>Sec. 25-2-896 Accessory uses for a principal industrial use</p> <p>Also, the draft ordinance (J) where the EV charging station is a conditional use does not mention the conditions of being closer than 1,000' from another charging station or greater than 25,000 square feet as the staff report states.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p></p>
EV Charging	4/10/2024	Email	Dear Sir or Madam,

We're interested in the pending Austin ordinance regarding zoning for electric vehicle charging. I noticed you have a few maps posted of the affected areas (Electric Vehicle Charging - PublicInput).

Would it be possible to get copies of the kmz or GIS map data for those displays?

Thank you,



EV Charging	4/12/2024	Public Input	This is completely unnecessary!
General/Multiple	3/29/2024	Public Input	Will we be able to speak separately on each of the four items at the 11 April joint meeting? Or will we only have one opportunity to speak at the meeting?
General/Multiple	3/30/2024	Public Input	Wouldn't it seem appropriate to map existing and planned area MF housing (if not units ) in zoning application and land use change to be transparent and equitable since development capacity has a limiting factor of infrastructure and predictable maximal impervious cover relative to damage by flashflooding ?
General/Multiple	3/30/2024	Email	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I just received two IDENTICAL notifications for the public hearings about the Land development Code. Same delivery day, same address, same name.</p> <p>I don't know if everybody did, or why I did. BUT--this is certainly not good use of my tax dollars! Think of the postage \$\$ that could be saved if each homeowner got only ONE such notice, assuming this happened to others as well.</p> <p>City of Austin needs to do better on things like this.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
General/Multiple	4/1/2024	Public Input	Your instructions don't say how to register for the virtual open house April 20.
General/Multiple	4/1/2024	Email	I want to speak
General/Multiple	4/1/2024	Email	I received notice in the mail that the Land Development Codes are changing on property that I own. Where can I find the proposed revisions that affect [REDACTED] ?

			Thanks, [REDACTED]
General/Multiple	4/1/2024	Email	Hi,  I own a property at [REDACTED], and I received a piece of mail that describes a hearing for upcoming Land Development Code changes, but no dates or additional information is provided, just an instruction to call or email this email address.  Can you provide more information on what the changes are related to?  Thanks, [REDACTED]
General/Multiple	4/2/2024	Public Input	In general, I support building as much housing as possible. I support loosening regulations as much as possible. I don't think we should have minimum parking requirements for businesses; As long as buildings are safe and follow all building codes, I don't think we should have limits on the heights of new buildings; I don't think we should have strict zoning - people should be able to build what they want on their land.  I also would like to know whether the city council has looked into a split rate property tax. Currently when we assess property values, we assess both the value of the land/location, and the value of the structures/improvements. We currently tax land and improvements at the same rate. I think we should tax the land at a higher rate (since this value is created by the community), and we should tax improvements at a lower rate (otherwise we are punishing people for investments that help grow the economy). This would make it highly unprofitable to hold vacant land or speculate on land, and thus would encourage more housing density. The city of Detroit is pushing for this exact proposal, and I think Austin should study what Detroit is doing and push for the same policy.
General/Multiple	4/2/2024	Email	I no longer live in Austin, please remove me from your physical "public notice" mailing list. Thanks, [REDACTED]
General/Multiple	4/2/2024	Email	I have been trying to sell my deceased parents house/property at [REDACTED] but am having difficulty because it is zoned LR. Will the new proposed code changes change the zoning? In my research, I found that it could be changed to MU3. Your reply would be greatly appreciated.
General/Multiple	4/2/2024	Email	Hi there. My name is [REDACTED] and I live at [REDACTED]. I received a notice about a land development code change and would like to read the entire proposed change document. Might you send it to me? Appreciate your time.
General/Multiple	4/2/2024	Email	Hello,  Can you tell me what will be the discussion and when?

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

General/Multiple	4/3/2024	Public Input	<p>Where in Chapter 211 does Texas State law allow Cities to alter existing zoning classifications, changing the restrictions imposed by them on every parcel currently zoned under that classification?</p> <p>Chapter 211 spells out rules for only two types of zoning actions by Cities: zoning land initially, and changing the zoning classification of parcels already previously zoned from one established classification to another, thereby altering their allowed uses.</p> <p>When it came to DB90, the city attorney said at a public meeting that it must be created first "on paper", and then applied on a parcel by parcel basis through the traditional rezoning process.</p> <p>If that is what is required for DB90, why is that not what is required for HOME or HOME2?</p> <p>Why are single-family parcels not required to rezone one at a time to a newly created zoning classification through the traditional process?</p> <p>How is the city able to effectively rezone 174,000 parcels with a single vote?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
General/Multiple	4/4/2024	Email	<p>Please remove [REDACTED] from your mailing list. She passed away two years ago. Her home in Austin was sold. A Public Notice was sent recently to her name at</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
General/Multiple	4/4/2024	Email	<p>Please provide information regarding Land development updates per your mailer to me:</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
General/Multiple	4/5/2024	Email	<p>yes ! im interesting .</p>
General/Multiple	4/5/2024	Public Input	<p>I do not support this new code, it's going to ruin our already housing diversified neighborhood by encouraging large developments. Almost every single family home in our neighborhood could be transformed into a towering building. Ruining the character of our historic neighborhood</p>
General/Multiple	4/7/2024	Email	<p>Good day,</p> <p>We are receiving communications from your division addressed to a [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. This is not someone we know. we did not buy the property from this individual either so they</p>

			are not the last tenant. we have returned these communications as not at this address over the last two years repeatedly. we are emailing you to inform you that the communications you are attempting to send are not being delivered to an accurate address and will need to cease please.
General/Multiple	4/9/2024	Email	<p>Received public notice but the LCDupdates does not specify anything to help me figure out what notice is related to why we received this. Could you please help clarify?</p> <p>See attached.</p> <p>Thanks  </p> <p>Sent from mobile device</p>
General/Multiple	4/9/2024	Email	<p>Hello I received a flyer in the mail saying that there would be a virtual open house on April 20th to learn more about the LDC update. However there is no link given. Could you let me know what that is?</p> <p>Thanks  </p>
General/Multiple	4/9/2024	Public Input	<p>From Acuna v City of Austin D-1-GN-19-008617:</p> <p>"IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Defendants be, and hereby are, commanded to desist and refrain from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refusing to recognize and accept Plaintiffs' protest rights pursuant to Texas Local Government Code § 211.006(d) as to any change in the zoning regulations... in order for such change to be effective..."</li> </ol> <p>211.006(d): "If a proposed change to a regulation or boundary is protested in accordance with this subsection, the proposed change must receive, in order to take effect, the affirmative vote of at least three-fourths of all members of the governing body. The protest must be written and signed by the owners of at least 20 percent of either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) the area of the lots or land covered by the proposed change; or</li> <li>(2) the area of the lots or land immediately adjoining the area covered by the proposed change and extending 200 feet from that area."</li> </ol>
General/Multiple	4/10/2024	Email	<p>I feel this is a rush to push through MU Combining District without full disclosure and explanation to what it means to the residence behind that property. The one sentence explanation on the city notice (C20-2023-004) does not give details. I oppose the "H.O.M.E." initiative and the evisceration of compatibility standards that will destabilize our neighborhoods. I especially don't support the random mass upzoning of property all at once in the ETOD zones because that zone encompasses our entire neighborhood. This initiative does nothing to increase green space with trees or water runoff. Council says the main goal is to create affordable housing--but it is REIT type investors and developers that profit from Council and Planning Commission plan. Short term rentals impact affordability in Austin. This is much, much harder on neighborhoods than Code Next proposed. The only thing I do approve of is for</p>

			all residential lots to be able to have 2-3 units per lot. That is enough to create the housing needed in Austin (unless it all goes to Airbnb type rentals).  [REDACTED]
General/Multiple	4/10/2024	Public Input	I am heavily in favor of the proposed changes to minimum lot sizes for single family homes and height limits.
General/Multiple	4/10/2024	Email	Hello,  I got a notice in the mail about updates near my property. I'd like to know what changes are happening and the reason(what development is being constructed).  Thank you,  [REDACTED]
General/Multiple	4/11/2024	Public Input	I support the Transit and EV code amendments because of their positive fiscal attributes. The City gets added tax income from added population within the city without the added cost of more roads, pipes and power lines.
General/Multiple	4/11/2024	Public Input	I support the Transit and EV code amendments because of their positive fiscal attributes. The City gets added tax income from added population within the city without the added cost of more roads, pipes and power lines.
General/Multiple	4/12/2024	Email	I've been trying to register for this meeting and the link does not work. Please send me one that does or register me and send confirmation. Thank you.
General/Multiple	4/12/2024	Email	The link to the virtual HOME meeting on this page is not active!
General/Multiple	4/12/2024	Email	Unable to sign up for open houses here, thank you
General/Multiple	4/15/2024	Email	Hi Lauren,  This is [REDACTED] the owner of [REDACTED], I just saw your notice about Land Development Code changes. I don't quite understand what the issue was. Would you mind explaining more about this? Thanks  [REDACTED]
General/Multiple	4/15/2024	Public Input	Hello, this message is for Lauren Middleton Pratt. The planning director. My name is [REDACTED]. I'm the director of planning and development for the housing authority of the City of Austin and I would like to talk to you about the amendments the proposed amendments to the land development code and rezoning my number here at my office

is [REDACTED] and I'm at extension [REDACTED]. It's a little after four o'clock on Monday, April. The 15th, maybe we can chat tomorrow or later again my office number is [REDACTED] extension [REDACTED] and my name is [REDACTED]. I'm the plant planning and development director for the housing authority the City of Austin hope to talk to you soon. Thank you very much.

General/Multiple 4/17/2024 Email

Good afternoon,

I had to go to the ER today and cannot make this.

Do you know if the presentation material will be made available?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

HOME 2	3/29/2024	Public Input	Why would that be of value to anyone? Subdivision takes over 1 year and over \$100,000 in Austin. Why would anyone subdivide to get 3 single home lots when a 3-unit site condo does the same thing for almost no cost? Eliminate all subdivision requirements for lots under 10,000 Sq Ft - allow subdivision to be done by survey and deed - THEN you have something useful! This is allowed in Houston, why not here??
HOME 2	3/29/2024	Public Input	I live in an area where there is some space between homes. I don't want to be able to look into my neighbors windows. How do I prevent my home from being one that is very close to another?
HOME 2	3/29/2024	Public Input	Having a 5750 SF "cliff" where up to 3 units are allowed on a 5750 SF lot but only one unit is allowed on, say, a 5749 SF lot creates inequity. East Austin has many lots that do not meet the minimum lot size. Moreover, with the removal of the Accessory Apartment option, HOME actually REDUCES density for lots under 5750 SF.
HOME 2	3/29/2024	Public Input	Do existing homeowner/community association rules/covenants regarding development still apply, or does HOME invalidate them?
HOME 2	3/31/2024	Public Input	When considering HOME 2, why will Council be presented with only one option? My lot is in Bouldin where there are many lots just under 5,750 s.f. Even after HOME 1 passed, these wonderful lots with alley access are STILL not allowed to have even two homes on them - even though a lot with just 8 s.f. more than mine can have three! There is no logic here. But that doesn't mean that allowing me to subdivide my lot in two so that I can put six units on it is



			<p>the only answer. An alternative reasonable proposal would be setting a new minimum lot size at 2,500 but allowing lots between 2,500 and 5,750 to have two homes on them. Remember that if HOME 2 (which I understand is at the end of development) doesn't pass, there are other options that can work well and help us to increase housing in Austin. Nothing that we build in Bouldin will be affordable, but at least we will be able to add some homes that cost less than \$1.5 million - for a few years at least.</p>
HOME 2	3/31/2024	Public Input	<p>As a longtime Bouldin dweller who is watching my neighborhood become increasingly unaffordable for families and longtime residents, I support any changes that increase density in a moderate way. We need to provide ADUs rules that allow for passive income and lot splitting. I know the voices about neighborhood character and the status quo are loud but they are also retrogressive. Please keep density, climate and equity for those of us in the urban core at the center of this conversation.</p>
HOME 2	4/1/2024	Public Input	<p>Without any impervious coverage increases and with a max of 1450 sf, I will guarantee that this new small lot allowance will rarely ever get used. No homeowner or builder/ developer will go through the (costly and timely) subdivide process if they are not incentivized to do so.</p> <p>Austin is not thinking forward enough here, nor are they running the language through the gamut of test fits, nor are they engaging homeowners, architects, and developers enough here. This is incredibly disappointing and not helping towards the goal of adding housing in an underutilized City. We are one of the most least dense of the top 10 cities in the US and we need to do something about this if we want to curb lack of affordability.</p>
HOME 2	4/1/2024	Public Input	<p>Will HOME Amendments potentially affect all areas within the City of Austin or just some zip codes or areas? In other words, what are the geographical boundaries of HOME Amendments?</p>
HOME 2	4/1/2024	Public Input	<p>What has to happen in order for HOME Amendments Phase 2 to be adopted? How do Austin residents keep this from being adopted?</p>
HOME 2	4/1/2024	Public Input	<p>Was this same process followed prior to adopting HOME Phase 1? I don't recall get a Public Notice.</p>
HOME 2	4/1/2024	Public Input	<p>In order to allow multiple houses on a plot of land, the land is likely to be cleared of bigger trees. Please provide more information regarding housing code provisions to ensure that we are building to maintain these trees, which do a lot for the environment as well as character of Austin.</p>
HOME 2	4/1/2024	Email	<p>I see your name under the recommendations and wondering if you know what happened to code for tiny homes including RVs are there any more guidelines updates about Home Phase 1 elements that passed Especially What "Including Tiny Homes: Making it easier to install a tiny home, an accessible and affordable way to add a small house to a property." means?</p> <p>Still wondering.....what permits do I need to build tiny homes? What about adding trailers? I guess no new info in home 1?</p> <p>Not seeing this addressed in Home 2 vote upcoming either?</p> <p>Pls lmk if I am missing anything.</p>

			I am not an architect or a builder. I am a person THANKS
HOME 2	4/1/2024	Public Input	I am opposed to making my neighborhood more densely populated. There's already enough traffic and cars parked on the street as it is. I will be voting against my current City Council member, and will donate money to fund any viable challenger.
HOME 2	4/1/2024	Public Input	I am opposed to making my neighborhood more densely populated. There's already enough traffic and cars parked on the street as it is. I will be voting against my current City Council member, and will donate money to fund any viable challenger.
HOME 2	4/1/2024	Public Input	Do we have the city infrastructure to support multiple houses in the same lot size as the original dwelling and/or does this presuppose that the original dwelling will be razed to make room for the additional smaller lots/buildings with multiple hook ups to city utilities?
HOME 2	4/2/2024	Public Input	This is an end run past the landowners in Austin. I bought my SF2 lot in 1993 in the belief that I would be able to protest any change in the zoning status of my lot or any lots near me. I thought I could maintain the residential status of my lot. This represents a zoning change without my approval. I am totally against any such change. Apply these restrictions to new subdivisions, but not my established neighborhood. You should all be ashamed of yourselves.
HOME 2	4/2/2024	Public Input	Not necessary to build two or more homes on one lot, to me it's sounds like accommodating gentrification, instead helping Austinites afford a decent home within city limits, instead pushing us out further out of the neighborhood to make room for other people to gentrify our area.it happen to east austin, please don't let it happen hear. Pleas just build affordable single homes not need for 2-3 condos one one lot that no one can't afford
HOME 2	4/2/2024	Public Input	NO. NO. NO.
HOME 2	4/2/2024	Email	<p>Asking on behalf of the Holly neighborhood Association, I'm looking into the details of the second round of the HOME development amendments:</p> <p>Under the HOME 2 proposals, the staff report states that McMansions design standards (Subsection 1.2.1 of Chapter 252, Subchapter F (Residential Design and Compatibility Standards).) will only apply to ' the city center.' What are those new proposed boundaries?</p> <p>Does it include the Holly neighborhood? Or the part of it within the lakefront overlay?</p> <p>If you could, please provide a map of the new boundaries.</p> <p>██████████</p>

HOME 2	4/2/2024	Public Input	Absolutely not. I did not buy my house in an area where the code has been unchanged for someone to come and build a duplex on Nextdoor. NO.
HOME 2	4/3/2024	Public Input	Zero foot interior side yard setbacks for existing and subdivided lots should be allowed with a restrictive covenant granted from the adjacent lot owner
HOME 2	4/3/2024	Public Input	I, am opposed to this code. Having grown up in Austin, this change doesn't benefit any residents but the developers. It doesn't seem to include any low income clauses. It doesn't make sense to make changes for more housing when traffic and public transportation cannot keep up with the current growth. No need for a response, please consider this my protest. If I have the wrong spot to voice this protest; please email me the link. Thank you for your time.
HOME 2	4/3/2024	Public Input	<p>I got this response to my earlier comment: "Staff was directed to recommend reduction to the current minimum lot size of 5,750 sq ft for one residential unit. This allows for lots under 5,750 sq ft to subdivide and increase density. Future code amendments could revise the minimum lot size for two or more units. Thank you!"</p> <p>Subdivision is such an onerous and expensive process (≈1 year and \$50k-\$100k) that it's unreasonable to expect homeowners to undertake that. The 5750 SF cliff hurts homeowners of modest means and further widens the "missing middle". Why were Accessory Apartments removed? Again, this code runs counter to the stated policy of increased density. If a 5000 SF lot can be subdivided to two 2500 SF lots, why not simply allow 2 units on lots under 5750 and skip the expensive, time-consuming subdivision?</p> <p>Finally, if indeed "Your input is important to us", I have to say staff's response is dismissive.</p>
HOME 2	4/3/2024	Public Input	I did not support Phase 1, nor do I support Phase 2. Austin already cannot handle the present growth as there is no water, higher utility bills, and an unreliable grid. More people will worsen an already dire situation.
HOME 2	4/3/2024	Public Input	How about lots that already have multi-family like a duplex. Can we add 4 units?
HOME 2	4/3/2024	Public Input	Hello. I support city growth with conservation. I support more housing with sufficient sidewalks, bicycle lanes and vehicle parking. Roads should be safe for all. Congestion makes it unsafe for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians, including those using mass transit. Good housing plans will make our city cleaner and safer. Thank you.
HOME 2	4/3/2024	Public Input	Hello, I was wondering if the new density levels will trump individual neighborhood NCCDs? I own in Hyde Park - [REDACTED] - and have been wanting to build an ADU. I meet city lot requirements, but not NCCD lot requirements - my lot is 6,150 sf. Thank you, [REDACTED]
HOME 2	4/4/2024	Public Input	The area of alley ROW dedications and easements that allow access to the rear of a lot and any adjacent lots should be included in minimum lot size and maximum FAR calculations. Narrower lots require rear vehicle access to off-street parking if driveways are not allowed in front of a house (which they should not). Providing much needed rear access to lots that typically do not exist should be rewarded and not penalized by reducing the lot size. Although minimum off-street parking is not required, there will still be market demand to provide it.

HOME 2	4/4/2024	Public Input	Terrible idea. Don't do it.
HOME 2	4/5/2024	Public Input	What is the maximum floors allowed to be built on a single family home plot?
HOME 2	4/5/2024	Public Input	Are you making an adjustment to the impervious ground cover ratios to accommodate denser lot building? How will this work to existing homes?
HOME 2	4/5/2024	Public Input	The registration links aren't active!!!
HOME 2	4/6/2024	Public Input	How can I find out the changes that will be allowed on and near my property? I live at [REDACTED] There are already two houses on my lot, the lot next to me, and the lot 2-doors down. We already have a dense, central Austin neighborhood and the neighborhood still has an eclectic, charming, central Austin vibe. I am very concerned about large homes being crammed into a small lot and causing flooding and urban blight. I am very concerned that the charming neighborhood feeling of central Austin historic neighborhoods like mine, Hancock and nearby Hyde Park changing. Please build planned density in areas like Mueller and the Grove, not change the character of well established neighborhoods. Keep downtown Austin dense but not our charming neighborhoods. The prices will still be high. There is lots of land out by the airport - create planned dense neighborhoods there. Thank you. Please schedule another Open House. One in-person, 2-hour open house is not enough for Austin.
HOME 2	4/6/2024	Email	<p>hi Lauren, All,</p> <p>i'm a registered architect in town that sat in on the mcmansion code adoption committee meetings (a long time ago). i realize you are very busy.</p> <p>can i schmooze a little in getting the names of people now at the city for residential and commercial permitting and code but also any links or advice on what to read in order to get caught up early on any changes?</p> <p>i'd like to focus in on what is changing but i haven't plugged in for a long time so i am rusty on changes!</p> <p>is the mcmansion tent and assorted allowed and prohibited protuberances going away? how best to get caught up on the new code?</p> <p>also is there any digital data available? or who can i tell to about digital data? at one point someone gave us a link to sketchup files!</p> <p>THANKS</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
HOME 2	4/6/2024	Public Input	Will the City develop and implement an easier process for homeowners to request approval for manufactured homes and will the permitting fees be more affordable or waived for homeowners?
HOME 2	4/7/2024	Public Input	I support the proposed code changes. Clearly, the staff has put in the time to iron out many technical kinks the occur during development such as: - FAR incentives for multiple units - 0' side setbacks - reducing flagpole mins and


			<p>setbacks Without any knowledge of the City's fire code, I am concerned about requirements for shared driveways (driveway width, length, turnarounds, etc) and hose lengths or hydrant distances. It is important that fire (and utility) codes don't hamper development. Personally, I would like to see tree planting required. Many projects may build a house on a gravel lot (i.e. [REDACTED]). I am also disappointed that three units were not allowed on the small lots. I worry that turning 1 house into 3 will not make financial sense in most single family neighborhoods. Allowing small three unit condos could change that. Please include garages in FAR as to not incentivize them. Front setbacks pushed to 10' would be a plus although 15' in an improvement.</p>
HOME 2	4/8/2024	Public Input	<p>It is wonderful to take steps in whatever ways possible to address the affordable housing crisis facing all too many Austinites—but we MUST NOT leave elder-orphaned seniors of modest means and increasingly fragile health behind.</p> <p>Imagine what it would mean to seniors and those providing senior services if the City of Austin would consider affordable mixed-use shared housing solutions in ETODs so that seniors can collaborate to age in place. Imagine seniors sharing resources to better care for themselves and each other in walkable urban village settings where they can mingle freely and intergenerationally with other Austinites. Imagine there being an intergenerational makerspace and baker space in the development under the sponsorship of others for intergenerational entrepreneurial and STEAM pursuits. In addition to HOME 2, please adopt future policies that will promote and allow mixed-use shared housing models within TODs or ETODs for the benefit of ALL Austinites, INCLUDING SENIORS.</p>
HOME 2	4/9/2024	Public Input	<p>The occupants of the houses on 37th st and Guadalupe are responsible for organizing and building the 37th street lights. If the affordable housing is removed, then the 37th street lights will die. Another sad example of economic progress and “beautification” throwing out the true people and elements that “keep Austin weird” The 37th st lights are more than just a cool tradition that was started in 1986 by people living in the houses proposed to be destroyed. They offer an important perspective for all viewers especially the lower income children. Instead of having to pay for lights or drive to one of the most wealthy neighborhoods in the city, they can go to 37th street and see that lower income working people can contribute to the success and traditions of the city as well. That they are just as important. We talk about pushing a progressive agenda - and we vote to push a progressive agenda - yet we are just hurting more and more of the people who matter. Please reconsider your plan</p>
HOME 2	4/9/2024	Email	<p>Dear City of Austin staff,</p> <p>I've got some questions about the proposed 15' minimum front building setback requirement under HOME phase 2. Could you call me on [REDACTED] when you're able to?</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>[REDACTED] Safe Streets Austin</p>

HOME 2	4/10/2024	Public Input	<p>If HOME 2 is intended to produce more housing, it misses the mark if it does not abandon the McMansion rules which have driven up housing costs for 20 years. Under the current code, I am 'allowed' 2300sf FAR on my 4480 sf lot. The proposal REDUCES allowable FAR to "the greater of 1,450 sf or .55 FAR." Elsewhere it says "up to 2,300sf" so a 'larger' small lot can't realize the .55 FAR. HOME 1 promised more units on smaller lots and HOME 2 then taketh away. This seems to deliver NO CHANGE for central small lots. My lot, as built in 1925 and without addition, has 63% ImpCvr. My house looks like the others across the street, but their % of IC is less because they have back yards; I don't. 45% IC is not enough to get additional housing. Flooding? Doesn't happen here because the area is hilly. Small lots need allowance of 65% IC (which I could get with change to SF4 zoning, but Oh the expense and time!) plus allowance for 2 if not 3 units to be the workhorses they once were for Austin</p>
HOME 2	4/10/2024	Public Input	<p>I have a 4,480 sf lot in central Austin and have, FOR YEARS, been looking for land use reform which would allow me to build a 2-unit or duplex home. Alas, apparently, that time STILL has not come. CM Pool's proposal directed the creation of small lots with entitlements of 3 units each. I thought my time had finally arrived! Why was that taken away? The draft says a SF lot must have 5,750sf to have 2 units. Why?? All around me, in Old West Austin, specifically within dozens of feet of me, on Oakland and Highland Aves, are 2-, 3-, 4- and even a 5-plex on lots less than 5,750 sf. Why cannot I have the same? Why is my lot "too small," in the City staff's estimation? There was a handsome 4-plex nearby (since converted to SF) that is on the SAME .10acre lot as me, built in 1930 with 3,200sf. And I can't have a duplex? Makes no sense and does not open up housing opportunities. Maybe these rules are appropriate for Tarrytown, but not where the "as built" from 90-110 years ago is otherwise.</p>
HOME 2	4/10/2024	Public Input	<p>Home 2 does not apply to SF4, which in the LDC provides a better-fitting set of entitlements for small lots. Why create too-restrictive special rules for lots less than 5,750sf? Why not use the current SF4 rules-- 3.5' side yard setbacks, instead of 5'; 65% ImpCvr instead of 45%; plus the option for Front Yard Averaging for front setback, and then allow any qualifying (by size) small lot to ADOPT SF4 rules, rather than forcing us to go through the time and expense of a zoning change to get those very sensible entitlements. Please do not eliminate Front Yard Averaging. I paid for a survey to find that I can build 8'4" back. Don't make me set back 15' from the front property line. It's not fair and I won't match my neighbors. And for God's sake, please allow AT LEAST 2 units (on at least a, say, 3500sf lot, IF you must impose a minimum; and FAR allowance of 3,200sf/2 units as for larger lots). We need more housing UNITS and smaller lots can provide them</p>
HOME 2	4/10/2024	Email	<p>Hello there,</p> <p>My name is [REDACTED] and I am writing in hope of urging you against voting to rezone. This is referencing the case number c20-2023-7220, the commission name is "planning commission", the public hearing date is April 11th, 2024, and the contact person is Lauren Middleton-Pratt. I am born and raised in Austin Hyde Park area, and I along with many of my community would be devastated if it was to be rezoned for density purposes. This neighborhood means a lot to me, especially 37th street, and I urge you to vote against this proposal.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, [REDACTED]</p>

HOME 2	4/10/2024	Public Input	COA rules once required a 7,000sf lot for a duplex; years ago that was reduced to 5,750. Now, HOME 2 fails to move the needle to allow duplexes on smaller than 5750sf lots. WHY? Does COA want to force people to go through onerous and expensive subdivision of lots to get those units? The proposal before you does not apply to SF4 zoning, which is appropriate (requirements and entitlements) for smaller lots-- examples: side yard set-backs of 3.5'; Front Yard Averaging for front set-back; 65% Impervious Cover. My small lot, as built in 1925, has 63% IC. I would need a zoning change to recreate that which is all around me, and which has caused no flooding or flow problems here. Why not allow lots < 5750sf to OPT for SF4 zoning, rather than force us through a costly, time-consuming zoning change? Why force us to chase waivers to get the FAR that our neighbors have? Subdivision, zoning change, waivers all add to housing costs-- unnecessarily. APPLY the appropriate entitlements please!
HOME 2	4/11/2024	Public Input	We should have a 5ft front setback!! If we want this change to produce smaller houses on smaller lots, trees will eventually become an issue when siting on properties with existing homes. That being the case, a smaller front setback allows for more flexibility in placement, and for a larger backyard!
HOME 2	4/11/2024	Public Input	The minimum lot size should be 1900sqft at the MOST! That is what the current minimum lot size divided by 3, which makes sense as 3-unit use is allowed on those lots. We SHOULD be looking at 1000sqft minimum lot size for future platting, which would (if we change setbacks) create cute little ~450sqft, 2 story houses with great little backyards.
HOME 2	4/11/2024	Public Input	I support all changes to increase opportunities for gentle density and increased property rights (i.e. using your property as you wish)
HOME 2	4/11/2024	Public Input	We should consider reducing th minimum lot size to 1800 square ft since many lots in Austin are 7200 sq ft. This would allow up to 4 dwellings to be built.  Further please have stairwells exempt from side setback rules. This would allow existing buildings to become two dwellings: one per floor, with minimal impact to the property.
HOME 2	4/11/2024	Public Input	I am a recent graduate from UT who for my last 3 semesters saved money by living over 5 miles from campus in a 3bd house that housed 6 unrelated 20 somethings. I biked over 30 minutes to class M-F. I believe the lot sizes should be 1900 sq ft. 2000 is a decent reduction but its still larger than many other cities in Texas. While I understand many SFHs in Austin are well above the current minimum lot size, it does create this logistical + vetting problem that could be solved by just by-right approving every lot in the city for divvying.  Also I really hope that y'all can approve setbacks of 0 on the sides of properties so we can have many more row houses that dont have just a foot or a few feet in between them. I feel like it unnecessarily cuts houses off from usable space and allows for heating+cooling loss that could be solved by allowing houses to be build up next to each other.  Please make north and west austin build their fair share of housing! While protecting the aquifer :)

HOME 2	4/11/2024	Public Input	<p>I know it has not been proven to allow for the construction of significantly more units, legalizing single-stair buildings can do a lot to diversify the types of apartments built and improve the apartment quality of life.</p> <p>This should be done in conjunction with developing the fire code. Austin should buy some smaller fire trucks too. Many cities in Europe have faster response times using these smaller trucks bc they are more nimble and can maneuver small roads easily and they will be more fuel efficient and cost effective for check ups.</p> <p>I would love if there could be incentives for green construction techniques like mass timber. Some mass timber projects are being built in Austin and we could really benefit from having the knowledge and skills develop in our cities construction crews. They are also very fire resistant!</p>
HOME 2	4/12/2024	Public Input	<p>I support the HOME initiative to increase housing supply &amp; affordability and to reduce sprawl. Please consider an amendment for the minimum lot size to be 1900sqft instead of 2000sqft, so a standard 5750sqft lot can be subdivided into three lots instead of two.</p>
HOME 2	4/12/2024	Public Input	<p>I fully support the HOME Phase 2 resolution! My only comment would be that we should have the smallest setbacks possible, 5ft or so. We should target an even smaller minimum lot size as well.</p>
HOME 2	4/12/2024	Public Input	<p>This should NOT be implemented!</p>
HOME 2	4/12/2024	Public Input	<p>I am in support of these code changes. I would also support the City shrinking the minimum lot size further (see Houston's 1,400 sf) and/or allowing multiple units on those new lots. Additionally, I would like to see the City add a review time limit on all project submittals. Adding a "shot clock" or say 30 days from when a project is submitted until the city provides written comments gives developers a consistent timeline which will reduce uncertainty and costs.</p>
HOME 2	4/15/2024	Email	<p>Hello! I have a lot a client wants to sell. They are asking about the new HOME regulations. I want to confirm that you have to have a minimum lot frontage of 50ft. The lot is a substantial size but is in a cone shape.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
HOME 2	4/15/2024	Public Input	<p>Although supporting middle-income earners is important, the City must prioritize our low-income families and preserving historic east-side neighborhoods to meaningfully address the affordable housing crisis. I fear HOME will only encourage developers to tear down existing housing (construction emissions will be detrimental to our climate goals) and build luxury condos and multi-unit housing options at sky high rents, only accessible to the wealthy. Additional units on a single lot will only incentive more of the development that is pushing out our low-income community members. Can you address this concern that has been voiced by thousands of community members? I can't support this plan until it includes safeguards to ensure the new development is deeply affordable and doesn't threaten the existence of low-income renters and our black and brown communities on the east side!</p>



HOME 2	4/15/2024	Public Input	The HOME Initiative currently applies only to single family lots with SF zoning designation. Will it also apply to RR and other single family zoned Lots in the future?
HOME 2	4/15/2024	Public Input	I am against this. There are better ways to build more affordable housing than by ruining neighborhoods of single family homes. Build more apartments/condos, rent controls, mandate smaller homes in some areas, etc.
HOME 2	4/16/2024	Public Input	<p>I have not seen a due diligence look at what can be done holding the current impervious cover of 45% instead of "bumping up" I.C. The modeling I have seen presents 3-4 back units sized at 2200 sf per unit, twice the size of the more modest and affordably sized "old bungalow in front" of ~1100 sf. The smaller house size is what many people want and need, is certainly more sustainable, and it needs to be championed.</p> <p>This seems like an obvious and a critical initial step, not only in the context of Watershed Protection concerns, but also in the context of greater affordability, natural asset preservation (i.e. trees), and urban heat and resilience. Please undertake a rigorous study of what can be done to add units, easing setbacks and compatibility and other tools, to stick to 45% impervious cover and gain the advantage of greater support across the combined community. We cannot afford the creep of lost tree canopy in Austin as climate change continues to worsen.</p>
HOME 2	4/17/2024	Public Input	Will neighborhoods with HOAs be allowed to build additional housing under the HOME initiative? Or, will it be dependent on approval from HOA?
HOME 2	4/17/2024	Email	<p>The graphics on the website are really helpful to see what the proposed HOME 2 initiative is proposing for single family homes on the potential smaller lots.</p> <p>It doesn't show the possibility of multiple units on these new smaller lots. From HOME 1, each SF lot could build up to 3 units. So can we assume that we could do 3 units (stacked flats or townhouses) on these smaller lots (as long as they conform to impervious and height restrictions)?</p> <p>This would be amazing and would allow for an increase in housing we need. And now having no parking requirement, this scenario would be much more possible.</p> <p>Thanks for your help.</p> <p></p>
HOME 2	4/17/2024	Public Input	How is tiny home defined? Can tiny home be off the grid ? Where do go to find the process to register to have a tiny home on my property?
HOME 2	4/17/2024	Public Input	Are parking guidelines, either on or off street, included in this HOME 2 phase?