



Draft 2 Mapping Process

SUMMARY

This document summarizes staff’s approach to mapping CodeNEXT and includes a summary of guiding principles, the process to mapping Draft 1, a summary of map changes from Draft 1 to Draft 2, as well as a Zoning Conversion Guide.

Staff considered a variety of factors and guiding principles in their mapping process. Staff’s approach to mapping will continue to evolve and develop, informed by ongoing work within CodeNEXT. Further, initial mapping efforts will serve to inform later efforts and may also identify areas where amendments to the zoning code are necessary.

BACKGROUND

Regulating land use through zoning requires two elements:

1. The zoning code, which identifies the zoning “districts” also known as the categories or classifications of zoning that regulate use and site development standards; and
2. The zoning map, which assigns the districts to specific parcels of land.

Neither element alone can regulate the development of land. Before they can take effect, both elements must be reviewed and approved by the city’s Land Use Commissions, which include the Planning Commission and the Zoning and Platting Commission, as well as the City Council. CodeNEXT includes developing the zoning code and the zoning map.

Developing the zoning map is also known as “mapping” or “mapping the code.” Staff recommends mapping the entire city at one time. The intent is to repeal the existing land development code and replace it with the new code while rezoning all properties within the city’s jurisdictional boundaries. Essentially, the CodeNEXT mapping phase will zone all property within the city’s jurisdictional boundaries, as applicable. Mapping the new zoning code is not final, however, since landowners are entitled to apply for rezoning. If approved by Council, rezoning changes the parcel from one zoning district to another. This is normal and appropriate as long as there are clear and predictable pathways to rezone a property or parcel.

Staff will present a recommended zoning code and zoning map for consideration and action by the Land Use Commissions. The Land Use Commissions’ actions will provide a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will ultimately decide which zones apply where. To understand how the CodeNEXT maps evolved, it is important to understand the various factors staff considered.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The primary direction for mapping comes from *Imagine Austin* balanced by additional direction from the following:

- Small area plans, including neighborhood plans (NPs) and Future Land Use Maps (FLUMS);
- Existing zoning/land use;
- Current entitlements, including development agreements;
- Other existing Council policy (master plans, studies, etc.);
- Conditional overlays; and
- Existing context
 - Building placement
 - Setbacks
 - Height
 - Scale/Proportion
 - Relationship to the right-of-way
 - Lot configuration

Earlier efforts of the CodeNEXT process have provided guidance as well, in the form of several reports including the [Community Character Manual](#), the [Code Diagnosis](#), and the [Code Approach](#) to rewriting the Land Development Code.

Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan

Imagine Austin provides the following guidance:

- “Austin’s long term sustainability requires a fresh focus on redevelopment and infill within the city’s developed areas. Favoring compact growth presents an alternative direction to earlier decades of sprawling, low-density development.” (p. 10).
- “Promote development in compact centers, communities, or along corridors that are connected by roads and transit, are designed to encourage walking and bicycling, and reduce healthcare, housing and transportation costs.” (p. 118).
- “Protect neighborhood character by directing growth to areas of change that include designated redevelopment areas, corridors, and infill sites. Recognize that different neighborhoods have different characteristics, and infill and new development should be sensitive to the predominant character of these communities.” (p. 118).
- “Encourage infill development opportunities that place residential, work, and retail land uses in proximity to each other to maximize walking, bicycling, and transit opportunities.” (p. 118).

Neighborhood Plans and Small Area Plans

The Neighborhood Planning Program was created in 1997 as an opportunity for citizens to shape the neighborhoods where they live, work, own property, or manage a business through visioning exercises. The neighborhood planning process addresses land use, zoning, transportation, parks and open space, and urban design issues. The goal of neighborhood planning is for diverse interests to come together and develop a shared vision for their community.

Neighborhood plans contain many recommendations that align with the Imagine Austin vision of a compact and connected Austin. Those recommendations were evaluated and considered as part of the mapping strategy and helped the CodeNEXT team understand how development patterns were considered during the creation of the neighborhood plans.

Master plans, like the Downtown Austin Plan, as well as small area plans, such as those for corridors and transit-oriented developments, usually have specific form and land use recommendations. These plans also have regulating plans that informed the mapping of these areas.

Future Land Use Maps (FLUMs)

Most neighborhood plans contain a FLUM, which is an area-specific map that provides broad direction about the type and location of future land uses. A FLUM depicts the types of future development for a parcel using different colors for different types of land uses. Each Neighborhood Planning area has its own FLUM. Each FLUM, in concert with the adopted neighborhood plan, informs development patterns and assists policymakers with making amendments to the neighborhood plan or zoning district. The only exceptions to this are Old West Austin and Hyde Park, which do not have their own FLUM.

The CodeNEXT team evaluated all existing FLUMs to closely examine development patterns as they were envisioned during their creation and how closely they align or deviate from Imagine Austin. The FLUM recommendations and associated zonings via the neighborhood plan provided a basis to analyze how development has evolved since the inception of the FLUM. This was carefully evaluated with existing patterns of development to calibrate development standard potential under the new zoning tools as proposed by CodeNEXT. Modifications to FLUMs is not included in CodeNEXT; however, updates and changes may be considered as part of an alternate process after an evaluation of existing conditions, development patterns, existing zoning, and application of the new zoning tools is studied.

Existing Land Uses

Analysis of current land uses played an integral part in the mapping process as it gave the CodeNEXT team a current picture of development in an area. How an area has developed over time was the precursor to understanding context. Even though patterns of development are evidenced by existing land uses as well as how they change over time, in most cases, the general character of places is constant.

Community Character

The CodeNEXT team evaluated development patterns as evidenced by the built form, the pattern of street connectivity, and the proximity and location of retail, jobs and transit, etc. Furthermore, through the use of the [Community Character Manual](#) and on-the-ground reconnaissance, the team sought to:

- Understand the range of different types of places and their components by districts, neighborhoods, and corridors;
- Establish a common foundation for CodeNEXT and future planning efforts in the City of Austin based on Community Character rather than uses, density, other numeric parameters, and policies that can be hard to understand; and
- Help the CodeNEXT team understand the types of zoning tools that could be considered based on place-based character and patterns.

Existing Zoning

Existing zoning is a factor in mapping. Guidance in the way of zoning was provided by specific, fine-grained policy decisions made during previous planning efforts such as neighborhood plans, small area plans, and planned unit developments. Existing zoning gave the CodeNEXT team a basis for assigning entitlements to a parcel.

Over 12,000 parcels in approximately 3,800 unique conditional overlays were examined by the CodeNEXT team in an effort to find consistent patterns of development restrictions that could be built into a new zoning district. An understanding of how these different entitlements support or are inconsistent with each other helped the team discuss how parcels should be mapped.

PROCESS: Mapping Draft 1

To map Draft 1, staff used the following process:

Located properties that were not getting rezoned (these are the now F25 zones)

- Identified in GIS. This included the following zones: ERC, NBG, TOD, NCCD, PDA, and CURE.

Translated current zoning to most similar Draft 1 zone

- Another function performed in GIS. Similarity was determined based on site development standards: lot size, uses allowed, density, height, setbacks, etc.

Researched Conditional Overlays

- All Planning and Zoning staff researched ordinances and entered information into spreadsheets created by mapping team. Every single conditional overlay was cataloged so that properties could be easily compared to Draft 1 zones to determine a best fit with a new zone. Where the complexity of a conditional overlay prohibited a best fit, those properties retained Title 25 zoning (stayed as-is).

Reviewed Interim (eg I-RR) and Split Zoning (single property with multiple zoning designations)

- Planning and Zoning staff was divided into five teams covering the five different Zoning Case Manager Areas.
- Each Zoning Case Manager area was divided into Grids that were assigned to staff via their team manager.
- Using an online GIS Mapping platform staff reviewed the Interim and split zonings in their grids and made suggestions on which zone to apply. Each suggestion was either approved or denied by the team manager.

Transects applied by mapping team using several inputs

- Imagine Austin Corridors served as the foundation
- Neighborhood plans (text) and Future Land Use Maps (FLUMs) were reviewed for further direction on desire for mix use or diversity of housing types
- Existing development patterns and building types
- Current urban patterns conducive to walking/biking to services and transit

Mapped other regulating plans

- Downtown Austin Plan
- Airport Blvd Initiative

SUMMARY OF MAP CHANGES: Draft 1 to Draft 2

Key changes from the Draft 1 map to the Draft 2 map include zone calibration, right-size zoning, fixing errors, additional review of small area plans and conditional overlays, as well as ensuring consistent application of the zones.

New Zone/Zone Calibration

Residential zones in Draft 2 are now applied more consistently, as there is a single spectrum of residential zones rather than transect and non-transect zones. In addition, adding more flexibility to form controls in the zones allowed for greater consistency along blocks- one zone can now apply to more places. This flexibility also reduces the number of nonconformities created by Draft 1 zones.

Some zones in the second draft have different standards that affect mapping. For example, R3C and R3A, zones applied to primarily SF-3 residential areas, have different lot width and area requirements than Draft 1 zones. Other changes include the application of R3 on SF-3 properties that received T4 neighborhood in the first draft, and the applying more nuanced main street and mixed use zones. Additional zone-specific changes are below:

Residential

- SF-3 with T4 (D1) applied in Draft 1 now has R3
- SF-3 along Imagine Austin Corridors and/or with a well-connected street grid received R3, while less-connected, more suburban SF-3 received R2
- Some SF-2 that received T3 (D1) or are similar to areas that received T3 now have an R2A designation
- Some SF-2 that is more suburban received R1
- LA has been reintroduced for properties along the Lady Bird Lake

Main Street

- Developed new main street zones based on intensity
 - Low intensity office and commercial zones that received main street zoning in Draft 1 (which allowed more intense uses) now have main street zoning that has more office and light retail (less intense uses) that better match current standards.
 - More intense commercial zoning that received main street zoning in Draft 1 (which allowed more intense uses) is maintaining similar commercial, retail, and residential allowances.

Mixed Use was mapped on commercial properties that did not receive Main Street zoning

- Properties that previously only allowed commercial uses will now permit a mix of commercial and residential uses.
- Removed Main Street from Far West and applied Mixed Use.

Park and Conservation Land – still under review with the Parks and Recreation Department

- Replaced the Open Space Zone; these areas are now zoned according to ownership. If the land was public it is now Public (P), Park (PR), or Conservation Lands (CL). Privately owned land reverted to the new zone that most closely matches current entitlements.
- CL was introduced on Balcones Canyonlands Conservation Program (BCCP) lands and certain Water Quality Protection Properties (WQPL).
- PR was introduced to City and County Parkland that meet certain criteria, such as land that does not have community centers or cemeteries.

F25 mapped on properties that are bound to Title 25

- NCCD
- ERC
- NBG
- PDA
- CURE

- TOD
- TND
- Highly specific Conditional Overlays

2017 Rezoning updates

- Staff consulted 2017 rezonings to update the Draft 2 map with current information

Right-Size Zoning

Some zoning designations were adjusted based on current entitlements or conditions. This includes modifying current mismatched zoning and proposed zoning that did not account for certain conditions. In some cases, multifamily properties are currently zoned rural residential, or City owned land isn't currently zoned public. These inconsistencies are corrected in Draft 2. Another example occurred when proposed zoning on large commercial properties not inhibited by compatibility or conditional overlays received a neighborhood level zone in Draft 1; this was changed to a more appropriate zone in Draft 2.

Error

Errors range from existing data inaccuracy to application errors. Some properties do not have zoning applied on the current map and needed further research to find the current zoning designation. There were also instances where properties had multiple zonings, also known as split zoning, and while staff attempted to reduce the occurrence of split zoning the data didn't translate appropriately. In some areas private property incorrectly received Public zoning.

Further Review of Small Area Plans

- Several small area plans, including neighborhood plans, were reevaluated and mapped accordingly with the new spectrum of Draft 2 zones. Examples include:
 - South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan FLUM
 - North Shoal Creek Draft FLUM
 - Windsor Park Neighborhood Plan
 - Refinement of Downtown Austin Plan
 - Refinement of Airport Boulevard Initiative

Further Review of Conditional Overlays

- COs were checked against the new spectrum of Draft 2 zones

Consistency

There was an occurrence, mostly in residential zones, where the same zoning was not applied to similar lots or blocks. Draft 2 attempts to address some of these inconsistencies. Examples include T3 and LMDR applied along a block with similar characterizes that now has a single zone, R3C. There were also instances of T4 mapped on properties that should have been mapped T3 to maintain consistency with similar and adjacent properties. Lastly, there has been an attempt to assign the same zoning to properties facing each other on the same street.

Zoning Conversion Guide

Since Draft 2 contains more zones than our current Land Development Code to account for nuanced development types, the following Zoning Conversion Guide seeks to explain Draft 2 zones using current zoning and existing conditions. Some zones, such as RR and LA, stayed the same. Others, such as the Residential House Form 'R' zones, reorganized our current SF zones. The Zoning Conversion Guide explains what types of SF (and other) zoned properties were assigned a particular Draft 2 zone.

Zoning Conversion Guide

RR	Where RR exists today
LA	Where LA exists today
R1A	SF-1 properties
R1B	SF-2 without McMansion
R1C	Suburban, less-connected SF-2 with McMansion
R2A	SF-2 with McMansion, in areas with pattern of duplexes on corner lots like North Shoal Creek and Allandale; and areas with connectivity similar to adjacent R3 areas
R2B	SF-3 without McMansion
R2C	SF-3 with McMansion, outside ½ mile from an Imagine Austin Corridor, and lacking connectivity and access to commercial activity
R2D	SF-4 without McMansion and current non-complying SF-3 that has a lot width less than 45' and an area of less than 5000 square feet
R2E	SF-4 with McMansion and current non-complying SF-3 that has a lot width less than 45' wide and less than 5000 square feet

Zoning Conversion Guide

R3A

SF-3 with McMansion, within ½ mile of and well connected to an Imagine Austin Corridor, Neighborhood Plans that call for transitional residential, and has lot widths at 60' or greater

R3B

SF-2 and SF-3 properties identified as Neighborhood Transitions by the South Austin Combined NP FLUM

R3C

Same criteria as R3A expect lot widths that are less than 60'

R3D

Not Mapped

R4A

MF 1-4 zoned properties either affected by compatibility, have a lot area less than 8000 square feet, or have single family use, and SF-3 with more than 2 units today that are within ½ mile of and well connected to an Imagine Austin Corridor, Neighborhood Plans that call for Mixed Residential and diverse housing types

R4B

Same criteria as R4A except with pattern of buildings set back closer to property line than 25'

R4C

Mapped on SF-3 with existing row houses

Zoning Conversion Guide

RM1A

SF-5 and SF-6 with McMansion, outside ½ mile of Imagine Austin Corridor

RM1B

MF (1-4) properties within ½ mile of and connected to an Imagine Austin Corridor, surrounded by house form residential, and have lots with an area larger than 8000 square feet

RM2A

MF-1 and MF-2 properties not within ½ mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor and lacking a connected urban form

RM2B

MF-4 and MF-5 properties within ½ mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor, have connected urban form, surrounded by house form residential, and lots with an area larger than 8000 square feet

RM3A

MF-3 and MF-4 properties outside ½ mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor and lack a connected urban form

RM4A

MF-5 and MF-6 properties within ½ mile and along an Imagine Austin Corridor, has main street building form, residential use, and connected urban form

RM5A

MF-5, MF-6 properties not along nor within ½ mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor and lack a connected urban form

Residential Multi-Unit

Zoning Conversion Guide

MU1A

NO, LO, and GO zoned properties within ½ mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor, that either have house form or the Neighborhood Plan calls for house form, and are affected by strong compatibility standards or COs

MU1B

Same criteria as MU1A on properties currently zoned LR, GR, CS, CS-1

MU1C

NO, LO, and GO affected by compatibility within ½ mile of and connected to an Imagine Austin Corridor, have house form or the Neighborhood Plan calls for preserving commercial-house form

MU1D

Same criteria as MU1C on properties affected by compatibility and currently zoned LR, GR, CS, CS-1

MU2A

NO, LO, and LR properties outside ½ mile of Imagine Austin Corridor or have large, unconnected suburban form

MU2B

GO properties outside ½ mile of Imagine Austin Corridor or have large, unconnected suburban form

MU3A

GR properties not within ½ mile of Imagine Austin Corridor or have large, unconnected suburban form

MU4A

CS-CO properties outside ½ mile of Imagine Austin Corridor or have large, unconnected urban form, where limited uses are appropriate

MU4B

CS, CS-1 properties outside ½ mile of Imagine Austin Corridor or have large, unconnected urban form

MU5A

CH zoned properties

Mixed Use House Form

Zoning Conversion Guide

MS1A	LO properties within ½ mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor that are affected by compatibility or conditional overlays and neighborhood plans call for mixed use
MS1B	Same criteria as MS1A with CS, CS-1, GR, LR zoned properties
MS2A	NO, LO, and GO properties affected by compatibility, that are within ½ mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor, and neighborhood plans call for mixed use
MS2B	LR, CS, CS-1 properties along or within ½ mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor, where neighborhood plans call for mixed use, main street character and residential units exists, affected by compatibility or COs
MS2C	LR, CS, CS-1 properties along or within ½ mile of an Imagine Austin Corridor, where neighborhood plans call for mixed use or main street character exists, and are affected by compatibility and/or conditional overlays
MS3A	Larger commercial properties along an Imagine Austin Corridor in areas that have existing main street character or have connected urban form
MS3B	Larger commercial properties along an Imagine Austin Corridor in areas that have existing multifamily, main street character, connected urban form, and to allow for flexibility of ground floor uses along blocks

Zoning Conversion Guide

CC

DMU properties with labeled heights designated by the Downtown Austin Plan at 40', 60', 80', or 120'

UC

Not Mapped

DC

CBD properties

Regional
Centers

CR

Where CR exists today and privately owned golf courses

CW

W/LO properties

IF

LI properties and a portion of Buell Avenue in the North Shoal Creek Draft Neighborhood Plan

IG

IP properties

IH

MI properties

R&D

R&D continues to stay where it is today

Commercial & Industrial

Zoning Conversion Guide

P

Properties owned by the City

AV

Where AV exists today and land owned and operated by ABIA

AG

Where AG exists today

DR

Where DR exists today and is undeveloped

PR

City and County owned parks, greenbelts, and outdoor facilities such as pools and sports fields

CL

Balcones Canyonlands Conservation properties and some Water Quality Protection properties as designated by PARD

PUD

Where PUD exists today, including the Grove and Austin Oaks

UNZ

Where UNZ state-owned land exists today

F25

Negotiated agreements that are remaining under Title 25 regulations. These include:

NCCD

ERC

NBG

PDA

CURE

TOD

TND

Highly specific Conditional Overlays

Other

Chapter 25