

## *COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE*

### MEETING MINUTES SPECIAL CALLED MEETING OCTOBER 18, 2010

Subcommittee Members: Council Member Sheryl Cole  
Council Member Laura Morrison  
Council Member Chris Riley

#### **I. Citizen Communication (3 minutes to speak).**

Donna Beth McCormick, Allandale Neighborhood, stated that the Imagine Austin process is inadequate and was not properly thought out. She prepared a written statement to read into the record, but due to lack of time, she asked that her written comments, on behalf of four members of the Allandale Neighborhood Association, be entered into the record (see attached).

Mary Arnold expressed concern about the population growth, estimated at 750,000, that has been predicted for the next 30 years. She felt there had been a lack of research on the current plan and felt that tools to limit growth, such as annexation, needed to be used to discourage or influence the estimated growth. She added that there needs to be better coordination among staff on the various master plans of city departments, and there needs to be more study of the city's financial structure and protection of our water resources.

Chris Riley said he understand how annexation could be used as a tool to limit growth, but he questioned what other tools could be used to limit growth?

Mary Arnold noted that there needs to be studies on how this population will be served, and she questioned how the figure was derived and whether it is an accurate figure. She also questioned how infrastructure to serve this growth will be funded. She said these are the questions that need to be answered by staff, and citizens need to be more involved in annexation planning and decisions.

Laura Morrison questioned whether staff has determined how much growth can be served given the city's current water resources. Garner Stoll responded that he was not aware if that determination had been made, but noted that staff considered a variety of growth projections, including fertility rates, to arrive at the figure. He noted that the estimated population is proposed for the entire ETJ, not just within the city of Austin.

Council Member Cole stated that other than annexation tools, she was not aware of any other tools that would prevent people from moving to Austin.

Sharon Blythe, Austin Memorial Cemetery, questioned where the 750,000 would be buried given the limited amount of land available for burial plots. She asked that burial space be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.

Andrew Clements urged the City of Austin and Capital Metro to continue dialogue and continue working together on proposed rail.

**2. Approval of Minutes from the September 20, 2010, regular subcommittee meeting.**

Motion approved by a vote of 3-0.

**3. Staff Update on the Comprehensive Plan.**

Mark Walters, Planning and Development Review Department, provided an update on the public participation process and outreach in areas with low participation numbers. He noted that inserts about the process were included in the Austin American Statesman and outreach has also occurred at music festivals and high school football games.

**4. Briefing and possible action on relationship and integration of neighborhood plans into the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan**

Garner Stoll, Planning and Development Review Department, provided an overview of the 1979 Austin Tomorrow plan and the priority growth areas identified in that plan, and how they coincide with current neighborhood planning areas. He noted that during discussions for selection of a consultant, the question of comprehensive plan vs. neighborhood plans was asked of the consultants, and WRT's response was that it would be possible to revisit or adjust neighborhood plans for consistency with the direction of the Comprehensive Plan following its adoption. As a result, staff recommends the following:

- Continue consideration of neighborhood plans in development of preferred scenarios;
- Use the plan framework to redefine land use categories;
- The Growth Concept Map should identify small area plans (neighborhood plans, corridor plans, station area plans) ; and
- Include Composite FLUM in Imagine Austin.

Bo McCarver, representing East Austin organizations east of IH-35, stated that the scenarios identified in Imagine Austin place much of the density in central east Austin, and does not take affordability into consideration. They recommend that the plan be suspended pending data from the 2010 census and after the 2012 charter election, which could result in a council with geographic representation. This would ensure greater input from citizens of east Austin and integration of neighborhood plans. He suggested consideration of three scenarios which can all be planned for simultaneously: (1) high growth; (2) no growth (stagnation); and (3) negative growth. He also noted that

Anthropologists have predicted that catastrophic diseases could reduce future population growth. He spoke about the lack of water resources and the impact of the 2010 census. Council Member Cole asked that he send his concerns to council via e-mail.

Cory Walton, Austin Neighborhoods Council (ANC), stated that ANC's concern is that there has been no in-depth analysis, research and data. ANC requests that staff explain how the 64 maps were distilled into the four scenarios outlined in the last forum and exercise. The process from this point forward should be based on honest data.

Gwen Jewiss spoke about the need to integrate the neighborhood plans into the comprehensive plan.

Mary Ingle expressed concern about the need to integrate the neighborhood plans in the comprehensive plan. She also expressed concern about the density proposed in the central core of the city, and questioned whether it can support any additional density. She added that the process is flawed and has been driven by financial interests, RECA and other forces that desire more density in the central city.

Council Member Morrison stated that consideration of neighborhood plans is important in this process, and if the community is not part of the process, the plan will not be successful. Although the Comprehensive Plan may not supersede the neighborhood plans, it's possible that the plans may be adjusted, and the bottom line is that those adjustments need to be known as the task force considers options for the preferred growth scenario.

She moved approval of staff recommendation with the additional directive that information on neighborhood plans and FLUMs be made available in a usable and accessible format to the Task Force and other stakeholders as they develop the draft preferred growth scenario, and that staff work with the Task Force Analysis Committee to develop that usable format; that the Task Force use other pragmatic data that can be integrated into that accessible data (such as information regarding East side creeks). She also recommended that staff report back to the committee at its November 1<sup>st</sup> meeting on the progress for developing that information. She also requested that staff report on how the 63 maps were distilled into the four scenarios, noting that the response to this directive could be provided in writing.

The motion was seconded by Council Member Cole. The motion carried by a vote of 3-0.

Roger Colvin, Task Force Member, said he and other task force members were available to meet with the public to discuss the process.