

City Council Work Session Transcript – 04/23/2019

Title: City of Austin

Description: 24/7

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 4/23/2019 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 4/23/2019

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:17:25 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. It is April 23rd, 2019. It is 9:15. We are in the boards and commissions room here at city hall. Manager is not feeling well this morning so we have a return visit. We have one, two, three, four, five pulled items. We have land development code to talk about today. Councilmember Flannigan I think is up at the legislature testifying on something. I've just texted him to see if he knew what his eta would be coming back. I would suggest let's see if we can take a look at the pulled items. We'll start there. The first pulled item was item number 32. I was just trying to figure out and couldn't ask because of quorums, councilmember Tovo, I was trying to figure out where the -- where this was relative to the study group and the question of whether or not we're approving contracts at less than the city's living wage by contracting out I think was the question. >> To: Yes. Thank you, mayor. So our group met last week. I think as we noted when we asked for a postponement, we wanted to use this as a test case of trying to get into the details about what -- where the costs are. And last week we met with our purchasing staff and asked them some questions and followed up with the questions in the Q and A and it's my understanding those answers actually got released this morning so we will have a little bit more information about that. We also asked our staff to come up with some kind of

[9:19:26 AM]

proposal phased in proposal, that might make sense for this contract in terms of a balance between permanent staff and contract labor. Some of the initial -- one of the challenges that we're having with some of the information that's coming back from staff is often it's expressed in differential, salary and hours, but we're paying more per hour than the contract than we're paying to the contract company for that hourly wages. That's not the wages that the individuals receive, that's the wages that we're paying to the company for that individual. And so we've asked staff to kind of recalculate using the same hourly wages so that we can try to determine where those costs are, but we have developed I think some good questions about supervisory and most of our contract employees we think the answer is going to come back are actually supervised by city employee staff, for example, so where that's being expressed as a cost of bringing those contracts in, we think that it's probably less than that because those are employees who are already being supervised by on-site staff. So again, I think we've got some answers

coming back or have come back to us through the Q and a and then I'll ok to my colleagues after we get that information back what it makes sense to do with this contract in terms of postponing it a little bit longer or moving forward with it on a short period of time. I think we'll know more once we ethane foe. I would invite myagols to jump in if I missed anything. >> Mayor Adler: That answered my questions. Greg? >> Casar: I think you may have asked also a separate question when you introd this item, which is when weed by contracts we do reup them to the living wa currently, but another topic Tocco of discussion is while these contracts are effect over the course of multiple years how is it that we can at the point of bidding make sure that contractors understand that

[9:21:26 AM]

we want some escalation in that minimum and for it not just to happen in fits and starts every time we approve new contracts. That's somethi's else we're working on. >> Mayor Adler: At least to mirror what it is that the city has done. >> Casar: It's a little bit more complicated than that, but generally yes. >> Tovo: I appreciate you raising that because I think we'll end up with a hybrid proach of making some remmendations about which contracts go -- come in-house and then what provisions we put in those contracts that are going to be outsourcing that labor. >> Mayor Adler: Got it. Thank you. I pulled item number 44, which was the workforce solutions capital area workforce board issue. I think that the workforce solutions people have been around to many of the offices. Three aspects of this. We know that workforce solutions is kind of a creation of the federal government and of this state, is in an awkward place when it comes to facilities because it can't buy a building, it can't save money, and it can't incur debt the way that would make most easil having a physical space. We know that the work that workforce solutions is doing is one of our top priority items as a council. And right now they're having to take programmatic money to spend on the new facility and operating in that facility. So the question came back, what could we do about that? Avis county stepped in and just made a grant in essence toward the building. Thank you, travisyouor that. In looking at our numbers and our finances it didn't look like we were in the same position to be able to do that and given everything that was happening around us up at the legislature and the like.

[9:23:27 AM]

So our staff took a look at it and came up with a solution that was a revenue neutral solution to the city and it was basically taking a piece of the money that had been put toward the \$380, which was designed to help get people trained in that kind of stuff, so it's on point on message with that. And to basically give a three-year loan to workforce solutions that they will pay back and then replenish that money. The money that they save obviously gets spent directly into the retraining effort, which was our priority item. So I think that's a really good thing and this enables that to happen. Tool haswo different things on it --T also has two different things on it. It asks our staff to work wthkforce solutions long-term to see if there are other things that the city might be able to do to he , sharing facilities or other kinds of things that might be available. And then the last thank it asks Fors our staff to look at with workforce solutions

and identify if there's anything that W uld be doing to help leverage workforce solutions' ability to pull down additional federal funding. It doesn't take any action on that, number three, it just says identify for us any ways in which could help facilitate that. That information would come back to us and then we could decide whether or not that's something that we ever wanted to do. So those are the three components of that and I just wanted to go through that because there were some questions about that, and answer any question if anybody had any on this item number 44. Yes. >> Tovo: I do. I'm supportive of the resolution and appreciate the sponsors for bringing it Foard. I wanted to ask with regard to the no interest loan, would that require -- this is I guess a question for the city manager. Would that require a budget

[9:25:27 AM]

amendment? >> I don't believe it would, but I believe there would be a legal document between the two entities, but I'll defer to economic develment. They've worked on it. >>T would not -- Rebecca giello, intimer director of economic develmentop it would not require a budgetmendment. The terms in the agreement itself, however, would be brought forward for approval with the council through an rca. >> Tovo: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: That was also the first question I asked. >>o:ov well, I wondered. We've had a lot of conversations about that so that's one of the reasons I was wondering. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Anything N O this one? Okay. The nextled items, all three of those items are Jimmy's items. So we'll hold those unt Jimmy comes back. All right. Let's tee off a conversation about the land development code. >> Alter: I have some items on the agenda. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Alter: So item 48 is a fee waiver for the vasacci that was hosted by arc this weekend. It was a great celebration. The center was jam packed. So far we have commitments to waive 845 out of 1280 of what theyeed for that, and I am wondering if any of my colleagues might be interest in contributing some funding to waive the fees for that event. It's a celebration -- spring festival that was celebrated there at the arc and also a fund-raiser for the seikh seem Pell that they're seeking to build out near

[9:27:28 AM]

the Heine due temple. >> Mayor Adler: Ann? >> Kitchen: [Inaudible]. >> Alter: Okay. That would be great. >> Harper-madison: I would also like take a contribution, but need to check our budget. >> Alter: I appreciate that. And if folks can just bring that on Thursday, that would be much appreciated. Thank you. >> Ellis: Alison, I'd like to help too, so let's chat. >> Alter: So there's \$435 in fees that have not been waived, hopefully between the three of you we can cover that. That would be awesome. Great, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Alter: I had one other. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Alter: I don't have all of the information down here right now because we have a printer issue upsirs, but there are four items related to DNA that are on the agenda, and my office has been try to be in tou with chief Manley, but the chiefs and all of the assistant chiefs are on some kind of retreat right now so we haven't been able to speak with them directly. We're preparing some questions for Q and a, but we were promised in a memo I think in February after several of us met with cef Manley and the head of the DNA the would be

getting an update on how they were going to proceed to hasten how we're going to get rid of our BAC with respect to DNA. I don't want to hold up these contract items, but we have not gotten that report that was promised. I can share with whomever I need to the memo and those details, but I think before we vote on those contract items on Thursday I would like to hear from the chief and understand better what the plan is to expedite that process of getting rid of the backlog forward. And it's 13 through 15 and then there's one other item as well. I won't speak for the chief, but my understanding is this has to do with capacity. >> Alter: I understand that, but we were promised I

[9:29:29 AM]

think an update on how they were going to improve the capacity and that's why I'm saying I don't want to hold these up, but I think we really do need an update as a council about what the new plans are for expediting these kits through the process. And I understand there are also a lot of things that are legislative delegation is pushing through at the capitol to try and take care of the parts of this that are related to the state, but I think our community is greatly interested in how we're addressing this backlog and before we just sign off on contracts I think we need to see a fuller plan to the extent that we can. >> Councilmember, it's items, 13, 14, 15, 29 and 30. And I'll check in with the police department staff and see if we can get an update for you before Thursday. >> Alter: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes. >> Ellis: I just noticed on item number 74 for the young men's business league, sunshine run, I'd like to help with that too. So I'll take a look at what I have left to offer for fee waivers, but would like to help out with that one a bit as well. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. Are we ready to get into the land development code? All right, I was trying to take a look at the documents that I have in front of me and make sure that I have the right documents. There was the initial draft that we had posted on the board as was requested. Subsequent so that there was some amendments that were posted by I don't remember

[9:31:33 AM]

the order anymore. >> Kitchen: Mayor, I have a set I can hand these out. >> Mayor Adler: I'm trying to inventory the documents. >> Kitchen: I've got mine if that would be helpful. >> Mayor Adler: I have yours too. So the ones I have are the initial one that was filed, then I have one that was filed by councilmembers Casar and the mayor pro tem. As I'm looking at that it had some charts that were attached to it. The document I have also a document from councilmembers Flannigan, Harper-Madison and Renteria. And then I have a document that was filed last night by kitchen. There were also some other documents that were filed for additions. One was planning that we had filed, and councilmember kitchen filed amendments to that planning document, and then councilmember kitchen filed an additional point number 2. I'm going to first let us deal with the five questions that the managers asked us to look at first. So I'm going to put aside my planning one and councilmember kitchen's amendments to that, and the additional point number two. So am I correct those are the four documents on the original base thing. The original document, the one by Casar, the one by Flannigan and the one by

kitchen. Are those autopsy of them? We've also received from comments from our staff. I think that was a planning document.

[9:33:48 AM]

I think this was just a document that raised the additional points I think is the planning document at the back. Okay. So those are the four things we have. And I thought we would just kind of go through this at kind of a high level, not parsing language, but talking about the issues that are raised, having each of those four in front of us and starting at the beginning of the document and identify the issues that are raised by the amendments so that we can discuss them. >> Kitchen: Just a question about process here. I don't know what time councilmember Flannigan is planning to be here, but would it be appropriate to-- if we're going to run through all of them, maybe it would be appropriate to just lay out the additions which would give him time to get here, unless he's not going to be here for awhile. I just hate to go through the main documents without him here, but you may have already made arrangements with him. May>> Adler: I haven't. He was over there testifying. There was a proc that was up. He's texted back there's a proclamation on the 1st floor of the house waiting to see. So he suggested that we proceed. And I just think that if we do it by order, not any one person's document, we can identify the issue and then everybody could just talk about the issue. >> Kitchen: That's fine I just didn't -- owe [inaudible]. >> Mayor Adler: Okay so as I look at it as we're going through this, and don't let me pass any issues that are important for us to discuss, it looks as if the consensus was that in response to question 1 it looks like a-1 seems to be what everybody seems to

[9:35:50 AM]

settle on. The question that seems to be really raised by the comments we saw is whether or to what degree we're using draft 3 as the base document. We have described a challenge with respect to the draft. People want a code that is simple and easy to apply. People -- some people are asking for -- I think we need to make clear as a council the degree to which we're comfortable with the staff relying on draft 3 I think is the question. Because if we create an expectation at the community that the staff is going to redraft something whole and the staff comes back with something that's basically builds off of draft 3, then people could be disappointed or confused. And I think that that's ultimately a question that we should decide on the dais so people know when the mapping of the code comes back they know what to expect. In my frame of mind the way we originally drafted it is had the staff redoing both the code and the map but working off the draft 3 staff recommendations and then change that consistent with the intention that we give in this document. But I think that we should foreshadow to the community that the people are doing to be working off -- that people are going to be working off of draft 3. Discussion on that issue? Leslie. >> Pool: Thanks, Steve, I appreciate that. And I agree. I think I indicated that I was supportive of a-1. I think that the direction that has been provided, I

[9:37:50 AM]

think most recently in Ann's update that she uploaded at the end of the day yesterday gives some additional direction and information to the community. For example, on timeline she adds, in order to complete the mapping process in '19, if more extensive zoning map modifications are needed, then we work on that as well. So that the community understands that we understand that not everything may be decided, but the general heart of the matter would be decided. She talks in 3 about communication, which was a point of concern I know for Ann and I and also for you, Steve, during the open process that there wasn't sufficient communication from the city out to the public for them to understand what we were doing and making sure that understanding and apprehension was aligned with our work or so she writes in here, include a transparent and educational public process under which stakeholders are informed and confident in how their input had been received and is being evaluated. And I think all of that in response to what you were saying about making sure that the community understands what we're doing really moves us in that direction. And I think it's important to have this in here as direction. - Direction to staff and also be part of the public document so people know what we're trying to do. >> Mayor Adler: And I have some questions about some of the specific language that you just made and I don't want to parse that language right now, but I think at a high level part of it's a timing issue. The more we're asking the staff to rewrite the code, the less likely I would imagine it would be that we could actually get this done by the end of the year. And I want to make sure that we set ourselves up in a process with expectations where we could get it done by the end of the year because that also seems to be what people wanted. And there's a push-pull in that. How much more you write and how much you stray from the code versus trying to get something done by the end of the year I think is the push-pull that I want us to talk about.

[9:39:54 AM]

Yes, councilmember harper-madison. Natasha, your mic is on. >> My mic was unintentionally on. While I can appreciate the time and effort that's gone into the process thus far, including draft 3, I feel strongly about our need to take into consideration the feedback that was given by way of the general public. We can leverage those parts, but it is my understanding that the will of my constituents is to start fresh. There was a lot of contention and a lot of folks were just displeased with draft 3. I'm new to the process and I'll acknowledge that, but that to say my interpretation of draft 3 was that we can do away with BETT D while I can appreciate that there's a specific timeline that we're trying to fall within, I also believe that some of our direction for staff is to simplify the code in which case it's simplified. I don't know that getting it done by the end of the year is impossible. So yes, it's important that the timing of it works well, but given ourselves some limitations by saying it has to be done by the end of the year also sets us up for the possibility of not getting it right. So those are my thoughts there. >> Mayor Adler: >> Kitchen: I understand the question that you're posing, whether we start with draft 3 or not. But I want to just define what that means so that I'm understanding. So if we start with a particular draft like draft 3, I would just -- I think that the understanding at least from my perspective would be that since we're not addressing everything that's in draft 3 right now, we're just hitting the open policy

items, that when it comes back to us there may be additional items that we want to address. So saying today that we want

[9:41:54 AM]

to start with a particular draft doesn't mean that we're accepting everything that's in that draft. It's -- there's a lot. And we have not as a council talked about a lot of it. So I just want to make sure that that's the understanding. I do see that the staff needs something to start with. >> Mayor Adler: That would certainly be my understanding. Just don't want people to get something back when the staff comes back in like August or September and go wait a second, this looks a lot like draft 3. Or I expected something that didn't look anything at all like draft 3 and I wanted to true up that expectation, whenever it is now, recognizing that absolutely we have a community process to go through. The whole document could change. Greg. >> Casar: I'm at the same place of listing draft 3 as a starting point, but understanding -- I agree entirely that we should simplify draft 3, I agree entirely that we should utilize the community input to improve it. And that it should be changed to comply with whatever policy direction we pass on Thursday. So I think we're generally headed to the same place and I just think that putting draft 3 in there is clear that that is what we are trying to simplify and improve as opposed to going back and having to come up with something totally different, which I think would end this year because we know how long it took for them to put together their draft that it is that we have. So I think saying that we're starting with Draft 3 doesn't mean that we're doing draft 3. It means that that is what it's going to -- that is the baseline document that the staff will have to do lots and lots of edits and simplifications to based on our direction. >> Mayor Adler: It's my understanding too -- yes, Paige. >> Ellis: I think the benefit of starting with draft 3 is that we can utilize the public involvement process that's already taken place and use what works in it and what didn't work in it. So I think starting with that gives us a lot of

[9:43:54 AM]

groundwork that's already been covered so that would be where I would want to start. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. So I think that -- I think that's kind of the general consensus out. As I look then to the next issue that seems to be raised by the amendments that folks have raised -- >> Kitchen: Mayor, could I ask a quick question, just a process question? So as we -- are we documenting that we have a general consensus in an area or is it that we're just noting that? Are we -- is someone taking notes of that? >> Mayor Adler: We're taking notes on it, the clerk is taking notes on it and I am. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: My hope is maybe based on this conversation to be able to reissue the document I did at the beginning and see if we can advance that conversation for Thursday. But the language that came by way of amendments that people were bringing them were all consistent I think with what we just decided. Some of the additional things were high level statement -- higher level statements. Some of them were like value statements. In the first draft I took out all the value statements and had us focused on exactly what the direct was so that we wouldn't be parsing value statements. So I'll be taking another look at that issue. Leslie. >> Pool: So you've mentioned a couple of times about value statements and

removing texts that have been offered up and I'm not really clear, I guess, on some of the text that has been deleted and reinsert it and it's in or it's out. I wasn't seeing some -- I wasn't seeing. Can you better define or give an example of how you're interpreting a value statement? And perhaps when we look at

[9:45:56 AM]

the timeline piece here, the following additional direction, it's a direction on overall scope and direction on timeline and a direction on communication so that everybody understands what we're expecting. Are those the value statements? Because I was thinking they were really straightforward expectations and objective direction. >> Mayor Adler: I think that one is. To say we're going to do as much as we can in this, but we're also going to allow for future planning and future work. What to me that fits with a direction statement. But you recall where we were able to move M forward two weeks ago is in saying let's not parse the language on pure value statement, I'm going to try to treat this the same kind of way that I was going to treat it the same way, reflect what people are saying. With the material -- I'm going to try to avoid going through and parsing all the language at this point. I think the concept makes sense and I think it's consistently held that this is not a deal and this is an opportunity to be able to handle additional elements in the future as necessary. >> Pool: For process then could I ask if when you go through the document one last time or the next time, if you are going to remove some of the language, like some of us have put in there, could you touch base with us to, as an example of how that may be considered a value statement so we could have some input on that. >> Mayor Adler: Absolutely. What I would do is since I can't talk to everybody because of quorum issues, what I would do is I would post a red line so that people could see exactly what was taken out >> Pool: So I'm asking for something more specific. If you are removing language that sets say Ann and I had put in and she and I have only talked with each other on that language, aside from

[9:48:00 AM]

here, then you could talk to her and me about the specific language that she and I put in if you were putting it in again because right now we don't understand. >> Mayor Adler: I would say trust me in this and trust me to get the information to you. I don't know that I can call you and Ann to talk about language in and out of that paragraph without violating the quorum rules, but I'll certainly talk to the lawyer or our counsel about that. But my goal is not to hide anything and my sense is that I could do this in a way that doesn't seem like I'm putting thumbs on scales or trying to weigh things as I tried to do what I did two weeks ago. But if you can come up with a solution other than that I'll hear other than working as quickly as we can and trying to post something to that message board for people to say wait a second, that was -- that wasn't a value statement. I don't want us to get lost in a procedural conversation about value statements versus direction now where we can avoid that. >> Pool: I just don't think these are value statements. >> Mayor Adler: Got it. Noted. Yes, Kathie. >> Tovo: I have a different issue. I want to just talk about with regard to 1 we have talked about an expedited process here and we've talked about the timeline. And I think I've noted before I think that -- I guess I would agree with the comment that was

made B think,eca because that's unusual enough, I'll say it again, agree with.reca's caution, what I interpret as a caution about making sure that we're allocating the appropriate amount of time to do this well and so I just want to note I think it's -- I think it's fine to have a goal, but we need to do this well. And part of what didn't work last time isingav very expedited timeline that doesn't allow for

[9:50:00 AM]

appropriate levels of public review, council comment, editing, other kinds of things that I think really improve not just the process, but also the product. And I want to clarify. What does the language here mean "The planning commission have already issued its report the new code and map." Should I interpret that to mean that we are not going to have any commission review of the land development code -- of the proposed land development code and map when it comes back to council? >> Mayor Adler: What I wrote by that language is saying when it comes to the council in October it will have already as part of this process go on to the planning commission, but I recognize other people have raised that question. >> Tovo: I have gotten lots of questions. >> Mayor Adler: I appreciate you airing that. >> Tovo: I think we should alter that language. >> Mayor Adler: I agree. >> Tovo: And I'll give it a whirl. >> Mayor Adler: That would be good. I appreciate you raising that because I've heard that question too. The process we go through will be the normal process we go through northward to ordinances. Public engagement as part of the normal planning commission process. The next question I think that probably might want to discuss through, I don't know, mayor pro tem, did you have something to say? >> Garza: Oh, what councilmember pool was saying about taking things out and you said that you would be -- what document are we working off of right now? >> Mayor Adler: The document that I would intend to bring up on Thursday unless there's an additional document would be the document that I posted back two weeks ago and then people can move to make amendments to that. >> Garza: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Based on the conversation today, I may or may not post something else if I think it would help us move Moore quickly on that time, but it

[9:52:00 AM]

depends on the conversation we had. But the base document is the one I had in March. >> Garza: But what councilmember kitchen was talking about was -- there wouldn't be redlines by you, they would be trying to add them into your document? >> Mayor Adler: Unless I offer an additional document, which I don't know whether I will do or not. And I don't want to get L on it. And if it's better for me just to say I won't try to process that, then I could announce that now, but I'd like to maybe give a staff edit if in the end of this meeting it would actually save us time. I think the base presumption is it will be the base document and people can bring amendments to it as in the asmp. >> Garza: So the understanding I had was we were going to work on your document on Thursday and any new changes could be added by amendment. >> Mayor Adler: That's correct. And now I'm trying to go through the issues that seem to be raised by the amendments that have. The first one was additional direction that would have had as I read it, it could have had the staff saying, well, we're being asked really to really blow up draft 3 and to

really start afresh. So I wanted to kind of raise that for a discussion to see if people wanted to back away from where we were two weeks ago. My sense is not. That was the first thing that seemed to be raised by the issues that people have raised. The second I think I think that's been raised in this section by people is in the code text area. And really it concerns nccds and cos, so I'm going to call that topic up so we could talk about nccds and cos. Alison. >> Alter: First I want to say that my focus is getting it done right, not quickly. There seems to be a majority of the council that wants to do this quickly. So I will just throw that out there as where I'm at in terms of the timetable. For part 5 on the former

[9:54:04 AM]

title f-25, my concern is what happens to complex cos under this. So there are some cos's that follow particular patterns and hopefully the base code will address some of those things that happen on a frequent basis in a way that those can be easily translated into new code categories, but there are some cos that are very complex that are not puds and are not nccds, and in conversations with you, mayor, was my understanding that your intention was that those would transition over, but there's not clarity in this language so I wanted to confirm that that is your understanding and then we probably need to make an amendment that effect. >> May Adler: I think that we have not really described in a way that's resolved either the nccds or the cos. And I just by way of quickly parenthetical thought, on the dichotomy between doing it quickly or doing it right, I'm certainly someone who wants to do it quickly and not right. And I don't think there are people on the dais who want to do that. I think that there's a controlling majority that think that we can do this both quickly and right, and that's what that group think wants to see if we can achieve. But certainly if it's not right, I'm not going to support it. >> Alter: I didn't mean to imply that that's where other folks were. I was just saying where my priority was so I apologize if that came across that way. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So with respect to cos. >> Tovo: I'm confused out of the order. I thought we were going through the document in the order that we've zoning out of jumped ahead. I know Ann has as well. I have a sense of how we're going to attack this because we have like 19 documents. >> Mayor Adler: We're going to go through this in order. It seemed to me that the amendments that were raised by people with respect to

[9:56:04 AM]

one and two and three are things that we've discussed. If there are big issues in there not parsing language, but big issues in there that haven't been addressed, then let's go ahead and do it. Because I was going to number four because that was the next one that seemed to have a big issue to me. We're already a five to 10. So I was going to go through this with the big issues that needed to be decided. >> Kitchen: Mayor, I think some of us may -- I know that my colleagues have made some suggested changes to some of these and I'd like to understand where they're thinking is. >> Mayor Adler: That would be fine. >> Kitchen: I'd rather just go through each one and if there are changes -- because some of you may think -- >> Mayor Adler: I don't have a problem with that. I started at the beginning, I'm going through it. I went to what I thought the next big issue was, but if someone thinks there's a big issue that we missed

then we see the big issue before we go. So anybody else have anything in overall scope they want to talk about? Does anybody have anything they want to talk about in timeline? >> Kitchen: I have a question on overall scope. And this is just ready for councilmembers Casar and Garz I just want to make sure that I'm not misinterpreting what you're suggesting here. I'm reading that to mean that in starting with draft 3 that when you start with draft 3 that the staff should also consider all the commission. Is that what you guys meant there? >> Casar: Yes. The language says staff should review recommendations made by commissions. >> Kitchen: So I'm reading that right. >> Casar: All commissions, commissions. >> Kitchen: Okay. And then may I ask another question? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Kitchen: Is then from councilmembers Flannigan, Harper-Madison and Renteria, I think I'm reading that too but I want to double-check.

[9:58:04 AM]

Basically all you're saying here is again look at all the -- well, so what you guys are suggesting is not to start with draft 3, right? Okay. So we still have an issue with regard to what to start with. And then you're just suggesting that you go back and look at -- which is what you just said a minute ago, right? All right, I understand. >> Mayor Adler: And ultimately I have a vote on that, potentially if someone votes for a vote on whether we start with draft 3 or not, we'll have a vote on that. My sense is that the majority of the people on council, my guess would be, want to start with 3. If you don't start with 3, can you get this done by the end of the year? >> >> Mayor, I think that we need to start with draft 3 as a baseline in order to have any chance of completing the tasks by the end of the year? I do however want to emphasize as was stated I believe in the manager's March 15th memo that there are a lot of revisions that staff are aware need to be made to draft 3 that are independent of your policy direction. It's very much staff's intent to endeavor to clarify, simplify, improve and address concerns that have been raised by a variety of holdovers. So although draft 3 is sort of a functional working document, I think is going to be necessary going forward. Certainly the whole time and the manager's expectation there will be substantial revisions again separate and >> Mayor Adler: And I think that's understood and covered by that language. Does anybody else have anything else before we go to the next section? >> Renteria: On the housing part of it -- >> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. We're not to the housing part. I don't want to skip ahead to the housing part because we'll be moving all over -- but I'll get there. We'll get there.

[10:00:05 AM]

I'm still on the front page on question no. 1, overall scope we've gone over. Does anybody have any timeline, additional things they want to raise? Council member Kitchen? >> Kitchen: One of my suggestions on E timeline was that we just acknowledge that in order to complete the mapping process in 2019, and it's an if -- if there's more extensive zoning map modifications needed, to address our policy direction, that those could be -- those would be adopted at a later date, after allowing sufficient time to complete any associated planning testing. I just think it's important to acknowledge, my intent here is that we do everything we can as quickly as we can, but one that really wants us to finish in 2019 with our

mapping process, but I think it's important to acknowledge that we may come up with policy direction that requires extensive zoning modifications and that those might not necessarily happen in 2019. So to me this language is important. >> Mayor Adler: I'd want to make clear for me that this doesn't -- that I want us to map the transition Zones, and I want that done by the end of the year, so my hope would be that we would try to construct a process so that we could actually get the mapping of the -- generally of the corridors and of the transition zones done, but something that goes beyond that, that was larger than that, or things even more appropriately addressed in the planning. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: I mean, that's why I generally agree with this, but so as to -- to make real clear expectations so that it's just not an ambiguous where people could be using the same thing two different ways. It's my hope that we're mapping the -- the activity corridors and centers and the transition Zones. >> Kitchen: Okay. So then so we would need to -- so -- okay, so I'm understanding where you're coming from. To me that depends on

[10:02:06 AM]

what -- what policy direction is decided for the transition Zones. There's been some recommendations that are fairly extensive, and to my mind if that's what the council goes with, fairly extensive transition Zones, I'm not certain we'd get that done in 2019. So we just need to mark this language as one that is one that we may or may not agree on. >> Mayor Adler: If we give you directions with respect to transition Zones that you don't think you can map on this timing, or corridors, would you please point that out to us? >> We will. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Kitchen: And the other thing from my perspective is the public, you know, in terms -- if we're talking about very extensive mapping, then I think we have to understand that there may be some more time needed both for testing and for individuals to understand how extensive we're talking about remapping. So I think that that's part of what I'm talking about. I think mapping transition Zones is fine and is appropriate, and I think mapping along corridors and activity Zones is appropriate. I'm just raising the flag that we need to understand, depending on the scope of the change that we're suggesting, that there may be some need for additional time. So that's all I'm saying. So -- >> Mayor Adler: And I hear that, and what I'm going to endeavor to do is -- my hope would be to participate in a document with the direction we give with transition Zones is direction that can be done on the timing that we're talking about. And to the degree that we hear it's not then I would probably want to adjust that direction, but I'm going to assume that, absent hearing otherwise, the direction we give with respect to transition Zones is something that fits generally within that time frame. Okay? Any further conversation on timeline? Yes. >> Would there be an opportunity for the professionals responsible for testing to be assisting staff along the way, just so we kind of can see it play out in real time and know that some of the scenarios have been worked on simultaneously? >> Mayor Adler: I would hope that would be happening.

[10:04:06 AM]

>> Absolutely. You know, one thing we didn't want to do purposely was get into process and we do testing as a process piece of it but certainly what we did with the previous draft versions of the previous product is use professionals to help us with that. >> Excellent. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Going a step beyond that, at the end of having gone through that process then there was testing that was done with aia and with other professionals in the community. I would hope that that would be happening concurrent with the development this time as opposed to something that happened after the fact, so that that was part of that process. But that's for the manager's side of it, but I share the same change in the past process to have that made more integral to the process. >> Thank you. D overall I think we share the same concern, which is getting a document that functions correctly and to the degree that we will include others to help us with that, we certainly will. >> Mayor adlerokay. Thank you. All right. Any other questions -- or discussion about timelines people want to raise? Okay. What about the next section is the code text section, the -- >> [Inaudible] >> Mayor Adl: I'm sorry, did I -- communications. Anybody have Thi they want to raise there? Is your light on? No? >> It was, but you skipped over it. When you said are there any other questions or statements, I do want to reiterate my position on not starting with what I believe was a document that wasn't functional to acm -- to the acm's point about a functional document, and then also to just reiterate my thought around being quick but not hurrying. I think it's very important that we acknowledge those concerns there, when we use the language like quick and we use really definitive timelines, I think it concerns people that we're not putting the necessary effort into creating a really functional,

[10:06:09 AM]

long-lasting, sustainable document. >> Mayor Adler: Gotcha. Leslie? >> Pool: I wanted to add a sentence, and this was in ans posting from yesterday afternoon under communication. A last sentence, "Include a transparent and educational public process underch stakeholders are informed and confident in how their input has been received and is being evaluated. And that builds on some of the comments that are being said around the table, for example, Natasha just pointed out that the community needs to understand what we're doing, which I think is what you were saying,ngther things, to get it right. So that would be -- I would like to see that sentence included under communication. Again, this was -- this was a weakness in our previous process. >> Mayor Adler: And I like all that sentiment. I want to make sureree' not building something in that cesat an expectation that would prevent us from being able to, in fact, if we can get it right -- to be able to have the document done by -- by the end of the year, so I don't want to create an expectation. Otherwise, I think that we accon Lish all of this within the time frame, and certainly as things go before the planning commission, there's public engagement opportunity, as there has been os it over thetas six years. So I'm fine including this because I read this today that this can -- obviously we would learn from the past experience that we have. I think that we've seen some real goodork with the strategic mobility plan and the -- the table that was done where things were considered in all or part and where they could be found. I think we have elements to do. So I'm fine with this so long as we're not catinre an ambiguity, that some people then rely on later to -- to stop the process. Ann? >> Kitchen: There's no intent to create ambiguity

[10:08:11 AM]

or to stop the process, so if you're thinking there's some words in here that might be interpreted that way, certainly could hear -- you know, could think about some alternative language. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Kitchen: This language is -- tries to add some language that gives some more clarity to the previous sentence, and it's the transparent and educational part that to my mind adds some more detail, and I do think it's important for stakeholders to be informed and confident, not that they're being agreed with but that they know that they -- that they -- when they're making a comment, that it's been received and they understand what the feedback loop is, okay? You know, something as simple as we got your comment. We've looked at it. Yes or no, we're going to do anything with it. So that's all that I intended here. It's not intended to mean that -- that you have to have a process where we agree with everything, but we do need a process where people know how their input is (lapse in audio) We know exactly what's going to be happening. Again, so that when we execute that we can stay to the timeline. I'm concerned just because I don't know what transparent and educational competence means in this context but I don't need to know that, if E Nager is going to say

[10:10:12 AM]

this is my process and this is how we're going to proceed, if we know the manager process then we'll know the process we're going to follow. Yes? >> Renteria: And I agree with you. We do have to keep it very simple so people can understand it. When we went into the transition and transition that, and people just didn't understand what we were talking about, and my whole goal is to see this done by the end of this year and have it simple so that, you know the normal person that walks in the city here can understand what we're talking about and can -- and I'm going to be as transparent as I can be because I know that there's a -- there's a big -- there's something that needs to be done here in the city, and I'm going to work as hard as I can to make sure that this gets done by the end of the year. >> Mayor Adler: Right. Thank you. Any other further issues to be raised in communication? Okay. What about the code text section? There were two issues that I think significant in the code text section that I had raised. One was nccds, and the other one was cos, and then council member alter, Alison also raised the co thing. What I gather from how the majority of people talked about cos is consistent with what you said, which is, is that where there are a lot of traditional cos that show up a lot, I think our staff's intent was to start incorporating those cos into the base zoning classifications, so generally speaking where that's happened we can forget -- we don't have to carry forward cos because they've been incorporated into the base zoning document, base zoning classification but to the degree that there are special cos that fall

[10:12:14 AM]

outside of that, then those cos would be carried forward, and then if that property was ever zoned in the future, then those cos could be handled at that point. That's what I thought, generally

speaking, was what I thought the -- where I thought we would end up. With respect to nccds -- >> [Dibblau >> Mayor Adler: What? >> Tovo: Are we on 3 -- oh, sorry, sorry. >> Mayor Adler: We went through 2, 3 and we were on no. 4. >> Kitchen: Well, actually we were on no. 5, but that's okay. We skipped -- >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So let's talk -- right, I apologize for that. What about code text, no. 4? My sense with respect to no. 4 as I read it I think that generally speaking this is what the guidance was that the staff was trying to follow in drafting draft 3, generally speaking, and if this is intended to go someplace beyond that or somewhere else, then I'm -- I'm not gathering that. I mean, this talks about, you know, trying to go to a form-based system, which I think we've generally tried to move in that direction, but it also allows for use specificity, which I think we have generally allowed -- tried to allow for in terms of how we -- how we mapped. >> Kitchen: Could I ask a question? Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Kitchen: Okay. So on the code text I would like to just ask about the proposed additions that council members Flannigan, Harper-Madison and Renteria

[10:14:15 AM]

were thinking about there. I want to make sure I understand it. So maybe -- would that be okay if they speak to that? >> Harper-Madison: I don't want to speak for my colleagues but if you have specific questions for me and my particular intent with the amendments to the document, I'm happy to spend. >> Kitchen: Okay. I'm reading this as relating to -- I'm not sure entirely what is intended here, except I think I see it as related to how our -- use restrictions are done so -- so that's what I was reading the amendment that you all were making, and I was reading that to mean that use restrictions -- there was a range of policy frameworks because there's a couple examples given here ranging from incompatible uses. So I just want to make sure I'm understanding the intent here is that there should be -- uses should be regulated depending on what's going on in the particular area -- with the particular use. Is that really what you all are wanting to do with that? Do you know? Or -- >> Mayor Adler: So as I read this, my sense of this was that it was saying the use rules we have should be context sensitive police applied citywide where is possible, as opposed to trying to come up with use policies by deciding what individual properties are. >> Harper-Madison: Correct. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: To try to address it more -- more broadly with respect to the kind -- kind of the zoning classifications or other general policies with respect to use. >> Harper-Madison: And if I may just offer clarity from my -- what my intent was, overall the intent is to create more in the way of simplicity and a code that's applicable across the city, as opposed to us spending so much time making very specific rules around certain areas. I think that is where the

[10:16:17 AM]

complexity comes in. I think that's where it's not simple. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Okay? >> Kitchen: Can I -- >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Kitchen: So the reason I was asking that is because I -- I proposed some additional language that -- that took the language that you all had and added a little bit more specificity to -- to the uses, and that's on page 2 under land use and zoning categories. So I think I

was under -- what you just said is consistent with what I thought that you guys meant, and so I picked up a lot of what you said with regard to that and then I just add some language about proposing options for prohibiting uses along corridors that displace potential housing opportunities, such as self-storage facilities or other uses that do not contribute to overall policy goals. I just want to -- just wanted to point out what I was trying to do there was pick up the concept that you all had brought forward about esus and then just add some additional clarity, so.... >> Harper-madison: I think E language that we used was context sensitive, so esseially I think we're saying the same thing. >> Kitchen: Yeah, I think I picked up Mo of your language and just added to it. >> Mayor Adler: So I haven't had a chance really to sear the language that you have, Ann, because it came yesterday. >> Kitchen: Sure. >> Mayor Adler: And I need to think through things like identifying hours O operation within -- wn a code. But with respect to the kinds of things -- and again, not to parse language, to raise the questions, I know tt we have -- I'm not sure that

[10:18:18 AM]

it's -- that all sites 5,000 or more needs greater water qualityreat tnt. I don't know if -- >> Kitchen: I'm not talking about those sections. I'm talking specifically about D, LAN use and zoning categories. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Kitchen: So -- because that's what I built off of. >> Mayor adler.ay so I haven't had a chance to run a red line back and forth, the words you've ord ad -- >> Kitchen: Sure. I just wanted to take the portunity now to ask what they meant, so -- >> Mayor a: Dlay. Greg? >> Casar: I don't want to jump to the -- my only comment on this was to make comments as it relates to one of council member kitchen's lines on water quality, but I D want to jump there if we're not there yet. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Moving past D. Yes? >> Tovo: So I appreciate -- I appreciate the conversation around -- around D. I think what -- what I need help undstanding, and it may -- I mean, this one of those things where I think we could spend a lot of time talking about it and really until we see it in the code it's not going to be clear what the decision is here, because context specific, it seems to me that when weak M choices about which uses are compatible with adjacent residential areas, we are making context specific decisions. So I guess I need some help understanding what is -- are we providing -- are we suggesting staff do methsog different or the same? Because crently our commercial Zones

[10:20:20 AM]

(lapse in audio) Matters T-- to the surrounding residential area if you have a small-scale grocery store, I think that's a very benicial use. If you hav a nightclub, you know, where that has to really be managed in a way that is -- is going to be sustainable, both for that business and for the residential areas, and I ink we all see this inur O district, but I see itll the time. So the use does matter, not just the size and scale of the building. But it could be that we're all in violent agreement on at. I just don't really (voices overlapping) A change. >> Renteria: Some of the cos, especially when it comes to communication, these days now with the new teloch, you don't need big [iibleud to send out signals, but -- tower to send out signals, but if you have a small radio station that wants to transmit, they would have -- because of the co

prohibiting communication it catches everything. You know, some of these conditional use, when you define communication, then what is communication? What it -- it falls into everything where they're just addressing the issue of a high tower with a phone transmitter, or what? You know, there a lot of different -- you C- - it's a catch-all of everything, so that's -- we need to define what -- so that we don't have to pass resolutions all the time that, you know, ask, you know -- that they can go around this conditional use on their pperty, on their land. >> Tovo: So refreshing of those categories and maybe separating out the uses -- kind of relooking at them and making some different decisions Abo what belongs in them based on -- Ren>>ria: I would like to see that, because we really need to be careful when we start, you know, just putting everything in one

[10:22:20 AM]

category, what is communication. Is it transmitting from a low-level radio staon, requires a ltle disk or something with a big-ol' tower, a phone? I see -- one of those. And there's other conditions out that catches everything.>> M or Adler: Okay. Any other -- yes, Ann? >> Kitchen: In response to what council member toaf tovo was asking, one of the things that I read this to say -- you know, wn council member harper-madison and Renteria and Flannigan brought this forward was pointing out the importantf addressing use restriction so I added a sentence saying we need to be simple and have clear requirements ofditions, and I just put a such don't know that it's distance requirements or hours of orations. Those are intended toe examples. The point ias making simply is, you K WRE all moving in the direction of addressing density along corridors, and when you do that you have to think about the uses and how they relate to the residentialind that, whether those are multi-family or single-family. So you have to think about just, you know, how those uses on the corridor impact the residential areas. And so I think clarity, which is something we don't -- we don't always have right now, so clarity about how these uses are addressed is what's really important, and simplicity about them, so people understand wt you can and can't do along a corridor, or if you can do it, you have to do it in such a way that, you know, noise is a big problem, you know, dumpsters are a big problem. E's a lot of problems that relate to what's happening along the corridor and how that impacts the

[10:24:21 AM]

multi-family or single-family residentia so I was just wanting to -- I was just thinking that that's really important and it's part of what we're talking about when we're talking about more density, so.... >> Tovo: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Tovo: And I forgot to comment, and I like the addition, council member kitchen, that you posed there of asking the staff to also, as they look at the commercial categories and uses -- of also screening out uses that we don't want to encourage on a corridor, such as storage units. I think that makes sense. I think that's a good addition. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? Move to the next category? >> Tovo: Ie a -- >> Mayor Adler: Yes? Kitchen: You had something you wanted to comment on. >> Renteria: That's what he's getting to. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Aer: We're moving to E now. >> Casar: Yes, mayor, I haven't had a chance to review and fully understand everything

within council member kitchen's additions on water quality and water forward. I'm a big supporter of trying to incorporate as much of that as we can this year, that helps us achieve all of these overlapping goals. The only one that I want to -- with my first cursory read that I want for us to flag potentially find some shared language on is that I remember from our previous discussions on water quality that sometimes just going with a square footage trigger doesn't always give you the best environmental outcome, because having water quality at 100,0 square feet, having a 4900 square foot duplex built without water quality isn't necessarily preferable to having a 5,000 square foot fourplex being built with water quality, because

[10:26:21 AM]

use fewer units that take up less space end up with more impervious cover at the edge of the city that lead to an environmental negative unintended consequence. So part of what I think was trying to get worked out that wasn't in the original draft, but was trying to get worked out as it came closer to council, is to figure out how we both get water quality protection and encourage missing middle, giving that missing middle is a better environmental option frankly than large single-family new home construction or large duplex construction. So we don't want to discourage that missing middle, but at the same time we do want to get the water quality. So I think there was sort of some negotiation around how do we get to both, because that blunt square footage requirement sometimes incentivizes large single-family or large duplex which may have made sense in the previous iterations of the code but we're trying to get away from. So I don't know what the solution to this is. I just know we're working hard on getting one, and really, council member kitchen, I think our AI are aligned. I want to include water quality protection while figuring out how to incentivize more small infill units and not incentivize larger single -- you know, one for water, one RFO two replacement -- >> Mayor Adler: And I haven't had a Chinese to go through this but -- chance go through this but I have the same concerns. I think we're all aligned together to say we want better water quality, so I have to think through the same thing about the square footage same points that council member Casar just made. I don't know whether it's an exception if you're an area where somebody has 90% impervious cover and we can incentivize them to drop it down to 50% impervious cover but that's an exception for an area that requires 30% impervious cover. I don't know -- but it actually net helped improve water quality in the area. I mean, those kinds of questions. And I know that, you know,

[10:28:22 AM]

the -- we want to move forward with the water forward plan as quickly as we can. I know there's been some pushback between what we'd like to have done and what staff feels like they're able to do and I don't want us to get into the middle of that discussion in the -- in this place. But -- so I'll -- obviously I mean, I think that we're all joined together trying to get better water quality. >> Kitchen: Okay. That helps me think through that. >> Casar: And I feel comfortable having the direction the vote this year to improve water quality overall and to reduce impervious cover in the city overall, and so I -- and I'm really comfortable having that, and I don't think we actually have that here, but I'm comfortable having that, and sometimes having really lot-specific rules actually inhibits our ability to get to that bigger goal

because water quality isn't a lot by lot thing. It's a much more regional issue, and so I think we can find some way to get to both. >> Mayor Adler: I think it's real important that we hit those citywide goals as well. Ann? >> Kitchen: We skipped over -- which is fine, but I just wanted to point out the creative spaces in the age friendly policies, and again, this is -- I don't expect people to comment unless you already have an idea, but I just wanted to flag that for you all and tell you what my thinking was there. These -- these both pick up on policies that the council has already addressed from a policy perspective, so the intent here is just to ask our staff as part of this code process to come back with options for us. So on creative spaces it says propose options to preserve creative spaces, including zoning categories specific to cultural space and incentives to

[10:30:48 AM]

(lapse in audio) Could capture that. And then the age friendly is similar in the sense that we have adopted an age friendly action plan, and there are recommendations in the age friendly action plan that relate to land use. And so again, I wanted to ask for input from the staff, and I picked up a comment added to the end of this something that council members Flannigan, Renteria and Harper-Madison had suggested, and that was that additionally there should be provisions that enable day cares and senior living centers in all parts of the city at a scale commensurate with surroundings, because that -- that fits with the age friendly policies, age friendly policies specifically mention multi-generational opportunities, you know, including senior living centers. So -- so I just added their language onto that. So -- so that's what those two things are about. >> Mayor Adlokey. Any further discussion on that? Kathie? >> Tovo: Yeah, I need to go back to water forward. So at the bottom of the document -- at the end of the document that I distributed I have a water forward draft amendment that is in sync with yours, Ann, but may go a step further. I'm not sure >> Kitchen: Did you distribute it? >> Tovo: Yeah. >> Thank you. >> Tovo: It's at the very end. So I think it's -- I certainly agree with coordinating with water forward to reduce water demand but I think we need to go a step further. We have -- we have opportunities here to integrate the two processes, and I think it's really important to do so. I think it would be very discombobulating for a development community to launch a new land development code and then launch a new set of policies that relate to water usage, and so I think that these should be streamlined and that they should be embedded within -- within our new land development code, and so my amendment -- my

[10:32:51 AM]

amendment speaks to that and talks about the regulatory requirements being codified and implemented as part of this comprehensive land use code revision process, and I think that's very in concert with what I've heard from developers, that they want a consistent process, a streamlined process, and again, I think the -- the timing is such that it really wouldn't make sense to roll these out as two separate initiatives. >> Mayor Adler: Does staff have -- >> Alter: I'm having trouble finding where in -- >> Mayor Adler: It's in the very back. >> Tovo: The very last thing age P 6, but I think that in concert with WHE -- it's not clear to me where it belongs, and I think it might make better sense embedded within the section that council

member kitchen brought forward. May>> Adler: Does staff want to comment on this now or do you want to comment before Thursday? >> Thank you, mayor Adler, Brent Lloyd, dsd, development officer. We definitely -- the language council member 'svo water forward language, as well as the provisions in council member kitchen's document paragraph E at page 2, we would like to run Tse by watershed protection and give them a chance to look at those a little bit more closely, and we will do that in very short order. I will speak with the environmental officer and staff later today, so we'll provide feedback to council on those provisions as well as your amendment before Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: That'd be great. Thank you. >> Tovo: And just to be clear, council member kitchen, most of your amendments I think came from draft 3. >> Kitchen: These are recommendations -- >> Tovo: Or were they also the flood mitigation -- some of the flood mitigation -- >> Kitchen: These are recommendations from clean water action. >> Tovo: Okay. >> Kitchen: And so I am not clear on how many of these are in draft 3. >> Tovo: To I guess -- and I may be confusing it with the

[10:34:51 AM]

conversations we had. I know these certainly aren't new to me and I think maybe that's because they were -- they were certainly being recommended by people looking at code -- code next draft 3 and the section -- especially the section that dealt with storm water use and what not. >> Kitchen: Yeah, they're not -- they're not new. I think they've been presented to us in the past by staff, if I'm remembering correctly, but -- >> Tovo: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Continuing on. Anything else in this section on code text that people want to raise? Ann? >> Kitchen: One other thing, and that's the F that I had suggested, and that's related to transportation demand management tools. And again, I'm not -- to me these subjects relate to what we're doing, the majority -- because one of the INGs we're focused on in these questions 1 through 5 are increased density. So -- and parking. So I just wanted to suggest some language here around tdm tools, that there be a set of tools that can be used. My understanding is that's consistent with what the transportation department is planning, but the goal of that is simplification. So -- so that developments that want to use transportation demand management instead of having to customize them each time, which takes time and money to figure out, also time and money for the analysis, that they can work off a predetermined set of tools. There's just some suggestions here on what those are. >> Mayor Adler: So how does that work? Is that -- I support that kind of stuff. Does that -- does the code have a provision that says there shall be a predetermined set of transportation management tools and then the criteria manual can have those tools so they can change over time without having to amend the code?

[10:36:51 AM]

>> Kitchen: Perhaps. Code does address transportation demand management, so the way that you just mentioned it might be a good way to phrase that. I would ask the transportation department, you know. You don't have to ask them right now but we can -- perhaps you can ask them for feedback on this also as you asked water quality for -- >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> I'm with the transportation department. As

discussed, that's exactly right. As previously with the code rewrite, we had the demand management time required in the code as part of that transportation impact analysis process and defined, and then we were developing criteria that was clear and concise in the criteria manual, and have continued to do that in the last six months in developing the TCM rewrite, so that is how it went forward. >> Mayor Adler: So the next section then is the zoning map. >> Kitchen: Wait, one more. I'm sorry. Would that -- am I hearing you right that it would make sense to say in the code that there will be TDM and that there will be a predetermined set that people can use? Okay. Got it. >> Yes. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So then the zoning map is the next section that we're talking about? >> Sorry, I wanted to briefly -- code text. Don't know what the amendment will be, but -- and if staff could help provide some guidance, but I wanted something, you know -- it says the revised land code should be sufficiently clear and unambiguous. That often refers to the criteria manuals, and I wanted -- maybe it's a family-friendly thing or -- but something specific to addressing my -- the homestead initiative that helps -- reduces requirements for families that are just trying to stay in place. So I think that a family

[10:38:53 AM]

trying to remodel and add to their home should be treated differently from a developer who's just bought a vacant -- a piece of property and is demolishing the house and putting two condos up. I think in those more I guess for-profit situations, for example, one thing I've often brought up is the sidewalk requirement. In those kinds of situations I do think the developer should pay for whatever sidewalk is required in our code, but when you have a homeowner just getting in on some square feet, they're required to put a sidewalk, and I don't think that -- I just don't think that's fair that we're asking our homeowners to complete our sidewalk infrastructure because they're trying to stay in place. >> So, mayor, pro tem [inaudible] DSD. I think any language that would sort of distinguish among classes would be something we'd need to talk with the law department about but fundamentally having different requirements for remodels versus new construction, which is, I think, the essence of what you're talking about, is definitely something that we can look at. And I'm familiar with the situation that you're describing where the issue is kind of for neighborhoods that don't have sidewalks, at what point do you trigger the requirement to dedicate sidewalks and if you feel that the current practices or code provisions are a little too overaggressive on that, you can certainly, I think, frame some direction that would give staff the go-ahead to revisit those requirements. And we can -- if asked, I think we could give you a sentence or two on that, but I think that there's a way to get to where you're going, but definitely I think distinguishing among classes of people or families, we would caution against that. >> Garza: Okay. I'll try to think of an amendment. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Then in the code text, are we ready to move there?

[10:41:21 AM]

From that. I heard conversation both ways with respect to NCCDs. This language generally says that UDCs and PDAs continue, and NCCDs come up as an issue. I would recommend that we keep the CCDS in there are a few in the city. [Inaudible] Heights up on 11th and 12th street place area. I think the consideration

-- because I think there are good things in nccds, the neighborhoods have negotiated design standards and those kinds of things. But we could certainly talk about whether or not as an overlay to nccds, whether those areas have to also take transition Zones or the citywide Adu policies that we were otherwise -- it seemed as if council wanted to O, to liberalize Adu thrss through the decide, so Y would overlay on top he T nccds, whatever we decide with respect to transition Zones or ads, that kind of thing. Discussion on this issue? >> Ovo: Just a point of clarification. I mean, therere a ads in at least a couple nccds that I'm aware of. Hyde park had a liberal Adu before the one revised at the city. There here TRE concerns about the nccds it would be helpful to know what are some of the regulations that causing some of those concerns. >> Mayorer: Dleg? >> Casar: So I think, council member tovo, you make a good point,here were still -- once we did our Adu reforms citywide, some of the nccds were not affected but frankly heir had Adu prosionvi but they didn't match up with the Adu

[10:43:23 AM]

provisions citywide, and so for me I think the question, if we f25 entire neighborhoods, then folks might ask, well, why does the transition zone end right here, and if the answer is it doesn't have to, that we can still provide some of the form and design protections in other parts with an nccd, but any transition zone that we map still applies and we don't St F 25 that out but actually, you know, keep design inform provisions but allow transition Zones to apply andhen if we change any of the base site development standards as it relates to single-family or multi-family, if those can get baked without dispting the nccd, then I could see how those could both co-exist. I think my concern is with f25'ing whole neighborhoods and then not have whatever we decide for the whole city apply in those areas. And I would be -- I'd be comfortable giving staff direction to do both as opposed to removing the entire nccd when actually I don't have particular issues with -- with, you know -- the nccd ordinances are manypage long. I think it's really just trying to make sure that whatever W do, without adding small scale housing can apply in different parts of the city without being f25'd away. >> Kitchen: I have a estion about that. Do you have auestion? >> Mayor Adler: What I was trying to propose is there were some people -- I was trying to avoid a vote to strike nccds. So I was trying to come up with language that might be able to preserve nccds, all the design standards, the bulk of what goes into an nccd, and suggesting that something -- one way we might consider that is to allow for in essence what would be an overlay on an nccd that would recognize transitions and ads, and

[10:45:24 AM]

to the degree that they already allow adus, then it wouldn't be changing condions or whatever. Ann? >> Kitchen: I have some questions here, because what I'm hearing you all say is to not keep the nccd, because what you're talking about is changingthat is -- and I may not be totally understanding nccds. I think council member tovo may understand them better, but mynderstanding of an nccd is it looks at comprehensively at a particular geographic area, and so it would have adessed a whole range of things. D so if you're talking about overlaying additional requirements you're essentially changing the nccd. I

mean, am I -- >> Mayor Adler: It's being changed to that degree, it would be changed to the degree that it WOU allow for transitions, and ads if it didn't otherwise allow for ads, but the bulk of what was in the nccd document would remain unchanged. >> Kitchen: But isn't the bulk of it addressing things like density in places and stuff like -- >> Mayor Adler: Design standards and lots of other things, but to the degree th it didn't allow for the -- the missing middle housing in the transition, then it would, and to the degree that it stopped the realization of density or housing on commercial corridors it would. >> Kitchen: What if it had greater density than we're talking about? >> Mayor Adler: It would certainly be allowed to continue that. Tovo: So I would suggest -- I mean, I think that se- where you're -- I mean, this isn't interesting conversation and I think if we actually spent some time looking at -- looking at the nccds, they're all different, and actually looking at their impact, I think that that wou d be probably a more productive way to proceed, because, F example, council member kitchen, you're right that these have -- I mean, the nccd I Hyde park, for example,

[10:47:25 AM]

identified -- and let me ide ove context, that these are like nationally recognized tools that are used in planning across the country, and they're Espe ally valuable -- excuse me -- in what it's ne -- what it's done in Hyde park I encourage and identify areas for density and for ads within an established neighborhood. And so Hyde park is -- has a -- I mean, we all got this information, though I'll have to look bk at when they sent it because it may be that the new council members need it, it's the highest -- among the highest density neighborhoods in Austin, somewhere I've got some details about how many ads. I mean, it encgedra ads, again, before that became a city policy. It did provide for transiones zrom the corridor and increased density in those small commercial nodes within the neighborhood as long as - - on the corridor. So I think if the were direction given to staff think it would need to be along the lines of analyzing it to see if it's providingany impediments to city policy goals, because rtaicey in the case ofhyde park's, you know, we've got a lot of evidence that not. It is, in fact, doing the oppote, and I think even opticos recognized Hyde park as one of the areas where we have a wide variety of T so-called missing middle. You have muftl I --ou have like 45 apartment complexes, you have ads on lots of lots. You have fourplexes, triplexes. Talk about missing middle D 'll get to this soon I think we need to have a realistic conversation about which neighborhoods have the so-called missing middle on the ground and what has helped achieve that, and in the case of Hyde park the nccd has helped achieve that. Now, council member harper-madison would have to providmo dreail. It's been a little bit since I've looked at 11th street and 12th street and the nccd works differently there as it

[10:49:25 AM]

does in Hyde park. That's the point. They'reonta C -- exactly what we've been talking about, contact specificite S development standards that allow the achievementf O aims without, you know -- in recognizing the existing patterns of development and encouraging and enhancing them. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion on this issue? Mayor pro tem and then [inaudible]. >> Garza: I think it

would be a good idea -- I know that votes are expected on Thursday, but we all said that, you know, there's going to be more direction that's needed, and I think it would be a good idea that -- to have a presentation maybe on nccds and understand exactly what -- what they allow more than other areas, because for me, and maybe this is a misunderstanding, but most nccds are in affluent parts of town with very active, engaged community, that were able to get these protections or these characteristics. And so as we have had a conversation about equity in our city, I want to know -- aren't there neighborhoods in my district with nccds? Why aren't there neighborhoods in Greg's district? I don't know if you have nccds. Why aren't there any -- I don't know if Pio does. So there may be a misunderstanding that I'm not aware of, but it seems like they are in certain parts of town, and if we want an equitable code, I want to understand them better and I want to understand why those guidelines need to still exist. If there's -- it sounds like if they're providing more than what other neighborhoods, then they wouldn't be affected by this kind of additional, I

[10:51:59 AM]

but I think they're a very valuable tool and it's exactly the kind of contact-specific zoning that is of value everywhere. I would completely support -- I would completely support a direction to look toward other areas that would benefit from them. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes -- I'm sorry, Natasha. >> Harper-Madison: I want to echo several things that we've heard, both by council member Tovo and mayor pro tem, and that -- I really need to understand better who's directly affected by nccds, which is why we sort of flag -- our language is sort of flagging the concern TRE and echoing what mayor pro tem said about equitable distribution. Some of the things I jotted down real quick is my -- in my limited experience, just sort of glancing through the 2016 audit report that indicates nccds inequitably affect the citizens of Austin and land use in the city of Austin. I'd like to get more clarity around who benefits. Because from my perception it looks like mostly long-time central Austin homeowners, and also from my understanding, Austin is a primary renter city. How are renters affected by nccds? Is it positive or is it negative? I'd like to have a more thorough understanding of that. I'd like to, you know, really talk about -- I mean, if we're talking about equitable distribution of the use of land in the city of Austin, then I really need to understand more. So you brought up the 11th and 12th street nccds, and that's certainly extraordinarily complicated, especially because the direct result of those organizations, you know -- if you take a look at 11th street, which was the result of the urban renewal process, and 12th street, they were supposed to happen simultaneously, but look at the clear and stark difference between the development on 11th and 12th street, you know. So I just -- yeah, I think a

[10:53:59 AM]

presentation is in order, especially for those of us that are sort of new to the table maybe getting a understanding of who and where are affected by the -- by nccds. >> Mayor Adler: Staff? >> Brent Lloyd, development officer. Well in advance of Thursday, among our growing list of action items, is to provide some general background information to council on nccds, and additionally just -- just for clear

comcatini, if council chooses to keep nccds but provide sort of limited direction for targeted changes, that's definitely something that could be achieved without having to rewrite the whole documents. And then, you know, it will provide I think some more information than background that we give you on Thursday, but nccds and draft 3 were proposed to be kept through the F 25 but they were not proposed to be carried forward as a new forward-looking tool, not because they don't serve a lot of value but because they're complex, they involve a lot -- a lot of them involve lot by lot zoning categories, and they're -- they do present some complexity in terms of administration. And so they -- staff recognized that they serve a lot of value, and that's, I think, one of the reasons they were preserved as f-25 in draft 3, but they're not without complicating factors. So we will try to provide council with some information and options with respect to N in advance of Thursday's meeting. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Tovo: And I would just say they're very -- each one is different. I think the ones in your district were used to encourage development and so they increase the entitlements. I mean, they're all very different -- they're not monolithic. But -- I wanted to just respond to the question, council member Harper-Madison, that you raised about how nccds are addressing renters, and just to point out something that I think I mentioned a couple meetings ago, but if you

[10:56:00 AM]

look at the census tract that most directly captures Hyde Park, 78% of the occupants in that area are renters. In the neighborhood around that, 74% are renters, 70%, so it's actually -- I mean, you cannot equate nccds with keeping renters out. In fact, it's -- I mean, it's of the -- I don't know that there's a causal relationship, but certainly all of that planning has -- has created an area that is majority renter, higher than, you know, many other neighborhoods throughout the city and districts across. So you know, again, and I think as we think about how to -- how to proceed with a land development code that is sensitive to the fact that we are a majority of renters, I think that's -- I think Hyde Park is a -- you know, I'm not sure that we should be looking to remove some of the tools that have helped foster this -- these environments. >> Harper-Madison: I don't know that what I'm asking for is removal so much as clarity. >> Tovo: I wasn't suggesting. >> Harper-Madison: And more importantly how are renters affected in different parts of the city by the application of nccds, and are nccds and other tools being equitably applied citywide from a codification perspective. That's really my question. >> Mayor Adler: Jimmy, we're still in question no. 1. We're on 5, talking about the nccds. We've been slow moving here waiting for you to come back. [Laughter] We're really going to start moving now. Leslie? >> Pool: Could you remind me what the acronym nccd stands for? >> Neighborhood conservation combining district. >> Pool: And then there's neighborhood contact teams as well, and neighborhood contact teams are associated with neighborhood plans. Are they also associated with nccds? >> I think the place in the code where they're mentioned called out is specific to neighborhood plans. >> Pool: Right. Okay. I think the audit that W also mentioned here had to do with contact teams and not the nccds, but I have

[10:58:02 AM]

to go back and pull that audit. I think it was from two years ago to remain myself. >> Mayor Adler: Ann? >> Kitchen: So I wanted to ask the staff, so you can give us a general overview on Thursday, but I think that what's going to be important is to really understand the impact. So I would be inclined to -- so I think we need to have that, so we have an understanding. I think that will be useful for everyone. I certainly don't -- my impression, which could be totally wrong, is that these were done years and years ago and are not so much done anymore, and so those of us that have neighborhoods that are perhaps newer neighborhoods don't have nccd -- I don't have any in my district, but -- so -- but what I don't want to do is -- what I wouldn't want to do is pass policy direction and just say they're going to apply to the nccds without understanding the impact. So if -- depending on how fast we're wanting to move on that part, what we -- my thinking is we might need to say, analyze the impact specifically, come back to us. Tell was the tools are, which I think is what you guys were saying -- tell was the tools are that might apply citywide, and then help us understand what's going on in the particular nccds, because I think th they could be an exam E of tools that are useful for the whole city in some circumstances. They -- so I just don't know. You know --nd tnk I want to know that before I say that we should overlay the direction that we're doing right now, because what we might be inadvertently doing is actually not fostering density that's there on the ground now. So.... >> Mayor Adler: So I think >> Mayor Adler: So I think the question with respect to section five in this

[11:00:03 AM]

conversation was relative to nccds. Some had questioned the continuing existence, some were defending them as a important constructive part of he city and I had thrown out the additional consideration of may we keep nccds, but overlay on top of them whatever transition Zones or Adu or I guess even preservation tools we adopt citywide so they would also apply in an nccd. That's the conversnat you've walked in to. Pio and then Jimmy. >> Renteria: 88. I really want to -- yeah. leally want to find out about the nccds, but codenext was to not create new, but keep the existing ones. In'tas involved in that process, but I would like to know why their recommendation of was not to create anymore. And so I'll be interested on the tools of how things work in those nccds and what didn't work so that when we do create a whole policy citywide tt we can be able to implement some of those that didn't work and the ones that -- we don't want to use those. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Jimmy. >> Flannigan: And my thought on the nccd ooze is partly what councilmember Renteria said,hey don't exist but for a couple of spaces, a couple of areas. And we hen't added any new ones and we don't -- from my understag don't plan to add any new ones. Soe need to take away lessons from what those did or did notccomplish and make sure we're not using nccds as a way to opt out of code rewrite because the challenge we face is big and we shouldn't be allgin areas to opt out of being a part of T solution, especially when T whole premise of the code rewrite is the code wrien number of years ago is T doing the job while the nccds were written some years ago too. So I don't want to lock them in. I get a sense no one is saying lock them in -- block

[11:02:05 AM]

them outntirely, but what will work moving forward as a city. >> Mayor Adler: Move on to the next topic. Let's do that. We'll go on to question number 2. This was the question abouthousing capacity. I think there seemed to be general consensus with C. I know mapro tem you suggested adding to C that it have the residential and commercial zoning categories. I think there was general consensus on that. >> Kitchen: Wait. I don't think there was general consensus on C. >> Mayor Adler: I looked at the langu tet she added at the bottom of that in blue on nc is what I was saying. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Pool: I didn't hear .at what? >> Mayor Adler: I was suggesting that Kathie's language in blue at the bottom of option C on page 2 of what she hded out that says we provide greater housing than in draft 3 through eanced measures to allow construction of additional residential units. And Kath added including adding residential to commercial zoning categories. >> Tovo: Which can go there or elsewhere. I agree, I don't know that there's consensus around C, but I don't want to lose sight of what I Thi is a consensus point that just looking at the couple of blocks within my house would yield lots more residential units than currently. >> Mayor Adler: My sense is that there is probably consensus among C. We'll know when we vote, but certainly if people want to talk about something other than C or about C, now would be a good time to do that. Ann. >> Kitchen: Mine is more of a question. I had suggested that we select B with targeted C options and the reason I did that is because to me it's not clear what it means for us to go with option C. What I was thinking in terms of is that we provide specific direction and so perhaps this is just really a question for staff that you don't have to answer

[11:04:06 AM]

right now. I think -- I thought I asked this at the work session, but I -- I probably didn't. So I want to know if we're Ng we're going with option C, what is the list of policy priority that is inherent in option C that we're not actually speaking to? So that -- I just want to -- if there is any. So that's all I'm saying is I want to know what we're voting on when we say option C. So is that something you can provide a list? >> Sure. And actually the list is actually in the manager's memo. >> Kitchen: Yes, but it wasn't clear to me from the manager's memo. Maybe I need to be more clear ony M questions. >> If council were to select option C with accompanying narrative, there I list of options in the manager's memo thatst aff would evaluate. It wouldn't necessarily come forward with all of them, bu a vote for option C without any addional qualification would basically be direction to staff to look at all those various options, bring forward the ones that make sense. And if counc chooses to be more proactive and provide actual direction in connection with option C, en we would follow that direction. >> Kitchen: Mayor, could I ask a question? All right. Maybe I'm just not un rstanding. So when I read the mayor's memo, I was -- it wasn't clear to me what all was in option C. So -- because I was reading language that said -- I'm sorry, I don't have it right in front of me, B I was reading language that said things like option C will address things such as or incling such as. So I wasn't clear if there was more to it. So here's what I Wil do is I will get more specifi with my questions. We don't have to do this right now, but I'll get more specific with my questions

[11:06:08 AM]

and let you know where it's unclear to me what we might be getting if we went with option C. So -- >> Mayor Adler: I think that kind of direction, I think it would be really helpful for you to do that. My understanding from the manager is he really wants us to take a position on A or C on the choices because he's looking for a clear direction. To the degree we can he's asking us to really try to answer it that way. But I think the questions that you're asking, what does that mean I think are real good stuff. Leslie? >> Pool: Well, I'm looking at some of the edits that were provided in councilmember Kitchen's most recent update and it speaks to preservation of 10,000 affordable housing units, production of 0 permanent supportive housing units each year, but half of those units being housing first and then it name checks the Austin strategic housing blueprint 10 year goals with direction provided throughout the document. And I think that -- also mentions the report down under B-3 and I think those inclusions are specific and helpful direction to staff and should be included. And then also also mentions in C, the city manager shall provide estimates for the potential impacts of the new map on transit ridership as well as affordable housing goals and you all include those items. >> Mayor Adler: So I think one of the big issues with respect to this section was the language that was suggested by Jim and that group for three units. It's right after the selections up in A. Three units for all residential zoning categories. Do you want to talk about

[11:08:11 AM]

that? >> Flannigan: Well, I don't think it's that complicated, but the very reality that we want to be able to build enough housing and that means we should allow people to build more units. There's a point to talk about where the market will deliver those units. You know, there are certain areas on the edge of the city where even if we zoned it for 1 F or 15 units on a single plot of land it's just not going to get built. When you have neighborhoods that were built in the last 30 years, they're for sure going to get torn down. I've got single-family homes that are getting built in brand new platted neighborhoods still to this day that are not going to get torn down and be replaced with triplexes, but just as a baseline we should be allowing three units on a site. And then separately on the other question where the three of us talked about the missing middle housing referencing the four-plexes as well, thinking about how it is that we ensure that the process defined in the code doesn't -- you allow it in zoning and you process it now like we do now with processes where you only allow one type of plex to get built and then you allow the complex. So I think this is a pretty simple element, just the three units in terms of base zoning. -- Residential zoning. >> Mayor Adler: So at a high level, Jimmy, with respect to this issue for me, I want to increase the amount of housing in the city and by setting the goal and asking the staff to give us a code that gives us the capacity to be able to go beyond that is real important. We're also trying to -- make sure that we're doing this right, but also for me trying to see if we can get it done by next year and focusing on the mobility deal because the timing issue becomes real important to me. Which probably narrows down to a certain degree the field that we have to

[11:10:13 AM]

operate in if we're going to be able to maintain that timing issue. And then I'm trying to also figure out kind of just the shock to the system with the degree of changes that we make in trying to get something within that time period that allows us to do something which is a substantial move forward, but isn't something that operates as such a -- that a shock that would then oops disrupt the process -- that would then disrupt the process or the timing. So I would probably try to address the additional housing units by focusing on the residential or commercial corridors, coming up with a transition zone that allowed for residences at RM-4 and above in the transition zones. So at the very minimal it would be four units but would also go up higher than that to run that back into that. The way that I would talk about increasing housing supply generally throughout the city would be to adopt the ad kind of things that we've talked about as a group. And liberalized it the way the amendments have talked about the different options and variations for that, but then also trying to significantly expand the preservation tool that is in the current draft 3, that's pretty limited right now and where that could be applied, but liberalize the use of the preservation tool where some was given additional units, but as part of that required them to preserve existing housing stock. I think that those steps could give us a little more housing in the city. I would hope housing that would enable us to meet the goals we've set, but also

[11:12:14 AM]

help us get this done on the timing that we've expressed an interest in doing. So I would prefer for me doing that rather than just adopting a three-unit rule across the city because I can hear how that's going to get played in a messaging standpoint. >> Again, Leslie and then come back to you. >> Pool: Are we good with the goal of preserving -- we have already have the housing blueprint goal of 135,000 new units and the strategy housing blueprint goal of 60,000 affordable housing units. And then are we also good with preserving 10,000 affordable housing units and producing 100 permanent supportive housing units each of those years? As a G >> Mayor Adler: Those are all goals so I support those things. When I look at it I'm trying to figure out what exactly is the code and the permanent supportive housing unit is a unit that otherwise is allowed by our code, but has the wraparound services that are associated with that. So in looking at this I think we need TPACE to be able to do those, but the code isn't going to tell us whether we get those things or not. It's going to be the things outside of the code to get those things. So this was new language. I just need to parse it so that -- I need to think about the ordinance on that, Ann -- >> Pool: I think this is being offered as additional direction. >> Mayor Adler: No, I understand that. I just need to look at the language well enough to be able to say that it's not the code change that gives us the wraparound services around those units, it requires the other work. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry, finish your thought. >> Mayor Adler: That was my thought. >> Kitchen: You're done? Well, that's -- >> Mayor Adler: Hang on. Let me go to Paige and I'll come back. >> Ellis: Were you next? [Laughter]. >> Mayor Adler: Jimmy, then Paige, then Ann. >> Flannigan: Sorry. Is it your turn? >> Mayor Adler: Your turn.

[11:14:17 AM]

>> Flannigan: So the three units on all residential lots to be seen in context to the other set of policies, so I agree with you mayor that the transition Zones and the corridors have to be more than three and I don't think there's disagreement from at least folks that I talked to about that. I do think if we're going to talk about the complexity of the job we're giving STA then the more slicing and dicing we do over the number of units the more complex the code ends up having to be and the more work staff has to do. It's simpler to say we'll do base 3 on residential Zones and then we can focus just on things higher than that on the corridors as opposed to having the staff do bh jobs. And I understand the hesitation too, right, but the -- I still kind of come back to the problem is big D the solution has to be big, and I'm -- I want to get us to the end of the road and I'm looking forward to hear what you all kind of lay out as alternative ways to get there. I just think a couple of key simple approaches is actually going to be the fastest way for staff to do this. >> I started getting nervous and we already have a lot of single-family homes that don't have room for it. We have flooding issues, we have traffic issues. I like the idea in theory it made me nervous and I realize I was in a place that applied to activity centers and corridors and places with transit just kind of seeing that if we started putting duplexes in backwards that we were going to have other domino issues with impervious cover and flooding and green structure and water quality issues. I stated looking at the neighborhoods in my districts and not knowing if it would play out well.

[11:16:22 AM]

>> Flannigan: A lot of our neighborhoods have restrictions that the code will not undue and o.s.s that applies to d-8 and just the market forces that are going to determine that the brand new homes that got built in Avery ranch aren't suddenly going to get duplexes built in the back of them. So yes. And I see that more as the market is going to determine the fact that those won't happen, plus the O regulations about drainage and tree protection and other things that will necessarily create difficult scenarios. That's why I'm more comfortable with a more straightforward approach because I think the other close of the code and the market will actually take care of that piece of it. >> Ellis: Absolutely. >> Mayor Adler: Ann, then Greg. >> Kitchen: I wanted to go back for a second to the goals. I'll go back and do some checking, but I think that there is a nexus with the code for the -- for certainly the preservation of affordable housing units which is the additional 10,000. And also for permanent supportive housing. So -- but I hear your questions about that and I'll go back and check it. I also just want to make a note that I put this in as the reduction of 10 permanent supportive units in conversations and with the folks that work in this area and an understanding it better that's too low. That's really too low. So given what we understand now about our homeless population. So I will -- I will be wanting to amend that to either take out the hundred or say or say least -- at least to address that because we have more information than we do when we -- we do now than when we put together the blue. And also I think there's a nexus with the code, but I think get some clarity on that. >> Mayor Adler: Greg. >> Casar: I have comments on the goals section, but maybe -- I'm going to save those when we get to the overall capacity question because I want to be able to provide those comprehensively. On the three residential units allowed everywhere

[11:18:24 AM]

issue, generally from an ideology perspective I think that that's an important goal and I would feel comfortable really targeting that potentially to the place where we think we will get it. You know, the pce that you've identified as the urban core in your joint document, councilmembers could be one way of cracking that issue that you describe. This is also a process of assembling, you know, majority support or hopefully even more than majority support, so trying to figure out between here and Thursday what six or seven or eight people could feel comfortable with, so I'm -- I'm happy to keep talking to folks and trying put together lanage on, you know, could we get more support if we servre the existing homes but added, U know, multiple ads, does it make more sense for it T beo in the urban core as Y all have defined it in your document, because that's where we anticipate the stuff has transit access and would most likely get built anyway. I think putting those sorts of parameters around it I think could be what gets us to a place where we have the majority or a strong majority of council that feels comfortable tackling that issue, because I do think that there are -- there are places in an urban en ronment where we currently already haveeehr or four units and it's not right on the corridor and it's in some of our most beloved areas and it makes for a variety of -- of housing prices and housing types and I think that's a good thing, but I think that the hope would be to find something that gets us a majority of people comfortable and tight M take some of those different amendments to get us to a place where we can get there. >> Tovo: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yeah, Kathie. >> Tovo: S raised it I'll speak to the definition of urban corthat was brought by several of my colleagues. I know there was an interest in making sure that as we're approaching the code where not allowing particular areas to opt out of Denty, and I just want point out

[11:20:25 AM]

that that urban core definition actually makes - wouldn't apply to districts 1, 2, 6, and just apply in very small ways to most of the other disicts. It applies pmarily to district 9. And so, you know, I think that as we lookt, number one, high opportunity areas, which are -- and I have a map I'd be happy toring B up when we get to that point, if it's relevant, as we look at T growth concept map and the activity cen,rs I think we -- we need to look he T whole city for places for increasing density, you know, while I hope -- I think council member kitchen, you said it best in a conversation earlier this week which I didn't attend but watched on TV, you know, we hope that projectonnect is going to be a plan for the whole city. We want to provide activy centers out of the urban core and ps for people to live near those activity centers, and so if we are trying to live out the vision of imagine Austin hewe, need to stick to that vision, which provides transit opportunities and jobs and housing for people in various parts of dotown -- in various parts of the city, not just I our -- in our downtown and in theeighborhoods adjacent. >> Kitchen: Could I speak? >> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. Leslie? >> Pool: Yeah, thanks -- ks fan pointing that out, council member tovo. I have a map here that I'd like to put up, and that shows our imagine Austin future -- future growth areas, and it shows our corridors, and it shows the downtown area, and it shows how we're growing and where people are building.

[11:22:26 AM]

And I don't think -- I'm pretty sure that one of the main aims of its rewrite of the code is not to get -- to make it a static document. The code previously lasted for 28 or 30 years; is that right Mr. Gonzales? >> Yes. >> Pool: Okay. So we're looking at a document that needs to be flexible and to respond to whatever happens in the city 20 years from now when -- and we can't imagine really what that will be as we won't be here, on council at that point. So to the extent that we are trying to overlay all of our growth concept map, our future land use maps, our strategic plan in mobility and housing and looking at where we have transit deserts which I think I pointed out last time we had a work session off to the eastern part of the city, we don't have any transit in our plans -- in our future plans, and I think that's a huge gap in our planning and we need to do something about that. So I would be really hesitant to nail this down making changes for density just in what we are today defining as the urban core. I have been following the city -- the changes to our city from a policy perspective out in the community for more than 30 years, and the downtown area and our urban core has moved outward since -- since I first started following it, and I expect that that will continue. So we have -- we have guidance to imagine Austin, and we're working on trying to get our mobility corridors out to all parts of the city where people are living so that they can get around, and I think we should -- this -- this new land development code has to be able to flex with how things are changing in our

[11:24:26 AM]

city. I can update the transportation -- the dedicated pathways, the transit pathways, commuter transit. I'll put this up next. And then I'll just end by saying I also have hopes that we will be able to revisit our future growth map so that on the previous map that was up there, that was determined about 7 years ago when imagine Austin was first passed, and our city has changed in those seven years, and I think we need to respond to that as well, and I'm hoping, really hoping, that the policy decisions that we make with the land development code in front of us will allow us -- will accommodate the changes that are happening organically in our community. >> Mayor Adler: Alison and then Jimmy. >> Later thank you. On the unit issue I agree with council member Ellis and the mayor and would not be favoring a blanket application of three units, and just more broadly, I want to add that for me I'm going to be looking at the questions of housing extras and how -- capacity and how we get them through the lens of how we're going to deliver those 60,000 affordable units, and I believe that we shouldn't be providing additional by right entitlements without ensuring that we're getting community benefits, affordable units in exchange. >> Mayor Adler: Jimmy? >> Flannigan: I -- I think it's important to remember that new housing is a community benefit, and there's an additional 60,000 of -- housing that's in the blueprint so we want to make sure we're getting those units as well. Council member Tovo, to your point, the challenge that I think I have struggled with to think through this, where the capacity goes, is that just speaking for my district, and I've got two

[11:26:27 AM]

major centers defined in imagine Austin, the lakeline area and the Robinson ranch area, and they are currently zoned for intense development, and we're tting -- I mean, Robinson is just about to start to turn over, but lakeline ceainly has had an unbelievable growth. I think there's a zoning case coming up very equiply. Zap just approved that plan, 100 units next to Avery ranch neighborhood. So for me it's not -- the convtion isn't so much about where all density goes. It's that I think we actually have sufficiently zoned in the regional cents that are on the edge, because the density is either going in or -- but for landown preference, which is not something we can really do too much about, is coming in soon. And so the real questio for me is -- you know, is two-thirds isust a number, but the intent being that areas of town that really should be densifying and growing incrementally aren't doing it and the areas on the edge that are identified as centers are doing it. So it's seor of a delta question today as opposed to a total question overall. If that makes sense. >> Tovo: I guess I would ask if you have the numbers -- I mean, if you look around you, say, for example, at downtown, we have thousands of new units comingn-li O, and if -- you know, I just don't -- I don't know that that's a comment that's really based in data. And I also wanted to point out, just so there's no confusion, the city defines urban core difrently than it is defined in the proposal that (lapse in audio). >> Oops. >> Tovo: The urban core?

[11:28:28 AM]

Sure. So just to be clear, I'm not looking at the land deveent code, so I'll ask the staff just to verify .is I'm actually looking at the quickest source I found was a statesman article about soccer, actually. And it defines the urban re, and this matches my memory of it, but again, I'll ask the staff to remind me, it is 71 in the south, which is consistent with our colleague's proposal, 183 in the north, which is consistent with our colleaguropo pl, but it -- but it's also 183 in the east, aspped to 35, and the western border is not -- well, let me read you what the urban core is, 71 to the south, 183 to the east and the north and the western border defined by mopac loop 360 andesa, and I think the area recommended be redefined as urban corby our colleagues is, as I recall, Ben white, 183 to the north, 35 to the east and mopac to the west. So it would -- it would atein whole sloughs of area to the west of our city that are high-opportunity areas, among -- among other things. It also cuts out -- and again, I -- maybe it's a good time to ask our av folks to pull up what we just saw, the growth concept ma'am. You can clearly see I outside -- outside of the boundaries both of the city'srban uore as well as the more narrowly focused urban core that'sroposed. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Casar: So we dave H the numbers from the consultants during the codenext process of how much is zoned inside the urban core as defined by the mcmansion boundaries versus outside of it. So currently nstea equivalency is 40,000 zoned inside the urban core and 104,000 zoned outside of it. So about two and a half times more is zoned outside the urban core than inside currently. So I think that it is not accurate for us to think

[11:30:30 AM]

that there is more zoning in the urban core than outside of it that's economically feasible based on the best consultants that we could get. And I don't think that allowing for three units inside of that area would make up much of that difference. It would make up a small portion of that difference. Or the levers that would be presented to us allow for more missing middle would so times allow for just a few thousand units and here you're talking about a 70,000 unit difference. Codenext zoned 83,000 units in the urban core and 200,000 outside of it. So I do think trying to get to a better mix of insidevers outside makes good sense to me. I do think that two-thirds of it being within that smaller piece just might be more than it is that we can easily do, but I do think getting closer to an even mix inside and outside the urban core in this case as defined by the expansion boundaries, but I'm happy to understand what the difference is in the boundaries as proposed in the Joint document by my three colleagues, but it is the case that there is more zoned capacity outside. I'm happy to talk more about capacity issues later, but I just think that that's an important fact that we have before us. >> Mayor Adler: Ann and then Alison. >> Kitchen: A couple of questions. Greg, I think -- councilmember Casar, one of my questions about what you just stated would be to take into account the size of the geographic area. And I don't have the data in front of me, but that would be one thing I would want to understand. My impression at least from my district, which I am more familiar with, of course, there's a lot more area outside the urban core than in the urban core. So I would expect to have greater zoning outside the urban core. So if you have data that you would like to share with us that relates more to the level of density, I would be interested in that. My concern about focusing

[11:32:31 AM]

only on the urban core is this: I do think it's really important that we consider density throughout the city. So to the extent that people have concerns that we would only end up with density on the out edges, I don't want that to happen either. So I'm perfectly -- I'm interested in some kind of direction that lets us look at density throughout the city. I don't think it's the two-thirds number maybe it's some number more than two-thirds. And I think it needs to be based on data, not just a guess. But the other thing that really concerns me about focusing on the urban core is I think there's a huge misunderstanding of what the neighborhoods are in the urban core and also a misunderstanding of how they're growing and what's happening to them. I really think it's important that we look at the whole city. Cause we have set some -- we've set some really ambitious goals which I think are great goals around affordable housing, under increased density, around I'll call them complete communities so everybody doesn't have to go downtown to work, so everybody can stay closer in their neighborhoods to get to the things that they want that they need to get to. We've got to imagine Austin and thank you, councilmember Pool, for putting that up. So to my mind to then take -- we've got all these policies that are looking at the city as a whole. So to my mind it takes some tools that we have and only focusing them on part of the city is just not going to get us where we want to go as city C and it doesn't make any sense and it also is -- I'm hearing it being suggested in an absence of understanding the data as to what is really going on in the urban core. And some of the concern about what's happening

[11:34:33 AM]

the urban core that I'm not familiar with is losing housing that's affordable. So it's even more of a problem of building larger homes than getting smaller units that may offer more opportunities for missing middle. So I think we -- I think the focus on the central core is something that I think is not appropriate. That's that we need to look more granular about what our tools are and we really need to understand what's going on in the whole city. And one last thing I want to say. The kind of thing that councilmember Ellis just pointed out in terms of looking at her neighborhoods and understanding impacts within her neighborhoods, I appreciate you saying that because that is the case everywhere in the city it's also the case in the central core. So I think we just need to understand that -- well, anyway, I've said enough. I think that we need to understand that is the case all over the city. >> Mayor Adler: Delia. >> Garza: I'm still trying to get to the bottom of the urban core thing because then Greg added another thing that is different from the mansion boundary than councilmember Tovo. So how does staff 59 the urban core right now? >> Hi, Lacy Patterson, planning and zoning department. In context when we were making decisions we were using the mansion boundary residential design standards as the definition for our urban core. So included the general 183, Mopac, 71, it encompassed a couple of neighborhoods south of 71 between Congress and First and then a little more up to the west. I don't remember if it's Mesa, the mansion boundary is the definition we've been using to this point. >> Garza: Okay. I guess I'll -- when we were talking about the asmp, we

[11:36:34 AM]

all -- I think the majority of us agree that you had to talk about those two things, ghetto and I feel it's the Mesa thing. And this is the reverse situation as we're talking about. We said would not talk about the asmp without talking about land use and we have the opposite, which is still true. We can't talk about land use without talking about the asmp. And the reality is where we want routes now or not, we have to think about where the -- where are the high frequency routes. So I'm not so much hung up on the urban core part of it, but I would say it needs to happen where there are high frequency routes now. And my assumption is most of those encompass a lot of what is being talked about as the urban core. But for me we need to think about -- if we want people outside of their -- getting out of their cars and using transit, that's where we need to put the density. >> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. Jimmy and then Pio. >> Flannigan: So the data question is important because there is some data that I can remember being presented. One of those data points was that over the last seven or eight years, depending on what year the presentation was, the fastest growing districts were councilmember Kitchen's and mine. So growth is already occurring today in terms of population in the outlying areas and a lot of that I think, councilmember Kitchen you could probably speak to parts of your district where you feel that -- I know all of my district is pretty distant and it is the fastest growing, our two districts being the fastest growing over the last period, since the last census. And the other thing I remember is when we did the North Shoal Creek neighborhood plan that neighborhood plan said that over the next 10 years they added zero population.

[11:38:37 AM]

So I take issue with the fact that there's not data underlying what we're talking about. There is absolutely data underlying what we're talking about. I also take issue with pointing to downtowns as an excuse to exempt out other neighborhoods in district 9. Downtown is a special unique place with special unique zoning and that -- just because you have density in downtown doesn't mean neighborhoods that are three and four miles away get to opt out of this conversation. I also take issue with the language we use because it is very important that we are not using absolute language. I'm trying and I'm not always going to succeed, but I'm trying. I am not and my colleagues that have worked on these documents together are not saying only in the urban core. It's not only. Two-thirds is not only. It's a lot and a lot of that is in response to seeing the amount of growth we've seen outside the urban core in recent years and I think the challenging part for us in this conversation is seeing buildings torn down and rebuilt one unit to one unit seems like growth, but it's not because we're talking about housing units. When I see development in my district it represents a ton of new housing units and that's evidenced by data that shows where new population is growing in the city. So -- the two-thirds and defining the core, part of that is responding to where we're seeing gentrification and depopulation. , Which we talk about being primarily east of I-35. And the majority I think and maybe staff could comment to the extent that it's a number in your head, the majority of corridors, activity corridors are in that boundary. Or some very significant portion of corridors in the boundary. So maybe a number that says some percentage of the units in the core is actually covered when we talk about transition Zones and corridors and other things and we add up all those things it actually does come out to the same thing. I just want to make sure that we are not -- may misrepresent anybody's position, I really want to understand because I don't want us to do the thing that

[11:40:41 AM]

kind of pivoted into in the. So I want to understand better. >> Tovo: Sure. >> Mayor Adler: Hang on. I'll come right back to you. Pio. >> Renteria: I had to cut off my mic because it was causing feedback. So thank you, mayor. The three units per lot, it's still going to be restricted on what you can put on your lot. Some people have trees that you can't cut it down. You don't have enough space, impervious cover, you're not going to build a giant one single unit. And we're going to be able to use that for affordability. It will just require one of the extra units to be affordable. And that's what I see. Maybe we should get the staff to come back and say about the urban core what the capacity of the urban core and then come back and give us what the capacity is and then we can decide on that. But we're still going to be restricted on what we can build. Just like single-family 1 and 2, these lots are huge, just like that case that we saw where that American had a 17,000 square foot yard and I couldn't build because it zoned SF 2 and it had to be for a servant acknowledgment for -- he wanted to build a house for his son. We need to relax these rules. So that's where I'm coming from. >> Mayor Adler: Paige. >> Ellis: As an apartment dweller I'm really excited that my district does have that opportunity. I like the expanded definition of urban core. I looked at if it is two-thirds happening inside urban core, I wondered how my district is able to step up because there's there is a need for affordable housing. We've got some already. Some of them are even near the

imagine Austin growth concept map like the Y at oak hill, and I think it's important in all districts E unable to accommodate the housing stock that we need. There's also a big consideration of sprawl too so tone very careful

[11:42:42 AM]

about this discussion of we are going to need more housing think where you had more transportation, where you had more places to work and schools. I do want to make sure my district steps up too and I know that's part of it is allowing for additional housing in a lot of places. So I just wanted to make sure that was clear that even though we have a lot of single-family homes, I like a connected, walkable lifestyle too and I want to make sure that my district is also stepping up. We have -- I just had a meeting with the demographer yesterday and it showed that my district has the most growth from 2010 to 2017, the district data actually is the leader of growth. And I'm proud of that. We have a great district. So I just wanted to make sure that was clear. I'm supportive of more housing. >> Council, Lacy Patterson again. Staff just wanted to provide for this conversation a little bit of the numbers that they provide us. So for the draft 3 card, they provided that a third of the capacity was inside of the urban core versus outside of the urban core. So 86,000 units were produced inside the urban core versus the 200,900 units, that capacity was provided for outside of the urban core. Just so that context is in your mind as you're having this conversation. >> Mayor Adler: Greg. >> Casar: So I think another key part of what is in councilmembers' Renteria, Harper-Madison is the amendment to go between two and three times capacity to three and four times capacity. I originally had remembered some of the consultant's documents being in the two to three times range, but in having gone and actually looked back at some of their improved documents that I thought were better that were getting closer on a better path it was actually in that three to four times range.

[11:44:43 AM]

So I wanted to lend my support to that position. As a matter of fact, some of the improvements that the consultants were suggesting as Codenext went to planning commission got the affordable unit capacity close to 20,000 units and had the housing unit capacity just over -- just over three times. So I think that apart from figuring out how we better get more housing capacity in the urban core versus outside and rebalance that some, I also wanted to make note my support of what's in your newest document that has it at three -- between three and four times just to make sure that we don't miss our 10,035,000 unit goal, which understanding is we're already -- that we're already not quite on track to meeting since we passed the blueprint. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ann? >> Kitchen: I'm hearing what people are saying and so we may want to say more about this. I guess I'm trying to think about where we might have points of agreement. And councilmember Flannigan, I didn't mean to suggest that you were only saying the urban core. I probably did say THA but I didn't mean that. So I just think that what disturbs me is the focus on the urban core as a criteria. To me the first level policy is the transit, like councilmember Garza said, the need to connect to affordable housing and the need to make sure that we are looking at the entire

city aligned with our goals. So I would be interested in language that captures that instead -- O I view the focus on the urban core as arbitrary and I also view it as missing a lot. I feel like we need to do more than that. So that's kind of where I'm at. I'm happy to try to help think about language that

[11:46:43 AM]

gets us there, but that's really what I'm trying to say here. So T may be the language like you have, councilmember Flannigan, and Renteria and Harper-Madison with recognition that perhaps two-thirds is not the right number. Perhaps we ask the staff what is the right number or perhaps we just recognize that we want to make sure we allow for housing opportunity all over the city. So I'm not sure what the solution is, but I just wanted to kind of go down to that and say that what I fundamentally disagree with is because I'm not hearing the policy that tells me that the urban core is where we need to focus. The policy that I'm hearing is that wanted it to happen all over the city and we don't want outside the city to take more of the burden than inside the city. And I agree with that. I just don't think that focusing now -- I'm happy to focus on that policy that we have things all over the city aligned with imagine Austin and our other goals around transit, but I am not seeing where that focus gets us to focusing on the urban core and I think we're missing too much of the city if only focus on the urban core. I think transit priority and the affordable housing priorities are the two key priorities that I'm trying to move towards. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's get Natasha, Alison, me and then we'll move on so we can continue moving on this document. Natasha. >> To piggyback off of what my colleague councilmember Flannigan said, I think the language about the two-thirds was essential to quantify majority. So while I appreciate your disagreement, I do think we should focus on the urban core, but focus doesn't mean exclusive, right? So if we're going to sort of talk about language, I think

[11:48:46 AM]

saying focused just means priority, not exclusive. And also to say I do see the policy there, especially if we're talking about being in accordance with the imagine Austin comprehensive master plan goals of complete, compact communities. The focus should be -- So a mayor pro tem pointed out, in alignment with transit, the housing options, transit options being in alignment with one another for the communities he does prioritize the urban core. And from my understanding. And again, the two-thirds -- I don't know that the number is arbitrary so much as it was an attempt to quantify majority. And I would also like to say that today is a very special day. It looks like she -- nope, she's still here. Today is Lacy Patterson's 30th birthday. So I'd like to wish you a happy birthday, Lacy. [Laughter]. >> Mayor Adler: Alison. >> Alter: Thank you. I find myself having similar questions to councilmember Kitchen. I think the insight from imagine Austin was that part of how we were to grow, were to not have everything downtown, but to have these opportunities. So I will be looking at the rewrite through that lens. I did have a couple of questions for staff because although I don't have all the details straight in my head, I did spend time trying to understand the capacity numbers with Mr. Gorenese during codeNEXT. I don't have all the specifics, but maybe staff can get us all the numbers. We have things that we are trying for that is new

development that hasn't even been conceived yet that we're trying to address with this code. And then we have things like pods and other folks who already have entitlements. All of those numbers get mashed up into the same capacity numbers. And we have some really large pods that are not in

[11:50:50 AM]

this urban core and then we have some pods that are in the central city that were happening at various times when the numbers were put together that were not necessarily accurately put into the numbers. So I think that if we're going to talk about capacity numbers moving forward and even now, we really need to understand some of that difference. Now, just because a development has entitlements, doesn't mean they're going to build it. But someone who comes in and has a pod or some other mechanism, we have Mueller, they have a lot of entitlements, they're not built out yet. We count those units as if they're the same thing as some piece of land that we're just imagining whether it's going to redevelop. And I'm not sure that those numbers are the same: So I think it would be helpful if you could give us a little more information to the extent you can about what we already know about our capacity numbers, slicing it that way. Use what we've actually permitted a whole lot of development. So you and SC we're blind on the blueprint, but you can also say that with respect to the units, we have 22,000 of the market units since we passed that roughly speaking. So the numbers matter and if we're going to set this goal of three times we really ought to know what we're talking about underlying. >> Laura Keating with planning and zoning. So when pregnant necessary OKed lot the -- Ferguson looked at the pod they were taking a single number from the buildout of those. On the one pod that was not included in the capacity analysis that I know of was the Robinson ranch. And so that was not included because it wasn't expected to develop over the 10-year timeline, the capacity analysis was using.

[11:52:50 AM]

So those numbers are going to be the same in the current capacity and the d-3 capacity and the difference. We could provide you more information on what those numbers were for each pod if you wanted that. >> Alter: I think. What I'm trying to understand is there's still a difference of how much do we already have in the plan that -- if a pod has a certain number permitted, it's different in mind more than just this imaginary plot of land that we're imagining someone is going to develop in an amount of certainty on whether it will be produced. >> So land that was going to redevelopment there's a feasibility analysis done on that land and that identified the parcels that were included in the capacity analysis. >> I don't want to take everyone's time here because I think this may be a rabbit hole, but there's a lot of information that's packed into the assumptions that you're making that is relevant for our decisions here. And we need a better understanding. >> Mayor Adler: Kathie. >> Tovo: I think if we're going to try to come up with a recommendation on Thursday for how much capacity should go in one area then I would request that we have multiple hours blocked out so that we can hear from our demography who has opined on this issue, from our -- I would like to have a full understanding of the capacity analysis that was done by staff member that I referenced several times that had different estimates for what the zoning on the ground can

yield in different neighborhoods, in some neighborhoods. In fact, I think if I'm remembering correct, Bouldin creek has capacity for 40 percent more units at the time they did this study. We have a lot of data to go through if we're actually going to make this assessment. But just -- councilmember Flannigan, I appreciate you

[11:54:51 AM]

inviting our correction of miss characterizations because certainly i didn't say anything along the lines of exempting neighborhoods in district 9. I did not, for example, bring forward a proposal suggesting that two-thirds of the capacity go in distributes other than mine. And in fact, I think you may have missed this discussion of Hyde park. I offered some analysis that was provided to me of the nccd and talked about fact that 7 of the Hyde park of the census tract that's most directly linked with Hyde park are renters. And pointed out that a few areas when we were talking about the addition that I'm suggesting we make to make it clear that we want to addenid rtial to commercial that there were multiple tracks that I'm aware of. And I think if we called on some of the experts I our areas to -- there are multiple tracts that are perfect for increased density. All we need to do is add mixed use to that cs zoning along the area of Guadalupe that is a few blocks fro my house. And then we have provided E opportunity for more housing to exist by right. So I thank you fornviting that. Certainly nothing I said I think talked about emptixe areas and as I pointed out, I think as we have this conversation one of the reasons why it's important to have this context level specific discussion is because there will be impacts on all of our areas and I think all of our areas should be involved in this. I think it's part of our text. But I would say too if we E going to come up with some kind of -- I think this is a rabbit hole, let me say. I think trying to come to a consensus about how much capaciould go in one area and redefining what that area is really takes -- if we're going to do it appropriately takes a real understanding of what's currently on the ground. You mentioned, councilmember kitchen, the geographic areas we' talking about in this newly defined urban core is very different from the outside areas.

[11:56:53 AM]

You can't -- we're comparing apples to Oranges in terms of whaitt would take to put two-thirds of the capacity in a much more limited geographic space and it has no -- it's completely outside of the context of what exists TRE currently. The appropriate time I'm going to show a quick slide show of nine of the properties. I think it's best in the transition discussion if we hit tt today. But it also relates when we get to my suggested edits with regard to missing middle I'll show you. To achieve this in the urban core will mean the demolition of -- likely of lots of existiing middle missing housing.so we really need to be more thoughtful about this conversation, about how we move forward. >> Do you want to close this? >> Pool: I wd to just mention the north shoal creek area just finished the neighborhood plan a couple of months ago and you all approved that. So I wanted to note that through that neighborhood plan we've increased the density by about 33% from what it is currently. And we have changing demographic in north shoal creek. It is becoming more diverse and also older. There are more people who identify as

African-American, hispanic, Asian and other/two or more races than there were in 2010 and I know we'll be looking at a new census coming up. But I think the north shoal creek plan was a really good model for how an existing neighborhood could organically achieve a 33% growth in the number of living units. So it's not flat, but it is definitely more diverse and older, and that I think is a really good point to be made for how our planning efforts end up with the result that we are looking for. And then when council member Tovo puts up he

[11:58:53 AM]

slide show I have three examples of some low priced or good priced units in mostly two that we might lose if we were to show the envelope on trying to upzone. So when we get to housing category I would like to show these as well. >> Mayor Adler: We'll make sure we do that. At a really high level, it makes sense to me if going to get from here to there that we focus on the elimination of the drive, so focusing on T transition Zones rather than the corridors and the centers. Focusing where we can get affordability. I think there is probably some link to where you're going to have in the marketplace the best opportunities to get affordability. And probably proximity to downtown but probably working it that way as opposed to coming up with a theoretical number. It is noon. Jimmy, I don't know if you want to daylight. We went through the pulled items. There were three pulled items that were left. I don't know if you want to daylight the items on those. And then I would propose that we take a break and come back at 1:00 and from one to 2:00 we do number three, two to three we do number four and from reeth to four we do number five. >> Kitchen: Mayor, that makes sense to me. I just wanted to highlight before move from I could quickly highlight a couple of things that touch what we just said if you would like to do that now. I suggested that under objective that the city manager provide estimates for the potential impacts of the new map on transit ridership as well as on affordable housing goals so that would be a data thing that would be helpful to us as we get things back from

[12:00:55 PM]

the city manager also under the city led testing process I wanted to tie back to the council resolution that we already passed with regard to testing. The third thing is -- this may bear more discussion later, but this has to do with the issue related to the McMansion ordinance -- taking existing homes and replacing with a larger home. And I think we've identified as an issue that is not helpful to our goals for missing middle. So I've made some suggested additional language here. Some of it touches on what council member Garza talked about in terms of her family homestead initiative. So I look forward to more details, but making remodeling simpler and easier. But also I would want recommendations from our staff or options from our staff to do everything we can to incent additional as opposed to larger single-family homes. And if we're going to we can't prohibit that. Okay, you get my point. I think that this one is critical to what's going on, particularly in neighborhoods that I'm familiar with. Last thing is on the zoning map, I'm interested in asking our staff to come back to us with options and a timeline for mapping changes. It's not my intent to put off mapping. It's my intent to recognize that we may need to

use a variety of tools with our mapping, all the way from actual upzoning to perhaps future land use maps or in some instances we may need to consider zoning upon sale of property. There may be other tools. I think we need to recognize that it's not as black and whites passing our priorities one day and the the next day rezoning the entire city. >> Mayor Adler: Thanks. Jimmy, do you want to go to the pulled items?

[12:02:55 PM]

>> Flannigan: 44 and 47 is kind of the same concern about budgetary direction at this time. And both of these things sound good. In fact, the workforce solutions stuff now that I'm chairing the economic development board at CapCog is something I'm really invested and involved in. I'm not a co-sponsor so I wasn't able to participate in laying that out, but that's most of my concern with 44 and 47. On 61 I have questions about the conditional overlays that were added that are already not permitted under G.O. So it seems like if -- once you get through all the things that aren't permitted there, you get down to two things that are conditional and just medical offices over 5,000 square feet. So I'm not sure what the commissions are doing. Most of those are already prohibited in the base zoning. and 63 I think is a good example about here's an area zoned light industrial, LI, that we're now zoning for housing. And then putting a unit cap on it through a commission. I don't understand why we would put a unit cap if we're converting commercial and industrial land over to housing. It seems like that's exactly the place we're saying we want the housing. Those are my issues on the pulled. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. It's 12:05. We'll take a recess and come back at one. We'll start with three for an hour -- >> Tovo: I had some things I wanted to talk about in two, in question two. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Do you want to talk about those now? >> Tovo: It will likely -- I'm happy to lay them out, sure. But I think it's a longer conversation. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll pick it up when we come back. But I would recommend that we try to work as fast as we can this afternoon to be able to identify issues, recognizing that we'll be talking about them again on Thursday as well. So city council will now go into closed session to take up one item pursuant to 551.086 of the government code we'll discuss competitive matters related to E 2, which is Austin

[12:04:57 PM]

energy generation. E 1 has been withdrawn. Without objection at 12:06:17 we'll go into executive session. Yes. >> Kitchen: I don't know the specific time, but I do anticipate asking for executive session related to some of our -- two specific issues related to the land development code. So I can articulate those later. I just wanted to give you a heads up. >> Mayor Adler: Thanks.

[12:07:50 PM]

<< Mayor Adler: Alright back on the record here. I want to supplement the Executive Session notice because we may also be discussing items... legal issues related to the land development code which

is item: D1 and with that at 12:08 p.m. we are in recess.

[12:08:15 PM]

Austin City Council Work Session is Executive Session.

[1:19:42 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. We have a critical mass here. We are back out of recess. While we were in closed session we discussed competitive matters related to E 2 and matters related to D 1. It is 1:20. We're going to continue where we were here in item number 2. Kathie, you had some additional things you wanted to raise? >> Tovo: >> Tovo: Thank you. So I wanted to talk about -- I want to talk about our understanding of by-right entitlements through mapping and code revisions by increasing the supply of income restricted affordable housing and of missing middle housing. And I've proposed taking it out, but I think the other alternative would be to say is including affordable missing middle housing. It wasn't clear to me and maybe it's just a misunderstanding, the way it's written right now it sounds like missing middle housing would be done through by-right entitlements and would not be income restricted. >> Mayor Adler: I think that's going to be an issue of discussion. I think the people's views on that differ on the dais. >> Tovo: So I think then I need to understand -- I think we need to talk about it because for one thing -- I have a lot to say about that, but I think if we're -- number one, when are our understandings of missing middle housing? As read the staff description it's everything from a duplex to a small apartment complex. And so if we're including -- if we're including by-right entitlements throughout the entire city for everything from a duplex for a small apartment complex, we're in effect disincentivizing the construction of affordable housing. And what the market will produce is not income restricted missing middle housing, it's just going to be missing middle housing. So if we're talking about

[1:21:44 PM]

that's a housing typology -- and I think this is one of the things that happened during the code next. I think some people talk about it as -- as providing us with a level of income diversity within that housing type and some people are talking about it as a housing typology. And I think we need to be very clear about what we're talking about. The staff's definition is housing typology. And with no tie to income. So I guess I want to have a full discussion about this and I also want to share my slides. >> Mayor Adler: Jimmy. >>

Flannigan: I think part of that conversation is not levels of missing middle apply in all areas. So the three-unit by-right that some of us have advocated for is not a small apartment complex, it's so easy to think that it means small apartment complex everywhere, but for me it wouldn't mean that. And there is an element of measuring the by-right entitlements that exist versus what they've gotten us because if there's staff analysis that says the real problem that's not getting us missing middle is that we only allow duplexes side by side instead of stacked, if that's an analysis that we can get that it's the zoning zone sections that are broken in this frame of the problem that would be good information to understand why areas that are -- what was the 40% of -- I can't remember what the story was about Bouldin creek, but that there were already entitlements that existed. By-right is -- maybe here's another reason and it's not renterías, maybe it's the non-zoning factors and how they intersect. >> Tovo: I think I agree with the disthat you raised earlier. I think there is a lot of confusion in the C around

[1:23:45 PM]

single attached, single-family not attached, duplex. And that is an area, I think, of at least the two of us in agreement that it's an easy cleanup. It looks like councilmember Casar has something, but I think how do we -- okay. Well, I have more questions once I hear from others. >> Casar: I wasn't meaning to interrupt. I just turned on my microphone for whenever. >> Mayor Adler: I think the issue on the floor is are we going to give by-right for missing middle housing and with or without affordability tied to it. >> Tovo: Right now our density bonus programs and vnu is one where we are getting onsite units and that is because the entitlements have been tied to requirement for income restricted units. And then in some areas, and I'm going to show an example if we can bring it up, of just one street in a neighborhood, in my neighborhood, but it's pretty-- we can kind of go through these quickly. Is is a mixed use property on Guadalupe and you can just kind of fly through them. The next one is -- this is a four-plex, a small house scale four-plex. Next, please. Next. And let me just caveat this that this is, you know -- I walked around for a couple of hours taking photographs and kind of tried to make -- I didn't track them back to ownership records and what T. I'm just trying to make some approximations based on what I saw in terms of doors and mailboxes, but it's consistent with what I see as the numbers in terms of rentals from the demographic D from other sources. This is the house -- we're going sequentially down the block. This is a house with an Adu. The house next to it had an Adu. Same, I believe.

[1:25:45 PM]

Next. And then this is a small apartment complex at the corner. And somewhere in mycript I have how many units are in at one. Then you have an alley and then next to that, and I think we have pictures of this, is a newer Adu and the house that fronts it. So this to me is as somebody who represents areas that have developed like this, this is pretty characteristic of the neighborhood I live in heritage. It's -- if you look at the figures that we got in Aldridge place when we went through the local historic district and the number of rental units within that local historic district, we talked about the park earlier. Haven't looked so much south in awhile in the neighborhoods that I represent in the south or in Dellwood or cherrywood, but my

guess is that we will see areas like that in other central neighborhoods that you all represent as well where you have missing mid housing. You have a four-plex next to houses with ads. All of that side of the street up and down from Lamar -- from Guadalupe down to Lamar almost every one of those houses has at least an Adu, sometimes a couple, and a mix of mf and sf zoning. Less so on this street than on some others. But you have the missing middle housing. So if you then have -- if we have by-right entitlements. What we need in the areas I represents income restricted missing middle housing. Can you get to the -- would you please pull up the next two slides? I think the next two are the ones I'm looking for. This is around the corner on 31st and a half. These are older, again just another example -- would you mind backing up one? This is the same street I was talking a, but it packs back up to the street I was talking about fronts 31st and a half. Next please, next please. Next please, sorry. This is -- again, this is just very quick research and there's information that's missing from here. But this is street view of

[1:27:47 PM]

another area in heritage. 'S one whole block and you can see there were four separate properties, one was a four-plex, one apartment we haven't figured out yet how many there were in that. One was a single-family and the one next to that was a duplex. These were demolished somewhere around 2007ish, after 2007 they changed the valuations were 250 on each. Next, please. And then missing made was constructed along that block in their place. And they're very nice townhomes. These are some of my closest neighbors geographically and very nice people. But you can see how that changed the valuations of those parcels. So we replaced what was missing middle housing with newer missing middle housing. And of course, I will acknowledge the market has changed, we're talking about different years. The valuations I showed you first were 2007. These sold in 2010 and when I can get I will try to bring back those sale prices, but they were pretty high. And these are current valuations. I think one is on the market in the 500 to 600,000 range. So again, I think we need to focus on income restricted missing middle housing and not provide by-right entitlements for yes, sir, to get us to that missing middle housing. Because what the market will provide is market rate missing middle housing, not income restricted. And what we could do I think what I think we've acknowledged somewhere in the document we don't want too, which is incentivizing the redevelopment of existing missing middle housing. So -- and disincentivizing the use of our density bonus programs. And I don't know why we would want to do that's the best chance of getting new units other than outside of our bond funding. Thank you so much. I think that was my last

[1:29:47 PM]

slide. And these are quick examples. I could probably come up with a dozen more if I needed to and likely you have them in our own districts as well. >> Greg and then Alison. And Ann. >> Casar: So I agree that we should try to -- need to have significant up zoning of our existing missing middle, our existing apartment stock. In fact, during the draft 3 process we were brought back by the consultants options for increasing housing capacity in the city by over 300,000 units. And that actually not up zoning some of

our existing small apartments or only apartments was only reducing capacity by only three or five thousand. So we can increase housing capacity without necessarily having to do that on top of where existing low income people live or where existing renters live and missing middle housing. So I think there is ways to expand the amount of missing middle and expand the amount of apartment stock without having to do it on top of where people would be most likely to be displaced. I do think it's important for us to get income restricted housing on the ground to get until on the ground and for us to get market rate missing middle on the ground. And we need to do each of those things. And because when people are getting displaced we actually just got a report back that the city paid for for on fair housing and it showed it overwhelmingly by far the number one way that people get displaced from Austin is that their rent increases, just that their rent goes up for their existing place. So people need more places and more options of places to go so we need more housing stock general to address that issue. So what I'm in favor of is adding entitlements on the corridors that come with a density bonus for you to take advantage of the increased height or the increased F.A.R. Or what have you. And that we allow for more missing middle in places

[1:31:48 PM]

where it's not allowed because just like -- and you represent more central neighborhoods than I do, councilmember Tovo, but I do have some of them and as you noted there are certain places that developed earlier in Austin's history where there was a lot of missing middle but frankly that here in the amount of missing middle has not kept up with population growth. There is not lots of new missing middle housing being developed and so we need more place that can be missing middle. It will not be as you point out as cheap as income restricted housing, but it certainly tends to be more affordable than the single-family product be it new or old that it often times nearby. We actually asked last year for the realtors to run comparables of single-family detached product compared to attached product in Austin right now and often times very similar product was 30 or 40% cheaper when it was attached as opposed to when it's detached. So yes, I think that we need to develop more missing middle housing generally by right and we can get more missing middle housing through the affordability unlocked resolution. I think we need to do it all. We need more housing generally. We need more income restricted units generally, but we shouldn't hamstring our ability to get missing middle because we require an affordability requirement in all missing middle. We can have both. We would have an affordability requirement on some missing middle and some missing middle that's by right. So for example, the R-4 zone that was proposed as part of draft 3 allowed for missing middle units by right and affordable units if you want to go above the four. So I think that kind of a program can get us some affordable missing middle and getting a missing middle on the ground that's good for middle class people so we can develop a city that's better for working class folks and for middle class people. >> Alter: So I appreciate that we are focused in on

[1:33:49 PM]

how we produce the affordable housing and how our code and the choices that we make with this land development code rewrite can get us there or not. I think those are the questions that we need to be asking. I have two concerns and they're related as much as they can because a lot was said by councilmember Tovo and councilmember Casar. The first is I think that we have to be clear with people about what we're talking about when we talk about missing middle because once you start saying multiplexes and that could mean anything as far as we know because it depends on the -- according to code next it depended on the lot size that you had, then you end up in a situation whereby right you're giving rights to do apartment conversions and you're not having any affordability requirement, precisely in those areas where you most want affordable housing, where it is most likely to be able to get an affordability density bonus or some other thing. So I think that we need to make clear what we're talking about missing middle and we talk about apartment conversions and we talk about other things, what does that word mean? Does that mean you can put an eight-plex, a four-plex. We're talking about adding an ADU, talking about adding a third unit, talking about making a duplex be attached. Those are really different concepts than putting an eight-plex or a 12-plex across the street from you or next door to you. And they have very -- people have very different reactions to those. So I think we need to keep that in mind I'm also confused as someone who is trying to figure out how do we get affordability -- affordable housing in high opportunity area which is lots of my district. I don't understand in the proposals that anyone has put forward how I get my affordable house in my district because we're giving everything by right and we're not requiring any affordability under some versions of this. And there are a lot of different versions and I think in that way that the mayor had proposed we were

[1:35:50 PM]

not giving my by-right unless we got the density bonus and that's where I stand. I think we need to be laser focused on the 60,000 units and we need to be asking ourselves how are we going to get this affordable housing in these areas if we give it away by right? If we give it away by right we're going to make the property values go up and our affordable housing vendors and us are not going to be able to purchase that land for affordable housing. I don't see how you get to the level of affordability that we're talking about. The market is producing enough market rate housing. We want more, yes, but we have tools that we could be using and harnessing to get this affordability and we need to be laser focused on that. >> Mayor Adler: Ann. >> Kitchen: A couple of thoughts. So thank you, councilmember Casar, for laying out the three buckets because I think that we're all trying to figure out the same thing, and that is how do we achieve what you laid out in all three of those buckets and how do we do it in a way that we're not using tools in one bucket that disincentivizes another bucket. So we want to get -- I disagree that it would be useful for this city to have more missing middle but I don't want to do something in that area that makes it harder for me -- that's harder for us to get income restricted or missing middle with income restricted. So I would love to see a list of tools for all three of those buckets. I may ask staff to do that. What are the tools for each of those buckets and how can we make sure that we're not employing tools that are at odds with each other. I frankly believe that what I've seen so far is that we need to tie by-right entitlements along our corridors to some level of affordability. Now, we can talk about what level and all that stuff.

[1:37:51 PM]

I think we have to as one of our tools otherwise we're not going to get our income restricted housed. I just want to point out -- don't have to talk about these now, but this is a reason I put out addition number two and addition number two is focused entirely on one of those three -- one or two. The come restricted and the second that you mentioned that is missing middle that is income income restricted. We can talk about these later but I tried to capture a list of all the tools that had -- that are relevant to the land development code that had been identified in our blueprint because I think now is the time for us to say that we want our -- that relate to the land development code. I think now is the time for us to say come back with a land development code that uses every tool that we've got to help us get our income restricted and our missing middle that are income restricted. So at the right time we can talk through those, but I think that we need to be doing that at the same time. So then my question I really the same. I've come to the conclusion and I'm happy to discuss it if I'm missing something, but I've come to the conclusion that we have to tie by-right to income restricted housing along the core and then I would just like to understand how we get our missing middle in a way that we're not disincenting affordability. And one of the things might something that you said earlier, that was that maybe we need to be looking at the non-zoning tools. That that may really be more of a help to us on getting missing middle or might be a help to us on getting missing middle. I'll let you speak to that, but I thought -- that's one of the tools we haven't talked that much about as opposed to just zoning, per se. So anyway. >> Pio, then my.im >> Renteria: To me the missing middle is

[1:39:54 PM]

basically-- by right to me it's saying okay, you have a right to go up so high, but you have to provide some affordability to that. And I agree with you on that. On ads, we also need to regulate a way too not make them as restricted because I have gone through the process and you have to build gar apartment, two-car garage apartment, you know, and I don't even have T cars and I'm not renting it out, but I was restricted. I couldn't put a shower in the bottom. And that just restricts me from being able to provide housing for family. And that's what it's going to restrict me to because I have a living space about 640 feet because of the impervious cover, the setbacks. There are a lot of restrictions out there. I have a place that in 2005 this guy from California came and bought two lots, built four units there and he tried to sell them for \$500,000. He couldn't. He told them for 250 each. He left. Thousand houses now are selling for \$650,000 apiece and that was your missing middle. Now there is no missing middle there. And these houses haven't changed. They're still the same house. The demand is so great there that if we don't build more we're going to continue to see those prices increase. My market value went up to 577,000. And when they say that area entitlement up 10 percent to 12 percent is true. All those units have gone up. And they were once when I paid \$21,000 for my lot. Of course, that was 40 years ago, so we don't know when that's going to happen. The economy could crash next year and you have houses selling for 250 and people will be walking out taking a

[1:41:55 PM]

huge loss. And it's happened before here in Austin. So we need to be very careful with this also. >> Mayor Adler: Jimmy? >> Flannigan: Thank you, councilmember Tovo, for the examples. I think more examples is helpful to the conversation because as I've said several times end up having a different picture in our heads and we're not actually connecting on the conversation. I found that listing of examples really interesting in part because it is so different than what I see in my district where there is missing middle, like I live in a duplex, but the zoning is SF 2. So what one might assume is an up zoning is actually more what's on the ground. So the analysis that we get back, it's going to be very hard for us and maybe for staff to really be clear where the zonings are actually matching what's on the ground and where the zonings are actually different than what's on the ground. When we talk about by-right or increased entitlements. A lot of what I think about is man, I've got all these duplexes in my district, including mine that if they were to be torn down you couldn't get another duplex given the current zoning. That's one frame of it. Also where you have the zoning for it doesn't -- I have not heard an example of a way to prevent a property owner who has three units, the duplex and Adu, from just tearing it down and building another three-unit building kind of under any regime. So I'm not sure how we might address that. I've heard a lot of examples about kind of shrinking the McMansion envelope and then having additional units be part of the ability to be maybe a little taller, wider. We've heard planning commission do that the last time. But if you've already got stuff like that one T ground, is there a way to prevent -- if the entitlements are going to touch what's currently existing. I don't know how to solve for that either. So like one of the examples you had was that there was a site that already had two or three units and it got torn down and was replaced with

[1:43:56 PM]

two or three units. >> Yerkes it was a block and it had four different properties. One was a SF, one was an apartment, one a duplex. >> So the tear down of that didn't get new units I don't know that it would require a zoning change necessarily, maybe the combining of lots. But you see the point. I don't know that I can stop the tear down on old missing middle to get new missing middle. And the questions about the increase in land value as we do the entitlements, I would like at least staff to point us in the direction of the research because I'm struggling to kind of wrap my head around how that works. Because I don't think it's as simple as you could build more therefore is more valuable because I just think it works that way. It's not that simple. And getting to the place where we have a density bonus program, the one we have right now I think we've all kind of acknowledged is struggling. And some of the proposals that we saw the last time around where it broke the city into regions and you calibrated it by region I thought was really good, but I instinctively can only imagine density bonus when you're talking about a project of a certain scale. I don't really understand how it works at the missing middle level and to be fair to councilmember Alt I think you're exactly right. We need to be clear when we're talking about missing middle that it's eight or three units. I think that's very important for us to be clear because I'm generally thinking about three and four units. I don't think -- I'm not thinking about the bigger ones. How would that density bonus actually work when really the math doesn't necessarily pencil out to build the third unit if bonus requirements are such that -- there's a market math issue that I would like to know

more about to be more comfortable with the level O requirements on affordability moving forward on the entitlements. I hope that makes sense. 'S very complicated.

[1:45:57 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: So I don't know where I am on the issue of affordability with missing middle housing because I don't know how to apply it. I want there to be more missing middle housing. I would like the missing middle housing that happens to have affordability with it. I'm concerned about the math issue. I don't know how you do that. Uei it would be a fee-in-lieu because I don't know that you could ever pencil it from an economics standpoint a third unit got you there or a fourth unit got you here. It might be the six unit deal that then requires it to be that big in order to have affordability. So I'm not sure exactly how you do it so I'm conflicted on that. And my repeated attempts to try and draft language that will come out here in a second with respect to the transition zones will reflect that in me. But I do know that and I'll say it as an aside and I'll say it again, when the manager is here as well, I think that's quite R everything that we're doing here is become increasingly more dependent on our ability to help calibrate density uses correctly. And I think that it's going to require us to have again this operational so I could be wrong, but my gut tells me it will require a person or two on staff that doesn't do anything but that and has that particular support cease because so much of what we're going to be doing is going to be dependent on getting that right. We're on a place where on the days we've often amended things to increase the percentage or lower the mfi. And we actually need a science behind that. We need actually someone to come in to say this is what this number needs to be in this situation to achieve that result. I would also like -- of the tools that I've heard to address the kinds of things that Kathie was raising and others have raised, Alison raises, is that preservation tool that incentivizes keeping the existing home, the existing structure by providing waivers from certain things greater

[1:48:00 PM]

F.A.R. Or less parking requirement, whatever it is that does that, I would love to see us really putting that on steroids while we're talking about trying to create situations where we're not incentivizing people to tear down a home that might otherwise have been preserved if we had expanded that preservation tool. >> Dsg development officer. E clarification and then a couple of comments that think speak to staff's perspective on some of these issues. And the clarification is just I've heard -- we've heard the term by-right used occasionally with reference to also income restricted and the two are separate concepts. So when we talk about by-right we mean an approval that can be issued without an affordability requirement tied to it. It's the density bonus type of projects that have the affordability requirement. Then the other -- couple other comments I wanted to make briefly. I think staff are fully prepared depending on council's direction with the density bonus to do some careful calibration work with the density bonus and to be prepared to address the issues of calibration going forward however, staff -- this is I think language of course was included in a memo that we issued on Friday. Staff feel that some by-right entitlements for missing middle housing are appropriate and I think there are -- we have staff here there can

Speak to that if council wants to hear from them. I think the two kind of overarching concerns are that from a planning standpoint I think some of the planning a zoning staff feel that based on their familiarity with the housing capacity analysis that was done, previously

[1:50:01 PM]

that some additional by-right entitlements for missing middle is an important piece in the equation for housing supply. Then additionally there are some concerns from an administrative standpoint about the challenges of administering kind of an income restricted density bonus kind of system for smaller projects that would fit within sort of umbrella of missing middle. So I think those are some concerns, but staff are fully committed to working with whatever direction council provides on these issues. They're sensitive issues and -- >> Mayor Adler: I would like to hear from staff because I think there is a significant issue that probably we're -- everybody is trying to find and search for the right answers. But before you do that, just to touch base for a second on the by-right concept. Because I think we are -- I think you have a point we're using that word differently. If someone going out and building is entitled to do something without asking for permission or a variance or anything else, I thought that was something they had by right or she had by right. And if I am by right entitled to another floor if I do 10% then I have an affordability density bonus by right because I don't have to ask him for it, I can either take or not. So the by-right concept I find myself getting tripped up over. If we're using by right with respect to affordability to say even though you can get it by right, you have to give up something in order to be able to get it, I can probably think of other applications within the land development code or I have to do that in order to be able to do something else. And I can do THA by right or not. Maybe there's an administrative approval or a variance I have to get. So I don't know what the right answer is on that, but I think you are correct that that word is being used lots of different ways.

[1:52:01 PM]

>> If you think of the concept of by right as just meaning there's no discretionary commission or council approval required, then I take your point that like an affordability requirement that is administered at a staff level is sort of still by right, but in the interest of sort of having some terminology that we can use to refer to the different things we've been using by right to mean approvals that can be issued without a corresponding affordability requirement imposed on the project. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Kitchen: Mayor, before -- I'm sorry. Before they speak, there's some things I would like to suggest because they may want to speak to them also. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Kitchen: we tend to focus on the density program when we talk about affordability tools, but there are a range of other tools too and I just think we need to be thinking about them all. >> Mayor Adler: Let's get to the tools in just a second. The question that they just came up to talk about was the issue of whether they thought -- they wanted to make a case or suggest why in their opinion it was important to be able to have missing middle by right without affordability being associated with it. I'd like the answer to that and then you can ask them whatever other questions you want to ask as well. >> Kitchen: One of the recommendations we adopted as

council was to develop a -- bring options for implementing a density bonus program for missing middle. So we've already said as a council that we wanted some options to do that. That's in our blueprint. >> Mayor Adler: No, I think it'll be a good thing to talk about too. >> Kitchen: That's the same subject you just raised. We'll just hear what staff has to say. Mayor just saying if staff is now saying that we can't look at affordable housing for missing middle, that's contrary to what we adopted in our housing blueprint. >> Mayor Adler: I think they were just -- do you want to talk to us about missing middle and whether or not it should always be

[1:54:01 PM]

associated with affordability issues? >> Tovo: Mayor, can I just ask that we talk about -- everybody is defining missing middle differently and I want to highlight that I think there's a very big gap between duplex and ads. And -- and four-plex to eight plexes. >> Mayor Adler: Would you define how you use the word as you talk about it? >> Tovo: I think in the context -- it's not clear to me what councilmember Casar regards as missing middle. You kind of talked about three units which is a different category than eight plexes. I think that we're trying to have a conversation that's really -- we might all be on the same page if we could be clear about what -- how we're defining missing middle. >> Mayor Adler: If you use the word missing middle would you please be clear about which word you're using? >> Hi, council, I'll get started again with planning and zoning. Before I get started I would like to say it's an honor to spend this special day with you. So thanks for having me. So to the definition of missing middle, generally what we refer to is yes, that kind of additional Adu duplex up to that smaller scale apartment, no defined number, but maybe 10 units or something. It's a smaller scale complex. And 10 may even be highly depending on the context. It's a quad plex, eight plex, town home Adu, that range that we're not really seeing being built right now around current zoning standards. To the conversation of-- >> Mayor Adler: Would you describe what's not missing middle? Is it an important building missing middle? >> A larger apartment buildings, like we're kind of seeing today. I don't have a definition of numbers, actual units, but our kind of large ones -- I don't want to start giving too much criteria because I don't have an actual definition on stories or size. >> Alter: That's the

[1:56:02 PM]

problem is we're talking about stuff and people are hearing an imagining one thing and it may be that we're on the same page. If we're talking about missing middle as duplexes and duplexes we can show what's been suggested. >> Mayor Adler: Are there two kinds of missing middle housing. There's house scale missing middle and then large scale until. Is that a way to differentiate the universe? House scale and not house scale? >> It's also what you're targeting it too. >> Mayor Adler: We could have affordable and not affordable missing middle housing. But as a typology the stuff that we're talking about, I wonder if for our purposes we could talk about house scale missing middle housing and larger than house scale missing middle housing. >> Tovo: I would say the clearer -- I think part of -- the missing middle is obfuscating the complexity within it, so I would -- and house scale and non-house scale I think is also

confusing. I mean, to me it's of-- somebody can come up with something else, but it's sort of house scale and apartment. If there's an eight plex or 10 plex, that's that's more like an apartment complex than it's like a house in an Adu. >> Mayor Adler: I'm confused. Does making it house scale or apartment work as a differentiator house scale and not house scale? Because think we could imagine what that is. And we probably have close to the Siew V of that. Okay. So let's try to use that word unless somebody has a better description. Yes. >> Harper-Madison: If I may when looking up a definition, it's pretty clear. It's a duplex, tri plex or four-plex, courtyard apartment, bungalow court, townhome, town home, multiplex or live work apartment. There's some very clear levels that are the definition of missing middle. >> Which is also in Spencer's memo on page 19.

[1:58:06 PM]

It's drawn out if it's helpful for today's conversation. [multiple voices] >> Alter: >> Alter: There are a lot of different numbers that go with multiplex and those numbers matter. And if we're going to start giving rights 10 unit apartments and saying there's no way to get affordability WOU Y put those right off the corridor or on the corridor in the most desirable places in our city then we are never going to get affordability where we most want it. And we create all sorts of conversations. >> Mayor Adler: Great. So I >> Mayor Adler: I would like to hear your view. When you talk about it, would you talk if makes a difference house scale missing LE and larger than house scale missing middle. >> Sure, they're both, house scale and not house scale are kind of comprised within that missing middle definition as per that T diagram that visualizes it within the memo. Now, units or smaller apartment complexes that could get you ten units they -- at least the draft of code next did have density bonus potential, even those Zones that allowed for four units max eight allowed for affordable housing bonus. So when we're talking about this missing middle scale, as far as we proposed it in the last draft, there was still ability tied to them, a ten units were never proposed in that house scale zone. So house scale itself as the entire missing middle was townhouses that were two stories tall a got you four to eight units or houses kind of in the same context. Now, going above that in still that kind of missing LE scale, right, because part of the concept it's missing and what Austin is producing now and that kind of eight ten is still kind of under production is an RM-1, maybe three, depending on the lot and they have density bonus potential within those. When we're talking about missing middle from a staff perspective, I would like to point back to the graphic

[2:00:07 PM]

in our memo. It is really that two units all the way to maybe ten or 12 or so, but within that scale there is the differentiation between house scale, which we tend to think of about four to six, and then above that, which is usually tied in with a density bonus, at least how we had it in draft three and if you had if you'd like to continue with that. >> Mayor Adler: I understand that definition. Would you understand the definition Brent raised which we should be giving entitlement to housing missing middle if it's tied to affordability? >> Yes. That is tied a bit to more of that house scale or not. The reason we say that is

because when we looked at the numbers from draft three -- let me pull up the report card real quick. We mapped a very limited amount of Zones different than what the entitlements are today that allowed for this missing middle product at these different ranges. When we looked at the capacity numbers, they didn't provide anywhere near the numbers that you are talking about in your different iterations of this direction to reach those goals. So tying it to a bonus -- and I would ask Erica to discuss this a little better about the feasibility of bonuses within those smaller scale housing products, but the numbers without allowing, we think, by right changing the map from what we allow today will not produce the numbers that you are directing us as it's written right now. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Go ahead. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry. When you say -- I think I heard you but I want to make sure I understand. They will not produce the numbers for affordable housing and missing middle? Neither one of them? >> Right. So missing middle for sure. >> Kitchen: What about affordability? >> Probably both. I can't speak to the affordability that's

[2:02:08 PM]

something we'll have to work through. >> Kitchen: Our target for affordable housing is 60,000 and our target for our total that 60,000 is part of 135, understanding of course we want more capacity than that. But if you're just looking at numbers, and so to say that we -- to say that we can't get the -- or that we don't anticipate getting our numbers would tell me also we're not getting our affordable housing numbers either. >> Probably. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Greg. >> Casaro yes. First of all, I concur that we need to have density bonus programs, affordable bonus programs in all parts of the city and from our last draft indeed we were getting the vast majority of those out of the corridor, out of the changes on the T corridors. So I think any characterization that we're not -- never gonna get it unless we squeeze it out of missing middle isn't true because we got almost none out of missing middle. It's hard to get out of missing middle and the main place we've been getting it in every single iteration that has come out has been out of the corridors which I agree should be city-wide. Out of missing middle, I understand that there is some reticence to administering small scale affordable housing bonus programs but I think that we can do it. I think we can figure it out. We're figuring it out for affordability unlocked, we had that in draft three. We're going to have to stretch our wings and be able to achieve that. So I think that the tight middle place is to say we have to allow some missing middle to get built on its own because it's a good thing for it to get built on its own and provide the option for affordable units within the missing middle. Which is generally what we had been pushing the consultants to do, but they actually didn't deliver to us at first but delivered at the end.

[2:04:08 PM]

At first they were apartment zones without any bonus and then they found out you could do a little bit more and potentially get an affordable unit. What I don't want us to do is wind up not getting missing middle and income restricted and just getting single family or duplex redevelopment where we have no affordability requirement, where -- and where we get almost no market affordability because we know any time somebody's renovating or building a new single-family home or duplex right now it is much more

expensive than what we could get through missing middle. I think there is a path where we map missing middle housing, again, defined as councilmember harper-madison mentioned, everything between duplex and smallscale apartment, not midrise, and have affordability bonuses on top but recognize that we want to get the missing middle housing itself. And that the vast majority of our affordable housing bonus units we can get are on corridors. In draft three they were able to deliver 6,000 more in capacity, which is only 6,000 of our 60,000. And then through multiple rounds of pushing and working with the consultants and with planning commission, we got it up to, I think, 17,000 in affordable housing capacity, which is still far short of 60 B, what was always told to us is we could -- getting us to 60,000 in affordable bonus units would require potential not missing middle upzone but large apartment upzone of single family Zones, which nobody has ever put on the table. So I think that is the struggle. But if we -- I don't want us to wind up in a place where don't wind up missing middle nor do we wip with income restricted. That's why I think r4 with the bonus or r1 with the bonus on top makes sense and affordability unlocked kind of works throughout the city. >> Mayor Aer: Kathie. >> Tovo: Yeah. Indta in my original place, where if we're rezoning to allow fourplexes, sixplexes, eightplexes, tenplexes, as a

[2:06:09 PM]

developer number 1 why would I partic in density bonus program and number 2, you're creating an incentive potentially for the demolition of existing missing middle housing. And I want to say the mapping -- part of what I was trying to illustrate with the three first street example is that we have an enormous amount of more diversity in our areas than I think as a parent at this level of council -- and I think you were describing scenarios before that you remember particulao your area that have to be attended to. We are going to need to recognize more context level work or we are going to fail at what should be one of our goals, which is the preservation of existing structures that are providingurally occurring relatively affordable housing. The new construction is never gonna be more affordable than the old. You and I probably need to have more conversation about -- really I'm not sure if I was understanding you correctly. There was just a really good presentation to one of our commissions about comparing rental prices, ownership prices in older house, historic housing, versus nature and when we're redeveloping properties I see it all or district 9. I mean, the rents are far higher than ey were with the existing structures. But I think we're still -- I'm not sure if we're even having a disconnect or not I hear you saying -- I hear you saying rm-1 and a bonus. Then I think we still just --S not at all clear to me where we are th the buy right. At what point does it become a density bonus requirement. The staff I think you said in codenext draft three had it at four units or three units. >> Yes. It was at -- srtinta at four units, in that r4 zone and you could get up to six or eight with aus.on >> Mayor Adler: It was a bonus. So property was zoned r4. Yo WER entitled to go to 6

[2:08:12 PM]

with a bonus. And I think the question before us is, f you take the -- what was an sf-3 lot or a lot and you zone it to r-4, which is an upzone, do you given them the r-4, recognizing that r-4 does not necessarily

he an affordability associated with it, but it does present the opportunity to bonus town units to get it. The question that's in front of us right now is do you take that lot and take it to r-4? Because the affordability is only by bonus, it's not a requirement associated with having r-4. >> Tovo: I guess I would ask if you concurrently do two units and we're providing -- allowing for entitlements beyond those two units, why wouldn't we computer some level of affordable housing benefit? It just doesn't. . . And I agree THA the calibration probably doesn't work to do another unit at that level. But I think you suggested a fee-in-lieu might be a way of computing -- capturing that benefit. >> Mayor Adler: Ann and then Greg. >> Kitchen: I think you all may have answered my question because my question was like yours, what is the point at which you start putting in the bonus? The other thing that I would suggest is that density bonus is not the only way to help affordability, so we need to remember that, too. Because we can't -- we've already established that we're not gonna get everything out of the density bonus program. So there are other things that we need to look at. To my mind it's got to be a combination of two things. We have to decide what the point is at which we put the bonus, which is the question that you raised, mayor. And then the other question is, we've got to couple that with disincentives for teardowns. Frankly I can tell you I'm

[2:10:13 PM]

well aware of houses that are cheaper than the condos or the multiple units that are new. And that's the case in the areas that I represent and I live in. So the fact that you are going to multiple units does not -- automatically get you a lower cost housing unit than keeping an original single-family home. So my point is just that we need couple these things and not put all of our emphasis on one. Because to my mind, if we -- if we just focus on the missing middle and particularly if we focus on missing middle then we some kind of affordability to it, then we're not going to have the other piece, which is we really have -- I really think we have to look at how can we help preserve the existing single-family homes that are cheaper than replacing them with a large, new single-family home? That's just as important to affordable as the missing middle part is. As the multiple units are. So I think that that's -- so I think that we've been talking about that. You look puzzled. But I think it's -- I think that -- all I'm saying is that we can't forget that piece. We need to do this with several pieces. And that if having one piece we're gonna end up with not the result that we're looking for. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So Greg? >> Casar: And I had to say this last time, and I'll say it again. I've never heard a single person on the dais in over four years of being here, a single person ever say that because there's multiple units it's going to be cheaper than an older existing home. I've never heard it said, and it's regularly used as an argument point against or in concern of missing middle, but I've never heard anybody say because there's

[2:12:14 PM]

multiple units it's going to be cheaper. I recognize you're restating that but it makes it sound like that's an argument that's been made, and it's just never -- it's an argument that has never been made. >> Kitchen: You just said it a minute ago. >> Casar: No, I didn't say that. >> Kitchen: Then I misheard you. >> Casar:

Okay. So on an apples to apple comparison when looking at similar square footage and Milner year built attached housing I cheaper than detached housing in general. That's what I said just now, what the data shows and what we've said consistently time and again. >> Kitchen: What I'm saying is the difference that's missing is the year in which it was built. >> Casar: I said year built just a moment ago. >> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. I have a couple more comments on discussion because I think we've discussed this one roundlet's go to the next, so call the people whose lights are on, Alison, Pio and Jimmy. One last, and then we'll move on. >> Alter: I've heard some agreement which I have a feeling, mayor, would be in draft three. I want to point out there seems to be agreement that we ought to look at some of the non-zoning items that are preventing the creation of missing middle because we are allowed to do missing middle in a lot of places. My neighbor has an Adu that her mother lives in. I have other people who because of the size of their house were not able to put a sink in their Adu so it can't be rented out. There are things that we can look at with respect to ads and with duplexes that I think there's broad agreement that might unleash some missing middle throughout the city. I think, again we really -- I need to emphasize this because I think it's super important as we talk and how this plays in the public, we have to understand what the numbers are we're talking about and if we're talking about three to four communities that our definition of missing middle it's a different conversation that plays very

[2:14:15 PM]

differently than when you start adding ten units and when the zoning categories change the numbers that you get the lot size so that if you can -- a lot that's about 7,000 then you can do even more than four units, you quickly get some really large buildings. I am not convinced at this point that in some of these areas where we're talking about putting this that you cannot pencil out a full unit but I we find there are zones that you couldn't do that we can be creative. We have to work within the confines of the state legislature and how that approaches, but it could a fee-in-lieu, could be that the city buys the unit. We just did a situation in Alamo where TRE was one affordable unit. That was bought by a CDC so it's not the developer doing it but the developer still did eat the cost difference between what they would have otherwise gotten and that gets us closer to our goals. I'm not the person able to do the calibration but if we give it all away we won't get any of that. And I think we need to be mindful of that and I think as we have this conversation we need to understand that when you're talking about numbers above four people get a lot more worried in the conversation so we have an obligation to be clear about what we're talking about we don't create uncertainty, we don't create misinformation. To the extent that staff can help us to be very clear, I think that's really important moving forward. >> Mayor Adler: Pio. >> Enteria: You know, when it comes to the missing middle, you know, in the inner core here of the city, with the land value going as high as it is, my lot is \$350,000, I mean, with nothing on it. And the people that have -- that have these older homes, yes, if they're not -- if they not ready to leave,

[2:16:15 PM]

it's a lot cheaper to be there but the repairs that -- once you pull a permit in Austin, you're gonna have to upgrade everything that you have there. If not, it's not cheap at all. So a lot of these people are saying, well, I don't want to live this way, in a house that was built in the '30s, you know, even though, you know, I have no payment for it, I just pay my property tax, which is super high, unless you're -- your tax was [indiscernible] and you're over 65. So it is a dilemma, you know, that -- how are you going to repair these homes, you know? When people are paying that kind of price just for the land, yes, you're not gonna be able to build 100, 200, \$300,000 homes even if it's a duplex because of the high construction cost that's out there. Yes, it's very difficult to put a fee-in-lieu when it comes to building two or three units on your property because -- or any property. So I can see with a fourplex where there's one person, I do agree with, you know, one, probably by giving them rights and administratively say, okay, you're gonna have to give us one unit or else you just don't build on it, but, you know, it's -- in the inner core the older homes, I don't know about -- you can save them. It's gonna cost you a lot of money. That's all I got to say. >> Mor Adler: Jimmy. >> Flannigan: Yeah. I would like to know more about the -- this thing we do in the city that's happening in the city where existing single-family homes are being replaced by multiple units and those multiple units are more expensive than the house it replaced. I think there's a really important detail about that's occurring under the current code with the current fee structure and the current process and the current, blah, blah, blah, right? If we corrected some of those things, zoning chapters, permitting timing, blah, blah, blah, maybe it

[2:18:17 PM]

wouldn't happen, mainly it'd change the economics around those homes that get built. I certainly had enough conversations with developers to know somewhat what you get on the ground is just what the easiest thing was to get on the ground because the bank is say I want my money back, you got to turn the project around quick. That's certainly not gonna get a lot of our community values terms of how the city grows. So I think it's important I think to try and divide the question on that to say, when that's happening now, is it because the current code basically only allows that type of construction? Versus maybe there's ways to close that gap. And that gap, again, might be different in the most highest land value areas and that gap narrows as you spread out and you get out to the areas in my district where it's just -- it's almost counterintuitive that you can't get as many affordable units traditionally because the -- it's all in the cost of the construction because the land value is so low comparatively. It's very challenging economics but I don't want to lose the thread on when we're seeing stuff happen now that we don't like, it may or may not be a consequence of a code we're trying to change. Or the non-zoning chapters. Or the fee structures or how long it takes to get a permit or, you know, on -- or because that site had to go through a zoning change, it meant a year and a half of carrying costs on the note, those type of elements. And I just want to say one more time I'm gonna try to be really good about not saying things like, you know, we want to do this and here we want to give it all away, we want to -- you know, I think we're all acknowledging that there's nuance to this conversation, and I don't want to lose that part also. I think there really is a lot more agreement here once really start talking about three and four units versus six and eight and 12 units and we maybe closer than we think. >> Mayor Adler: That would be my hope. I appreciate getting a little bit more information on the preservation tool

[2:20:18 PM]

that was in draft three. I don't know whether or not -- because I agree with Ann there are multiple tools, and it could be -- these are not mutually exclusive kinds of things so if we were to map missing middle, one decision is whether we do it by right and whether we're talking about right for a house form or something larger than a house form. Another question would be, is the same time we're doing that in that same area, could we also have an on-street zoning tool that was being used so that even though it was an area that was getting upzoned potentially, we were trying to create stronger incentives for someone to maintain the existing home because it got them other stuff to be able to use, and that might be a way to mitigate the pressures associated with upzoning if that was the decision that was made. But that -- if the conversation we're having here about missing middle housing is also question number three, which was missing middle, and we may have just had the conversation about that element in both of them. I don't know if there's other items in number three that were not addressed in the conversation that we had. Greg?

>> Casar: You know, councilmember Garza and I posted -- mayor pro tem Garza and I posted what our criteria, tried to come up with a set of criteria to lay out some expectations for where missing middle housing would be mapped. So I'm interested in what people's thoughts were there. Then we laid out what transition zone length would generally look like, which comes out to about two lots and up to seven lots or so, depending on the set of whether you met all the criteria, whether you were on transit and in the urban and/or have street connectivity and have opportunity, that in a normal sort of perpendicular situation means the -- perpendicular zone means the zone is between lot or two

[2:22:19 PM]

deep and 1/13 of a mile deep. In the kinds of neighborhoods where your lots face the streets than it's somewhere between 400 feet deep and a quarter mile and we tried to provide those illustrations for people. When we talk about how much missing middle we're actually talking about mapping, I think, you know, one baseline option is to make sure that we are allowing more units just generally on lots, but if we're talking about this in between missing middle, something in between adding a U behind you and really RM-1 or R zone, we wanted to sort of lay out what we meant by transition zones off the corridor because the mayor's original document didn't specify quite how deep it would go. It asked for council criteria to talk about how deep it should go. I don't know that everybody has a copy of this but I'm just interested in whether people thought the criteria was good or bad, whether two to seven lots was too many lots or too few lots for people we were pretty limited in the number of people we could do. >>

Mayor Adler: Let's put that question on the floor. Alison. >> Alter: I had a question for Mr. Casar, because I was having trouble understanding the density involved. I'm not sure I agree with the criteria or approach but I want to make sure I'm understanding it before I raise any questions. So by my calculation starting from looking at the bottom, looking at T one where the streets are parallel to the corridor, it starts with RM-3 and goes down from there. And you still end up with RM-3, I think, by the time you get seven lots in. Can you give me a sense of how many units we're talking about at each lot? Because if I go back to codenext and look at it, it looks like it's dependent on

[2:24:20 PM]

the size of the lot and by my calculations, which could be wrong, for 7,000 square feet, that was, you know -- rm-3 was six to eight units or rm-2 three to six units, rm-1 is [indiscernible] And so on if you took the higher end of that that's quite a lot on a 7,000 square foot lot when the base lot is more like 5,000. I'm just having trouble translating this into unit sizes so that can understand it. So can you walk M through that 401 that meets all of the criteria? >> Casar: Yeah, absolutely. so, again, we didn't actually go and P rmnd r-4 or r-3 in -- on the missing middle blocks. We just put missing middle with lessening intensity because we want to give staff discretion to be able to map this O lots as is most appropriate. But just to really try to create a smooth transition what we said was we want to represent steadily decreasing entitlements per lot and, as you mentioned, if the lot really big behind a corridor in rm zone would allow significantly more units, whereas if it was just a standard, bigger single-family lot it might be eight units. And so that way you go from a corridor, which might be an actual midrise or high rise apartment downward and if it's as you said 7,000 square foot lot you're really only talking about maybe - - did you mention rm-2 or 3? Lt>>: I'm going off the bottom, for example, a [indiscernible] That's where I got my stuff. >> Casar: Exactly. So you're talking about on the back of the corridor something way significantly lower than corridor zoning is rm-2 or rm-1 say W less than Ms zoning and depending on the size of the lot Y L are getting fewer units. You have to take non-zoning

[2:26:24 PM]

requirements into account but eventually you get down into r-4 which allows four, and then potentially more units with a bonus and then r-3, which allows three. That would be the longest transition zone and, frankly, in this case I'm talking about three zones scaled to maybe that midlevel missing middle zone and then four lots zoned in the house scale missing middle zone, which is r-4, r-3. >> Alter: So rm-3 allows for 60 feet. That's same height allowed in the corridor today so we're getting that pretty far in, as far as I understand this. Again, I'm trying to translate the example and maybe the example is just an example, but the example is what the community is going to be looking at and trying to understand what the proposal is before us. So, I mean, I think we also need to understand when we're talking about missing middle and we're talking about the transition what we made from the other conversation, we now have to talk about what are the heights involved and how do those relate to what's existing. We also need to talk about impervious cover. There's quite a bit of different impervious cover numbers if you start to look at rm-4 has impervious cover of 90%, rm-3 70%, versus rm-1 of 45%. These are off the corridors. You know, my experience lately off the corridors if you're in a rainstorm is the flooding and you're driving through 2 feet of water because we don't have the infrastructure for what's already there. And so I just -- there's a lot packed into this and I'm -- packed into this and I don't fully understand what I would be even voting for, trying to explain this to my constituents who are asking about it. So there are a lot of dimensions here, and I know the goal is meant well to try and get the housing, but there are lots of knock-ones for other goals that I think

[2:28:24 PM]

we need to understand as well. >> Mayor Adler: As I was looking at it and then I handed out something, too, that I'd throw out on the table, too,, I began with the premise that I want us to have more density and density along the corridors. Especially the activity centers and corridors. And then the centers. That's where I began. What I've had and the thing that I originally laid out a couple weeks ago was we would then build a transition behind that, a transition area behind that, so that you don't go from that density that we're in - think we've all agreed we want to put on the -- accord immediately to single-family home. Then the question is how do you transition from one to the other? I would hope that when we were mapping it out we would take into account the kinds of things that you've listed. I like the things that you've listed. You know, it's a transit center, corridors, in a place where there seems to be demand for that kind of missing middle intensity, does it have the street connectivity we want, is it in a high opportunity area. I also appreciate that you allowed not only the things that would increase that transition but the things that would decrease that transition. So you specifically listed that if it covered more than half of a neighborhood that you wouldn't do that, which is a nod toward the concern people we're raising in some neighborhoods where they had a corridor on two sides and if you lived a quarter mile in from each of the sides I'd effectively take in the whole neighborhood so I appreciate you suggested some measure of context sensitivity with that so I like that, too. I will tell you when I was inking about how deep this would go into the neighborhood I wasn't thinking seven lots. And I'm not sure that I have a planning reason for that. I have just kind of a

[2:30:24 PM]

culture shock to that. It goes back to what I said at the beginning. I think that we're trying to both do something here that drives the goals that we want in terms of density and affordability and supply but also trying to do it in a way that feels right for where we are. So I took the list that you have, and what I handed out was kind of some changes to what it was that you had had in your deal. So what I've handed out has Greg's amendments to the set documents in blue and my amendments to what Greg had in red. And basically what this did is it deleted the line that said this is gonna be two to seven lots, although I think it's -- there's certainly a range. I'm not sure that what I described would end up with seven lots. I think it ends up with less than seven lots. But it keeps the criteria that you had in terms of what you've shown on the chart. That makes sense to me, that it shouldn't be the same in all places. But rather than -- but describe more -- I think what the process needs to be. If I have the commercial uses the front then what has to happen next to it is something at least RM-1 so it doesn't trigger compatibility, which is what we said before. It could be more than RM-1 but that would depend on what's happening on the corridor. So in many corridors RM-1 will be the appropriate thing to have behind it but I might have such intensity on the corridor by virtue of what's being zoned that the appropriate backing or fronting or adjacent use would be RM-2 or something else. That would be toward the top of what Greg was talking

about in his scale. So it says that we have adjacent to it the rm-1 or higher, so it doesn't trigger the compatibility. it plays off of whatever it was that was the density on

[2:32:25 PM]

the corridor, and then it has a couple statements that I think make sense, that transitions in scale -- and scale occur midblock, not across the street, and that parcels on opposite sides of the street generally are mapped with the Zones of a similar scale, so that the transitions happening in the backyard as opposed to the fronting street where homes are looking at each other. It would have the transition areas stepping down to residential house scale. This is kingly possible, so you're trying to get down to the r-4 as soon as it makes sense to be able to do that. Obviously you're not going to put an r-4 next to an rm-3 kind of unit, so but you try to do it as quickly as you can, with these other parameters. And then r4 being the least intense zone within a transition area so that would mark then the end of the transition area. And as I played with various things, it seemed to me that while it had more than one lot or two lots, in many cases it was less than seven lots in area one of the ones that I -- every one of the ones I mapped. So the intrusion into the neighborhood was somewhere in that middle. But it wasn't keyed on the number of lots. It was key on these kind of design principles. I don't know if this kind of thing makes sense at all or generally speaking something you could apply but that's where my head is kind of right now. The one thing related I spoke about was H that talked about the missing middle and affordability, that language probably isn't very clear and that's because that issue is not very clear in my head yet either. Kathie and then Leslie. >> Pool: Just have a question on your terminology. You -- in F, on page 2, it says see attached exhibit E and which exhibits are

[2:34:26 PM]

those? >> Mayor Adler: That was Greg's attachment. But Greg's attachment, he was mapping was B, C, D, and E, and F, which were his language. I then added T plus G, H, I, J, K, L, M which obviously are not mapped on to Greg's deal. >> Pool: So this continues forward? >> Mayor Adler: I would recommend that that in your left hand be modified so as to incorporate the kinds of provisions that I've put in red, which I don't think -- which don't show -- would not show the same encouragement that Greg's maps show. >> Tovo: I have a lot of different responses, but I think the one I would start with is that we started out with a memo asking us to provide some policy direction to the city manager and this -- this seeming to well beyond providing direction. I mean, this is actually -- this is a level of specificity that is actually getting into the mapping and if we want to do that I'd request that we take some time to actually talk about it. You know, this is like a multiple-hour conversation even trying to understand what your map shows, what your revisions show, and then actually testing it against some real neighborhoods. I don't know if you've done this. I don't know if you've done this in any areas. I can tell you off the top of my head a whole lot of the areas I represent are gonna fall into that category where it's got a corridor on either side and you've in essence mapped the entire area as a transition zone. I understand there's a provision that shouldn't happen but then what does that look like? I'm not really sure that between today

and Thursday I could explain to my constituents how this operates because for one thing I don't understand myself how it operates and I can spend more time figuring it out and will, but it's -- it's very challenging to be able to do that between today and Thursday so I would ask if we're going to

[2:36:28 PM]

contemplate this or revision to it that we not -- that this not be Thursday's conversation. That this be -- that we prolong E cthversation to another time. I think providing some general direction about transition Zones is kind of what the city manager asked us to do. Mapping it and providing calculation for how that changes lot by lot by lot is pretty in depth work. We may be up to it but if we're gonna start writing the code ourselves I think we're gonna need a little more time. >> Mayor Adler: Ann. >> Kitchen: Well, couple things. First off, thank you, cocilmunber Casar. Appreciate your making an effort at bringing forward some thoughts. So I appreciate that effort. But my concern is similar to what councilmember tovo is mentioning. There's -- whatever level of criteria we bring forward, we need to understand the impact. And this -- there's no data here to tell me what the impact will be. And much less going to -- citywide, much less trying to figure out what it does for my neighborhoods. It also is new, and that may be a good thing, but it doesn't track what the planning commission did on transition zoning. What the planning commission did was suggest that they map -- that you map density directly on the corridor and the centers, that you use a Flum on the transitions, and then you consider other areas. And then they also suggested a list of 13 criteria to consider when you're considering the character of the corridor and the surrounding neighborhoods. So they did -- they went into much more depth in understanding the differences across the community, and so if we're gonna put criteria, which we

[2:38:29 PM]

would need to do at some point in terms of transition Zones, there's a lot more complexity than these four criteria. I think it's not that I'm saying these four wouldn't be the one. It's just that, okay, what about things like blocks that aren't perpendicular parallel? What about places where you have residential blocks side by side or mu zoned lots where they're essentially wrapped around? What about places where you have, you know, localized flooding? What about areas that are bound by other Zones, U or environmental? My point is simply this, is that those -- that's a level of detail so I would much rather say to staff that we -- we can say we want transition Zones, ask staff to bring us back options, spend a lot more time to actually analyze the impact, both in terms of are we getting what we want? I mean, acknowledging that we want more missing middle, we want that we want three things, more missing middle, more missing middle with affordable, and affordable. So I think the level of analysis is necessary, and I don't see how we could possibly vote on this kind of criteria on Thursday. >> Pool: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Leslie and then Jimmy. >> Pool: Thanks. And just to tag on to what councilmember kitchen is saying, the question was to what extent should we obviously encourage more missing middle housing types and then it names some. And so to the extent that we're trying to answer that, I think that's the question that we're answering, is to what extent should the new code encourage more missing middle

housing types? And to that end -- and that's pretty simple. I think we have a lot of consensus around the dais that we'd like to see more. And to that end, on page 3,

[2:40:29 PM]

number 1c, I'd like to insert cooperatives in the bullet that talk about reduce site development standards or missing middle housing options, and then it enumerates them, such as duplexes, multiple -- multimechanisms, townhomes, I'd like to insert co-ops and cottage court to facilitate development of additional units. We've had presentations about cooperatives, we know it can serve all ages, could be particularly intriguing as a housing solution for our seniors who are looking both for affordability and community that's not like a retirement home. So I'd like for us to explore co-ops in the income restricted housing category as well if staff would add that in there. And my staff and I also working with cooperative advocates to see what might work. Just the one edit I'd like to offer up for question three since we're just talking about to what extent should the code impairment more missing middle, I think we've answered that. And we're looking for more. And I would like to include specifically cooperatives in the enumerated list. >> Mayor Adler: Jimmy. >> Flannigan: On the document you handed out, mayor, which is question four, right? Compatibility standards. I do have a couple of concerns kind of with the way this lays out. The one that really jumps out to me is parcels on opposite side of street should be mapped with Zones of similar scale. The street itself is a buffer, so I don't know why we would not want to leverage that. Will be scarier for folks to sit across a fence versus across the street, I would imagine, because when I hear folks talk about their concerns with the compatibility, it's about scale of the built environment, not -- and so the street is a buffer. So I wouldn't want to do that. I think at a higher level here, I want staff to solve the problem for us in a way

[2:42:30 PM]

that communicate what we're trying to achieve. What councilmember harper-madison and Renteria and I kind of laid out as an option, as an example, is to define the entitlement that you are looking for either by right or by bonus at the corridor level and then stepping it back from there. Not being so descriptive that we're saying in this moment that if it's parallel or perpendicular or it's just as a general guideline and then letting staff go and find exceptions to the exceptions to rule that will drive the conversation here's a lot of interesting ideas in here, but I almost am a little worried it's a little too specific at this stage when I prefer us to say we need certain level of intensity on corridors and especially ones on the transit priority network and it should gracefully scale back from there. Staff should help us solve for the process in which that occurs. And I also struggle with citing specific zoning categories from draft three because I think councilmember alter kind of was pulling that out and saying well, that says this height and that says that height. I may notice the way the Zones are defined in draft three so I'm struggling a little bit with the specificity on this one. >> Mayor Adler: For me, I think part of it goes to what is it we're trying to achieve? My hope is that we'll figure out what we can do right to be able to have something done by the end of the year. My preference would be we end next year focused on transportation and on the

transit issue that's coming up. And I think we have the best chance of being able to maximize that opportunity if we're able to move past this. So, Jimmy, I think one of the things I was trying to figure out was, we could at the very least we need to answer the five questions the Nager asked us to answer so under any scenario we should answer those five questions. Then beyond that, to the degree that we can give him

[2:44:32 PM]

direction, to the degree that we can, we may not be able to do to differing levels, we should do that, so that when the maps and the code come back to us in -- or come back to the public in August or September or whatever they come back, they're the least number of surprises people knew what was going to say and they could point back to this moment and this time and whatever majority of us thought was the right way to go. Only because I'm concerned that if we leave -- if we don't give direction then we're stepping back into the challenge we had with staff before, where we really didn't give a lot of direction and then staff was trying to come up with something and not having been through so much and having so many conversations over so many years, if we're able to give better direction and can do that so that when the maps came out there was as little surprise in the maps as possible that increases the chances then that we'll be able then to move to the next stage of the process and be able to work through that so that it gets to us in a timely way for us while we're together as a group, able to accomplish that. So I understand the challenge, and I'm on both waves that. I don't think we should give any more prescription than is expedient we feel comfortable doing. I'd like to see us give as much as we could, given that, because I think that will make the back end of the process work better. And part of what handed out here was in response to what Greg handed out. What I was saying, here, there might be some other directions that wouldn't end up with the same result. So I wrote those down. And then with respect to the whole neighborhood getting mapped -- I think it's real clear no one today has talked about even with two

[2:46:32 PM]

corridors on both sides of the neighborhood that it would cover the whole neighborhood. It explicitly said that would not happen. So no one has discussed a scenario where that would. I don't know exactly what that would look like, and it seems to me that really the key indicator on that is, what goes on the corridors in those areas? Because we're starting out with a premise, collectively as a group, that we want to be able to achieve density and more supply along the corridors and then whatever happens behind the corridor is in part dependent and most dependent on what happens on the corridor because what's behind it then is the transition to the single family neighborhood. So I think that it's not just the transition area that has to be decided with respect to those neighborhoods. It's what happens on the corridor because I think things begin to key off of that. >> Flannigan: The mayor pro tem's point, these are neighborhoods that are all encompassing including missing middle that are not necessarily single family neighborhoods, and I think it's important to remember that, too. That we're not just talking about mansion

to the interior neighborhoods. Some of these interiors already have two, three, four unit kind of mum stuff. >> Mayor Adler: Ann. >> Kitchen: I just want to reiterate that, you know, I -- I guess what I'm saying, I appreciate what we're saying in terms of doing as much as we can right now and I appreciate that. Mayor, I think you pointed that out but we don't really know what we're doing with this criteria, and I may -- it may be good criteria councilmember Casar. It may be good. And I'm willing to say -- I'm certainly willing to say this could be the best criteria, but I don't have any data about how it will impact, and I can name a number of circumstances that -- like I just named out from the planning commission that don't seem to fit in here, but if I'm

[2:48:34 PM]

reading this right -- maybe I'm not reading it right, but if I'm reading this right this, says to me everywhere that you meet one of these four, then you'll be mapped this way. And so the question I'm asking is, well, what about all these other exceptions that the planning commission recognized? And suggested that these things need to be considered and they may require a different approach? So I could certainly, you know, support something that said to staff please help us figure out the appropriate criteria, here's one way that you might consider it, here's other ways that you might consider it. I'm happy to view them things as a suggested approach. To consider. But I'm not prepared to vote on one approach, particularly when I don't have an analysis of how that works. And so that's what my concern is. And, mayor, you mentioned you don't want to be surprised, and I agree with that. But if I go and map this, I will be surprised because I don't know what it -- I don't know how it works on the ground right now. So I think the more prudent thing is to take the kind of approach that councilmember Flannigan is suggesting, which is we be real clear what we want on the corridor, we be real clear that we want transition areas, we be real clear that, you know, some of the criteria to look at for transition areas, even suggest things staff looks at, but I don't see how we're prepared to choose what those transition criteria are, particularly if we're going to vote tomorrow -- I mean, on Thursday. And I'm not even gonna mention the fact that the community hasn't had a chance to tell us what they think about this. >> Mayor Adler: Greg. >> Casar: And I included this exhibit not as direction, right, the direction is in the mayor's document. I included the exhibit more

[2:50:35 PM]

so that people could have an idea of what it would generally look like, what this direction would generally look like as a -- as trying to extend some level of visualization for people. And I looked at the planning commission's level of criteria and was kind of stuck between people saying if I put all of the planning commission criteria, many of which I really thought were great, that it would be way too prescriptive so I didn't want to be way too prescriptive, at the same time didn't want to include nothing and then I feared people would say well we're sending staff out without direction and who those what it is we'll get back. Since the question of missing middle criteria was put before us I tried to have general criteria and illustration of what it could look like, but didn't mean map it exactly like this. It's just

when we say between two and seven lots and generally smoothing down off of a corridor this is kind of what that looks like. I of course would want the staff to know where creeks are and to know where the streets are kind of diagonal instead of straight and to give them that work to do. So it's really just an honest attempt at trying to do -- to just say let's kick off a small transition zone this year. And in part I also wrote it with the not impacting the majority of the neighborhood and at two to seven lots to give them a sense that is actually a pretty meager transition zone compared to some of the things that actually were even in draft one in some neighborhoods. In part just to -- just to show, look, this actually would not be that big of a change in many areas. Any of my neighborhoods that are off some Austin's major corridors and major activity transit networks, you've got 50, 40, 70 houses deep off the corridor so this would say if you hit all the criteria this would take up one eight lot block and leave the rest to be dealt with in future, it could be dealt with with our Adu and parking policies. Again, I'm sort of torn

[2:52:35 PM]

between being too prescriptive and not giving enough and wanting to show people generally what we mean or not showing people what we mean so this was trying to sort of hook the middle by giving direction and having a picture. >> Mayor Adler: Let's give other people a chance. >> Casar: One thing I had scribbled down to mention but never did was that my conception of this but it's not written so it's not -- so I'd be happy to add it is obviously if something is missing middle zoned to just E it that missing middle zone under this mapping so as to not get rid of missing middle with other missing middle, let's leave it -- it's missing middle zone, that's great, leave it missing middle zone. >> Mayor Adler: Alison. >> Aer: I to I just wanted to add, I appreciate you putting forward something. This is not an easy task that's before us and I know a lot of work went into that. I think what we're trying to do is understand what you're proposing and that's not to suggest that there was any -- the intent was there and you were trying to move us forward. As I look at the things before us and I look at where we're going and what's being said, I appreciate the mayor's comments of let's focus on what our goal is and what we're trying to achieve. I will look more carefully between now and Thursday at what you produced mayor Adler, but I'm inclined to support more of what you've put forward in the first place, which seems the simplest to me, which is you get the compatibility not to be an issue on the corridor by have a one lot in transition zone and then you add concerns about context sensitivity, if we find if we explore this further there are particulars that's not going to work like diagonal streets and other things where there's concern and then we have a planning process that's focused on E transition areas with a very short time line for when that happens and then you can have some of the discussions that need to be had for those transition areas that can be very specific. I have parts of my district

[2:54:38 PM]

that have commercial that goes in a couple blocks right next to where there's regional, and what I would want to do on this block would be very different than what I want to do on that block. And the blanket approach would miss important opportunities because we have diagonal streets that are doing kind of

weirdki S of things. Then what I would say also is part O what -- ife do the code writehat W will have is we will have Zones we don't have now to do things we don't want to do. It's very different to come in and ask F zoning that gets to you a zoning category that existshan T to have to create a co and do all that negotiation and whatever. So the transition areas we could think about -- and I have to I haven't feddered this with staff so I don't know if this is possible but you could have me ksod of expedited permitting process if you're in a transition area and you nt to create housing, you getting to through process that's a little faster so you get to know what it is but it still goes through all the public process, which is I think part of what people are concern edabout and you also have the planning process that would be goi on. So, you know, to the extent that we are trying to move forward all of the things that I've heard that sort of combination is the one that I would be most comfortable with. That recognizes that tre'she value in planning, there's value in the public process. But we do have a need and broad agreement that we want to have entitlements increased on the corridor so that we get more housing. Now, I personally only want those entitlements if there's some affordability involved, but as we're going through this process, I think that might be direction that would be easy to understand, without all sorts of different ways T you go off I lots of wrd directions. And then for missing middle, we could focus on some ofth E things that know and that we agree on.

[2:56:39 PM]

I mean, I'm hearing a lot of agreement of we have ability to do, you know -- from fourplexes down but they're not happening, and so one of the things that we could unleash that would allow those happen more organicay because I think there's people that want to do those even where they arebutt's not a matter of increasing the zoning because they'd still have those other constraints there. That's just where I'm thinking where we are right now. And how I'm thinking about things as we move forward. I appreciate the additional changes that you're bringing forward here. I want this code to be simple ant the direction to be simple. That seems simpler to me. >> Mayor Adler: Kathie. >> Tovo: So sorry about this, but we moved on fm number 2 before I had a chance to ask my questions absomet F this, and we can talk about I today or talk about it Tuesday. But I've highlighted on the draft I handed out. One I'll highlight a couple other changes. I'm suggesting that we change the language from the granting of new entitlements in areas currently susceptible to limit displacement and disincentivize redevelopment of housing, I think we don't wantdoo that with any existing multi-family residential developments. >> Mayor Adler: Wait, I'm sorry. >> Tovo: I'm sorry. Question two, 1b. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Tovo: Three. So I've said especiallyn I areas currently susceptible but generally we want to reduce is displacements and [indiscernible] Especially multi-family residential development not just older -- anyway, it just seemed to me we don't want to distinguish between existing and older and we also want that to apply to her areas. And then I've highlighted a becausi'me not -- I'm not followint' W happening there. I'm not understanding the point there. About the non--- we've

[2:58:40 PM]

talked about non-zoning regulations so I kind of understand what we're talking about there. >> Mayor Adler: So -- >> Tovo: Do we mean revised? Non-zoning regulations will be revised? But then it wasn't clear to me how the prioritization of non-zoning regulations -- I'm not making sense of those sentences. >> Mayor Adler: I think that this point was the one that was discussed where in -- in the formulation of draft three, we had different sections, non-zoning sections that were drafted independent of one another but focused on that particular subject matter.. And each one of them is a really good policy within that area. But what we found when we tested is was when we overlaid all those things on the same tract you would no longer achieve what was even allowed for under existing zoning. So all those things here and it's impossible I think then for staff to pick out the favorite among the children that they have because all of those things are important. So what this was was a paragraph that was intended to say that ultimately as decision makers we have to set priorities and give direction and we're really the only ones that can do that. And that first priority that was established here was we're going to get higher yield density and supply along the corridors, we're going to get that done. So as I look at how I overlay the non-zoning stuff, if -- I want to do it all. But to its degree doing it all means I'm sacrificing my primary goal, then I have to reflect that in the priority. I don't ask for everything

[3:00:40 PM]

that I would have otherwise asked for on that lot Beuse I've set the density and the supply and the corridor rightest. And then the language said, but with that there are some things among other non-zoning things that would be prioritized among others and one of those is right-of-way acquisition because if I don't get the right-of-way acquisition I need on the streets it's forever gone and I'm not going to be able to ultimately build out transit or mobility system that I want. So it had that. It had traffic mitigation and transportation demand management because that traffic and affordability really big concerns in the city. And then it had drainage and water quality. Someone had also recommended prioritizing other things too, and at some point as we began to list everything, then we haven't prioritized anything anymore because we have listed everything over again. In talking through I know that tree protection was a big one and I thought that heritage tree preservation was probably something that could still be kept in here without compromising the corridor development. Which is why I've put that back. But that was -- that was the issue in that paragraph. >> Tovo: And I appreciate that explanation. I sort of understand some of it. But I'm still having a little trouble making these work together so I'm with you on the first sentence. The next we're saying the prioritization of non-zoning regulations will be for transportation right-of-way acquisition. In other words, if there is -- if it comes down to higher unit yields or right-of-way acquisition -- >> The thing becomes a really difficult thing because those are equal and probably we could give more definition than that -- more direction than that. >> Tovo: I'm just having trouble understanding how these -- how the the second

[3:02:40 PM]

sentence -- are saying higher yields owe is our maybe goal, but we're going to balance that against our need for right-of-way acquisition, for traffic mitigation and transportation demand management, drainage and water quality issues and parkland dedication. Okay. >> The more things we list the less direction we're giving. >> Tovo: I get that point, but is that what you're saying. We need to balance our goal for high unit against these other priorities? >> Mayor Adler: That's correct. And so the degree that I can get the other things that are listed as priorities a still get the density that I need then I want to get those things too. But if I have a forced choice in those situations, this was saying as council we should probably give direction to staff on what we would pick in a forced choice situation. >> Tovo: Okay. If I could suggest that maybe that second since just be a little bit rewritten to -- but how does parkland dedication fit into that because you would -- it's not taking up space on the tract that you're developing. >> Mayor Adler: It would be taking up space on the tract that we're developing. Parkland and open space and civic space. All spaces. And some might impact or not impact to different degrees and there may be ways to say if it's a corridor tract you can do a fee-in-lieu in situations where you wouldn't be allowed to do a fee-in-lieu, but in this case because it's the corridor tract and we're trying to get that we're going to allow that more it's just trying to give direction because one of the problems we had with the last code is when it got tested we had so many things we were asking of those corridor tracts it could no longer -- the corridor tracts could no longer deliver the density and density that we wanted the corridors to give to us for transportation and affordability reasons.

[3:04:40 PM]

>> Tovo: All right, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: R. >> Mayor Adler: Jimmy. >> Flannigan: Where I got confused on that same document is how we turned it around to say specifically which parts of the regulation would we consider varying in order to achieve these objectives. So the way we laid it out in our document was options to allow some level of administrative variance for some building form of regulations like setback height cover to maximize the housing of trees, parks, floor risks. So I'm not sure what we're saying is we want to sacrifice drainage. What we're saying is that's one of the things we don't want to sacrifice is these other regulations regulations that that may be the place for variance in order to achieve unit yield and flood protection and trees and parks. So -- there's a couple of different ways to read it and that's how I think we put it together. And then the other thing that we added was feasibility regulations can overlap so that we're maximizing the opportunities where the drainage requirements also serve as the vegetative buffer, also serve as the open space in areas where -- in ways that can be safely Austin and et cetera, et cetera. And that's how we laid it out. >> What page are you on in yours? >> Flannigan: It's on page 3, C three and four. >> Mayor Adler: Question 3-c. Okay. Alison. >> Alter: So I feel pretty strongly that we need to keep the parkland pieces in either most of our corridors are parkland deficient. It's one of our top 10 goals to create access.

[3:06:45 PM]

The land requirement doesn't really kick in until you get a certain size and at some point when you have that certain size just for the dogs you need to have a space whether you want them for T people or not and so I think we -- once in land is gone you can't get the parkland. It's not a requirement if it's affordable housing so that's an incentive for folks to have more affordable housing as part of that. So I feel pretty strongly on that. I've heard this comment that we ended up with draft 3 with something where things couldn't be built on the corridor I'm just wondering if someone can provide some of those models because I haven't seen those either because we ditched Dra 3 or they were never shown to me, but I'm--t I'd like to play around with them a little bit more and better understand some real scenarios where these are interacting and this is happening. And I don't know who prepared those, which groups did those or if it was something that staff did. I've heard that in the ether, but I haven't actually seen the templates. And it would be really helpful. I don't know, mayor, if your staff has access to those. I'd just like Tonder and what we're talking about. >> Mayor Adler: We worked with staff to get them. I think aia had done some of that work. There was some charrettes that had been done that I understood -- >> Alter: A yeah, I know that's what's been said. I just haven't been able to understand how that would play out in practice. >> Mayor a so: Can you get her -->> Hat was the question, I'm sorry? Ayor Adler: The testing work that was done on the other code that demonstrated that there were some suggestions that we weren't able to achieve what we wanted in the corridors because of the overlapping otherwise non-requirements. If you could get that to everybody, that would be helpful. >> Sure. We can look for that documentation. >> Alter: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ann. Kiten: Just two

[3:08:46 PM]

things. I think I took a similar approach to what councilmember Flannigan was saying in regard to the prioritization. So kind of similar to your language, but a little bit different. The second thing isn'ted T go back too the discussion of the transition zone mapping because I did have a question for councilmember Casar, just in understanding. One of the things that you were putting forward was the street connectivity and the language I think was well connected street grid. Can you help me understand a little bit more about is that tied back to something that would be defined for me or just tell me what had in mind. >> Casar: Mayor, so we tried to take the -- looking at what planning commission talked about and what community members talked about, what people thought qualified them for better missing middle or worse and some folks said if you are a certain number of lots in but the streets curve and switch back or there's a creek and you can't actually get to the street, we want it to make sure that we were addressing that we want -- if indeed what we're trying to do is get more family friendly, walkable transit that people can walk to, then more walkability and street connectivity or whatever that set of words is would make sense. We wanted something that could fit easily on this chart. So if it's more walkable neighborhoods where missing middle housing traditionally was a housing type until we often times outlawed it, that's what we're trying to steer towards while recognizing we want it all over the city. If there isn't great street connectivity you may get less missing middle housing with less intense Zones. >> Kitchen: So was that like thinking in terms of the corridor being the the main area for density and working back from it.

[3:10:47 PM]

Does that mean well connected to the corridor. Is that what you were thinking? >> For example, there might be some more suburban style developments in neighborhoods where you have really one collector street and then a variety of arterials and then a little branch street that comes back towards the corridor to really give staff the ability to not go and necessarily map that little street just because as the crow flies might be nearer the corridor, but may not be well connected enough to be the place where missing middle is mapped, instead for missing middle to be mapped where there is better street connectivity to the transit. >> Kitchen: Then I have one last question if I may. So I think this was in yours or -- I'm getting confused. Mayor, if you picked up the same thing that was in yours, you're reflecting that vulnerable areas as in the gentrification study, I had been thinking in terms of susceptible areas because I had been thinking that the gentrification study has sort of some tiers and it would be important to pull in the susceptible areas because those are the areas that are identified as at risk if I'm using the right words, at risk for gentrification. And that they might be the areas that we actually have -- not that we actually have, but that we might not go to that level as well as the vulnerable areas already gentrified areas. So was there a reason why you didn't go to susceptible? >> Casar: I think many times the vulnerable areas were overlapped both of those, but I can go and check. I think the term susceptible is often times the census tracts that were adjacent to those that were gently gentrifying and I think often times vulnerable overlapped with both the dynamic and the susceptible

[3:12:49 PM]

tracts next to it. I think it catches both, but I'll check. Vulnerable and susceptible is also a fine line, also from what I remember, a fine categorization. >> Kitchen: I think you would want to do both. >> Casar: In these areas where often times land values have been lowered because of a variety of historical injustices and inequities, when you have -- we tend to get the housing stock quickly that we zone. If you put -- when you put higher level density zoning in some parts, for example, of councilmember Renteria's district or the southern parts of mine, you might quickly get that housing cost where we understand that when an area is more expensive and often times higher opportunity you might have mf-3 zoning where single-family houses have sat and it's been mf 3 or 4 zoning a long time. That's part of the reason if we want to have housing supply across the city to make sure we redress those injustices with -- as we have here ramped down or susceptible, higher opportunity or if it's high opportunity, well connected to transit, et cetera. >> Kitchen: Okay. It occurred to me that it ought to be not just vulnerable, but susceptible. >> Asar: Okay. >> Tovo: I had a question and for you regarding the citywide testing. Let me also say that I think the additional language that you've added about remodeling about -- this actually gets back to the point you made earlier, councilmember Renteria, about making remodeling easier. I think that generally -- >> Mayor Adler: Were you reading in question two? I'm sorry. >> Mayor Adler: Yeah, still on question two. One of the things that I heard again and again out there in the community about transit I think one of the real missed opportunities in the drafts that -- all of the drafts we saw were no preservation

[3:14:49 PM]

tools generally. And I Thi you mentioned the preservation tool that ended up in draft 3,ut I hope that we can really come up with some more -- some more strategie tt other communities use to prevent -- to prevent demolition, to work toward preserving the existing housing that we have, especially when it's providing nurally occurring affordable housing. But C-- owe I thohtug C's provision was very good. B with regard to T testing I think follows along with what I was trying to do, but is better language. But I wasn't clear on the timing. So I had added in some language about when the testing should be done and I said prior to council approval. But if you've said when you think the testing should be done it's not clear to me. >> Mayor Adler: Prior to council approval. >> Tovo: Can you help me see where that is? >> Mayor Adler: I'm not sure it said that, but I would have assumed that testing happened before it came to us. >> Kitchen: I think the resolution we passed said prior to. >> Tovo: Okay. So I think -- gd. Then I would just suggest that that be in that provision where you're ainut. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Tovo: On a slightly different subject we're getting calls and texts about -- >> Mayor Adler: And by approval I mean approval the fall, right before we adopt something in the fall. I hope that the testing happens before it co the planning commission. >> Tovo: It's my understanding that we are having public tesny on the land development code on Thursday .I don't know if you are getting calls and texts and whatnot, but I know my office is so I wanted to ve tt. >> Mayor Adler: As we announced last meeting. >> Tovo: Do we ha a time certain for this conversation? >> Mayor Adler: No. My hope is wll start it as early as we can. It's an agenda that Len itself to us being able to start earlier than later. It's going to be a lot for us to discuss too.

[3:16:59 PM]

In the last section on parking. >> Mayor Aer: I have one more thing -- >> Kitchen: I have one more thing on exalt. We've -- compatibility. We've talked a lot about compatibility as itates to the zoning but I wanted to call people's attention to the fact that I had suggested that we need to say more with regard to the non-zoning atsec of compatibility. And so I'll just call your attention to language about standards related to noise, uses, utility screening, trash, loading and pickup and those -- and shielded lighting. So think currently we don't have as clear direction in those records as we need to. So I wanted to include that. And -- I'm looking at page 5righ now under code text. I also wanted to include green infrastructure are the to tree canopy related to corridors and centers and curb heatandsl effect that the instruction -- the direction to staff being to include those green infrastructure items. That's at the bottom of page 5. >> Mayor Adler: Anyth else inompatibility or missing middle housing housing? >> I wanted to thank councilmember Garza and mayor pro tem Garza for the effort. As we talk about the need for more housing, not just affordable housing, but mor stock in general. We've always TD about building up density along corrors and putting more missing middle into transition Zones and I think what we've been working on does exactlyhat. I just wanted to put that out there. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thankou. >> Harper-madison: Mayor, I have a question/suggestion/request about language. I notice THA both you and councilmember Casar sort of transitioned into using

[3:19:00 PM]

terminology from draft 3 of codenext as opposed to what's in our current code. So when somebody said earlier I had to look it up because I didn't know what it was. So I want to make some certain that we're very consistent with language. So use mf as opposed to -- or sf whatever the thing is as opposed to using the codenext draft 3. It's almost as though the assumption is we are starting with codenext draft 3 in which CAS I've already expressed my opposition to that. And until we as a body agree that that's our starting point, I'd like for us to use the current language that's in our current code. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Or even to describe it qualitatively to say what it is so if someone doesn't know what sf 3 is we just describe. >> Harper-Madison: I think that would be very helpful both for the sake of being consistent and too for our constituents and stakeholders to be able to follow along with conversation. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else on compatibility or missing middle housing. We'll go to Leslie first. >> Pool: I wanted to check with councilmember Kitchen if her 3-b, she wanted to bring up anything under compatibility question 4, 3-b it's about the required density bonus program participation in order to unlock the height of 65 feet? >> Kitchen: That goes back to some of our earlier conversation about connecting the entitlements to increased affordability. And my suggestion here T was above the 65 feet. I think that we-- if we're understanding correctly we were taking that from I believe the planning commission recommendation. I'll go back and double-check the source of that, but we wanted to carry forward that recommendation. So that's what THAs about. >> Pool: I wanted to make sure that my comment about co-ops was also included in

[3:21:01 PM]

whatever new draft we're going to have. >> Kitchen yeah. I had some language about co-ops too and others might. You should draft whatever you were thinking. I had the co-ops in the addition to R. Two two that I have. >> Pool: And I included them in what missing middle would include. >> Kitchen: Right. >> Mayor Adler: Why were where the 60 feet was. -- I don't remember where the 60 feet was. >> Kitchen: I will double-check the source of that. But I think we're keying off one of the other -- >> Mayor Adler: My recollection is I liked the concept by putting in the 60 feet. I needed to check whether that university applied or -- universally applied or whether that concept had different feet attached to it in different situations. >> Kitchen: I'll check. >> Mayor Adler: Kathie, did you have something else? >> Tovo: Yeah. In 4, 3-a, 1, I've just suggested some basic criteria for when the minimal transition zone would not occur. And at the moment it says sentences where market affordable housing is adjacent to a corridor, but I think it's important to call out and/or missing middle housing as we discussed earlier. So market affordable housing and/or missing middle housing as adjacent to a corridor. There must be a better word than adjacent. I didn't mean immediately adjacent, but for the moment that's where it is. So I think that we kind of talked about before, if we have -- as we have -- if we have areas that have high

[3:23:02 PM]

areas of missing middle already, I think it would, and/or market affordable housing adjacent, we should be careful about mapping a zone on there. That that could potentially up zone it. >> Flannigan: Does adjacent mean like actually on the street, facing the street itself or are we talking about one lot away, two lots away? >> Tovo: Well, I think that will be dependent on whether we adopt extremely -- it wasn't my understanding that we were going to adopt extremely specific language for this language so this was responding to the draft we have here when we were talking about one or two lots from the corridor. This was not responding to the proposal that came a couple of days ago from the group of colleagues who proposed two even units. This was really again back to that initial -- back to that initial proposal. Can you help understand the questions here? >> Flannigan: I think because adjacent sounds like if you've got something that is literally on a corridor, like facing the corridor itself. >> Tovo: No. >> Flannigan: I just got hung up on the word adjacent. If it's in the transition, which sewer is it -- I think in the transition is the intent? >> Tovo: Yes. And in particular I was thinking about situation where you've got a four-plex right next to that area -->> Flannigan: Because they're literally not facing Guadalupe. They're off in the transition area. That makes more sense. >> Tovo: I'll think about that language. Thanks for airing the concern. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ann? >> Kitchen: In the same place that councilmember Tovo just mentioned and again if we're just talking about the lot right next to E lot right next to the corridor, that first time. First off, I still believe that we should note G to a

[3:25:03 PM]

level of detail that we should ask the staff to help us figure out transition Zones. But if we're going to start down that road, which we have done with several of these versions, I think that we have to do more than just acknowledge the place in the neighborhoods where it would end up meeting up most of the neighborhood. And I agree with the instance that councilmember Tovo mentioned, but I think that we -- there are two suggestions that I have that are not in here right now so I want to speak to those for a minute. I will be suggesting if we end up -- if the group ends up wanting to provide some additional level of detail, which again I don't support, but if that's where the group goes I'm going to suggest that at least two of those criteria that the planning commission came up with to recognize the character of an area, the residential block sided by Ms or mu zoned lots and the orientation of blocks relative to the corridor we have to at least think about those areas. So I'm going to suggest that those are -- THA language be included. The other thing is it's something that, Mayor, you had in your first version that got taken out and I'm not sure why it was taken out. And it was the potential to take the back portion of the deep lot mapped with a different E so I had added it back in in my document. So it says that in those instances the back portion of the deep lot should be matched with the zone that does not trigger compatibility for the front portion while providing relief for the adjacent property. That means if you have a deep lot and one part is -- if you have a deep lot like this and behind it you have a residential lot that's

[3:27:04 PM]

deep, Y could do one of two things. You could zone the back part of that deep lot that's on the corridor, zone it down some so you don't trigger compatibility or conversely the residential lot that's behind it you could zone the back lot of that remain lot like rm 1 and still keep the -- still keep the single-family at the front of that lot. I'm just trying to suggest that there are some circumstances around town that we need to account for that I we just zone the way that this is suggested, we won't be accounting for those types of circumstances. >> Mayor Adler: And your two factors, one was orientation of the lot -- >> Kitchen: One of was orientation of the blocks relative to the corridor. We've been talking in terms of perpendicular or parallel. You have places where you have streets that come in at angle and the result of that is creation of lots that are really just kind of mashed together and aren't in a grid. So the way the corridor butt up against the residential area creates a lot of different kinds of lots you even have lots that where the residential is sighted both in the back and on the side in such a way that it's really high-rise surrounding a lower scale house. So those kinds of circumstances exist -- >> Mayor Adler: What was the first one? >> Kitchen: Orientation of the block relative to the corridor. The second one residential block sited by a medium zoned lot. So you have behind the lot and to the side of the lot. >> Sided with a D. >> On the side of. Sorry. Side. >> Mayor Adler: So it's both on the back and the

[3:29:05 PM]

side. >> Kitchen: Those are two of the criteria that the planning commission considered as become circumstances that required them along the impact on them. >> Mayor Adler: And I see that one too and was talking to someone that had that kind of lot. Obviously the impact of having commercial WHF is on both the front and back of your lot is exacerbated because it's now two sides of the lot. I haven't figured out in my head the right resolution of that is because on the one hand it's -- the impact is that much greater so you might want to have the zoning of the commercial lot be as high so the impact doesn't this great. On the other hand, it might be an indication of a lot that is really one that needs to be up zoned because it's surrounded by higher intensity used. >> Kitchen: Meanwhile that person who lives on that lot is just -- >> Mayor Adler: I understand the issue. >> Flannigan: Mayor? That's the point. I mean, we can't rezone the city and then say nothing will change. Sorry. Taking that right back. >> Kitchen: That's not what I'm saying. >> Flannigan: I did thing I didn't want to do. Taking it right back. [Inter]gh I heard it the moment I did it. [Laughter]. I heard it the moment I did it. >> Mayor Adler: So let's turn to parking. It's 3:30 >> Flannigan: Cut me off. That's fine. >> Mayor Adler: Let's go to parking. >> Kitchen: My point is that I was not saying that. We can talk about that later. >> Flannigan: I take it back. >> Mayor Adler: Let's go parking. Anybody want to make any comments about parking? I'm in favor at this point of reducing parking within walking distance of the kinds of things that were in here. I'm not a place yet where we're ready to end parking requirements.

[3:31:07 PM]

I'm going to place not ready to end parking requirements. [Laughter] >> Kitchen: I missed that. Mayor Adler: Anybody else want to say anything? Yes, Ann. >> Kitchen: Mine relates to the A.D.A. Requirements. So I had some suggestions around that. My suggestions were that the A.D.A. compliant parking should be required for commercial and multi-family, not just for certain larger scale developments. I think it's important that we -- people with disabilities, whether it's temporary or more permanent, that they be able to park or they be able to get to where they're going. So I don't think we should limit that to just certain larger scale developments. So I said to have an adequate number of dedicated parking spaces to exist to ensure those with permanent disabilities, temporary illness or injury are afforded to place to park near where they live, shop or visit others. I think it's particularly important with an aging population and so that's the endments that I had there. I didn't think that we were giving sufficient direction with regard to the A.D.A. Compliant parking. >> Mayor Adler: Jimmy. >> Flannigan: In the document that the three of us prepared, we included an element that talked about exploring options for utilizing public parking and right-of-way parking, street parking. To achieve those A.D.A. Complaint -- those A.D.A. Complaint parking opportunities.

[3:33:08 PM]

To be taken on out of -- 2 B taken out of context sound bad. So we wouldn't want to take out -- I don't think anybody is saying that. So it's a better question to say, well, we don't require A.D. Parking on single-family homes or duplexes now so what is the universe in which we require it? And then can we do this in a way where the city looks at street parking and make sure that there is sufficient A.D.A. Complainting to a community while we acknowledge that eliminating parking minimums does not preclude a developer from including parking on their site. I still think there's a conversion to be had about parking maximums or including king in the F.A.R. Or whatever. The thing is I keep going back the Google building with 16 floors of parking just a couple of blocks away from our biggest transit centroid what does that mean and what is the context of that for the larger conversation? I'm more comfortable illustrating the parking requirements -- limiting the parking requirements across the city because the parking is going to get built to the level the market demands it, and but for a parking maximum that's what's going to happen. I think the areas where we might disagree that that will happen is where I would love to know more. So there's been a couple of contexts like there's this neighborhood street and the neighborhood street is an area where this may not work. I kind of want to know the street so I can look at it and think this doesn't happen in my part of town. I want to know about this. We need a lot of examples of parking to understand why to move away from something I currently support, which is eliminating minimums. >> Mayor Adler: Natasha. >> Harper-madison: I believe Ann had her light on before I did. >> Kitchen: You can go ahead. >> Mayor Adler: She did, but she's had lots of chances. >> Harper-madison: Something I would like to add to the document we put together. As a matter of experience

[3:35:10 PM]

when I was -- I spent the better part of a year in a wheelchair and I didn't realize that this was the case until this was my experience. Street parking is free for people with disabilities. So if you have a handicapped placard and/or license plate, you do not have to pay for street parking if it's metered parking. So just to put that out there. A lot of people don't know that and you don't know that until you need it. >> Mayor Adler: Alison? >> Alter: As I understand it for the A.D.A. Part there is some issue with parking on the street because you don't have the way to get out safely. And when you eliminate parking on the corridor there's no place for people to park to access things on the corridor. So I like the way that you framed it sort of how do you solve for this problem as opposed to being very prescriptive about that. I wanted to ask if an issue is here? I think -- an issue is here? I thought she came in. I raised this I think two weeks ago. As I recall in the app which congratulations. >> Thank you. >> Alter: Great job. Staff was studying just about having us not eliminate parking. I wanted to hear a little bit from you about the reasoning behind that approach and staff's view on that. >> Sure. In the strategic mobility plan we talk about parking as it applies to demand management and a congestion management tool. So the policy that we teased up and that was approved by council with the asmp is to be mindful about right-sizing parking and in a context sensitive way. And I know that in a word can mean a lot of different things, but one of the things that we tried to

[3:37:11 PM]

socialize a lot with the asmp public process when you remove minimums it doesn't mean that there will be no parking and council member Flannigan has pointed that over and over again, there are a lot of forces, financial forces and financial institutions and things like that that are -- that will help mold what that context sensitivity looks like in addition to the built environment. So we commit the transportation department staff to working with that policy to right size and what does that mean. And a lot of cases it doesn't mean zero parking, it will mean there's been a lot of discussion in the past process of sidewalk, where there's sidewalks, for example, become important. What existing onstreet parking so there's a lot of different ways that we look at that context sensitivity from both the onstreet safety aspects as well the land use aspects. So that to see there a lot of different context to look in the different parts of the city, older parts of the city, newer parts of the city, but going to less parking and going to maximums instead of minimums is consistent in that right-sizing policy from our plan at all. It's just a matter of exactly that, right sizing it, what does it mean for different parts of the city in different Zones and different areas. So I hope that answered the question of the inherent ambiguity of what was passed in asmp and how that would apply here for consistency. >> Alter: Thank you. I don't necessarily have a solution, but I am concerned about a blanket elimination of parking within a quarter mile of corridors and I know some versions of this have some exceptions for where it would be disruptive and just to someone that there are at least in my district the streets that are off the corridor are very narrow, they don't necessarily -- they certainly don't have sidewalks on both sides and some don't have any

[3:39:11 PM]

Seahawks. And people are already parking because for some reason those draw driveways are not as big as some other driveways so they only have one spot, they don't know why. And so you have parking on both sides of the street, you have no sidewalk and then you can't walk and you can't move in both directions with your cars. So it's really does restrict mobility and to create more of those in the neighborhoods it has a chilling effect on the ability of walk. You don't want to send your kids, you know, to walk over to the park because there's no safe place for them to walk because whether the two cars are trying to get there it becomes an obstacle course. And then these are precisely the places where we're trying to get people to walk to transit. And so if you have disincentives to walk for transit or you're not going to let your kid take the bus because they can't walk through the streets safely and some of this is a function of the older parts of the community. I don't know if it applies everywhere, but there are places where the streets are not as wide as they are in new subdivisions. So it creates a different set of conditions that work against the walkability that we're trying to get precisely in the areas that have the most access to transit or other things so we've had to have residential street parking all over the place and even that doesn't help. And that's just when buildings come in and they don't provide enough parking when they need much less when you say there are shops and stuff going in with no parking at all. And I agree that the market will provide some, but there is a certain amount that the market just says it will spill over and it's no big deal and it does -- at least when we're in North Transition to having high capacity transit that everyone fakes, it is a problem Matt Lick for mobility and safety, which I think are things. So I appreciate that there are the exceptions, but I do wonder if those exceptions are going to be more often the rule. Mayor Adler: Greg?

[3:41:11 PM]

>> Casar: So I support the general sense of the market is going to provide some level of parking so parking requirements generally allow us to overbuild. Parking in a community. In a community where we're trying to get more transit and less car dependency, but if we do go with a compromised position of eliminating parking requirements within a quarter mile of activity centers, our high frequency or our transit priority map and our sensors, then the only modification that I would want to the base recommendation is that the staff in their memo asked if it would be a little more prescriptive about exactly where it is that things could be disruptive and instead of going to the staff language that asks for the staff to not eliminate the parking requirements in places where staff goes and finds that it would be specifically disruptive with all of our input. So ultimately if we go to that promise place of eliminating those parking requirements, just within a quarter mile of those several places, we honestly are probably where we're going to get the transit ridership and the parking reduction we want anyway, my amendment or I would hope that somebody would amend it in the style the staff has asked. >> Mayor Adler: I understand. Jimmy? >> Flannigan: And thus again eliminating parking requirements doesn't eliminate parking, I think we all acknowledge that. It's an interesting example scenario because most of my neighborhoods -- almost all of the neighborhoods in district 6 have really wide neighborhood streets and those also cause a public safety issue because it means that people are speeding. So it's like a damned if you do/damned if you don't situation. So the common thread here is that it's the cars that are making the street unsafe.

[3:43:12 PM]

So rather than, say, look at a challenging situation and conclude that more parking should be required, I would say we need to be getting the sidewalks built as the solution to the problem. But I think it's so much about what the examples are and I'm afraid we're doing the thing again where I'm thinking about street X and someone else is thinking about tree and we're not talking about the same thing. >> Mayor Adler: Pio. >> Renteria: I agree with that. I think that the staff be able to come out and accommodate the A.D.A. Parking space requirement and we are going to need their help in figuring this out. But I still support that they should be the minimum, not the maximum because it's a big waste and it's also increasing the cost development and the affordability and everything else that goes along with it. I'm in support. >> Mayor Adler: I do support making modifications for parking as an incentive for ads as has been discussed before. And if it can be an incentive with respect to house preservation, I'd put that in that area as well as some additional preservation tool. Casar: Mayor? On the A.D.A. Parking issue, I would ask that we try to preserve some level of flexibility for the staff because for example, Capital Studios serves lots of people with a variety of disabilities and they have zero parking because they have -- they are in a different context with their bus line and their location and other things, than so where in a neighborhood versus something on a corridor. So I would really just want to preserve the ability for us to prioritize mobility and housing and accessibility for people with disabilities and recognizing that we want our transportation staff to be able to craft something

[3:45:14 PM]

that works in context as different as a small neighborhood four-plex compared to Capital Studios downtown. >> Flannigan: I would add just again to note kind of what Councilmember Harper-Madison said, there might not be on-site parking at Capital Studios, but there's -- itchen: There's parking, yeah. >> Casar: Yes, but what I mean is there is not on-site A.D.A. Parking. And -- at Capital Studios. So it's less having to do with your comment and more just broadly as we say there should always be an on-site A.D.A. Spot that there are some instances of places where it's serving that community very well and there isn't an on-site A.D.A. Spot, if that makes sense. >> Mayor Adler: Got it. >> Kitchen: Can I speak to that. Yeah, I hear what you're saying. I'll look at that language to that effect. I think it's important to write that in such a way that it would not be the norm what's happened over at Capital Studios is yeah, they can park on the street, but they have to get across in their wheelchairs and take a ramp that is -- there's been a number of accidents on that ramp because that ramp had to be built at more of an angle -- here's an example of more flexibility because of where placement of a tree was. It caused the ramp to be steeper than you would want and there have been accidents there because people are trying to come from the street to the -- so we need to write this -- point is folks need to have a safe way to get into the structure if they're in a wheelchair. >> Mayor Adler: Got it. Paige? >> Ellis: Absolutely. I'm in support of minimizing the need for parking. I think it also is appropriate to mention it gets us in line of our assembly goals of not having single

[3:47:15 PM]

user vehicle trips. If we're going to do that, I have faith that the new code rewrite is going to put us in a place where if you are near transit that you the options to not use your car for everything or some people may not even need to own one, which would be nice for our community to be able to get to a where that's possible. And also with our community climate plan I think it's important to know that this is the direction we're heading and I think we're all generally in agreement about newer modes and newer ways of living that hopefully if we can Tracy that here and look at WHA staff is going to bring back to us that it's going to put us in a really good spot to be able to actually live that out. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Staff, are there other questions or issues that you want to raise with us? Or that you want us to think out or additional direction? It's my intent at this point to abide what the manager asked, which is to ask for a vote on those five questions so at the very least we get those five things done and then we have the far ranging conversation, but I wanted to now if you guys had an hing -- I'll come back. >> Not that we can think of GHT now at this moment. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ann and then Leslie. >> Kitchen: I think we -- I'll ask councilmember pool to go first, but -- >> Mayor Adler: I forgot. >> Kitchen: We have seen additions and I don't think those are outside what the manager was asking for. Mayor Adler: That's fine. >> Kitchen: Go ahead. >> Pool: So I pasedas around-- we've been talking about the district level plan, ago called small area planning. And we were thinking about we could call it district level planning it might reduce some of the confusion that it -- we're not talking about neighborhood planning here, we're talking about larger, but discrete areas of town that are focused on activity centers, activity corridors. And so this is essentially the text that was passed unanimously back in -- I guess it was September of

[3:49:15 PM]

2017 with the criteria for staff to bring us a planning process to determine the district level planning areas. And councilmember kitchen and I have worked pretty hard on extracting this and reformatting it and thinking through the importance of having this as a pnninla addition to our policy direction document to the city manager. So there is one small new piece that is in this document than what you have seen before other than the bl text and the red text which you have seen before. Down at the bottom item number 6 says triggers for plan updates and we're trying to signal how often staff should be prepared and we should be prepared to ensure they have the resources for it to trigger when a small area plan district level plan would be updated. I think that is one of the weaknesses in our planning process at whatever level with our various neighborhood plans and nccds and our contact teams and all of the groups out there that are working on policy documents THA we have together crafted. And when we ask them when we're looking at updating a period of time, usually it's like five years or so. It's not infrequent that they're not able to get that work done because there are other priorities that are out there. So we wanted to indicate that as part of this direction to the city manager staff would explore mechanisms that would get when the plan is updated like demographic changes, infrastructure improvements have been played down and for example, maybe we have bigger storm water horizontal infrastructure which means

[3:51:16 PM]

we can increase density in an area because the flooding may be reduced because we've done a better job of moving it off a site. So that would be a trigger to come back to council with recommendations on how to adjust the district level plans. So Ann may want to speak to this as well, but we were really set on ensuring that this direction was on our document to the city manager. >> Tovo: So I'm just trying to manage the documents. So Ann and Leslie posted some, and the mayor I think made some suggested revisions. >> Mayor Adler: And then what you have was just handed out was the revisions that I added with an additional six -- >> Tovo: So this is the most recent revision -- okay, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Jimmy. >> Flannigan: I still struggle with what you end up with at the end of -- [phone voice]. >> Mayor >> Flannigan: Wow, cut me off, city mayor. I struggle with what the conclusion of this process looks like and what it actually does because we already -- we already have like sidewalk master plans and bicycle master plans and other things that cover the city. So -- and kind of reasonably speaking. I don't imagine many ever these are these are going to make it out to the edge of town that I represent, but it doesn't mean there's no value here. I'm just struggling to understand what's laid out here sounds fine, I just don't know what the conclusion of the planning process is and what it accomplishes. >> Kitchen: Would you like me to speak to that? Here's my thought on it. So I don't think it's useful

[3:53:16 PM]

if it's just a plan that sits on the shelf. So my thought is it's useful to help the -- help direct what the city can direct. We're limited, the market impacts a lot of this, but we do have tools that we use to support how an area is built or how it develops. So to my mind and for example would we have a number of different activity centers that have been proposed by imagine Austin. So you could do a plan of one of those areas about what that might look like in line with our city goals and then you use that plan to help us direct the investments we control at the city level, whether these are affordable housing investments, other kinds of investments, parks investments, transportation investments, investments in, to see where we're spending our dollars. The other thing would be to think about how we do economic development. And so for example, one of the things that is coming back to us is when we revamped our economic development program asked a map-based one to go back to us so we could use incentive dollars in particular places where we wanted to support small businesses or create space or things like that. So the point from my perspective is that if we want to achieve a goal on how to have places, like activity centers, then we need to take it a step further to say more than this is nice for an activity center. And we have tools as a city to make that happen. We can't go all the way there because the market controls a lot, but we can do some things. And then examples that we

[3:55:17 PM]

have already of this planning is things like the statesman property, I forget what we call that area, but that's a planning area for what that might look like. There are some other examples throughout the city where this has been done. This has been used in other cities to help you get to where you want to go from how you want your land use to be. So that's how I see it it being useful. I think that one of the things we don't have in our city is that planning is not a tool that we are using to the best -- we're really not using planning in a way that we could for our city. So that's what I mean by that. And it does -- it occurs all over the city. For example far south Austin, that's a proposed activity center in the Manchaca/slaughter area. I would love to have a conversation about what that could develop into so that it could become an activity center. And that's a matter of planning that area. I've got an area even further south than that that's been proposed as an activity area. So I think that -- I think it's an important tool that we don't have right now. And then what we end up doing with it is up to us as a city to actually make it work. But just because -- but I don't think -- well, I think it's an important tool for us to have. I'll leave it at that. >> Flaigan: It's so strange how I just have this block. I don't understand exactly what it does. So maybe a good idea would be for you and I to sit down and take an example area that's kind of not a most controversial spot that we would probably pick and just think through what that might look like. And I would say to the extent that you listed a bunch of stuff here I am probably more likely to support prioritizing areas like you've got in 2-b-5 areas that are in the

[3:57:17 PM]

gentrification displacement study and finds areas where gentrification is a primary factor and displacement and opposed to just areas -- later you've got -- in 3, those most susceptible to change, which is a much bigger area as opposed to just -- so I think that may be getting farther to the ways if we're thinking about it through an equity lens. >> Kitchen: I think these were just suggested areas. And there's a whole other step in actually identifying the areas. This was -- these were suggested. >> Pool: If I could just weigh in on it. I agree that gentrification and displacement study absolutely, and we've named it in here because I think that should be a starting point. And we can look to see what area is in early stages of just displacement and gentrification so that we can apply some tools and maybe stop it or reverse it. So yeah. >> Mayor Adler: Natasha? >> Harper-Madison: I think Jimmy probably spoke to my confusion already. So when you and councilmember Kitchen meet I'd like to be there as well because I also don't understand the practical application of WHAs being suggested here. It seems counterintuitive to not just zone the whole city, you know, the same way. So I'd like to also be a part of y'all's conversation. And I think in some ways you guys both have the institutional knowledge that I don't quite have yet that will be helpful for me. >> Kitchen: And that is not instead of zoning the city. This is in addition to what you might do with your base zoning for the city. It's not instead of. >> Harper-Madison: No. And that wasn't how I interpreted it, but it does seem to me as though having two separate classifications would probably be a problem. So here's the base zoning and in addition to that we do this, this, this. >> Kitchen: It wouldn't be separate classifications either. >> Pool: An example might be knowing what schools have in our zoning areas and we can apply them in a

[3:59:18 PM]

different configuration in this district level plan to support that's a transit hub and there's a regional center or something like that. We're using what we already have crafted and then showing how it applies rather larger but yet discrete area, not as small as a neighborhood. It would be an assortment of neighborhoods that are kind of a coherent part of the city. So to help all this, that's one reason why we wanted so to help in this, we wanted the city manager to come back to give some input on how we might go about doing but we wanted to get this piece that, again, we had talked out in 2017, as being an essential element to getting the zoning plan properly on the ground. So it's an additional tool to help us know how areas are growing and what zoning should be there. We're not creating new zoning. I don't think I've helped you at all. >> Harper-Madison: No. [Laughter] >> Pool: I do think this is something that we should have maps in front of us and kind of study the areas of town that would be a little more easier -- >> Mayor Adler: Do you want to talk to planning? >> Yeah, with planning and zoning, I'm manager of long range planning. Thank you for having me here this afternoon. I wanted to kind of provide a little bit of update of what the planning and zoning department has been working on in terms of looking towards future ways of doing small area planning. Since 2017 and when the resolution that's been referenced was passed that basically directed staff to approach small area planning in a different way than we've in the past. The resolution in 2017 was basically asking us to pivot and begin focusing small area planning resources on centers and corridors in those areas of the city that we know are probably going to be changing and we ought to be focusing resources

[4:01:20 PM]

around and ought to be putting planning in place in locations where it could leverage city investments and mobility in transit. In May of last year, we provided a relatively lengthy memo to city council a planning commission that began to outline sort of a process for pivoting and beginning to develop small area plans along corridors and centers, outlined that a planning product type that we'd be delivering in the future. District plan is a nice name for also but we've just been calling them small area plans focused on centers and corridors at this point. We've actually teased up, I believe, to bring a request for council action to you all at your May 5th meeting that would initiate a pilot planning process along the north Lamar corridor. Staff's notion is that we would suggest piloting this new planning process along a particular corridor, taking the data that comes from that pilot to use as lessons learned for how we move forward with future plans as we kind of move into this new arena of planning that is going to be different from how we've done neighborhood plans in the past. We want to make sure that we really are gathering the data and doing that -- doing that well, starting off slowly within the north Lamar corridor and using those lessons learned as we move to future areas. In terms of the -- sort of the information that has been laid out, I think it fits really nicely both with the draft resolution that you will be seen initiating -- or asking you to consider initiating a pilot, small area plan along the north Lamar corridor, has a lot of this information and even that resolution, so we'd be asking council to direct us to develop a plan along that corridor that addresses a lot of the key policy concerns that are kind of listed under the objective piece in the document that you all have laid out. We're also in the process of developing scoring of all of the

[4:03:21 PM]

other imagine Austin centers and corridors, particularly those that either a plan for high capacity transit under the project connect vision, or that -- and/or that have received investments under the 2016 mobility bond. We're in the process of scoring those along criteria that pretty much match up directly with what you have described in your planning process, and would anticipate bringing back to the council at some point a map that basically shows staff's recommendation for kind of high, medium, low priority areas based on those criteria. We won't be ready by the 5th for that information, but probably not too far off of the timeline and resources are really tied together. We are envisioning the small area planning process along corridors. Would hopefully be somewhat quicker than some of our neighborhood planning processes in the past, with about a 12 to 18 months of active planning in those processes. But the resources piece is a significant piece to kind of timeline in how quickly we can move through the plans under our current staffing resources. We expect that we could do one to two plans simultaneously, so that breaks down to the best case scenario under current staffing and resources for the department, that would be two plans per year or two plans per 18 months, kind of best case. And that may 11th memo from last year that I referenced, we actually provided some analysis of kind of what an additional even as many as ten fte would still only produce the ability to develop four plans here year, which is, you know, obviously roughly 20 plans over a yearly basis. We've got over a hundred centers and corridors combined, so if there's a vision for being able to develop plans for every single center and corridor that's been identified on the imagine Austin map, that obviously could take a while, with those resources and with even a pretty huge addition to existing resources. And I think that -- and then community engagement, I just wanted to emphasize the proposal

[4:05:22 PM]

that you all will receive in terms of a resolution to initiate a pilot planning process along the corridor, absolutely 100% in agreement with description of community engagement under this document. This would be moving away from the neighborhood planning paradigm that we've used in the past where our engagement has been kind of primarily participation of adjacent property owners, tends to be kind of hard to get renters involved, and pivoting to a priority where we engage those folks but also engage transit riders, folks that make coming into the corridor to use it, folks that may be working in the corridor and people that may want to live in the corridor but can't, as well as kind of thinking about citywide interests, so the community engagement for that pilot will definitely be in line with what's kind of been laid out in this document. >> Mayor Adler: My hope is that there's a third way here, in terms of being able to get a lot more planning done, a lot more quickly. And I don't know what that means. I don't know if that means restructuring what it is that is the planning or how that comes out, but it just seems as if so many of the conversations we're having around the city with respect to affordability get us back to a planning conversation, or making sure the transit work gets us back to a planning conversation. So many things seem to get there. You know, I know that Denver, when it did its code, came out of

thatroce P with planning process that's very different from what they had going into it. I don't know if there are other places to look at, but obviously, two plans a year won't substantially get us to WHE we need to go. Four plans a year really doesn't substantially get us to where we need to go. And I don't know what the alternative is. I don't --on't now what the third way is, but it's -- I'd love for us to T T figure out a way to do more planning, recognizing it's going to take

[4:07:22 PM]

more resources or a different way to look at planning. I'm not sure. Alison. >> Alter: I want to thank Ann and Leslie for bringing this forward and an earlier version of the proposals. I think it's R critical as we move forward. We are setting some audacious goals about capacity, I'm not sure I'm totally on board on those, but what I do believe is that we have an opportunity by different tools up the capacity over time, and planning is one of those tools. So we don't have to, from the get-go, have all the capacity we ever need to have and you have this land development code. Planning allows us to increase that capacity over time where we want it, where we have goals, where we want it, and so that's why if you take imagine Austin and then you plan in the areas that weren't all right when imagine Austin was passed, to be developed, but many more of them are now, but we don't have the planning infrastructure for those places to really allow them to thrive in some of the ways that some other parts of town have which are all part of a planning process, so for instance, if you took sections on a corridor that had a bunch of warehouses of a high proportion area, they were considered a desirable place to live, you could go in and do a planning process and say, hey, we don't want warehouses on our corridor, we want housing, and you could at that point go and figure out, if I give them a whole bunch of entitlements, residential, if they want to take advantage of them, can I tip that balance and make it be residential, which is what we want as a city. You also can have the public process happen with the community and then you understand really what's needed, what are the pieces that are needed in order to make it work, and you can allocate public resources with

[4:09:23 PM]

respect to sidewalks and other stuff so that they support the project, and they're not piecemeal. So for me, it's really important we have staff who have trained in planning, it is very valuable. I think sometimes through the codenext process and how we've set this up, we've lost sight of the importance of planning and importance of context sensitivity, so I'm excited to see this be part of what we do in the future. And we've done it a lot in the past. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? E all right. Ann? >> Kitchen: The -- >> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. >> Kitchen: Addition number 2 -- well, I'm not going to go through it all. We've already talked about affordability. I just suggest that you take a look at it. And there are two items that I didn't include on them -- on this that are in the blueprint, but I didn't include them because they're already in the base document. And that relates to the ads and I'm forgetting what the other one was now. But in any case, this is designed to build upon what's already in answer to the 1 to 5. So that's why the ads aren't specifically mentioned in there because they've already been talked about. I would ask if anybody has concerns

that you don't want to go forward with any of these, or if you have questions about any of it, if you'd let me know, you can post on the message board. Because again, I pulled these from the house blueprint. I think the things that -- my impression is that they are -- they are policies that we've already approved, we want to make sure they've happened. If you have any concern about any of them, if you let me know, that would be great.

[4:11:25 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Greg, Kathie. >> Casar: I think -- it was a quick scan, but the only place I noticed I had questions, exactly how bedroom requirements end up working. I don't know if we've seen those before so I'd be interested in what the options might be or just getting those, but it's in the blueprint, so I think it's something we should look at. Second, this goes back to the longer conversation we had earlier on missing middle housing. The housing blueprint says we should develop affordable housing bonuses that go along with some of our missing middle zones, and that's -- what you pulled is from section that says that. Let's come up with some small scale housing bonuses. Which I've been in past resolutions supportive of, but what I don't want is for this to say that the only way you can ever build missing middle housing is by participating in affordable housing bonus program because much of the missing middle houses we've just touted during this work session was just built without an affordable housing bonus program. It is great, especially now that it's a little bit older. So I want the opportunity to create some that is just around, that is just good, and then also for us to have some income restricted ones through targeted programs and not lose sight of having both of those as options. >> Kitchen: Okay. That's what's intended here. >> Casar: Let's just make sure it's clear. >> Kitchen: I think it's clear, but if you read something that tells you it's not clear, just let me know. Also, the other thing is, this is designed, as is direction to the city manager to bring back options, so it's not -- this language does not set how something would be done, it's asking the city manager to bring back options to include in the code. So... >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Kathie. >> Tovo: I'm supportive -- I need to look a little more closely at these documents, especially the second one. I'm pretty familiar with the planning one because it's gone through several iterations.

[4:13:26 PM]

I'm supportive of including that as direction. Again, I think I'm generally supportive of the other one, I just need to look at it a little more closely. I think there was some back and forth about how this would be incorporated, and I think there was a suggestion, mayor, possibly from you about including it as a budget rider? Am I mixing that up with some other -- anyway, there was some -- I would just suggest we not include it as a budget rider. I'm prepared to support it as part of the answers that we give back to the city manager. >> Kitchen: Yeah, this is intended to be turned into actual code language. >> Tovo: Yes. >> ChK: These are the things that relate to the code. >> Tovo: And I support that. Just because there was a comment out there about riders, I just wanted -- to say I wanted to keep it with the planning. >> Mayor Adler: I think what I said, I thought the broad principles fit really well in a land development code. The specific criteria I'm not sure fit in the code, and I reserved the opportunity to take a look at it to see if

there's something that fit in the criteria manual, expo as opposed toomet sng that was in the land development code. But I haven't H a chance to go back andook L that again. Jimmy? Ok. Kathie? >> Tovo: Super important question. He we hav a lot of different documents. Are we operating under the continued assumption that we are making amendments to that -- what was it, April 11th-13th document? >> Mayor Adler: The answer to that is yes. I may very well take a stab at another document, and if it's helpful, then we can use it, and if it's not, then we won't. But the default is that we'll make amendments to the document that was supposed to -- three weeks ago, whatever that was. >> Tovo: I think that may be the easiest. I like the idea of proceeding along even if we have lots of amendments to consider, proceeding along with the same document that we're all familiar with. >> Kitchen: Yeah. I'd like to suggest that we know right now that that's what we're going to amend.

[4:15:27 PM]

And, you know, mayor, if you have other suggestions, then you can bring it as an amendment. But I think we should keep the same -- >> Mayor Adler: It would be brought as an amendment if I did it. >> Kitchen: Right, so that we're not trying to understand where we're starting from, and also so the public will understand. >> Mayor Adler: I understand. >> Kitchen: So can we get a time certain? What did we decide? >> Mayor Adler: We're going to do it as soon as we can. >> Kitchen: I think the public needs to understand when they should be there. >> Mayor Adler: I think we have a meeting that's open, that's been open for us be able to do it, so if I was to say a time certain, I would say if we can tee it up before we take citizen communication, fto bs able to talk through issues, we'll do that. If we can't, hopefully we'll be able to take it up after lunch. We have some zoning cases and two of them look like they could be something that's discussed. I'm not sure about that. But I think we can tell the public that we're not going to end before a certain time. I just don't want us to -- to preclude us from being able to Ta through issues. >> Kitchen: I understand tt, but this is a huge issue for the public, and we've actually, since last Friday, we've put some really new specific stuff on the table that's after the last opportunity that people had to comment. And so I think it's just easier for them if we say THA we're going to start at a CIN time. >> Mayor Adler: My only thought was to keep itpen because that would give people the greatest amount of time to be able to talk, but I'm fine with the council doing -- to limiting it and saying they can't talk before a certain time or limiting it and saying they can't talk after a certain time. I think I wouldn't agree with that, but to WVER degree the council wants to limit when people can talk, we certainly can do that. Jimmy. >> Flannigan: I'd prefer giving the public as manyions as possible and we can say, allow folks who are there befe noon if they'd like toak,pe and we'll allow folks who are there before dinner to speak T iy'd like to speak, then if we're still going, then we're still going, but I don't want to set up a situation where only the people

[4:17:28 PM]

who can come to city hall after 4:00 P.M. Are the ones who got to speak. >> Kitchen: But that's not what I'm talking about at all. People want to hear when we're talking about something. So they want to know

when we're going to start talking about something, as much as we can possibly estimate. And I know we don't know for sure. >> Flannigan: I'm sorry to interrupt, but are you saying people want to hear us deliberate before or they have an opportunity to speak? >> Kitchen: I'm not saying either one of those. I think people want to know when we're going to take it up from a deliberation standpoint. >> Flannigan: I'm comfortable with the fact we broadcast and save the video archive in perpetuity. My constituents have a very difficult time coming to city hall. If it's just about observing the debate and hearing the debate, that's going to be archived. >> Kitchen: I think that people would like for us to listen to what they have to say, since they haven't had an opportunity to comment on a lot of this. So I know it's difficult to set a time. And I know I'm not offering a solution, so I'll think about that. I just -- I just think that they're part of this process too, and I'm going to think about what -- what the best way is to address what they might need to hear. >> Tovo: My sense is, we'll have people who can only come and dress this after dinner. Is that other people's sense of this? And so I would -- you know, I think about it before Thursday as well, but my guess would be the one good option would be to take them earlier as they want to, but to make sure we have some opportunity after dinner to let them speak as well. >> Mayor Adler: That's what we did last meeting, and I would do that again. Tovo: Is that kind of our plan? >> Mayor Adler: I know we've had some where people come on a lunch break, before 1 o'clock, or people can speak before they pick

[4:19:29 PM]

up their kids from day care. I think there's different time slots that work for people. My understanding is we're probably going to be talking about 24 for most of the meeting, so I'd hate to delay it until dinner and be on break all day. >> Mayor Adler: I think if we do the way we did it last time, we're not going to take any action until after dinner, and people who show up after dinner will be given the ability to be able to speak before we take action. Greg. >> Casar: Does that mean we won't be voting on amendments between potentially the first thing in the morning and all the way until the last speaker is done speaking? It's just if we've got, like, potentially dozens of amendments to vote on, I don't remember exactly how we laid out last time. Lyal remember that we laid out the public testimony really for the first shot, then we were going to have used the rest of the public testimony we have to craft amendments, then start voting on them. If the vote somebody can come early after dinner and we get a couple hours of people, are we going to start voting on amendments at 9:30 at night. I imagine there's a majority here that thinks. So I would prefer maybe to set -- if we're going to have speakers -- when people asked me when they should speak, I told them the first meeting, maybe I heard that, but I told them if you want to talk on this, this is the meeting to talk on it because they're voting the next meeting. But if the impression was or fact that we told people you can speak at both, which I'm conceding that may have happened, I don't remember it, and if we did, then that's fine, people can talk. Then I would say let's have two slots for speakers, two specific discrete times, but that we're going to be discussing and voting and taking amendments throughout the day because we're not going to do a good job of it -- I imagine most people would tell us do a better job than taking all the vote at 1:00 in the morning. At least if I was a constituent, that's what I would come and tell us. >> Mayor Adler: That's a good point, too. What do people think?

[4:21:34 PM]

Jimmy? >> Flannigan: Take the testimony throughout the day, but we've got to get T work. I mean, I think that's what we've got to do. And as T mayor pro tem has said fairly eloquently and repeatedly, we have heard a lot from the community, but forew things that are being proposed,ut also those are things that we talked about either in public or other places before, so I think we've just got to get to work and not leave ourselves in a place where we're deliberating at 10:00 and 11:00 and 12 o'clock at night. >> Mayor Aer: Leslie? >> Pool: Can you remind me what number this is on our agenda for Thursday? >> 11. >> Pool: 11. Okay. And it's not on consent; right? >> Mayor Adler: It was 11. >> Pool: So usually what we do -- >> Mayor Adler: I say that, I don't know that's true. It was - >> Pool: I was just thinking with the lower number, that would mean we take it up earlier rather than later, and if W signal that toeth community, then let them know that once we're doneith consent, the things that we have to stop for, our zoning, I guess, which is at 2 o'clock, citizen communication at 12 o'clock, so it sounds to me like justy B its placement on the agenda, it would come up earlier rather than later. And I don't know how to deal with dire ING people to come earlier because their schedules really compel them rather than ours, but I do think that bringing up amendments, which we have talked thugh pretty extensively today two weeks ago at our work session, we -- it may not be as heavy a lift to vote in vus amendments that we've kind of rehearsed today and two weeks ago, THA we think, although itch --although I haven't seen all of them yet. But just knowing what's in here, I think we allave H a pretty good idea which way we're going to go and we may not need too much back and forth debate on it so maybe

[4:23:35 PM]

it will work out okay without trying to -- >> Mayor Adler: We also -- >> Pool: Als >> Mayor Adler: We also have the ability to change our vote, if someone brings something up and we think we really want to reconsider that one, just take the majority of the people, the same majority it would take to change something, in order to be able to reconsider a vote we took earlier in they. Okay. So we're goi to start considering this as we're able to consider. We're going to take people as they come. And I would suggest that we come back after dinner to give people a chance to be able to sak,pe but we'll start voting on amendments, and if we vote on something earlier in the day that people want to change their mind on, we'll entertain that and enable that to Happe with that, it's 4:25. The meeting is -- I'm sorry. >> Harper-madison: I just got here so I don't know what's customary. I was going to let y'all work that out but I did have some questions and crnscebout this dition number 2 on affordable housing, that minimum bedroom quirements, and then prioritize areas close to high performing schools, both of those make my nses go off. I have several schools am my district that are not high rforming, so I don't want those families to be excluded. And then the requirement for bedroom numbers. I'd like for us to be able to talk through that some and just sort of talk about what the implicationsf that could be for -- I mean, everybody in the city of Austin but most especially the constituents that I'm -- you know -- >> Kitchen: That makes sense. I was reflecting what's in the blueprint, but I get your point. I'm happy to change that about the high perfocean schools. I don't remember all the conversations about why this ended up the way it was in the blueprint. But I get youoint.

[4:25:35 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Kathie? >> Tovo: Sorry. Where is that point? >> Kitchen: It's in a. >> Tovo: Oh, there you go. Okay. Okay. And so I know that, couilmember kitchen, were you saying that re going to revise the multibedroom? >> Kitchen: No, I was talking about the highformance school part. >> Tovo: Okay. I know we've had conversations about this and we're not in all agreement, but in my opinion I think we need to provide -- the market is not providing T option of multi-bedroom U ,and I think that we need to do more -- I believe we need to do more in oureod to encourage/require it becau again, the market it providing that, and there are many families in Austin with children or caregivers who are really -- who need that option. So -- >> Harper-madison: Which I appreciate, but'd like to encourage better than irreent. Requirement to me sounds like a mandate, which sounds almost punitive, the result, ifou don't comply, it's punishment, in which case I don't want to disincentivize developers. It's the word specifically, ui"rment" that has -- I don't like "Requirements," necsarily as it pertains to multiple bedrooms, if for no other reason, like you said, we don't all necessarily agree about what families need, what's culturally appropriate, what's frankly decadent forome of the families that I work with to have amu iple bedroom situation. And we're probably never going to find ourselves in consensus there, in which case we don't ve to, but requiment I- struggle with that. >> Tovo: Yeah. I don't know how to resolve that because we just -- again, the market is not producing it, and we can encourage it and have it in planning documents all we want, but we're, for the most part, not getting multi-bedroom

[4:27:35 PM]

market ratenits or affordable units, for THA matter. So -- you know,nd I think back to a situation that actually was in district 10, but my office was involved because we had a personal relationship with one of theeople reaching out on behalf of the community members, and there were many families who were going to be displaced fro an apartment complex up in the far west area, and there were families who needed multiple bedrooms, and my staff member, Ashley, called lots and lots of apartment complexes trying to find an affordable rental rate with at least three bedrooms. And there were all kinds of issues, including the ft that the apartment complex itself was under new ownership, and they wouldn't allow a family of that size to be in a two-bedroom apartment. So trying to find a three-bedroom apartment that was affordably priced was near impossible. So I think there are families in our community at various income levels who want that option. And if the market is not providing I I don't know how we get there. So I't know. Let's have more conversation about it and see if the'sre somewhere where -- you know, how do we -- how do we get the market to produce this, if we're -- yeah I know, that's just the question. Theuandary. And we've been in the quandary for a long time and haven't made any resolution to it. But thanks for your perspective on it. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? 4:30 this meeting is adjourned.

