

# Summary of Feedback from January 6, 2012 Meeting

---

## 1. Parkland Dedication

- Important to define what “parkland” means – different expectations of improvements, access, and maintenance
- Broaden to “open space dedication” and choose greatest need on case-by-case basis (e.g., active recreation, water quality land, etc.)
- Traditional parks belong in uplands—wilder, less maintained lands along creeks (still need to consider wildfire, safety concerns)
  - Need diversity of park types (e.g., playgrounds, trails, etc.)
  - Allow trails within buffers and floodplain—TIA credit for installation?
  - Fee simple dedication of greenbelt areas doesn’t need to be parkland
- More connected green space spreads out use and reduces impacts
  - Heavy concentration of use leads to degradation (e.g., Lady Bird Lake)
  - If we increase open space, who will take on additional maintenance?
  - More land means less money for improvements to existing parks
- Need to balance watershed protection issues with creating livable, connected neighborhoods—sometimes can conflict, integrate development and nature
- Need to give the developer more incentives to dedicate parkland/open space—offset the cost of additional buffer requirements
  - Dedicated review team (easier process, more interdepartmental coordination)
  - Full credit for privately-maintained parkland that is open to public
  - Provide some credit for 25-year floodplain, especially in wider floodplains
- Should give zero parkland credit for floodplain—developers will want to dedicate this land to the City anyway to avoid tax and maintenance burdens.
- Critical Areas Map could be a way to give floodplain areas more parkland credit
  - Combine PARD Need Deficiency Map with other mapped City priorities (e.g., Imagine Austin, Trails Master Plan).
  - Include wetlands, wildlife corridors, cultural assets, and critical species
  - Use Travis County Greenprint Map as example
- Need better coordination among City departments and between City and County

## 2. Transfers of Development Rights (TDR)

- Need to simplify the process
  - Concurrent platting (site plan instead?), 1-mile limit are too restrictive
- Allow development rights to be banked and used at a later time (e.g., Circle C)
  - Can be hard to track
  - Use in conjunction with City mapping of targeted areas for acquisition
- No incentive is needed because developers will want City to take the land for free—removing the tax burden and assuming maintenance liability
  - Require construction of trail and incentivize stream restoration
- Provide increased credit for dedicating floodplains on smaller waterways or providing additional water quality treatment through overland flow
- Impervious cover limits in the eastern watersheds are too high – not protective
- Impervious cover limits by land use in the eastern watersheds are unnecessary
- Difficult to use TDRs if impervious cover is already high
  - Alternatives: smaller lot size, increased density, height

## 3. Redevelopment

- Expand concept of Barton Springs Ordinance to other watersheds