ZQA Proposal	Council Modifications
The Board of Standards and Appeals would have the authority to issue special permits to developers seeking to build market-rate developments in excess of the height and setback limitations for buildings on irregularly shaped sites. The BSA would have the authority to issue special permits to affordable housing developers seeking to eliminate parking requirements for buildings constructed within the Transit Zone.	Council Modifications The BSA would <i>not</i> have the authority to issue these special permits. This would leave the typical procedure untouched, and affected height and setback modifications would continue to go through the public review process just as they are required to under the current state of the City's zoning and land use rules and regulations. The BSA would have the authority to issue parking exemption special permits to affordable housing developers <i>only if</i> the exemption would facilitate either the development or preservation of affordable housing.
The BSA would have the authority to issue special permits for the removal of up to 90% of existing parking built for affordable senior housing located outside the Transit Zone.	The BSA would have the authority to issue these special permits <i>only if</i> new residential units constructed on the parking lot are affordable.
The BSA would have the authority to issue special permits to developers seeking waivers for the market-rate parking requirements for the construction of primarily market-rate residential developments located within the Transit Zone. Proposed nursing home developments would be exempt from the public review process in many community districts.	The BSA would <i>not</i> have the authority to issue these special permits. Rather, the City Planning Commission would have the authority to approve any reduction in market rate parking through the ULURP process, requiring City Council approval. ULURP public review would continue to be required prior to the construction of new nursing homes in neighborhoods already containing large concentrations of nursing homes.
Developers building affordable housing and affordable senior housing on sites located within mapped Transit Zones would benefit from reduced parking requirements.	The Transit Zone map would be modified to reflect the concerns of constituents who reside at the outer borders of Transit Zones.
Increased height limits would be granted to developers building in medium-high to high density Contextual Districts.	There would be <i>no</i> increase in height limits granted to developers building in medium-high to high density Contextual Districts.

The Sliver Rule would be removed, which would allow developers to build taller when constructing buildings with widths spanning less than 45 feet.	The Sliver Rule would remain in effect.
The minimum affordable senior housing unit size would be reduced from 400 square-feet to 275 square-feet.	The minimum affordable senior housing unit size would be reduced from 400 square-feet to 325 square-feet.
The front yard setback requirement would be reduced to a five-foot minimum.	The front yard setback would be required to provide a minimum of seven feet.
Developers would be allowed to put up rear yard obstructions standing as tall as 15 feet high in most R6 to R10 districts for affordable senior housing, with exceptions.	Developers would <i>only</i> be allowed to put up rear yard obstructions for affordable senior housing built in commercial districts or on wide streets.
The mandatory minimum distance between buildings located on the same property site would be reduced from 60 feet to 40 feet.	The mandatory minimum distance between buildings located on the same property site would remain 60 feet.
MIH Proposal - Income Range Options	Council Modifications - Income Range Options
1. Twenty-five percent of the development's	1. Twenty-five percent of the development's
floor area would be available to families	floor area would be available to families
earning an average of 60 percent "area median	earning an average of 60 percent AMI, so long
income," or AMI, which is approximately \$46,000 for a family of three.	as 10 percent of the floor area is affordable to families earning an average of 40 percent
540,000 for a failing of timee.	AMI, which is approximately \$31,000 for a
	family of three.
2. Thirty percent of the development's floor	2. Twenty percent of the development's floor
area would be available to families earning an	area would be available to families earning an
average of 80 percent AMI, which is	average of 40 percent AMI, so long as another
approximately \$62,000 for a family of three.	affordability option is mapped in conjunction with this option.
	with this option.

- 3. Thirty percent of the development's floor area would be available to families earning an average of 120 percent AMI, which is approximately \$93,000 for a family of three, but these affordable units would be unsubsidized. This option would only be permissibly used in conjunction with another affordability option mapped simultaneously.
- 3. Thirty percent of the development's floor area would be available to families earning an average of 115 percent, five percent of the floor area would be available to families earning 70 percent AMI, which is \$54,500 for a family of three, and five percent of the floor area would be available to families earning 90 percent AMI, which is \$70,000 for a family of three. Additionally, this option would include a provision allowing for its reevaluation every 10 years.

MIH Proposal

Affordable residential units in mixed-income building must be distributed throughout at least 50 percent of the new building's floors.

Council Proposal

Affordable residential units in mixed-income building must be distributed throughout at least 65 percent of the new building's floors. Additionally, HPD's design requirements would be amended to require that all tenants have equal accessibility to all shared amenities.