

SCW Questions, Concerns & Suggestions for Consideration

Thank you for your questions. Staff has worked to provide some reactions, brainstorming, and responses to Council questions below. Staff's responses are in blue.

Due to the nature of these and recent questions we've received from other members of the public, namely the development community, we thought it might first be helpful to establish what the code amendment proposed to be discussed on July 18th is, and what it is not:

What is being proposed on July 18th:

- 1) The Combining District and Density Bonus Program, if adopted, will establish **an opt-in set of zoning regulations** and **voluntary bonus program** by creating two new combining districts, which through a subsequent rezoning may be added to a property's zoning designation. Once added, if developers meet the requirements of the program, they are able to achieve additional density as identified in the density bonus map.
- 2) This code has been developed to, **as best as possible for a zoning code**, instill elements that are in support of the:
 - *2016 Vision Framework Plan* for this area
 - *Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint*
 - *Austin Strategic Mobility Plan* (including Project Connect)
 - Project Connect's *Austin Light Rail Implementation Plan*
 - Comprehensive plan for the city, *Imagine Austin*
 - 2022 Council Resolution requesting a code to be developed for this area
- 3) This code establishes one financial component to support buildout of this area of the city.
- 4) This code is designed to support transit-oriented development and density in support of Project Connect.

What this code is not:

- 1) This code is not a replacement for developments seeking to add a planned development area (PDA) combining district or rezone to planned unit development (PUD) zoning. This code amendments provides another option to increase entitlements apart from a more expensive and extended timeline associated with a PUD zoning application, while also providing a way for the City to require community benefits in exchange for increased density which is not a requirement in a PDA.
- 2) The fee-in-lieu generated by this density bonus program is one of many financial tools necessary to realize the full development of this important area of the city.
- 3) The code is not the way in which right of way can be procured for Project Connect impacted sites.
- 4) The code is not a definitive solution for Project Connect's infrastructure needs in the district (due to the combining district's opt-in nature and potential timing incongruences for Phase I of Project Connect).

Though the code does not address all items asked within the subquorum's questions, staff views them as integral to the discussion because they center around the South Central Waterfront. For that reason, we are addressing the questions holistically, rather than only answering questions specific to the July 18 South Central Waterfront council item.

1. Public Infrastructure

- Question: What are the identified needs that a TIRZ was going to pay for?
 - Specific: Land acquisition needed for space
 - Specific: Cost to construct improvements
 - Were there any plans for TIRZ funding to support infrastructure above and beyond what we could do as a city without the TIRZ? In other words, would city infrastructure go above and beyond with TIRZ funding?
- Specific pieces we want to know about
 - Electric substation
 - Electric transmission
 - Extending roadways such as Riverside Drive (*Barton Springs*)
 - Drainage infrastructure
 - Specific: Pipes
 - Specific: Regional water quality ponds
 - Specific: Regional Detention ponds
 - Austin Water
 - Specific: Fresh Water
 - Specific: Sewage

- Specific: Purple Pipe
 - Project Connect needs –
 - Right of way for station, TPSS, TC&CB, and other light rail facilities
 - Buildout of station, TPSS, TC&CB, and other amenities and facilities
 - Bus stops
 - Bike/ped connections to station
 - First/last mile connections
 - Parkland acquisition and development
- Clarification:
 - Includes infrastructure needed on public right of way
 - Includes infrastructure needed on private property but serves multiple properties, not just property where it sits.
 - Does not include infrastructure on property needed just for that property.

The infrastructure needs were outlined in the Council approved [Amendment 1: Preliminary Project and Finance Plan of Tax Increment Reinvestment Zone No. 19 on December 1, 2022, Item #10 in Exhibit D \(p. 129 of the PDF\)](#). Council established the priority of funding for Tier 1 projects (Roadway and Drainage and Affordable Housing). The infrastructure projects outlined in Exhibit D would fund capital improvements in alignment with City code and per Exhibit C: South Central Waterfront Vision Framework Plan of Amendment 1 of the Preliminary Project and Finance Plan.

The 2016 South Central Waterfront Vision Framework Plan envisioned 6 million square feet (SF) of new development over a 30-year time horizon. Currently the real estate market indicates at least 30 million SF of mixed-use development will be delivered in the next 15 years. The City's consultant identified existing area infrastructure and validated the order of magnitude for Framework public infrastructure costs for roadways, drainage, water, wastewater, reclaimed water, and electric duct banks (approximately \$131,000,000 compared to \$121,000,000, the 2020 update of 2016 Vision Plan estimate). The analysis affirmed the need for an electric substation but did not include an estimate in the revised estimates. Also excluded from revised estimates were costs that the developer would pay for through participation in the Density Bonus program (parkland, open space, affordable housing and community benefits, streetscape, and green infrastructure) as well as what would be needed to support the private development.

- On June 27, Council asked staff, without a TIRZ will public benefit percentages need to shift?

Staff's recommendation remains to split the fees-in-lieu evenly amongst the three categories (Housing; Parks; Infrastructure & Community Impact Benefit). All three areas are identified as priorities for the South Central Waterfront through public engagement, council resolution, and the area's adopted Vision Plan. As the density bonus program's fees-in-lieu will not be the only financial tool for the area, an even split remains the most reasonable approach to staff.

- On June 27 Council asked for a table of the different projects and infrastructure categories with eligible funding sources.

Forthcoming.

2. Feasibility Issues

Concerns:

- ICC/DDA Requirement has no bonus for more streets and circulation and is counting against impervious cover.
 - What is the average amount of square footage that an ICR is expected to be? In relation to current parcels, what is the percentage of land the ICRs are expected to be?
- Cost impact is not considered by the density bonus.

Internal Circulation Routes (ICR) are only applicable to sites that are 90,000sf or larger. There are four options for ICRs that range in width from 20ft ROW to 52ft ROW, for an average of 31.75ft ROW. The modalities for each vary from pedestrian only, to bicycle, to shared streets with low-speed vehicular travel.

Assuming an average downtown city block is 300ft by 300ft, and an average width of an ICR of 31.75ft, and assuming an ICR completely bisects a parcel in half from property line to property line, the average area of an ICR is 9,525sf (300ft x 31.75ft), or just roughly over 10% of a 90,000sf parcel. Of course, variability in site design, ICR option selection, and specific parcel sizes are all factors in the actual amount of land percentage that a site would put towards this requirement.

The cost of ICRs is not considered in the density bonus calibration because internal circulation is generally required of properties outside of the SCW district. Subchapter E of the Land Development Code Chapter 25-2 requires internal blocks no larger than 5 acres with internal circulation routes along the boundaries. The blocks in Subchapter E are approximately 2.42 times larger than those required in the SCW Combining District because the SCW regulations are intended to create blocks the size of a typical downtown block (300ft by 300ft). The Subchapter E internal circulation routes require vehicular circulation while internal circulation routes in the SCW Combining District only require pedestrian circulation in some locations, minimizing the space required. Therefore, even though the required block size is smaller in SCW than required by Subchapter E, the width of the ICRs in SCW are narrower, decreasing the impact to the developable land. Additionally, since most of the subdistricts in SCW don't have height limits, the development entitlements from the land required for the ICRs can be moved to another portion of the site.

- 30% community benefits seem unrealistic and may undermine the goal of realizing more high impact community benefits such as infrastructure, parks, and affordable housing.

How to Consider Commercial on-site community benefits

Beyond challenges raised in the subquorum's comment, staff previously flagged as a "next step" the need for how to address commercial on-site community benefits. Aside from affordable childcare, a near-term cost-effective and viable solution for oversight of on-site commercial community benefits is not available to ensure compliance. Any oversight solution for these other benefits is not anticipated prior to Council action on July 18.

Creative space, live music venues, and similar are all desirable uses for the South Central Waterfront area. Due to the lack of oversight program, in version 2 of the staff versions of the

code, staff is submitting a revised density bonus program removing certain uses from the on-site requirements and collect a fee-in-lieu. Staff is removing roughly 50% of the on-site community benefits. Staff is comfortable removing the identified commercial community benefits from on-site requirements as other City programs already incentivize many of these uses.

Staff will return to Council with a recommendation to require on-site commercial community benefits and forgo fee-in-lieu once an oversight process is established.

As a result of reduction of on-site requirements for community commercial the modified bonus program shall allow for a more scalable approach by offering flexibility in the required percentage for remaining on-site community benefits.

Succinctly, staff's modification to the program is:

1. Removing the following on-site community benefits as options:
 - Affordable creative space
 - Affordable child and adult care
 - Market rate child care and adult care services
 - Live music venues
 - Grocery uses
2. Keeping the following on-site community benefits:
 - Private common open space (space accessible to all)
 - Transit supportive infrastructure buildout
 - Public parkland buildout
 - Alternative community benefits not described
3. Creating a broader permissible range of distribution between on-site community benefits and fees-in-lieu:
 - 15-35% of density bonus (above gate keepers) can be earned by on-site community benefits (this range is currently 30-35%)
 - The remaining 65-85% of density bonus can be earned with fees-in-lieu (versus 65-70% in the current draft)

The above shift would allow for scalability to generate incentives for on-site community benefits that have been identified by this body, specifically that the density bonus program is “designed to accommodate the SCW vision...and centering Project Connect and the massive public and private investment needed for its success.”

Suggestions:

- Please provide any calculations of the total bonus entitlement given under the density bonus and the cost of each development requirement, such as ICR's, Bird Friendly Design, etc.
Costs will vary by project but ballpark estimate is better than no estimate.

Additional entitlements are not currently offered for ICRs or Bird-Friendly Design as they are baseline requirements for the Combining District. ICR costs were not studied by economic analysis as similar requirements are already in code (Subchapter E of Chapter 25-2, mentioned above).

Bird friendly design cost was not calibrated as this addition came about over the course of the public input process, and this feedback is in alignment with goals for the Vision Framework. However, staff have received feedback related to the cost prohibitive nature of the requirement, and have been working to understand how to modify this to keep the intent (bird and bat safety in this area) to offer the developer compliance through less cost prohibitive options such as a selection of at least one of the following criteria to comply:

- Latest adopted version of bird collision deterrence credit in U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED).
- Latest adopted version of American Bird Conservancy's (ABC) Prescriptive Rating Option.
- Latest adopted version of bird collision deterrence measure in Austin Energy Green Building (AEGB) Commercial Rating.
- Please send any backup (reports, presentations, white papers, etc.) from the consultants that provide a more in-depth explanation of the feasibility of the density bonus as proposed.

See attachments.

3. Achieving the Vision Plan and Project Connect Goals

Concern:

- SCW density bonus as proposed does not accommodate for the fact that some community benefits are needed more in certain areas of the district. For example, transit supportive features and housing are more critical near the Project Connect alignment, and parks are more critical near the waterfront and creek.

Suggestion: Map categorical subdistricts to prioritize different community benefits, as is being proposed for the Downtown Density Bonus update.

- Allows us to prioritize needs based on different areas
- Each benefit could have 3 different designations for each item
 - What can't be used
 - Optional for developer to use
 - Developer has to use, but considered part of community benefit
- Potential community benefits that would feed into subdistricts
 - Extra Parkland
 - Project Connect Infrastructure
 - Extra connectivity / great streets / public walkway needs / Smaller blocks
 - Environmental needs

- Other community benefits that maybe would be appropriate to link in
 - Ground floor activation requirements
 - Affordable Housing
 - Affordable Commercial / Community Space
- Can force prioritization by limiting each subdistrict to a short list of community benefits to prioritize in that area.
- If we can't do this, why?
 - How do we achieve the goals / priorities for different areas?

Compared with Downtown's roughly 846 acres, the South Central Waterfront is approximately 118 acres (~14% of the total area of Downtown). For larger areas like Downtown, subdistricts may be appropriate to influence varied characteristics, height, and density. However, for an area the size of South Central Waterfront, staff are not in support of subdistricts. This is from a timing, program complexity, and planning principles standpoint.

Timing

The creation of these combining districts does not provide the City with regulatory ability to choose at the time of zoning application, the timing of development or elements of site plan design for any property, including parks development and light rail infrastructure location. As a result, the timing of site plan application by which, for example, Project Connect related community benefits could be had, may not align with the needs of the Project Connect Austin Light Rail Phase I component. That said, planning for development is ongoing in this district today, and setting a baseline for community benefits in exchange for density is important. This baseline sets a consistent zoning structure to, as best as possible, realize the intent of the 2016 Vision Framework Plan and Council goals established in 2022.

To establish a baseline from which current *and* future development can occur in the South Central Waterfront, the combining district code and density bonus program should be established now. Further, the code should be established in a manner that is flexible enough to accommodate future location and buildout of parks, light rail, and other amenities regardless of their specific locations.

Program Complexity

Establishing subdistricts will make the code more complex. With subdistricts, the density bonus program would need to combine the height and density subdistricts (that exist now) with subdistricts requiring certain community benefits and / or additional development requirements for very small areas (for example 1-3 parcels in size in some cases).

This adjustment would create challenges for staff in terms of effective implementation and monitoring. Additionally, staff reasonably assume this would also pose challenges for the development community, and may reduce the likelihood for them to opt in to the program. Establishing subdistricts would also require a full redraft of the code and additional noticing.

Planning Principles

Given that the exact location for certain key amenities have not yet been determined, staff does not find a planning principal that justifies site specific determinations. Further, staff are concerned that, in implementing very small subdistricts within such a small portion of the city, it may create the appearance of making site specific determinations.

Solution-building in Lieu of Subdistricts

- Adjustments proposed in #3 of the response to Question 2 above could encourage sites that are better suited for remaining on-site community benefits (e.g., transit supportive infrastructure, private common open space, and parkland dedication) to gain a larger portion of their bonus density that way.
- Once parcels are rezoned into them, these combining districts and accompanying density bonus program is one tool in the toolbox for development. Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) are another tool. The goal of staff is that this program, once adopted, becomes the floor for what is expected for PUD applications in the future, where tailoring specific sites based on specific needs from infrastructure and open space standpoints can continue to be negotiated in a public process.

4. Project Connect

Concerns:

- SCW has by far the most private property acquisition and capital investment needed for the Phase 1 LRT alignment. Reducing the public cost of acquiring and developing rail infrastructure in this area is a public benefit to the City of Austin.
- Where possible, development regulations should facilitate/encourage integrating Project Connect stations and needs into nearby buildings.
 - Use ground floor areas for transit while developers use air rights above transit.

Suggestions:

- Provide an option in SCW density bonus where Project Connect infrastructure provision and ROW supersedes all other community benefits- [see Vela ETOD amendment](#)
- Exempt ROW from a developer's site area, counting toward impervious cover
- Ensure that developers are incentivized to accommodate and work with Project Connect Office on rail implementation.

Questions:

- Being as this area is where two rail lines divert, how much collaboration with the Project Connect office staff was done to create this program?

Project Connect Office (PCO) staff has worked closely with the Planning Department and Law Department to create the community benefit requirement associated with transit-supportive infrastructure in the SCW density bonus program. Regular coordination meetings have been held between Austin Transit Partnership, PCO, and the SCW team since late 2023. However, given the voluntary nature of the tools being used to implement SCW Vision Plan and the Project timeline, it became clear this tool is best for creating units/density/mixed use development in support of Austin Light Rail Phase I ridership.

- Understanding that these sections of rail will be the largest investment in private land acquisition, what accommodations can be made to the program to prioritize land dedication or factor that into the density bonus?

No reasonable accommodations can be made within this Combining District and Density Bonus Program. That said, per Chapter 25-6, Article 2, Transportation Improvements and Right-of-Way Dedication, we have the tools to acquire the ROW for Project Connect, when a site plan is submitted and the dedication meets rough proportionality of the impact of the development. The Statesman PUD does not require the ROW dedication to be concurrent with the site plan submittal.

- How many parcels will be directly affected by the Project Connect lines? And how much developable land will be acquired for Project Connect?

ATP is currently working on this analysis and plans to provide current estimates for property needs as part of the federally required Draft Environmental Impact Statement this fall. The analysis will be based off of the preliminary engineering work that is also in development. Based on the proposed district boundary map provided by City staff there are real estate needs for properties along Riverside Dr as well as properties to create new right of way for the light rail alignment to connect the bridge over Ladybird Lake to South Congress Ave within the boundary area.

- Was there any previous discussion on how to best support Project Connect needs and those specific parcels?

Yes, PCO has been collaborating with ATP and the Planning, Housing, Transportation & Public Works, and Law departments.

5. Housing

- How will units be calculated for on-site affordability above 2:1 FAR? Specifically, please explain how the multiplier in staff proposal 6.1 A 2. will work.

If the Council requests that staff consider an adjustment, staff could recommend that the on-site affordable housing requirement of 3:1 FAR starts above the 2:1 base entitlement. The calculation for the required number of affordable units would then be calculated as follows:

The number of required affordable units = 5% of the total units, adjusted by the difference between the project's FAR and 2 FAR (capped at a maximum of 3 FAR), divided by the project's FAR. This can be expressed as:

$$\text{Required Affordable Units} = 0.05 \times \text{Total Units} \times \left(\frac{\text{Project FAR} - 2 (\text{Max } 3)}{\text{Project FAR}} \right)$$

- How many affordable units (and at what MFI levels) in the SCW are we trying to preserve?

According to data from Co-Star exported in March of 2024, there are 262 units that rent below 70% MFI and would currently be eligible for protections under Chapter 4-18 (this would need to be confirmed with rent rolls at time of application). The three apartment complexes are SoCo on the Lake (9 studios and 75 one bedrooms), The Willows (3 studios, 63 one bedrooms, and 31 two bedrooms, and South Congress Square (81 one bedrooms).

- Could we leverage fees to preserve? How do we proactively do that?

Part 7 of the proposed ordinance prioritizes fee-in-lieu for the preservation of affordable housing; and permanent supportive housing for low barrier approaches for persons experiencing homelessness.

- Can 4-18, when applied to SCW, be modified to provide eligible units off-site?

Allowing developers to provide eligible units off site would be challenging due to ownership concerns, equity concerns, and concentrations of poverty. On-site for rental and a FIL for ownership affords staff the opportunity to leverage existing funds for deeper affordability and locate developments to better achieve the goals of the Strategic Housing Blueprint.

- Can 4-18, when applied to SCW, be modified to require preference for a comparable sized unit but not affordability?

A comparable size replacement would do little to ensure that the replacement units would actually be affordable and does not achieve the goals of the Strategic Housing Blueprint.

- Could we turn existing (or future) middle aged and/or mid-rise units into affordable housing within or near SCW district?
Example: During Statesman PUD convo offered to do approximately 2x affordable units in 422 building, mid-rise middle age units more economical to buy down.

In addition to the on-site affordable housing requirement for rental units, the City aims to leverage fee-in-lieu for ownership units to build and preserve affordable housing within and near the SCW district through acquisitions, partnerships, and development assistance. The

requirement for on-site affordable housing aligns with the SCW Vision Plan, previous Council directives, and community input, all aimed at maximizing the availability of affordable housing in the district.

The quantity of on-site affordable housing is precisely adjusted to the maximum feasible amount given current market conditions. The goal for these affordable units is to be financially supported by the market-rate units, in exchange for additional entitlements that enhance the project's overall revenue. The *Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint* encompasses multiple objectives, including the dispersion of affordable housing in high-opportunity, transit, and job-rich areas like SCW.

6. Affordable Commercial Space

- Can affordable housing and affordable commercial requirements be merged?

Staff do not recommend this as these are calculated differently in the density bonus program.

Currently, housing is a gatekeeper requirement while affordable creative space and other commercial space such as grocery, childcare, etc. is available for bonus area. This recommendation would require a restructuring of the bonus program and may be difficult to implement given that affordable housing is determined by the number of units which could likely not be achieved for creative space due to the significant variability of the size of these spaces.

- Allows entire site to be included in calculation for affordability

The affordability requirement is currently calculated using 5% of 3:1 FAR for the entire site, not by building.

- Avoids complexity with parcels that are most/all residential or most/all commercial with a stray use

Currently, properties with only commercial/office use would need to pay a fee greater than those with residential uses (\$5/sf of residential vs. \$9/sf of commercial). This increased fee goes into the buckets for affordable housing, parks, and infrastructure/additional community benefits.

- Could set guardrail (cap) on what % applies to commercial to avoid eating too much in residential

7. Existing Non-Residential Space

- How does the staff recommendation impact Whataburger, Sandy's, and Thom's Market?

If a site includes an existing non-residential space, the proposed development must replace each existing non-residential space with a space that is comparable in size for a period of 5 years. A non-conforming use is not discontinued or abandoned under Section 25-2-945 (Abandonment of Nonconforming Use) if the non-conforming use qualifies as an existing non-residential space and is required to be replaced under this subsection.

Sandy's and Whataburger meet the criteria for this through:

- (Sandy's – 700 gsf, and established in 1947; Whataburger, established in 1979 with ~3,000 gsf) Restaurant (Limited) that has operated for a minimum of 10 continuous years with a gross floor area of 20,000 square feet or less.

Property owners of Sandy's and Whataburger (Sandy's and 601 Barton Springs LLC, respectively) have the opportunity to opt into this density bonus program. If opting in, the redevelopment requirements would be triggered.

Thom's Market meets the land use requirement (Food Sales) and the size requirement (under 10,000 gsf) but data provided by Co-Star indicates that it does not appear to have been established at the site for a minimum of ten (10) years, and so does not currently meet the criteria for this redevelopment requirement unless participating site plans are filed after ten (10) years of continuous establishment.

8. Bird (and Bat)-Friendly Design

- Are there specific migration patterns we should be aware of that apply to this?

Birds migrate through Austin year-round since we are situated along the Central Flyway, an important migratory pathway. Migration peaks occur in spring and fall. Austin has bird populations that are both year-round residents and migratory. Designing buildings for one category (resident vs migrant) makes the building safer for both resident and migrant birds.

- Are there specific heights where this is more important than other heights?

Yes, the first 100' from the ground up is the most heavily trafficked by birds due to the typical height of mature tree canopy.

- What species are the requirements focused towards?
 - Distinction: Bats vs migratory birds

There is less research available for bats, but bats do regularly strike building glass in large cities during migration. Bird safe shade structures, screens, grilles, and similar external options also reduce the incident of bats striking buildings. Appropriate lighting is also important to bat safety year-round.

Focusing on birds, these requirements are not focused on specific bird species but can positively impact the populations of everything from small (hummingbirds and warblers) to large (hawks and herons) birds.

- Are there degrees of bird friendly design?
 - Example: how much reflectivity is
 - Came up in Statesman PUD needed?

There is no universally accepted "tiered" system for the application of bird friendly design criteria. However, instead of requiring the entire building to adopt the criteria, height limits can be applied in the most heavily trafficked areas for birds (e.g. the first 100' from the ground up)

Glass reflectivity alone does not predict the rate of bird strike. However, generally speaking 15%

glass reflectivity is broadly accepted as helping reduce the threat of bird strike when incorporated with other treatments. If done correctly, mirrored glass can also be treated to reduce bird strike.

- How do these requirements interact / possibly conflict with green building standards?
 - Concern: Bird friendly might conflict with LEED requirements

Bird friendly design is a component of several green building standard design criteria. The proposed bird friendly design for South Central Waterfront offers compliance options for several different green building design standards to best meet the needs of individual buildings and reduce potential conflicts with other green building design requirements.

- Are there objective #s for how many birds are saved by different versions of this?

There is not enough data across several case studies to give a clear answer on how different versions of the criteria would impact the number of birds saved. Each building poses a different level of threat to birds due to a number of factors including building orientation, distance from habitat, number of windows, etc. Compliance with the proposed design criteria standards offer broad flexibility in how a building achieves a bird friendly status.

9. Parks

- How are we going to ensure parkland dedication funding can be used proactively?
 - Context: Normal PLD = Collect and spend fees as / after redevelopment occurs
 - Big parcels of land for parkland are best acquired early before redevelopment.
 - Concern: Need to bridge the gap, borrow against future payments

As mandated by the state, existing parkland dedication funds can only be required from multifamily sites at the time of the certificate of occupancy once the new development has been built. Through the Density Bonus program, there will be more funds available to PARD. These funds may be used to develop projects in parks like Auditorium Shores and along the Lady Bird Lake corridor. The additional Bonus funds and parkland dedication funds will be inadequate to acquire land in South Central Waterfront, due to the high cost of real estate in the area. Additional bonus area may also be achieved through parkland build-out which may subsidize the overall financial needs for parks in this area.

- How are we dealing with the 10% state imposed limit on what public parkland dedication can require on site?

Legal has advised PARD that exceeding the 10% limit within a Density Bonus program is possible but must apply to the entire Combining District. This is challenging due to the varied site sizes in the South Central Waterfront.

Currently, additional dedication in the Density Bonus Program is voluntary. Additionally, if approved by the PARD Director, public parkland buildout can result in increased density as an

on-site community benefit density bonus.

- How do we ensure parkland dedication will implement ALL parks envisioned by the vision plan?
 - Specific: Bouldin Creek boardwalk
 - Specific: Statesman parcel

Overall, the parks concept outlined in the Vision Plan will not be achievable because the combining district and bonus program is limited in its ability to afford many incentives for on-site parkland dedication in exchange for bonus entitlements. Additional bonus fees will not generate sufficient funds to purchase new parkland in the area due to the “proactive” issue noted in the questions, namely, the fees will not cover the cost (or even the feasibility, due to build-out) of buying new parkland in area that has already redeveloped.

The Bouldin Creek Boardwalk is part of a currently submitted PUD. If the tract opts out of the PUD and into the Combining District / Density Bonus Program, PARD would be able to require (as parkland) a band along the southern portion of the site. It is unknown whether this width would be adequate to construct a trail or boardwalk. A developer would be able to receive bonus credit for the construction of the trail to PARD standards.

The approved Statesman PUD commits 8 acres to parkland – the future Waterfront Park; if the same tract were rezoned within the Combining District / Density Bonus, PARD would be able to require 1.8 acres, most likely along the Waterfront.