



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Mayor and City Council

**THROUGH:** Dr. Eric A. Johnson, Assistant City Manager

**FROM:** Lauren Middleton-Pratt, Director, Planning Department

**DATE:** May 30, 2025

**SUBJECT:** **Summary of Proposals and Stakeholder Feedback for the University Neighborhood Overlay Density Bonus (DBUNO) Code Amendment**

---

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide information about the University Neighborhood Overlay Density Bonus update, which comprises items 66, 93, 116, and 117 on [the June 5, 2025, City Council agenda](#). It provides a summary of Planning Commission recommendations, staff responses, and stakeholder feedback received throughout the proposal development process.

On April 18, 2024, City Council approved [Resolution 20240418-077](#) initiating amendments to the University Neighborhood Overlay. Staff's proposal responds to the direction from City Council, and the proposed code amendments would:

- Support increased capacity for student housing needed to meet anticipated demand,
- Encourage development of additional non-student housing in the district,
- Provide an incentive for the development of a needed grocery store,
- Incorporate additional tenant protections, and
- Provide additional quality of life enhancements as the district continues to develop over time.

Between summer 2024 and spring 2025, staff engaged stakeholders, conducted analysis, and developed a proposal based on the input provided. On May 13, 2025, the Planning Commission took action to approve the staff proposal with modifications. Staff has analyzed the Planning Commission modifications, and while staff is generally supportive of many of the recommended modifications, there are several modifications that staff does not support or where staff recommends an alternative approach. **Attachment A** outlines Planning Commission's recommended modifications and indicates staff's responses. **Attachment B** provides a summary of stakeholder engagement, stakeholder feedback related to the staff proposal, and staff's responses.

Two versions of the Land Development Code amendment ordinance will be shared as part of the backup for the June 5, 2025, meeting: a Planning Commission version and a staff-recommended version. While Council may choose to consider the Planning Commission version or the staff-recommended version as the base motion for the potential code amendment, staff recommends consideration of the staff-

**PAGE:** 2 of 2  
**DATE:** May 30, 2025  
**SUBJECT:** Summary of Proposals and Stakeholder Feedback for the University Neighborhood Overlay Density Bonus (DBUNO) Code Amendment

recommended version of the ordinance.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at [lauren.middleton-pratt@austintexas.gov](mailto:lauren.middleton-pratt@austintexas.gov) or 512-974-1827 or Alan Pani, at [alan.pani@austintexas.gov](mailto:alan.pani@austintexas.gov) or 512-974-8084.

cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager  
Erika Brady, City Clerk  
Corrie Stokes, City Auditor  
Mary Jane Grubb, Municipal Court Clerk  
Judge Sherry Statman, Municipal Court  
CMO Executive Team  
Department Directors

Attachments:

- A. Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses
- B. Summary of Stakeholder Feedback

## University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Update Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses May 30, 2025

On May 13, 2025, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the UNO Update as amended. The Planning Commission-recommended ordinance incorporates each amendment unedited, while the staff-recommended ordinance includes amendments supported by staff, modifies amendments as necessary to receive staff support, and omits amendments not recommended by staff. This document describes the staff response to each Planning Commission-recommended amendment and any modifications included in the staff-recommended ordinance.

No.	Planning Commission Amendment	Staff Recommendation	Staff Response
WG1	General Amendment, Chapter 4-18: Early lease renewals and new leases should be limited to no earlier than 5 months from the renewed lease or move-in date, except for group residential uses.	Recommended	Staff is supportive of this as a general amendment. Staff will work with the Law Department to incorporate into the correct code section or criteria manual.
WG2	General Amendment, Chapter 4-18: Require walkway and common area lighting, peepholes or door viewers, and deadbolt locks on each dwelling unit door in accordance with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) standards.	Recommended	Staff is supportive of this as a general amendment. Staff will work with the Law Department to incorporate into the correct code section or criteria manual.
WG2b	2b – General Amendment to expand language: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lighting – Specify to include public and semi-public spaces</li><li>• Fencing visibility (lower or non-solid)</li><li>• Expanded controlled access to beyond individual doors to lockable gates or card access</li><li>• Require maintenance, regular upkeep, and rapid</li></ul>	Recommended	Staff is supportive of this as a general amendment. Staff will work with the Law Department to incorporate into the correct code section or criteria manual.

Attachment A: Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses

No.	Planning Commission Amendment	Staff Recommendation	Staff Response
	<p>cleanup of public areas to encourage local stewardship and discourage crime</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request staff to work with SafeHorns to add language that would enhance safety standards</li> </ul>		
WG3	General Amendment: Staff should consider developing a policy to require security camera systems in public spaces and limit third-party data sharing and footage retention.	Recommended	Staff is supportive of this as a general amendment. Staff will work with the Law Department to incorporate into the correct code section or criteria manual.
WG4	Remove § 25-2-656 (M) Tower Spacing requirements.	Recommended with Modifications	Staff does not support removal of tower spacing requirements but can support a modified tower spacing requirement that allows for more flexibility and ensures access to natural sunlight for all bedrooms. As an alternative to the Planning Commission recommendation, staff proposes a revised tower spacing requirement of 5' setback from the property line, removing the requirement for additional spacing from existing buildings. A minimum of 5' setback would allow for a maximum of 15% openings (windows) under the International Building Code. This setback is needed to ensure sufficient natural light reaches dwelling units and bedrooms.

Attachment A: Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses

No.	Planning Commission Amendment	Staff Recommendation	Staff Response
WG5	Remove the "Gatekeeper Community Benefit Options" requirement for all subdistricts.	Recommended with Modifications	As an alternative to the Planning Commission recommendation, staff proposes reducing the menu of options available to further prioritize ground floor activation. Under the alternative staff proposal, staff removed the option for Green Roof and On-site Water Reuse from the menu and shifted transit-supportive infrastructure off of the menu to its own section as recommended by Planning Commission. The revised menu of options would include: ground floor local uses, grocery store use, and transit-supportive infrastructure.
WG6	Require that in all developments in UNO, regardless of subdistrict, at least 75 percent of the building frontage along the principal street and on the ground floor of a building must contain one or more local uses and must comply with the dimensional requirements found in Section 4.3.3.C in Subchapter E (Design Standards and Mixed Use). A lobby serving a use other than a pedestrian-oriented local use is not counted as a pedestrian-oriented local use. This requirement is waived for developments that include transit-supportive infrastructure or a grocery store that is 2,500 sq ft or more or group residential uses. When calculating the net length of the building frontage the following shall be excluded: emergency exits, required utility connections,	Recommended with Modifications	As an alternative to the Planning Commission recommendation, staff proposes a modified list of community benefit options to better prioritize ground floor activation in all subdistricts.

Attachment A: Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses

No.	Planning Commission Amendment	Staff Recommendation	Staff Response
	and any other service component required by the building or other codes and requirements.		
WG7	A development that includes a grocery store that is a minimum 2,500 sf in size is allowed to waive the pedestrian-oriented commercial uses requirement and waive the above-ground parking limitation of 40 and 60 percent of parking spaces previously required by Appendix A in the appropriate subdistricts.	Recommended with Modifications	As an alternative to the Planning Commission recommendation, staff proposes allowing a waiver from the parking maximum requirements for grocery stores of 8,000 sf or larger.
WG8	Transit-supportive infrastructure may be required by the Director of Transportation and Public Works Department in any development in DBUNO, as necessary. If an applicant provides transit-supportive infrastructure, the affordability requirement is reduced by two percent. The director of the Housing Department is authorized to reduce the affordability requirement by more than two percent if the director of the Housing Department and the director of Transportation and Public Works agree that the value of the transit-supportive infrastructure is greater than or equal to the value of the reduction. The director of the Housing Department may not reduce the affordability requirement to less than one residential unit or the equivalent of the fee-in-lieu for one ownership unit.	Recommended with Modifications	Staff supports aligning the incentives provided for transit-supportive infrastructure with those offered in the Density Bonus ETOD program.
WG8b	Include language to work with the local transit agency to determine the appropriate transit-supportive	Not Recommended	Staff does not support altering the definition of Transit-Supportive

Attachment A: Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses

No.	Planning Commission Amendment	Staff Recommendation	Staff Response
	infrastructure and expand the language on transit modes to include fixed rail, buses, bike share, micro-transit, and transit plazas.		Infrastructure, as this definition is used in other density bonus programs including DBETOD.
WG9	Remove all story requirements for above-ground parking garage structures. Revise parking requirements so that a development in the Outer West Subdistrict (90' allowable height) is limited to 60 percent of spaces previously required by Appendix A and is limited to 40 percent of spaces in all other subdistricts. There is no limitation on underground parking in all subdistricts.	Recommended with Modifications	As an alternative to the Planning Commission recommendation, staff proposes increasing maximum above-ground parking allowances to six stories in all subdistricts.
WG10	General Amendment: Revise grocery store definition to require produce and fresh food sale (see example in notes).	Recommended	Staff supports a general amendment to create a grocery store use that better serves the community; however, revision of the food sales use is out of the scope of the current amendment process.
WG11	Add civic uses as allowable local uses to the list of pedestrian-oriented uses.	Recommended	Staff supports allowing all civic uses permitted by a property's base zone to be considered a local use.
WG12	A development in all subdistricts can include local uses with no square footage/floor limitation, regardless of base zoning. If a development has more than 3 floors of non-residential uses, they are required to pay an affordable housing fee-in-lieu for that additional non-residential square footage.	Not Recommended	Staff does not support allowing commercial uses without limitation. Staff from the Planning Department and Housing Department is concerned about the impact this may have on the availability and future development of

Attachment A: Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses

No.	Planning Commission Amendment	Staff Recommendation	Staff Response
			student housing within the area.
WG13	A hotel-motel use is allowed in all subdistricts with no square footage/floor limitation, regardless of base zoning. For a hotel-motel use to utilize a bonus height or utilize a development standard under DBUNO, the development shall provide hotel-motel use fee in-lieu to the University Neighborhood District Housing Trust Fund for 100 percent of hotel-motel use.	Not Recommended	Staff does not support removing hotel/motel use limitations, as this could significantly reduce the potential for student housing development. The proposed entitlements are structured to support the housing needs of the University of Texas and Austin Community College student populations, and unrestricted hotel use may compromise that objective. Under the staff proposal, hotel-motel uses would continue to be allowed where allowed as a use in the base zone.
WG14	<p>Subdistrict Boundaries and Heights - Adjust as recommended above and make any necessary changes to NPA/FLUM</p> <p>Establish subdistrict boundaries and heights based on working group-recommended amendment as modified to reincorporate staff's 600-foot Transit Core Subdistrict except for sites fronting Guadalupe between 27th and 21st street,, which would have a maximum height of 300-feet.</p>	Recommended with Modifications	Staff supports the goals behind the changes to the subdistrict boundary and height map. Staff has revised the recommended subdistrict maps to incorporate Planning Commission's modifications with minor changes to height and boundary locations. Staff created a subdistrict including the former Guadalupe and Dobie subdistricts that emphasizes pedestrian-oriented development and respects the heights of nearby University of Texas buildings.
WG15	Revise affordability requirements for the subdistricts:	Recommended with Modifications	Staff supports better balancing the development costs of affordability



Attachment A: Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses

No.	Planning Commission Amendment	Staff Recommendation	Staff Response
	<p>Max Height 600' – Ownership: 10% units at 80%MFI OR FIL; Rental up to 300' height: 30% bedrooms or 10% units at 50% MFI (No FIL); Rental between 300' and 600' height: 23% bedrooms or 7.5% units at 50% MFI (No FIL)</p> <p>Max Height 175' – Ownership 10% units at 80% MFI OR FIL; Rental: 30% bedrooms or 10% units at 50% MFI (No FIL) AND MATCH TO DBETOD</p> <p>Inner West, Max Height 130' – Ownership 10% units at 80%MFI OR FIL; Rental: 30% bedrooms or 10% units at 50% MFI (No FIL)</p> <p>Outer West, Max Height 130' – Ownership 10% units at 80% MFI OR FIL; Rental: 10% units at 50% MFI (No FIL)</p> <p>Max Height 90' – Ownership 10% units at 80% MFI OR FIL; Rental: 10% units at 50% MFI (No FIL)</p>		<p>requirements by bedroom and by unit to ensure that unit-based developments remain a viable option and that housing for full-time residents is provided. To accomplish this goal, staff proposes reducing the median family income threshold for rental by the bedroom to 40% of area median income. Staff does not support removing the allowance for rental by the bedroom within the Outer West subdistrict as this may impact the availability of student and cooperative housing within the area or lead to compliance issues if there continues to be a preference for by-the-bedroom rental practices in subdistricts where program requirements do not authorize it.</p>
WG16	New regulations and zoning changes shall not apply to the two property parcels south of "Hole in the Wall", along Guadalupe Street.	Not Recommended	Staff does not support removing parcels from the rezoning ordinance within the recommended applicability area as this would represent a downzoning from their existing entitlements.
WG17	General Amendment: Explore opportunities to dedicate parkland fees and other resources to Pease Park, Eastwoods Neighborhood Park, and other nearby parks.	Recommended	Staff supports this general amendment.
WG18	General Amendment: Explore opportunities to utilize funds generated from the Parking Benefits District to provide bike	Recommended	Staff supports this general amendment.

Attachment A: Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses

No.	Planning Commission Amendment	Staff Recommendation	Staff Response
	and pedestrian connectivity to Pease Park.		
WG19	General amendment: Explore opportunities to conduct a transportation study of the DBUNO/ West Campus area in coordination with ATP and CapMetro.	Recommended	Staff supports this general amendment.
WG20	General Amendment: Align bicycle parking requirements with previous recommendations from the Urban Transportation Commission and incentivize bikeshare facilities, where possible.	Recommended with Modifications	Staff supports enhanced bicycle parking requirements beyond those recommended by the Urban Transportation Commission. The proposed standards reflect the high-density goals of the Austin Bicycle Plan (2023) and are consistent with the City's broader mobility and sustainability goals. The UTC recommendation for bicycle parking based on ASMP mode split goals was implemented through a code amendment last year.
Ahmed 1	Expand applicability boundaries of the Drag/Guadalupe (130') subdistrict of UNO to the boundaries of Lamar to the West, MLK to the South, Guadalupe to the East, and 29th Street to the North with the exception of areas already within other UNO subdistricts.	Not Recommended	Staff does not support the Planning Commission's proposed applicability boundaries. Staff supports maintaining the recommended boundaries.
Powell 1	Add language into section K of the proposed ordinance to include "the minimum lot area is 2,500 square feet."	Recommended	Staff supports that minimum lot size, which is what exists at present.
Maxwell 1	General Amendment: Continue to align the areas outside of and	Recommended	Staff supports this general amendment.

Attachment A: Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses

No.	Planning Commission Amendment	Staff Recommendation	Staff Response
	within UNO to maximize affordability and usability for residents and property owners going forward.		
Azhar 1	General Amendment: Request Austin City Council and City staff set out a process to consider changes similar to UNO north of campus, and in other areas adjacent to higher educational institutions with the aim of expanding housing options for students and others, including affordable options, and engage with relevant stakeholders.	Recommended	Staff supports this general amendment.

Attachment B: Summary of Stakeholder Feedback

## University Neighborhood Overlay (UNO) Update Planning Commission Recommendations and Staff Responses

Staff have conducted several meetings with a wide variety of stakeholders, including student groups, University of Texas (UT) staff and faculty, local long-term residents, homeowners, developers, neighborhood groups, and local subject matter experts. Staff shared an online public survey with over 6,000 stakeholders and held stakeholder meetings early in the process to hear stakeholder feedback on the University Neighborhood Overlay update resolution. After staff developed their proposal based on analysis and stakeholder feedback, they conducted another set of stakeholder meetings and sent out a separate online survey that requested feedback on the proposed recommendations. Additionally, staff held an open house at the University of Texas campus for all stakeholders to attend, learn about the proposals, and provide feedback. This open house also served as the required community meeting for the proposed amendment to the Neighborhood Plan Future Land Use Map.

Below is a list of the groups that staff met with through the engagement process:

- The Austin Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIA Austin)
- The Central Austin Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee (CANPAC)
- College Houses Cooperative (College Houses, Inc.)
- On the Moov
- Real Estate Council of Austin (RECA)
- SafeHorns
- AURA – an Austin for Everyone
- University Area Partners (UAP)
- University Tenants' Union (UTU)
- University of Texas staff and faculty from the Division of Student Affairs and related offices
- City of Austin Codes & Ordinances Joint Committee
- City of Austin Downtown Commission
- City of Austin Historic Landmark Commission
- Interested residents through engagement events such as the UNO Open House

As the groups listed above include a variety of stakeholders, staff received a range of feedback. Additionally, some members of the groups above participated in multiple meetings as they belong to multiple groups in the area.

Much of the input received was incorporated into the original staff proposal; the table below provides a summary of feedback received from stakeholders that wasn't incorporated and staff's responses to this feedback:

No.	Stakeholder Feedback	Staff Response
<b>Subdistrict Heights</b> – Staff's proposal responds to Council's request to provide unlimited height in Inner West, expand the Inner West subdistrict, and match heights allowed within DBETOD as a minimum for UNO.		
1.	75' noted as the most efficient for mid-rise developments	Staff's revised proposed subdistrict 6 height maximum of 90' matches that allowed within DBETOD and DB90.

2.	Interest in maintaining a “stepping down” of heights to minimize impact on surrounding single-family neighborhoods	Staff’s revised proposed heights step down from subdistrict 2 (420’), to subdistrict 4 (175’), and to subdistrict 6 (90’). Additionally, compatibility will apply to any applicable property and requires additional step-down in heights.
3.	300’-420’ noted as height that is below “super high-rise” classification but would still support development that is required to have smaller floorplates	Staff’s revised proposed subdistrict 2 height of 420’ was selected as the split between “high-rise” and “super high-rise.”
4.	Interest in more height step-downs between the max 420’ in Inner West and 90’ in Outer West	Staff’s revised proposed heights step down from subdistrict 2 (420’) to subdistrict 4 (175’) before subdistrict 6 (90’).
5.	Interest in expanding the boundaries of the Inner West subdistrict to allow more sites to develop to 420’ of height instead of 600’ or 90’	Staff analyzed capacity needs and potential build out of the UNO area. The analysis, as well as feedback supporting development of additional mid-rise buildings, provided the guidance for the proposed subdistrict boundaries. The staff proposal optimizes potential capacity by balancing the areas with different height limits across UNO. The creation of subdistrict 1, with heights up to 600’, allows for increased capacity, and the expanded subdistrict 2, with heights up to 420’, responds to feedback supporting expansion of sites that can develop to 420’. The proposed combination of districts will help meet the needs for housing capacity in UNO.
6.	Stakeholders expressed both interest in a 600’ height allowance for the Transit Core subdistrict, and concerns regarding the height allowance, as well as concerns for how the street front character of “The Drag” would be preserved	Staff created subdistrict 1 following Council’s direction to provide unlimited height and expand Inner West. Additionally, staff reduced the height of subdistrict 3, which fronts Guadalupe facing the university, to 300’.
7.	Interest in changing Outer West max heights from the proposed 90’ to 130’	Staff created subdistrict 5 with a maximum height of 130’.
8.	Interest in Guadalupe as a subdistrict with a 130’ height	Staff created subdistrict 3 along Guadalupe that incorporates Planning Commission’s recommended 300’ height limit.

<b>Tower Spacing</b> –Staff’s revised recommendation includes a “tower spacing” requirement, which requires a 5’ setback above 120’ of building height. The proposed spacing will allow for more windows in units, better light access to units and building, and more light to reach the street levels. There are examples of tower spacing in multiple peer cities, including in university/student developments.		
1.	Concern that tower spacing requirements were too stringent in staff’s original proposal	Staff studied tower spacing requirements from several peer cities, such as Dallas, Atlanta, and Seattle, and staff’s original proposal was the least restrictive tower spacing proposals amongst peer cities. In response to the Planning Commission recommendation, staff revised their proposal to reduce the minimum setback from the previous 20’ to 5’.
2.	Interest in increasing the small lot frontage exemption on lots with up to 100’ of street frontage to allow more lots to utilize it	Staff revised their proposal to reduce the minimum setback from the previous 20’ to 5’. This will allow for more design flexibility on smaller sites.
3.	Interest in reducing tower spacing to 5’ on each development site	Staff revised their proposal to incorporate this recommendation.
<b>UNO Boundaries</b> – Staff did a housing capacity analysis to determine the expansion needed to provide sufficient housing capacity within UNO boundaries for the anticipated population. The proposed boundaries provide sufficient housing capacity for the population in this area.		
1.	Interest in expanding North of W 29 <sup>th</sup> St	This area is covered by DBETOD, which already allows for heights of 120’ or 90’ based on subdistricts.
2.	Interest in expanding East of I35	Staff analysis provided the guidance for the proposed expansion areas that will help meet the needs for housing capacity in UNO.
3.	Interest in expanding SW, between W 24 <sup>th</sup> , N Lamar Blvd, and W MLK	Staff proposed expansion to the SW to multifamily and commercial properties that would be able to utilize the DBUNO.
4.	Interest in expanding South of MLK	This area is within the Downtown Austin Plan and Downtown Density Bonus (DDB). There is a resolution to update the DDB and plans to update the Downtown Austin Plan.
5.	Interest in reducing NW expansion	Staff analysis provided the guidance for the proposed expansion areas that will help meet the needs for housing capacity in UNO.
6.	Interest in reducing SW expansion	Staff analysis provided the guidance for the proposed expansion areas that will help meet the needs for

		housing capacity in UNO.
<b>Ground Floor Activation</b> – Staff’s proposal includes continuing the requirement for occupant space on ground floors while also adding the option for developments to provide pedestrian-oriented commercial use as a Gatekeeper Community Benefit Option.		
1.	Concerns that parking structures or parking amenities, such as significant frontage being dedicated to a parking garage or for vehicle pick-up/drop-off, would detract from streets’ character	Developments’ parking structures will be required to be screened and designed to blend into the building façade. Above-ground parking structures are capped at six stories.
2.	Interest in striking a balance between activating ground floor spaces and limiting the potential of vacant retail spaces	Staff revised their proposal to offer pedestrian-oriented commercial use as a Gatekeeper Community Benefit Option rather than as a base requirement. This provides developers the option to choose another Gatekeeper Option if it appears that a pedestrian-oriented commercial use isn’t viable for their development.
<b>Grocery Store</b> – Staff’s proposal includes the option for developments to provide a Grocery Store use of 2,500 sf or larger as a Gatekeeper Community Benefit Option.		
1.	Interest in incentivizing the development of at least one grocery store within UNO boundaries that stocks a wide variety of affordable, fresh, healthy produce and goods	Staff’s revised proposal offers the inclusion of a Grocery Store Use as a Gatekeeper Community Benefit Option, and reduced the minimum required square footage from 8,000 sq. ft. to 2,500 sq. ft. This reduction was based on stakeholder feedback that a smaller square footage requirement would greatly increase the chances of a productive store being built.
<b>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles</b> – The core principles are Natural Surveillance, Natural Access Control, Territorial Reinforcement, Maintenance and Management, and Social Management.		
1.	Interest in inspections of developments every 3 years for maintenance of security apparatuses, locking features for entryways, lighting, and perceptual safety of spaces like parking garages, alcoves, etc.	The Development Services Department (DSD) is not resourced to provide inspections to all UNO-participating developments (estimated at 9,500 dwelling units) on a regular cycle. There are existing programs that could be applicable to existing UNO developments. Additionally, there are equity concerns with providing enhanced inspection and oversight to a specific geographic area rather than the entire community.
2.	Interest in Crime Prevention	UNO’s Streetscape requirements are aimed at creating

	Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principle Definition being included with Streetscape requirements	<p>a safe pedestrian network which would address CPTED goals, through means such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>wide sidewalks that can contribute to a sense of openness and visibility</li> <li>UNO street tree and street furnishing requirements that can aid in creating a visually inviting space</li> <li>Pedestrian scale street lighting to support well-lit public spaces</li> </ol> <p>Staff's proposal is aimed at creating a pleasant and lively streetscape through ground floor activation. The ground floor of a development must include occupant space along no less than 75% of the net length of street frontage to promote activated streetscapes and along 43% of the street wall up to a height of 65ft.</p>
<b>Delayed Move-Ins</b> – Staff's proposal requires a lease addendum for all UNO participating properties with notice and remedy requirements in the case of a delay of occupancy.		
1.	Interest in requiring lessors to notify prospective residents 60-90 days prior to move-in date if Certificate of Occupancy has not been obtained	Staff's proposal would require notice to all signed tenants if a certificate of occupancy for a leased unit has not been obtained 60 days prior to the lease start date.
2.	Interest in codifying tenants' rights for lease termination or appropriate compensation upon delayed move-in	<p>Staff's proposal would provide remedy options for tenants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rent abatement on a daily basis until the unit is ready for occupancy and the ability to terminate the lease at any time without fees or additional requirements</li> <li>Sufficient compensation for temporary relocation with rent payments required under the lease provisions</li> </ul>
<b>Early Leasing Restrictions</b> – Staff's proposal restricts early leasing to 5 months and would be included in the lease agreement.		
1.	Interest in limiting the offer date for a lease renewal to 6 months before the end of a tenant's lease and limiting new lease signings to 5 months before the lease start date	Staff's revised proposal restricts early leasing to 5 months before the start of the lease term and should be applicable to all leases, lease renewals, and pre-lease agreements.
2.	Concerns that students are rushed into housing decisions and locked into higher rental rates than they would pay under a more standard leasing timeline	Staff's revised proposal restricts early leasing to 5 months before the start of the new lease term, and should be applicable to all leases, lease renewals, and pre-lease agreements.



<b>Affordability Requirements</b> – Staff’s proposal requires all affordable units to be provided at the 50% MFI level and all affordable bedrooms at the 40% MFI level.		
1.	Interest in increasing the affordability of units and the number of affordable units available	The MFI percentage requirement for affordable units was lowered from the original 60% to 50% and 40% MFI based on expressed interest in deeper affordability of units.
2.	Interest in revising affordability rates in bedroom rentals to the citywide unit rental rate divided by number of bedrooms	Staff’s revised proposal lowers the affordability rental limits to 50% and 40% MFI. Revising the bedroom affordability rental rate to match unit affordability rental rates would result in a much lower number of affordable bedrooms.
3.	Interest in ensuring that affordable units still have quality-of-life offerings afforded in standard units and basic amenities, such as external windows	Staff proposes the closing of the “Borrowed Light Loophole” by requiring external windows within all bedrooms in all units.
<b>Parking</b> – Staff’s proposal responds to Council direction to discourage above-grade parking. Staff analyzed developments built in the last 10 years and found that parking being provided has been decreasing. However, there is still a strong desire for parking in the district.		
1.	Suggestions to consider 30-40% parking ratio	Staff’s proposal of a 40% max parking ratio, with the ability to increase to 60% if half of the parking is underground, aligns with the recently adopted Downtown Austin parking ratios.
2.	Concerns about the staff proposed above-ground parking limiting the ability to reach the proposed 40-60% parking ratios	Staff followed Council’s request to discourage above-grade parking and the city’s goals of supporting public transit and reducing parking but has revised their proposal to increase the maximum above-ground parking allowance to six stories.
3.	Concerns regarding expenses and feasibility of underground parking requirement	Staff followed Council’s request to discourage above-grade parking but has revised their proposal to increase the maximum above-ground parking allowance to six stories.
4.	Interest in capped above-ground parking offered as Gatekeeper Community Benefit Option	Staff followed Council’s request to discourage above-grade parking by limiting it to six stories.