TRANSPORTATION - Equity

PROBLEM/ISSUE: ***How can our Code ensure transportation infrastructure that enhances Complete Communities and contributes to Social Equity?:***

- ***Elderly and young drive less, don't want to be car dependent***
- ***Less expensive transportation choices (other than SOV) help bridge the equity gap***
- ***Think about the problem as a public health issue, as well as a social equity issue. (Perhaps other organizations could fund corridor standards/regulating plan work. Identify new partners.)***
- ***Ability to age in place requires both housing and transportation options that work in unison. Ensure access to a robust transportation network***
- ***Street designs and street typologies should consider the safety needs of people of all ages and abilities.***
- ***Transportation Demand Management and Health Impact Assessments should become regular practice; the use of TIAs should disappear***
- ***Commercial Development (over a certain size/scale?) should provide Active Transportation supportive features. e.g. shower facilities, bike share programs, etc.***
- ***Imagine Austin Centers and other districts should offer shared solutions for parking and other infrastructure.***

PROPOSED APPROACH: ***Look for ways to better integrate attractive transportation options into development and re-development projects that serve the needs of all community members, despite their agility, age or income.***

CASE STUDIES: ***Raleigh's code; AARP, Code for America, WalkAustin, Capital City Village***

TRANSPORTATION – Complete Streets and Connectivity

PROBLEM/ISSUE: ***How do we ensure that developments and re-developments create or contribute to multi-modal connectivity to their sites?***

- ***Complete streets should be standard practice and required of all development; Multi-modal improvements should go in at same time as roads during each phase of development/construction.***
- ***Preserve ROW and ability to provide complete streets, while enabling desired placemaking and building frontage along streets.***
- ***Street designs and street typologies should consider the safety needs of people of all ages and abilities.***
- ***Walkability is impacted by block length and perimeter distance; Set standards for both***
- ***Connectivity often dead-ends at large (new or redeveloped) sites: Enforce existing connectivity requirements through leadership in development review staff; Enhance connectivity requirements of all modes of transportation through sites.***

PROPOSED APPROACH: ***Find ways to couple better requirements with better review processes to safeguard connectivity outcomes in development and re-development.***

CASE STUDIES: ***Site plan cases case studies reviewed by Neighborhood Connectivity Division.***

TRANSPORTATION – Street Typology

PROBLEM/ISSUE: ***How do we ensure that developments and re-developments are truly walkable and all streets accommodate modal variety?:***

- ***Examine the public ROW on a corridor-wide basis to define required sidewalk and landscape zones. The City doesn't have the capacity to do plans for every corridor.***
- ***Redevelopment – problematic piecemeal approach; developers don't know how to comply (Subchapter E) and City departments have conflicting needs. e.g. South Lamar***
- ***Take all the regs about the TODs, Subchapter E, corridor plans, neighborhood plans, etc. - simplify these into clearer regulatory plans that have a clearer and simpler regulating plans…using a typology***
- ***Further integrate pedestrian, bicycle and trail infrastructure into the code***
- ***Examine how the code can assist in transit-ready or transit-enabled streets***

PROPOSED APPROACH: ***The City needs to be able to set standards per street type and existing ROW dimension, so that developers can understand how to comply. Examine the public ROW on a corridor-wide basis to define required sidewalk and landscape zones.***

CASE STUDIES: ***CNU walkability standards; look to Pedestrian and Bicycle master plans for guidance; Riverside Drive, East 7th Street, Airport Blvd.***

TRANSPORTATION standards, criteria and process

PROBLEM/ISSUE: ***Mobility of people should be central focus of transportation. How can we create and enforce regulations that exemplify placemaking and context sensitive transportation choices?***

- ***Current code is too focused on vehicle speed and ability to drive from one destination to the next and park. Emphasis should be placed on the experience of getting to the variety of daily needs in a pleasant and efficient manner.***
- ***How can the land development code best compliment the TCM requirements (what is best to put in the Code and what is best to leave in the TCM). OR, can the requirements in the TCM be folded into the new code.***
- ***Respect existing small area plans and standards and integrate context sensitive elements into the Code; retain those elements that move the dial toward people-centric mobility***
- ***Review is an art: Provide adequate leadership and training for staff involved in land use and transportation review; Encourage multi-disciplinary team review to eliminate current silos and encourage creative solutions.***
- ***Restructure the planning and development review teams to focus on Imagine Austin Centers and Corridors directed by skilled team leaders***

PROPOSED APPROACH: ***Ensure all modes of travel are considered equally in the new code. Examine relationship between Land Development Code and Criteria Manuals. Enforce better regulations through code administration that upholds legality while allowing creative thinking.***

CASE STUDIES: