

**DRAFT 02.22.2012 - Comment and Change Log to Draft Report East 11th and 12th Streets Development Strategy**

This comment and change log serves to capture general editing and public comment. The following does not represent the final changes to be incorporated in the final document. Rather they serve to provide a summary of edits, changes and public comments.

The Comment and Change Log will be updated and included as an exhibit in the final report and will summarize action taken by EPS to incorporate the suggested or recommended edits.

Section	CHANGES	RESPONSE
Table of Contents	Labeled parcel Figures 4 and 5 correctly from Block 6 and 7 to Tract 12 and 13	The EPS Team has corrected some labeling inconsistencies in the document.
Executive Summary - Sections addressing project specific tracts	Included narrative to provide information by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regarding federally-funded projects and requirement of demonstration of progress in addressing long standing unresolved activities.	Included summary of recent HUD communications.
Section 5 - Housing Issues and Strategies	Labeled census tract correctly in footnotes, 9, 11, 12 and 14 from 8.05 to 9.01	The EPS Team has corrected some labeling inconsistencies in the document.
Section 6 - Disposition Issues and Strategies	Labeled parcel correctly from Block 6 to Tract 12 - Figure 4, Page 33	The EPS Team has corrected some labeling inconsistencies in the document.
Section 6 - Disposition Issues and Strategies	Labeled parcel correctly from Block 7 to Tract 13 - Figure 5, Pages 34 and 35	The EPS Team has corrected some labeling inconsistencies in the document.
Appendices - Appendix A	Activity Node Analysis" from McCann Adams Studio (second part of that Appendix) has changes on pages 1, 3, 6, 7, and 8 (pages 27, 29, 32, 33, and 34 ), reflecting the corrected names for those same parcels (Tracts 12 and 13).	The EPS Team has corrected some labeling inconsistencies in the document.
Exhibits - Exhibit A	Add map reflecting publicly owned tracts, federal source and federal disposition requirements, if any.	Map to be incorporated as an Appendix to the report.
NAME	COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Aimee Wooster	Blk 16 - Doesn't like the idea of rental units, apartments/senior living, etc., facing the existing houses on Juniper. (1) Feels that Juniper street is narrow enough, and not enough space for moving in/out of units, and traffic.	The EPS Team is not recommending any changes to the regulations for Block 16.
Aimee Wooster	We/I (900 block of Juniper St) are already on the edge of the neighborhood. If there were other houses/townhomes, like is planned for Block 17, it could, at least, provide community / neighborhood feel to the outskirts of the last block of Juniper St. Businesses already face E 11th St. I'd like to see more of neighborhood feel, closing off the neighborhood, with Block 16 facing Juniper St. There is already an apartment complex, Robertson Hill, and East Village Lofts. To build market apartments, and have 10% affordable housing, doesn't seem good enough reason for an apartment complex.	The EPS Team is not recommending any changes to the regulations for Block 16.
Aimee Wooster	Wells Fargo Traffic, on Curve St, limits access to an apartment complex moving in/out. The street is narrow, and cars park illegally in the red zone, to hop into/out of the bank. I wish the police would enforce the red zone! I have had scary instances with people parking on the street, and cars using the road.	Comment noted.

Section	CHANGES	RESPONSE
Aimee Wooster	The same goes for synergistic use of Block 16. May I have an example of what would be synergistic to the African-American Cultural Center? Just wondering what ideas have been thought of, that would work.	The EPS Team would encourage proposals to be creative about such elements, and even work with the Heritage Facility tenants to identify complementary uses or features. However, general examples may include: performing arts space; community parking spaces; office space for non-profits; restaurants and other retail that Heritage Facility patrons can utilize; design elements or public art that reflect the district's history, etc.
Aimee Wooster	Maybe a meeting with the 900 block of Juniper St would be helpful, for input on Block 16, and an understanding/ more of a consensus on what others would be okay with for Block 16? I don't think anyone would argue Block 17. However, Block 18, I am unsure about. And I don't know what others envision for that land.	The EPS Team is not recommending any changes to the regulations for Block 16.
Aimee Wooster	I love the idea of a grocery store. However, I would only support the mid-size store. I did hear someone say they liked the idea of a small grocery. But it doesn't seem practical, for me at least. I need real access to a grocery store, one where prices aren't too high. I currently use HEB at Hancock Center. Occasionally, I go to E 7th, but it's easier to get to the Hancock Center, which is bigger, with a better selection. I like the idea of using the Safeway spot again, for a mid-size grocery. Or, if the other two adjoining businesses, could be used for a larger grocery store. However, my one concern is traffic	The EPS Team recommends pursuit of a mid-sized grocery store (~20,000-25,000 square feet) but believes that even a small grocery store would represent an improvement to the Study Area's tenant mix.
Ethan Smith	Grocery Store at Tract 5 - E 12th b/w San Bernard & Angelina is not supported for this site. Agrees the site at IH35 and 2th St is a more viable option.	Comment noted.
Ethan Smith	Development potential of 118 parking spaces between Salina and Poquito development scenario is not supported. Considers the back of the current establishments as their most valuable asset for shows, etc... Recommends paving parking lot at 12th and Salina.	The parking concept behind the buildings on the north side of East 12th Street near Chicon would only be pursued if the property owners believed they would represent improvements. The EPS Team is not recommending public acquisition of these areas.
Jim Rath	<p>There are four transmission lines that cross the 12th Street corridor. They run from the former Holly Power Plant to three different substations: from Holly to 12th, 12th to UT, Holly to UT, and Holly to 38th. A map was included as component of comment.</p> <p>If Austin Energy intends on keeping a major substation at Holly, it seems to me that the most sensible route for these transmission lines is along I-35. It's the most direct route, it wouldn't run over residential areas, it wouldn't require burying the lines or acquiring new rights of way, and it fits the already industrial aesthetic of I-35.</p> <p>Is this relocation something Austin Energy would consider? As a potential funding source, how about tacking this on to the Holly demolition?</p>	Comment noted.
John Goldstone	Getting the Urban Renewal Agency and Neighborhood Housing out of the way as a potential for more development on 11th and 12th street and eliminating the condemnation power that is keeping lenders from making loans.	Comment noted.

Section	CHANGES	RESPONSE
Kristopher Bowen	I believe more money should be spent to bury all the power lines than was presented in the Market Study. East 12th street is longer than E. 11th street and significant money should be spent on the street scape, beautifying and opening up the functionality of the all the publicly owned lots for commercial development.	The cost estimates were not based on detailed engineering or design, but were based on a "per linear foot" cost for East 7th Street, Rio Grande, etc.
Kristopher Bowen	I believe the URP plan project controls and some of the NCCD controls should not be eliminated - as contemplated by the Market Study report. The Market Study report addresses rectifying the numerous, sometimes overlapping and incongruent definitions in the documents in place, but this could pose a threat leading to a change the intent of the URP, and thus throw the baby out with the bath water. Residents and city leaders have spent years writing detailed land-use plans for the area and creating the vision for the street — buildings with a mix of shops and offices below and market rate housing above. I am afraid that the elimination of certain project controls will allow for the type of undesired projects in the corridor that the Central East Austin neighborhood associations have already taken steps to prevent, such as a 4-story nursing home as contemplated by the Market Study, and hospital services, convalescent services, rehab hospital, etc. No! The focus needs to remain on bringing a co-op organic grocery store and restaurants to this neighborhood, whereas it is still easier to buy beer than bread here.	The EPS Team is recommending reconciliation of inconsistencies among the various documents, and a continuation of the general trend toward less restrictive regulations rather than more restrictive. However, we recognize the work and thought that is represented by the existing documents, and acknowledge that any such amendments or reconciliations would and should be subject to a community discussion.
Kristopher Bowen	The term "mixed use" has different meanings in past development plans - how will the definition of this term be ultimately resolved and what will be the impact of that definition? As proposed in the Market Study, the PUBLIC (meaning stakeholders and neighborhood residents) will not be able to have their input regarding future project controls heard, as subject proposals will be subject to administrative approval rather than a public review process. I am not a fan of silencing the voices of the stakeholders and neighborhood residents regarding the use and controls for future projects in my neighborhood, and I am not a fan of the suggestion to ignore the input the stakeholders, such as myself and others, provide. We are the boots on the ground, this is our neighborhood, and our investment. Without public comment, the uses and controls could get out of hand and adversely impact the lives of those who are involved and who have and continue to expend significant time and effort into our neighborhood.	The EPS Team is recommending that the community re-confirm the importance of the most specific "project controls" or else continue the general trend of providing more development flexibility while maintaining the spirit and goals of the past plans and regulations. We are specifically encouraging the community's voices to be heard during this conversation of development regulations. However, once the regulations are in place (as they currently exist or as they may be amended), we recommend a more streamlined entitlement process whereby developers can have certainty and save time and expense if they have a project that conforms to the regulations.
Kristopher Bowen	Everyday I read about how Lamar Street has more and more brand new apartments being built in the heart of 78704. One report stated a whopping 1700 new apartments are going to be added within a mile of the intersection of Barton Springs Rd. and South Lamar. It is time to reintroduce diversity and affordability to areas that the City has allowed to completely gentrify. Central East Austin is saturated with affordable housing, and what is ideally needed is more market rate condos and market rate homes as a counter balance. To date, the approved PSH locations are 20 units in Marshall Apartments (East Austin), 24 units at Treaty Oaks (SW Austin), and 124 units at Suburban Lodge 2501 S IH-35 (East Austin), and the Foundation Communities project on E. 11th Street (project is .9 miles from Marshall Apartments). In this election year, the time is now for Austin City Council members to commit to the "equitable geographic dispersion" of public housing/permanent supportive housing across all parts of Austin, and to commit to fulfilling the Urban Renewal Plan's promises of making E. 12th street TWICE as nice as E. 11th street, as it is long overdue.	Comment noted.
Kristopher Bowen	The amount recommended is widely considered by area stakeholders and East 12th Street property owners to be too little in comparison to investment on East 11th Street and other recent corridor improvement projects. A letter written by East 12th Street property owner Scott Way calls for the city to dedicate \$20 million. Whatever the amount invested, competent and committed oversight should ensure that investment of public resources produces desired development—retail-grounded and residential that is owner-occupied rather than rental. Funding should come with requirements for property owners to commit to producing desired development.	The EPS Team is encouraging substantial public investment in the area. The EPS Team disagrees with the idea that only for-sale housing units should be allowed.

Section	CHANGES	RESPONSE
<p><b>Kristopher Bowen</b></p>	<p>The Market Study suggests Tract 12 - the City owned land between Curve St. and Waller St. on East 12th Street - has already been planned and platted for single-family attached housing (e.g., townhomes). To contribute more substantially to the commercial activity on East 12th Street, the community should consider modification of the URP to allow uses such as live/work units offering ground floor commercial space within side-by-side townhomes. The land should be sold as quickly as possible to a motivated developer. I also respectfully disagree with the Market Study assessment concerning commercial square footage. The current Market Study recommendation leaves only 300 sq. ft. or so of ground floor commercial space, as this is how this large lot was slivered. It is foolish to think a small restaurant, small coffee shop or drycleaners could operate in the small space as suggested. I suggest starting from scratch on the vision of this lot, and here is how a grocery store could even be placed in the location with the assistance of NHCD. Of all the city owned lots, Tract 12 is the largest in the corridor, and ideal for a ground floor grocery store (similar to the size of Wheatsville Co-op), along with retail including a coffee shop, a cleaners, etc., leaving room above for market rate condos and offices above. I have researched this lot during this process, and determined that if the national objectives were not met, that a developer could reimburse to HUD the current fair market value of the property minus the pro-rata share attributable to non CDBG funding (Non-federal funding) in order to acquire this City-owned property. Specifically how have the set HUD national objectives for these parcels been met since these lots were acquired for the purpose of Urban Renewal? To date, these parcels have just ben vacant lots. Couldn't a developer be courted to build a grocery store/ commercial center anchor on the largest lot owned by the City in this commercial corridor? In my opinion, it certainly would be more functional if NHCD and the neighborhood got on board, and I believe it would be a better use than that suggested in the Market Study. Once all of the power lines are buried on E. 12th street, I hope the type of businesses that are attracted to this commercial gateway include small startup restaurants similar to the Blue Dahlia and Barley Swine, a neighborhood coffee shop similar to the successful east-side Bennu coffee shop, a locally owned garment cleaners, etc. Tract 12 is ideally located to attract new urban residents to market rate condos within walking distance to Downtown, and new customers driving off of I-35 seeking to grab a quick bite or pick up some groceries before commuting home.</p>	<p>The EPS Team is clarifying our recommendation that mixed-use development be allowed on this site, not just small ground-floor live/work spaces.</p>
<p><b>Lee Sherman</b></p>	<p>The NCCD (and amendments to the URP) waived compatibility standards and the resulting project controls are very permissive. Many Central East Neighborhood stakeholders feel the resulting allowable development is not compatible with adjacent single family homes. To illustrate this point, please see the below rendering of recommended development on the southwest corner of 12th and Chicon. Notice the single family home just west of the 50-foot building with 0-foot side setbacks. The residents south of the alley are concerned about loss of privacy, parking issues, and the imposing view of a 50-foot building just 30 feet away from their property. We all support redevelopment of 12th Street and density in the urban core, but this goal should be achieved in a way that respects the adjacent single family homes (as stated in the various planning documents and regulations). Before we can support this recommendation, normal compatibility standards must be added to the NCCD at least between Comal and Chicon and wherever else affected neighborhoods desire. It should be noted that the NCCD waived compatibility standards over the objections of many neighborhood stakeholders when it was implemented.</p>	<p>The EPS Team is not recommending any increase of design restrictions or compatibility requirements.</p>
<p><b>Lee Sherman</b></p>	<p>Poverty has historically been concentrated in our neighborhood. We have a disproportionate amount of Project Based Section 8 Housing. We also suffer from real crime problems, reinforcing the well documented trend that crime is correlated with poverty. Despite this trend, intensification of poverty has been observed with the City investing in Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) at Marshall and additional subsidized housing being proposed in each new development. The Market Study Team has noted, there is a need to "dilute the concentration of affordable housing rental units." How does one do this by building affordable housing rental units? Market rate, mixed-use projects with owner occupied housing and neighborhood serving retail would do more than mixed income projects to dilute our affordable housing rental unit concentration. Ownership projects also would provide stakeholders that are typically more committed to the area long-term and willing to engage in the hard work of community building. As for the "continuing needs of impacted market segments," I have seen no evidence that seniors or any displaced (or potentially displaced) persons desire to live in subsidized rental housing. The long-term community desire is owner occupied housing, so please focus on delivering this as soon as possible instead of building rental housing.</p>	<p>The EPS Team disagrees with the idea that only for-sale housing units should be allowed, and has noted in the report that the Study Area neighborhoods' proportion of rental housing is similar to the City's overall.</p>

Section	CHANGES	RESPONSE
Lee Sherman	KNA, OCEAN, ANC, and others have called for \$20 million in streetscape and infrastructure improvements based on similar investment in other parts of town including 11th Street. We all want to see streetscape improvements on East 12th Street. Removing the power lines would help with aesthetics and making sewer improvements might spur desired development. With all of this said, there is concern for what type of development would be accommodated by these improvements. As mentioned above, many neighborhood stakeholders want normal compatibility standards and for certain civic uses to be prohibited in the NCCD. If these changes are made to the NCCD, this recommendation would have near unanimous support.	The EPS Team is encouraging substantial public investment in the area. The EPS Team is not recommending any increase of design restrictions or compatibility requirements.
Lee Sherman	Administrative as opposed to public review seems like it would allow a project like the above to be built without any community input. That is of great concern to adjacent neighborhoods.	The EPS Team is encouraging continued community input in setting the development regulations. Once such regulations are set, however, projects that comply with them are encouraged to be processed as expeditiously as possible.
Lee Sherman	Kealing NA voted unanimously to support prohibiting certain civic uses in the NCCD (as first requested by Swede Hill NA and Robertson Hill NA). KNA felt that these uses were not consistent with the vision we have for 12th Street. If the NCCD is to be reopened, compatibility standards should be restored where desired by affected neighborhoods and the following uses should be prohibited as requested by SHNA, RHNA, and KNA: Hospital Services (general) Hospital Services (limited) Convalescent Services Rehabilitation Hospital and/or any similar new use created to distinguish this use from convalescent services Congregate Living Residential Treatment Group Home, Class I (General) Group Home, Class I (Limited) Group Home, Class II Family Home Guidance Services Counseling Services Detention Facility Transitional Housing Medical Offices > 5,000 sq. ft. total Limited Warehouse Distribution Construction Sales/Service Commercial Offstreet Parking (conditional)	The EPS Team is not recommending any increase of design or use restrictions or compatibility requirements.
Lee Sherman	As discussed in the report for this recommendation, higher density developments are unable to provide required parking. Furthermore, the very permissive height / setback / impervious cover allowances are not desired by many neighborhood stakeholders. Subchapter E of the City Code requires widths for streetscape that are unattainable with existing development allowances. Trying to fit higher density buildings into these requirements seems like trying to fit a square peg into a round hole. Instead of waiving requirements to accommodate higher density buildings, why not scale back development to something that would be high quality, compatible with adjacent single family residential homes, and meet parking/streetscape requirements? We would like to see normal compatibility standards implemented to resolve these issues – at least where desired by affected neighborhoods.	The EPS Team is not recommending any new, more restrictive development regulations, nor any reductions in allowed densities.
Michael Casias	Encourage combination of rental and homeownership. Large percentage of population not yet qualified for homeownership.	The EPS Team agrees and has recommended that rental housing be permitted.
Michael Casias	Would like to see sample home prices, rents in study area today, e.g. Robertson Hill rental and East Village lofts sales. Will show high price pressure and squeezing of remaining affordable housing.	Some market pricing examples are provided in the market analysis slides attached as an Appendix to the Development Strategy.
Michael Casias	Average family is no longer nuclear 4-person family. Housing choice/diversity should mirror populations-See 2009 Housing Market Study to determine largest need.	The EPS Team agrees that household types are changing. We did note rapid declines in "family" households (and household sizes) in the Study Area neighborhoods, and are recommending a fraction of future units be provided to accommodate families rather than only singles or small households. Most units' sizes and configurations would still be left to market forces and development regulations to determine.

Section	CHANGES	RESPONSE
Michael Casias	I understand that the goal would be to create family growth, but it doesn't seem like the lots are big enough to support house size desired for children.	Most residential development on underutilized parcels in the Study Area would be attached or multifamily units. These types of units may not be ideal for all families, but may represent an affordable option for families that prioritize location over having their own yards.
Michael Casias	Publish objective criteria for selection (point system), including financial capacity and experience delivering proposed uses.	The EPS Team would recommend that such information be articulated in any Request for Proposals for development/disposition of public land, but we have not made specific recommendations in our Development Strategy.
Michael Casias	To allow for greatest community benefit single RFP should be let for all available parcels reserving the right to select one or multiple purchasers.	The EPS Team supports this concept in principle, and we have not recommended anything that precludes this option. However, we are uncertain that a single developer would be able to progress on multiple parcels simultaneously, or that the best "price" (actual dollars or community benefits) would be achieved through a bulk sale of multiple disjointed parcels.
Michael Casias	Add "Minimum" to percentage of the 10% of rental units at 60% AMI (required if rental)	The EPS Team is recommending a 10% affordability requirement for rental properties.
Michael Casias	Add "Minimum" to percentage of units at 3+ BR (encouraged) Also add 2+ BR.	The EPS Team is recommending that larger units be encouraged but not required.
Michael Casias	Add Live/Work allowed on ground level	Comment noted.
Michael Casias	Blk 17 - Consider public partnerships to accelerate development.	Comment noted.
Michael Casias	Tract 13- Due to small site area, allow for placement of historic homes on site for conversion to neighborhood retail.	Comment noted.
Michael Casias	1120 E 12th - Convey to exchange for community parking or other public benefits.	Comment noted.
Michael Casias	Direct public resources toward most effective investments with most community benefits, including public infrastructure, local businesses and mixed income housing.	The EPS Team agrees with this principle.
Michael Casias	Recommendation to clarify or amend area planning documents may take too long; need immediate interim steps. Also need to approve and expedite projects that follow the spirit of the strategies.	The EPS Team is recommending several amendments to existing development regulations, and encouraging such amendments to occur as soon as possible. However, until such amendments are approved through the existing process (including community dialogue and action by multiple organizations), projects will be subject to the existing regulations and process.

Section	CHANGES	RESPONSE
Michael Casias	Strategies may take too long. In the interim approve projects that will upgrade infrastructure and assist with waiver of some regulations that do no impact health, safety and welfare, provide for administrative waivers of setbacks, landscape requirements, etc.	The EPS Team is recommending several amendments to existing development regulations, and encouraging such amendments to occur as soon as possible. However, until such amendments are approved through the existing process (including community dialogue and action by multiple organizations), projects will be subject to the existing regulations and process.
Michael Casias	While waiting for CIP funds, preference to developments that will install infrastructure.	The EPS Team agrees with this principle.
Michael Casias	Small business permitting/development should provide free consultation/training on a periodic basis.	The EPS Team agrees with this principle, and encourages small businesses to take advantage of the many resources and programs already available through the City.
Michael Casias	If RFP, utilize Economic Development Department or same department responsible for Seaholm and GreenWater RFP process, not sure NHCD is proper entity.	As has occurred in the past, the EPS Team has recommended that NHCD continues to coordinate with EGRSO and other City departments on solicitation documents and processes.
Richard Ferris	Being a 12th St property owner for over 50 years I appreciate you addressing the infrastructure needs for 12th St. The Transmission lines , telephone poles, at&t telephone boxes Grande boxes all situated at the corner of 12th and olander which creates a hindrance to development plans. How will this be addressed?	The EPS Team is encouraging public funding for the undergrounding of utility wires and improvement of streetscape throughout the corridor. Specific designs are beyond the scope of our study.
Richard Ferris	Your plan calls for mixed use on the south side of the 1000 block of east 12th and I would like to know how this will be achieved?	The EPS Team is encouraging the allowance of mixed-use development on this site through amendments of the Urban Renewal Plan, to be consistent with the NCCD, and then prompt disposition of the land for private development.
Richard Ferris	Mixed use needs to be more clearly defined.	Comment noted.
Richard Ferris	How will the properties that are city owned or purchased by federal funds be liquidated?	The EPS Team is recommending a combination of RFPs for certain sites and straight land sales for others, if the City is granted the time to conduct such processes by the Federal funders.
Tracy Witte	Does the report take into account general trends across the urban core of Austin or compared demographic changes in the study area to those in Census Tracts in central city West Austin neighborhoods when connecting changes in the study area to recommended developments such as senior housing or family housing.	The EPS Team has focused on data from the Study Area neighborhoods, while also referencing Citywide market trends and acknowledged demands for senior and family housing cited in other City reports.
Tracy Witte	We want development that respects and is compatible with adjacent neighborhoods. We want to realize the long-term vision of the corridor as quickly as possible. We do not want to sacrifice the long-term vision to satisfy what is feasible in the short-term.	Comment noted.

Section	CHANGES	RESPONSE
Tracy Witte	Does the report factor in affordable housing that is planned for the 3100 block of East 12th Street and other rental projects in the study area that are likely to receive funding this year?	The EPS Team has acknowledged that the Study Area neighborhoods have higher concentrations of affordable housing than much of the City, and we are not recommending any projects that are wholly targeted toward low-, very low-, or extremely low income families.
Tracy Witte	Does the report factor in Downtown Austin Plan's "intensification" of Housing Authority-controlled sites? That initiative/tactic could add hundreds/thousands of units to 78702 over the next decade.	The EPS Team has acknowledged that the Study Area neighborhoods have higher concentrations of affordable housing than much of the City, and we are not recommending any projects that are wholly targeted toward low-, very low-, or extremely low income families.
Tracy Witte	Report cites rising housing costs and taxes as a factor in the decrease of seniors and modest-income families in the study area. What is meant by "modest income"? What evidence underpins the assertion that this decrease is due to rising housing costs and taxes? What other factors contributed to the decrease, and to what degree were these factors more or less responsible for the decrease than rising housing costs/taxes? For example, did school choice or a trend towards having fewer children play a part in this decrease? Did the desire to retire and live elsewhere motivate a certain percentage of seniors to re-locate?	Statistical evidence has proven difficult to obtain, but EPS has heard anecdotal evidence from multiple stakeholders that high taxes are contributing to the departure of some long-time households. This trend has also been noted in previous community discussions on gentrification. The EPS Team acknowledges that the causes and effects of gentrification and neighborhood change are complex, and well beyond the scope of this Development Strategy.
Tracy Witte/Stam Strickland	NHCD to publish on its website a map identifying the URB and City owned parcels in the Urban Renewal Area along with a corresponding legend that (1) identifies the source(s) of funds and the amount of each source of funds used to acquire each of the parcels in question; and (2) identifies any and all restrictions/requirements that must be satisfied for the City to either (a) contract to develop each parcel, or (b) convey each parcel to a buyer, fee simple with no RFP-related development, and with only the current URP and NCCD zoning and use restrictions running with the land.	Related information is provided as an Appendix in the Final Report, based on data provided to the EPS Team by NHCD.



Section	CHANGES	RESPONSE
<p><b>Tracy Witte</b></p>	<p>The report asserts that developers fear the complicated regulations and the lengthy and uncertain outcome of any public review process. The remedy for this ill is to “reconcile” the NCCD and the Urban Renewal Plan” by eliminating all the URP project controls and some NCCD controls, and subject proposals to administrative approval rather than a public review process. (Report, PP 4, 10-11; Appendix B, PP 13-14). Essentially, the report suggests that further relaxing already lax controls and enforcing them administratively is what is needed to attract development. So far, lax controls on East 12th Street have attracted only UNDESIRE development such as a 4-story nursing home, and it was only public scrutiny of such proposals for compliance with the few controls in place that prevented them from moving forward. Swede Hill and other Central East neighborhoods have repeatedly called for streamlining the process by PRESERVING—not eliminating—the URP project controls and vision statement by including them in the East 12th Street NCCD, which affords East 12th Street properties some of the most relaxed building standards available anywhere in the city to lots adjacent to single-family zoned parcels. The URP will expire in 2018 and we will be left with only the NCCD to govern development along the corridor. One way that the community can be certain that development is consistent with the vision for the street is to define/codify that vision in the NCCD and insist on public process for development approval. URP controls supported by the affected neighborhoods should be preserved and fleshed out in the NCCD. Additionally, any discussion regarding the alteration of the URP and NCCD should include a consideration of the long-ignored SHNA and RHNA request to prohibit the following uses along East 12th Street from I-35 to Comal. The NCCD was adopted “as a zoning tool to implement the Urban Renewal Plan for East 12th Street,” which mandates a mixed-use walking corridor lined with neighborhood-serving ground-floor retail and owner-occupied residential or office space above. The uses below are nowhere contemplated in the Urban Renewal Plan and are inconsistent with the vision that adjacent neighborhoods have for this street. The generous building standards codified in the NCCD, including the waiver of all height limits and setbacks normally required of development adjacent to single-family uses, is for the express purpose of delivering desired uses, as outlined in the text and project controls of the Urban Renewal Plan. Uses that should be prohibited: Hospital Services (general) Hospital Services (limited) Convalescent Services Rehabilitation Hospital and/or any similar new use created to distinguish this use from convalescent services Congregate Living Residential Treatment Group Home, Class I (General) Group Home, Class I (Limited) Group Home, Class II Family Home Guidance Services Counseling Services Detention Facility Transitional Housing, Medical Offices &gt; 5,000 sq. ft.; Limited Warehouse Distribution; Construction Sales/Service; Commercial Off-Street Parking (conditional)</p>	<p>The EPS Team is not recommending any increase of design or use restrictions or compatibility requirements.</p>
<p><b>Tracy Witte</b></p>	<p>The report notes that “...seniors and modest-income families have been moving out of the neighborhood,” in part due to rising house costs or taxes, but does not provide any evidence that these populations sought or selected apartment options after selling their homes in Central East. When pressed to articulate the rationale for senior housing/assisted living on the northern tract between San Bernard and Angelina, EPS clarified that its recommendation was “soft” and “we do not suggest by any means that only senior housing should be considered for the site. If the community discusses senior housing and quickly determines that it is not of interest, an outcome that conforms to the existing NCCD provision for mixed-use/commercial would certainly be a major improvement to the existing condition as well. ” EPS also suggests that the city’s expenditure of Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) funds to acquire these parcels obligates the city to provide benefits to low- and moderate-income persons on this tract. However, questions remain about when and how, exactly, these parcels were first acquired by the city or its non-profit housing arm and whether obligations incurred from the expenditure of these funds have been satisfied. The URP controls for this site—if not eliminated as suggested by EPS—permit commercial or mixed-use development. These tracts are directly across from Marshall Apartments, where the city recently invested \$2.5M to renovate project-based Section 8 property and convert 20 of 100 units to permanent supportive housing (“PSH”) for the chronically homeless, to be overseen by Caritas of Austin. Recently, a privately held single-family zoned property directly behind Marshall was deeded to Caritas of Austin for an as-yet-unspecified use, which may be related to PSH at Marshall. To balance its investment in deeply affordable rental housing on an urban renewal corridor, the city should dedicate this tract to a grocery store or other much-needed retail services desired by the neighborhoods, and any residential should be market rate and owner-occupied condos.</p>	<p>The NCCD and URP both support mixed-use/commercial development on the “Tract 5” site referenced herein, and EPS is not recommending that such uses be prohibited. We have specifically suggested that this site may be appropriate for a smaller grocery store if a larger one cannot be attracted to another site nearby.</p>