

## City Council Special Called Meeting Transcript – 8/28/2019

Title: City of Austin

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 8/28/2019 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 8/28/2019

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[3:03:45 PM]

>>> >> >>> >> >>>

>> Mayor Adler: All right. We have a quorum present. Today is August 28th, 2019. This special called session here in boards and commissions room. It is 3:04. This is to discuss the land development code revisions. We're going to go ahead and recognize you. I think what we're going to try to do is get through the entire presentation, hold questions until the end, that way we make a video

[3:04:45 PM]

record if somebody wants to just get on there and see what the presentation was, they have the opportunity to do that and then we'll ask questions at the end of this this. I'll turn it over to you. Again, I want to just say thanks. The purpose of these meetings is to try to daylight some of the stuff that you're going in response to -- that you're doing in response to the direction that the council gave to staff early they are spring. But just so that people in community can see what you're working on and how you're translating that direction into your work.

>> Thank you, mayor. Good afternoon, councilmembers. Anik Beaudet, I am co-lead on the project of the land development code revision. And I'm here today, we have our consultant Peter park co-presenting with us today, as well as lacy Peterson and Greg Dutton from the planning and zoning department. So we're just going to jump right into it. We like to always start with

[3:05:45 PM]

our project schedule that was released late July, and with a stop here at the special called work session today on. On the 28th I will note that we have also added and confirmed another special called work session to work through and socialize the work that we're doing in response to council's direction on may 2nd. That will be, again, September 11th. And then we will also be able to brief you all on progress

at your regular called work session on September 17th. And the planning commission is scheduled to have their public hearing October 26th, moving into November with council's public hearing potentially in early November, and then moving towards first reading in December. So again an overview of the schedule. As we finish the presentation I will bring this slide up again to go over some pertinent next steps related to the month of October. October is going to be a

[3:06:46 PM]

very busy month with regard to public participation. So I will bring the slide up again at the end of the presentation and talk through details there for you all and also for the public. So our agenda for today is really three topics. We're going to start with our methodology and approach in service to your direction on the approach to transition areas, including compatibility. We're going to talk a bit about our approach to downtown and how we're treating downtown, and then also parking. So with that I'm going to hand over the transition discussion to start with Peter park.

>> Good afternoon, Peter park, I'm a consultant working with the staff. Happy to be with you this afternoon. So -- I'm so sorry, I didn't realize you already advanced the slide. So we're going to start with the transition areas and we want to clarify several

[3:07:48 PM]

things about transition areas. Our working definition of the transition areas. And sort of the use of terms because sometimes people say transition Zones, sometimes they say transition areas. We're trying to be very clear that with the transition area we mean where the missing middle Zones would be applied. To provide the transition from the corridor to the residential neighborhoods. And so as -- in previous presentations our slide format is to start with a council direction and speak to how the current code deals with these. We'll address some potential revisions and the had most important thing, what is the effect of the change. So council directed to new missing middle housing in transition areas adjacent to activity centers, activity corridors or priority network. Under the current code as you all know, you don't have

[3:08:48 PM]

transition areas, you don't have Zones that we describe as missing middle Zones necessarily. So therefore the current code doesn't really provide sufficient opportunity for missing middle housing. This has been discussed a lot in the past. And also under the current code there aren't affordability bonus in most neighborhoods. That mechanism has a way of leveraging more affordability, does not exist in most neighborhoods. In draft 3, draft 3 introduced missing middle Zones with the affordable housing bonus.

And missing middle Zones were applied -- in draft 3 they were only applied where current Zones would allow multiunit development, right? Or where they were recommended in neighborhood plans. So that's how draft 3 dealt with introducing missing middle Zones to Austin.

[3:09:48 PM]

And under the potential revisions, what the staff has been working with is applying the missing middle Zones per the council direction, in transition areas based on what we're describing as a data driven and a context sensitive approach, and we'll describe that in a second. So the effect would be to increase the missing middle housing along in corridors, everyone's priority. And that the missing middle housing would provide those transitions from fronting corridors to lower density residential areas. And this would in turn support your 50/50 mode share goal to make your transit objectives more effective. So there are two aspects of transition areas that we want to really clarify.

[3:10:48 PM]

Let's say the transition areas, we describe it as a cumulative approach. Cumulative approach based on the council direction. So the council direction was to -- that the LDC should map properties for missing middle housing in transition areas that meet some or all of the following criteria. Entitlements in length of transition area should be relatively more or less intense for areas that meet more or fewer of the criteria listed below. So number one located on a transit priority network or imagine Austin centers or corridor. Two, located in the urban core. Three, has a well connected street grid and four, located in high opportunity as defined in the enterprise opportunity 360 index. So it was really the cumulative incidents of these criteria that the staff have been using to determine go two lots deep or five lots deep.

[3:11:49 PM]

So the more of the criteria present the more that the transition zone would be mapped towards five lots deep. And so to illustrate this, here's sort of a sample configuration of typical urban condition where -- along the corridor, the fronting parcels are indicated in the red and the lower density residential areas would be indicated in the yellow. So you never knew that counting to five could be kind of complicated, right? You know, the thing is in Austin you have a lot of varied patterns. So this is why we want to make really clear what the methodology is for how to count to five. So you can see here part of

[3:12:51 PM]

the council direction, the fronting parcel in red on the left side on the corridor and then counting one, two, three, four, five parcels back defines sort of this depth of where the transition area is, where the missing middle Zones would be applied, right? In the case where, for example, autism our criteria are present -- all four criteria of present. That's how staff has understood when to map five deep. So, for example, here what you see is the mapping of the fronting zone on the corridor. The first two lot depth are mapped the more intensive missing middle zone and the next three would be mapped the less intensive missing middle zone, which would be from the corridor front to

[3:13:52 PM]

the lower residential densities. This is the typical methodology in terms of how to count to five. In cases where the criteria are not as present, this is how you count to two, right, which is really going back two lots from the corridor. And again, the missing middle zone that allows more intensity, would be number one, the missing middle zone that allows less intensity of missing middle housing is two and then it goes to the single-family residential zone. So that's sort of the cumulative approach. So the depth, the two to five are the criteria that are present. And that as a mapping tool is actually something that can be done in gis. These criteria are mappable and so I'm not going to say it's automatic by any means,

[3:14:53 PM]

but it is mappable using the tool gis. So that's one way to sort of do the first stage of work. The next stage is a contextual approach. The council direction was the length and level of entitlement transition area should be substantially reduced in vulnerable areas identified in the UT gentrification study regardless of the number of criteria met above. And the city manager shall also use the following conditions as appropriate when mapping transition areas, otherwise of blocks relative to corridors, residential blocks sided by main street or mixed use lots. Bounded by other Zones, use or environmental features, drainage considerations, and whether it's most appropriate to split zone or not split zone. I can say with regard to last one in general, Pratt that's being followed is not creating split zoning. You don't need to do that anymore if you're going to

[3:15:54 PM]

have transition Zones. So that's just not part of the approach. But what is important is to recognize that when we're talking about contextual approach, this is a little bit more of a-- I guess the best way is a hand crafted way of making the map. Of understanding what are the contextual conditions as you get down to making decisions and applying some judgment with regard to some of it these considerations. So under the current code some existing situations. Under the current code you have single-family Zones often directly adjacent to the commercial corridor. There's this district adjacency and proximity.

And another situation that you have today is when you're trying to provide missing middle opportunities, because you don't have the Zones and because the maps are not really zoned that way, it generally requires a rezoning and then it's a by

[3:16:55 PM]

lot sort after reactive process rather than a proactive approach to actually providing opportunities for more diverse housing in the form of missing middle. So in draft 3, draft 3 didn't include transition areas because we didn't have the direction that we do now. And also it didn't have the benefit of the recent in-depth gentrification data and studies such as the UT gentrification study. So the approach that the staff are using now is mapping transition areas based on context and we'll describe a little bit about what that's about. And also reducing the length and level of transition in areas susceptible to displacement guided by the uprooted study. So the effect is a much morphine tuned application of transition Zones based on context and the missing middle where context supports transitions.

[3:17:55 PM]

So going back to the context here, in this case here's those five when we're hitting on all three cylinders, this is what five lots deep would look like. In the case where we don't meet all the four T gets dialed back to two. In the cases of -- in the case of areas vulnerable to displacement, for example, it definitely gets dialed back to two in terms of the length or the depth of the transition area. And also -- and the color will change here, the less intensive missing middle Zones would be used to be mapped there. To map those transition Zones both less deep and with the less intensive missing middle zone. And so what we're really talking about here then is energy counting the five lots and developing the

[3:18:55 PM]

methodology for counting five lots, this is defining kind of the transition area or the depth of the transition area. And with that I'm going to hand it over to lacy and she's going to explain a little bit more about what some of these things mean. >>

>> Good afternoon, council, lacy Patterson with planning and zoning. Thank you, Peter, for that explanation. So now we get to the fun stuff. So as he said, Peter said, this is kind of the transition, our missing middle Zones defining the transition area. We use this transition area because blocks are often perpendicular or have different orientations off the corridor. And we don't always see this -- a parallel grid system. So these transition area depths are applied to properties for consistency.

[3:19:58 PM]

With this process the amount of lots included in the transition area does vary. In most cases, though, the depth of the ranges of the transition area could be from 500 to 700 feet, but never extend over 850 feet from the fronting property, the front of the corridor. Moving forward,. So there are many instances where the corridor lots are depose can see on the slide. In this places the transition area does not extend further. So in other words, the lot count does not restart and the transition area depth remains consistent. Connectivity to the corridor is also factored. Thousand the lots are adjacent to -- though the lots are adjacent to the corridor lots on the right of the slide, and within the

[3:21:00 PM]

transition area they're not -- so they are -- so they are adjacent to the corridor property and sided by the corridor, but not connected to the corridor, so they do not have a missing middle zone applied. There are those properties that are sighted there in the middle of the large lot, and they will they will. There will be heirs with transition constraints, for example where there is a floodplain and properties are encumbered with different building standards. Transition areas and missing middle Zones or new missing middle Zones are not applied to these areas. So the depth of the transition area is not the limiting factor, but it's the presence of an environmental constraint. I'll go ahead and give it back to Peter so we can talk about capability.

[3:22:00 PM]

>> So lacy mentioned on this slide in this case on the right side showing that transition area. So you see there's a cul-de-sac of residential. Those would trigger compatibility because a transition zone -- sorry. A missing middle Zones weren't applied. The transition area is not established. So in this case those adjacencies, the residential would in fact trigger compatibility on this larger commercial site. And that's really the primary situation where compatibility would be triggered. So with regard to compatibility, council provided direction that lots adjacent to parcels fronting an activity corridor will be mapped with a zone that does not trigger compatibility and that could provide a step down from the zone from

[3:23:01 PM]

the parcel fronting on an activity corridor. The next bullet says the same thing, the revised map shall eliminate the compatibility.

[Reading]. Will not trigger compatibility, will be in scale with any residential house scale zone, which is again what the missing middle Zones would do with regard to the compatibility. And then in general, consideration -- consider revisions that minimize the impact of compatibility standards on properties facing transportation corridors, particularly in relation to shallow lots. So under the current code, and this had been discussed a lot in previous discussions, the current code compatibility method is rather unpredictable and inconsistent because it is based on a use. So if there's a single-family use, even if that use is in a

[3:24:02 PM]

multi-family zone, that use will trigger such expression on the corridor so there are two aspects about it. There's a kind of complexity and inconsistency about that. It's also a very long reach of suppression, of 540 feet. And so what happens then is that the current compatibility standards and the current code restrictive covenants height and unit yield quite often, specifically on the corridor where you're trying to grow more opportunities. In draft 3, compatibility was based on zone adjacency only. And the length of the compatibility area was also reduced. So this was moving a little bit closer to what is typical practice in these kind of compatibility standards. And the majority of the corridors were still affected by compatibility

[3:25:03 PM]

and again became very, very significant when you had a shallow lot. In terms of the reduction of development on the corridor. Sue with the council direction the staff is mapping new transition areas with the missing middle Zones that don't trigger compatibility on each other or they don't -- and they don't trigger compatibility on the fronting parcels on the corridor. So the effect here, the result is that you will have a much more consistent and predictable way that compatibility is applied compared to the way you have today, and again, the effect will increase the buildable capacity on the corridors. So next we'd like to move on to downtown zoning. We've been doing different benchmark testing on all the Zones, but there's some things that we're learning and Greg is going to share some of the findings and some of the approaches that we have for downtown zoning.

>> Thank you, Peter.

[3:26:04 PM]

Greg Dutton, planning and zoning. So I'm going to pivot for a minute to downtown. Council gave us some direction about downtown and it's up on the screen. I'm just going to read true it. Code and map revisions should maximize potential for employment and residential units within downtown in

accordance with the downtown Austin plan and the guidance in this document with affordable housing benefits included and calibrated. And then second piece of direction, the application of non-zoning regulations to smaller remaining downtown sites should allow for greater potential for employment and residential units than draft 3 with affordable housing benefits included and calibrated in accordance with the downtown Austin plan and direction of this document. So as you probably know, most of downtown today is zoned central business downtown or downtown use. CBD has a F.A.R. Of five to

[3:27:07 PM]

one. Du has five to one with 120-foot height limit. And there are a variety of Zones mainly in the western part of downtown. And for draft 3 all those Zones were translated, CBD became DC. Dmu became CC. Those Zones are exactly the same as the two main downtown Zones we have today. And then the variety of Zones that we have today became CC subzones of different signed. And in doing that, applying that zoning was from the downtown Austin plan. Those were zoning recommendations taken out of that plan and mapped for draft 3. So for the new draft we're not proposing any change to that downtown zoning. We think it should stay the same. There are a couple of minor tweaks we are making to the CC zone, adding a little bit of height increase just five feet in some of the subzones to accommodate standard building types. And then increasing the impervious cover by five

[3:28:08 PM]

percent to 100%, adding back zero lot lines. Those are just small tweaks to the CC zone. So the overall effect of the change is that we're carrying forward what the downtown plan is recommending as far as zoning is concerned. We're making some tweaks to CC and really that should help with small site development, we think. And overall keeping the entitlements about the same where they are today leaves a significant delta for the downtown density bonus, so it keeps that program very appealing for developers. To go a little bit more with the downtown density bonus, council direction is repeated there at the top. And at the risk of being repetitive I won't read that again. Code and map revisions should maximize potential for employment in residential units within downtown in accordance with the downtown Austin plan.

[3:29:09 PM]

And the guidance in this document, with affordable housing units calibrated. The downtown density bonus program that we have today is one of the few things that we've taken from the dap and put into today's code. And you're probably familiar with the subdistrict map that has far in height caps based on different geographies downtown. So that map was carried forward into draft 3 with no change at all. It was exactly what we have today. And what we are thinking about proposing is some of those



subdistricts had their caps taken off. So today there's always either an F.A.R. Or a height cap in every subdistrict, but there are projects coming in that are either hitting their F.A.R. Cap or trying to go over, so we're thinking if there's a desire to do that and the market is there, why not unlever a potential downtown. Let's take the caps off some of those subdistricts. And the effect of that would just be that we would help maximize potential downtown

[3:30:10 PM]

for residential and employment, but it would also increase capacity for market rate and affordable units. The downtown Austin plan -- so it's going to be really repetitive if I read that again. That direction is the same. It's just speak speaking to or calibrating the mapping provisions to maximize potential and keeping in accordance with the downtown Austin plan. So there are things in the downtown Austin plan that were pulled into draft 3, so today again in our current code we don't have anything codified from the downtown Austin plan except for the bonus program. So in draft 3 we pulled forward the zoning that was recommended from the downtown Austin plan and some revisions in the overlay that speak to uses, frontage and compatibility. So for the new draft we're

[3:31:10 PM]

imagining that there won't be any change to that. That that's going to be carried forward as it was in draft 3. But will effect of that is it does implement the downtown Austin plan and respect the work that went into the downtown Austin plan and it kind of allows for some fine tuning downtown, even down to the street level that's very hard to do with a base zone. So it allows some fine tuning. Downtown parking, we had direction from council as

follows: Code revisions should apply parking structures are able to evolve over time as transportation patterns change, including design standards for structured parking that will facilitate eventual conversion to residential or commercial uses. The manager should determine if parking in certain areas should be counted against F.A.R. That's floor area ratio. The manager should explore options for parking maximums or minimum yield in areas

[3:32:12 PM]

necessary for transition area supportive employment. And so today there are things that we do downtown that we want to carry forward. There are really four main things. We have no minimum parking required downtown. There is parking required for accessible spaces. There's a parking maximum. And shared parking is allowed. And we want to carry all of those things forward. In draft 3 we didn't have a parking maximum downtown and that was an inadvertent omission so that was coming

back for the new draft. There are a few new provisions that we want to propose that we've explored. One of those is that downtown today, if you want to have a commercial parking structure, it's a conditional use permit. But there's a lot of unused parking that exists today and we think we should just allow that to be used as commercial parking. It would mean that underutilized parking today

[3:33:13 PM]

could be utilized by the public or other tenants. It would just be a way to get that parking that might otherwise be fallow to be used. Shared parking is allowed today. You can do shared parking downtown and you don't have to come to the city for review because there's no minimum parking requirement being met. We want to make sure that that's clear because we want it to be as easy as possible again so that underutilized parking can be better utilized. Then we did explore the idea of convertible garages and weather parking should be counted against F.A.R. It doesn't quite seem like the market is there yet to make it a requirement. We want to make sure that it's allowed but we kind of want to incentivize it so that if you convert your garage in the future to happen bitable space it won't count against the F.A.R. In your zone. And then that way it's kind

[3:34:14 PM]

of -- it's more of a carrot project it than a stick approach. Approach than a stick approach.

>> So the effects of the change are that the market decides the parking downtown up to a point. We will have a maximum that you cannot go over. And we will still have a requirement that accessible spaces are provided. It will mean that underutilized parking will be more easily shared so that hopefully it will depress the need for new parking and that it will allow spaces for cars today to eventually be converted to spaces for people in the future. I'm going to turn it back over to anik and she will talk to you a little bit about parking citywide.

>> Thanks, Greg, in the council direction on may 2nd you all asked that minimum parking requirements should be generally eliminated in areas that are within a quarter mile of activity centers, activity corridors and the transit priority network except that

[3:35:14 PM]

some parking requirements may be maintained for areas where elimination of parking requirements would be particularly disruptive. Conditions to be proposed by staff. So as we've been working on the project, we are taking the approach that defining disruptive is a function of the adequacy of the sidewalk system. So with that approach I'm going to go through how the draft -- how current code through our previous work and what we're thinking in our potential revisions as parking relates to the

adequacy and completion of the sidewalk system. It's important to note before I get started that our sidewalk program and our cip and through the 2016 bond and 2018 bond we're making significant progress on our sidewalk system. And in coordination of developing the slide with public works, when the 2016 bond is complete, over 70% of the sidewalk network in this area will be complete.

[3:36:15 PM]

There's still spatial investment to be made to bring that to 100%, but it's important to note that we are making progress, we're really aligning our cip investment with the direction here with our land use proposals here with the code. So in current code with relations to sidewalks, right now we require them pretty much at all stages of development, subdivision, building permit, residential review, site plan. We have a fee-in-lieu option which is granted at a high frequency and that's going to become important when I talk about what we started to draft in draft 3. But note that it's given in a high frequency. And there was no requirement or there is no requirement in current code for rehabilitation of current sidewalks and we know through the sidewalk plan that the functionality of our existing sidewalk is equally as important as completing our absent sidewalk network. And then in 2017 there was a code amendment that allows for mitigation outside of the transportation impact analysis for smaller

[3:37:17 PM]

projects and that is allowing us to get more sidewalk construction that matches our investment with our cip. In our previous work when it came to roadways we are -- sometimes there was a request to not build the sidewalk at the same time as the road and so we clarified that that the sidewalk would need to be constructed at the same time as street construction as required by the code. We strength they end the fee-in-lieu. We want the ability for the sidewalk program to be able to assess what would be the most efficient for that particular site with regards to whether it makes more sense for the city to take a fee-in-lieu and complete a sidewalk segment in that area or does it make more sense for the developer to construct in that area. And we have a very fine

[3:38:17 PM]

tuned sidewalk program and so we've strengthened the ability for our review and not make it so automatic that fee-in-lieu -- not make it so easy for fee-in-lieu to be granted. And then lastly, we put a requirement in for rehabilitation to bring existing sidewalks up to Ada and other standards. So all of those things that we Teed up in our previous work are carrying forward to the revisions that we're doing now. And in service to council direction, in looking at this disruptive clause that we are thinking about, parking not being required within a quarter mile of centers, corridors or the transportation priority network, tpn, if you're on an accessible route. So if the site is on an accessible route per our sidewalk

system, you can take advantage of no parking parking. Then we'll go further in developing code requirements that some parking or some

[3:39:19 PM]

other type of mitigation could be required if you're not on an accessible route. So that is on context sensitive approach to the council direction and the direct of the change would be parking reductions would be applied in areas conducive to multimodal transportation options where we want to promote walking to the corridor, cycling to the corridor, using transit, et cetera. And integrated land use regulations with mobility infrastructure. Now to parking maximums. Council directed that the city manager should look at parking maximums in an area for support the transit area development N current code as Greg pointed out, parking maximums exist only in the CBD and some regulating plans across the city. In our previous work we reduced overrule, we modernized parking requirements for all of the uses in the code. They hadn't been looked at in quite awhile.

[3:40:20 PM]

And -- like looking at restaurant or other uses and looked at what is a more appropriate modernized amount of parking to apply. So generally parking requirements went down in our previous work. And then we set a city-wide maximum of 200 percent of that amount. Right now we're considering per council direction 100% maximum downtown and then 150% for sites on centers, corridors and on the transportation -- on the transit priority network. And then keeping with that 200% citywide. Now, it's important to note that we want to take a data driven approach to this. Parking is sensitive and so we have folks on our cross-functional team plug three to five years worth of site plans and certain contextual situations to look at how much parking has been provided. Our current code allows overparking in most areas

[3:41:21 PM]

unless you're in the CBD where there's some maximums. And even with the maximums that are in the code there is still provisions to have those waived. And so once we get that data back the centers, corridors, transportation priority network and citywide may change a bit, but it's important to note, you know, in relationship to each other, of course, you know the downtown should be the lower cap and so on. It just -- it makes the most logical sense. So the effect of the change is a tdm first approach to transportation mitigation as we know that parking is one of the biggest incentives to driving, and we want to support a reliable high frequency transit system and allow for development to focus on housing people versus housing cars. So that concludes the bulk of a summary of the work we've been doing in those

[3:42:21 PM]

three areas. And I'll briefly touch on next steps and then we'll be available to answer your questions. So in the timeline again we'll be talking with you all on September 11th and we plan to touch on zoning outside of the transition areas as well as nccds and cos and parkland and other dedications and some administrative processes that we're teeing up in service to council direction. October is going to be a very, very busy month. We will have two open houses. We'll have public testing. We'll start our office hours that will extend through October, through November, onward through December if necessary, and that's the opportunity for residents to come talk with staff about a particular property or really about anything that they might want to know about the code and the draft that's out. We are still scheduled for October 4th release of the

[3:43:22 PM]

code, staff report and map. And again, planning commission public hearing on October 26th. We welcome any district meetings that you would like to have. We'll make ourselves available. Some of you have already contacted me about specific dates, which is fantastic. We'll make ourselves available to assist you with assuring that your constituency is well informed about the project as it moves forward. So with that we are here to answer your questions. Thank you so much?

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you for daylighting this. It's very clear. Questions? Anybody have any questions? Yes, Natasha.

>> Harper-madison: I have one question. On page 27 of the presentation under potential revisions, not required within a quarter mile of centers, corridors or tpm if on an accessible route. I'd just like to get some clarity about how you're defining accessible route.

>> Sure.

[3:44:25 PM]

Our sidewalk program in public works, we use the Americans with disabilities act definition of accessible route. And essentially the sidewalk -- there has to be a sidewalk route with appropriate curb ramps, appropriate design standards to the street or to a public facility. No breaks in the sidewalk route.

>> Mayor Adler: Did that get it, Natasha?

>> Harper-madison: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Leslie.

>> Pool: Good to see you all. A couple of questions. Transition Zones. Will the transition Zones and the by right allowable units apply everywhere throughout the city and in each district?

>> So the by right units

[3:45:28 PM]

within the transition areas will be those missing middle Zones that are applied within there. So those Zones are, as we kind of mentioned in the last council session, work session, are two Zones. And they are four units by right per lot and six units by right per lot with an additional bonus on top of that.

>> Pool: So my question was will the transition Zones and the by right allowable units apply everywhere across the city and in each district?

>> No, councilmember. Those are unique to the transition Zones. Those Zones and the four and the six plus additional bonus are unique to the Zones that would be applied in the transition zone and not elsewhere throughout the city.

>> Pool: Would you say that everywhere that transition Zones are mapped these two criteria will apply?

[3:46:29 PM]

>> Can you specify which two criteria you're referring to?

>> Pool: Basically -- well, I was asking if this applied throughout the city in transition Zones, and I got a definition of what a transition zone is, which I already knew. And then I got an answer that says yes, where the transition Zones will be mapped. So my question is do we have a sense of exactly where those transition Zones will be now?

>> So again, this is what I was speaking to earlier, the importance of -- so the transition areas are the areas as identified by council direction, right? Against those four criteria. Those are what the staff are using as transition areas. The zone districts that are being used in the transition areas, there are two types. And we would describe those as missing middle Zones. As lacy mentioned, one of

[3:47:30 PM]

them, the less intensive one, is base entitlement of four units per lot and the next one is six units per lot. And both have density bonus available. We'll all those missing middle Zones. They're not exclusive to -- if this is your question, they're not necessarily exclusive to being applied in transition areas. There are

other parts of the city that are today zoned multiunit zone that one of these missing middle Zones might be an appropriate zone to use. Does that help?

>> Pool: It does. So in the transition Zones and the by right allowable units could, depending on the circumstance, apply everywhere across the city and in every district.

>> Mayor Adler: Every council district. Are there transition Zones that have this in council districts all over the city?

>> Pool: It may be at this point we're going to need a

[3:48:30 PM]

map to see where all those -- maybe the next time you're going to come on September 11th to talk to us again maybe we could have a map to show where the transition Zones are.

>> Casar: I think the question was where are the transition areas. And I think you said it's the same as according to the existing council direction, which is transition areas will be adjacent to activity centers, corridors and the transit priority network that extend into every council district, but do not cover every council district. And that they will go generally two to five lots deep based on how you've calculated it, and it will never take up the majority of any given neighborhood as you've described it.

>> That's right.

>> Casar: So I think that's it.

>> Pool: What I was looking for is a general understanding that we were all anticipating that everybody would have some skin in this game. And I just wanted to make sure that that was --

>> Mayor Adler: I think where we're missing stuff is the districts. She was talking about council districts, not zoning or planning districts. Will we have transition Zones in council districts

[3:49:30 PM]

throughout the city?

>> Kitchen: I have a related question, but I'll let her finish.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Leslie.

>> Pool: So let's see. I wanted to ask a question about lower impervious cover in the watersheds and how staff will address that requirement. Since it looks like impervious cover is proposed to be higher in the two transition Zones. You did have a slide with a flood zone.

>> Yes. So watershed staff is still developing their calculations based on what we learned at our benchmark testing. And so we're not prepared to discuss that today. And I know they would want to be present to explain their calculations, but generally what we're learning is that in the transition areas for the missing middle Zones that we are looking at an increase in impervious cover, but how that also complies with the council direction of not increasing it citywide and also against watershed.

[3:50:31 PM]

So we believe that we are going to be able to make that work, but it's still in development and we'll be prepared at one of the work sessions to have watershed come and explain those calculations, as you can imagine those are complex and we're still working on those.

>> Pool: We had an open house, town, town hall with our flood folks in my district and there was a high level of concern about that. Yeah, they'll resident want to hear directly from staff on that. There's already a lot of local area flooding in my district in the central city areas like Brentwood and that's due to aging infrastructure and undersized pipes. And of course more extreme rainfall events. So if we're already experiencing flooding under current conditions, how is staff predicting conditions will be improved if we are going to see higher impervious cover allowances? And that may be a question to park and address when we have our flood folks here, but I would like to have y'all's input on that.

[3:51:33 PM]

I'll just run through these and then let -- because then I'll be done. On the parking on page 27 you've got that table there. The parking minimums for areas where there is a low walkability score and few sidewalks, what plans do you have for addressing that? In particular in ways that would support people who may be in wheelchairs or who otherwise would be affected by the Americans with Disabilities Act?

>> Can you repeat the question?

>> Pool: This goes to sidewalks and where we have low walkability scores and few sidewalks, how are parking minimums for those areas going to be handled where we have low walkability scores and few sidewalks?

>> Yeah. So what we're proposing is the finding disrupt activity

[3:52:35 PM]

of the completeness of the sidewalks. So in the areas that aren't on an accessible route, don't have complete sidewalk systems, we'd be looking at ways to have a context sensitive approach to how much



parking might be appropriate in those areas if the sidewalk system is not complete. So we haven't landed on what that might look like if there's an accessible route, can go to zero parking, cannot do parking and try to -- in service of council direction with maximizing affordability in units as the general direction. But where that starts to deteriorate we are looking at what is that right application of the amount of parking that would be required since it is in that quarter mile of the transit priority corridor and the activity corridors? And it is where we want to marry that land use and -- land use and mobility

[3:53:35 PM]

integration. So we feel like it should be a little different of a requirement than throughout the whole city, but we understand that if the sidewalk network is not complete that there should be sensitivity to that.

>> Pool: Right. And we also talked before when we had these conversations last year about the Americans with disabilities act, the we need with parking for people who have disabilities, and that was part of the direction that was in the guidance document to the city manager that we incorporate Ada requirements into these discussions. So I'm just looking to see that that is actually being embedded in here and that the discussion that we're very here would include that. The last thing I want to ask with regard to sidewalks and walkability and parking minimums, are we going to tie the condition of our sidewalks to some kind of a process that would be triggered automatically where the condition of the sidewalks is so deteriorated

[3:54:37 PM]

that they're impassable and that we have kind of a SWAT approach so that the city goes out within, I don't know, a shot clock on sleeps is 30 days so maybe we have a shot clock on sidewalks. So that accessibility is ensured. I want to tie the walkability of the sidewalks to our public works so that it triggers projects and they go out and they have to repair the sidewalks and that it's done really quickly. If we are going to be in a situation where we are relying on our sidewalks for people to get around.

>> We'd be happy to coordinate with public works on programmatic improvements that would run alongside any code regulations. So we're happy to take that idea and see how does that differ or is in line with what we might be doing currently, what we might improve upon so that there's a lot of programmatic elements. The code is not-- the only

[3:55:39 PM]

regulatory tool and has to work in concert with our programs. So there's a good suggestion.

>> Pool: Yeah. These are some things that residents have been bringing to my attention. You know, they're not necessarily opposed to having -- in many instances they do have questions about the reduction of parking minimums and that was an element that I opposed specifically when we submitted -- when we did our voting on this document that you guys are working from that we suspended back in may. But as a trade-off to that we have to ensure as a community that the sidewalks are going to be passable. And if they deteriorate and we're behind the curve in repairs, we have to be able to explain that. So it would be great if we could somehow tie that then to the work that our crews do on the streets.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ann?

>> Kitchen: I have a number of questions. I'll try not to ask them all.

[Laughter]

>> Mayor Adler: And we can give everybody a chance to kind of circle through a couple of times. That would be okay too.

[3:56:40 PM]

Greg will be after you.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So I'll focus on -- I will defer my parking questions and I'll focus on the transition zone questions. So I wanted to follow up on a question that councilmember pool asked because I wasn't quite sure if I heard the response. So -- I think she's -- and that was the question about all over the city question. And to my -- my question related to that is I'm looking at the direction under N, under that -- under the -- the question number 4 where it talks about staff will consider mapping missing middle areas in high opportunity areas not impacted by environmental concerns in order to help achieve goals related to housing throughout the city. So I guess am I assuming correctly that because this references mapping missing

[3:57:40 PM]

middle areas that perhaps y'all haven't -- are you considering that a different subject than the transition Zones and have you gotten to that yet? Or is that -- does that subject apply to criteria we're talking about today? Is my question clear? So in other words, I was reading staff will consider mapping missing middle areas as staff will consider transition Zones, will you perhaps y'all are putting that into other cognitive and you are going to think about it later? Or am I asking -- do you understand what I'm asking?

>> I believe I do. Yes, there's the transition areas criteria. And if the direction to also include high opportunity areas for this missing middle housing opportunity is sort of separate from that.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So will you be getting back to us later about your criteria for that?

>> Yes.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Then my next question is -- relates to some of the other

[3:58:41 PM]

criteria that are in here related to transition Zones. So I think I understood correctly, and thanks for the -  
- the illustrations. That really helps understand it. So if I'm understanding correctly, you said that the  
depth, the two to five depth depth, based on those four criteria, and if they met four they got a five.  
Five in. If they met less they got some number less than that. So in general that's the approach, right? So  
then related to that my question would be how are you thinking about that third criteria and that list of  
four? Which is well connected to street grid. So how did you define whether something got a check  
mark for that third category.

[3:59:46 PM]

Category?

>> So we want to go back to the slide on 18.

>> Kitchen: Page 18?

>> Slide 18 on page 18, yes.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> So this is trying to kind of visualize what those differences between well connected and not well  
connected is.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> So we have on the left hand of the slide we would call well connected grid. There are short blocks,  
there are breaks in the streets and breaks in the blocks. Whereas on the right-hand side of the slide  
there are really deep lots on the corridor. And the residential area is further away from the corridor and  
outside of that transition area as we've defined it. So as you can see, there's even that kind of cul-de-sac  
in the middle of that big

[4:00:48 PM]

corridor, deep corridor lot, that isn't connected to -- if there was a cut-through in between those lots  
instead of the cul-de-sac end, we would consider that connected to the corridor. But in this instance the

dance, when you actually think about the wrapping around to get to the corridor, is further than that five-minute walk.

>> Kitchen: So I think I understand. So this map shows us that for this particular illustration, this is an area that meets all five -- or all four of that list except for this area where we show the cul-de-sac. So the depth into that area goes whatever that is, three or whatever. But then to the top and the bottom of it, it stays at the five. So that's how you were thinking of --

>> So on the left side of the corridor, right, you see the transition area and the mapping of the missing

[4:01:49 PM]

middle Zones, right?

>> Kitchen: Uh-huh.

>> And on the right side of the corridor, there's no mapping of the transition area. The missing middle Zones are not applied in in that situation.

>> Kitchen: That makes sense. I'll just ask a few more on those to make sure I'm understanding them. Okay, so then when we get to -- I wanted to understand how you apply -- how you are thinking of applying that orientation of blocks relative to the quarters criterium. I can see the illustration on page 19. That's an illustration about the floodplains and I assume that's relating to and that would apply to drainage and flooding considerations, not just flood plain, right? Okay, so yes, drainage and

[4:02:50 PM]

flooding, not just flood plain.

>> Define what you mean by drainage.

>> Kitchen: Well, that's my question. One of the criterium, there's five and drainage and flooding considerations is the flooding criteria. Are you defining that as flood plain or -- have you defined it yet?

>> Working with the wad department at this point we've defined it as the flood plain data they have at this moment.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So that's how it's -- okay, that's how it's defined. Okay, then getting back to the other question, the first one is orientation of blocks relative to the corridors. So if you have a block coming in at an angle, I'm trying to think about how that applies. Have you all thought about that yet? Because I'm not really seeing an illustration of that.

>> We kept our lines straight in these illustrations. So using this slide 17 as

[4:03:51 PM]

kind of an example, you see how even though we have straight lines and orientations, the block of the lots -- the facing of the lot changes their orientation away from the corridor. So think of the -- any portion of this slide where the angles of the street start to diverge in a 45-degree angle. That transition area depth is measured along that angle to define the same distance from the corridor.

>> Kitchen: Well, that's really my question. I'm wondering why it's the same distance. That's what I'm not quite understanding, particularly for an angle. And I need to see that.

>> Visualize --

>> Kitchen: I don't understand why coming in at an angle might impact the number of lots in. It would seem to me that it would. So we can have further conversation about that.

[4:04:51 PM]

It's easier to see if you've got some kind of grid, but coming in at an angle doesn't do the same thing for the lots. And so -- so can we have further conversation about that then? Okay. I'll pass it on to someone else and if you would come back to me.

>> Mayor Adler: Greg.

>> Casar: Hi. First thanks for all the work. I know it's a lot of work in a short amount of time. To clarify on parking, y'all are intending to keep the other evolutions on our parking minimums that you had in draft 3 and then enhancing that with the new direction, right?

>> That's correct.

>> Casar: And, you know, one thing that I'm thinking about, and, of course, it could be something planning commission handles, is there there being no parking probably only creates an

[4:05:54 PM]

impact over time. Usually, most of it a positive impact, but there could be some of the conflicts people have seen, but it would take time for a lot of new places to develop with less or no parking. So I guess a question might be how are we -- how are we thinking about for you to think about if we're planning on building a sidewalk or if there's a small gap and we're thinking of filling it, we might actually weaned up having the full sidewalk connectivity over the course of a year or two, but having no parking minimum, a new building may not develop for a year or two and you may not see a real reduction in parking ratio per person over the course of five, six, seven years. I see that it's a pretty simple solution to say let's have the no parking within a quarter mile when there is a sidewalk network, but if there's likely going to

be a sidewalk network completed in the next two or three years and the land development code's parking reductions may not have much of an impact for five or ten years, I would hate to set

[4:06:54 PM]

our regs based on the ground right now if we're going to change the course over a short time period. Maybe something to think about unless you have already --

>> We have been thinking about that. Thank you for confirming that, you know, we are thinking about that and we're trying to figure out how to go further than what we've presented here today, but it's -- we generally wanted to talk about, you know, the idea of defining disruptive by the adequacy of the sidewalks and not tying it to a use, per se. And then if that lands well, how can we be thinking about the future as well, because you are exactly right, we're making great progress with our sidewalk cip, once the parking is there it's there for a long time and could take the place of a unit which is the overall goal. And so we are still developing what that might look like.

>> Casar: If we continue to have more parking and

[4:07:56 PM]

less other stuff then we can continue not having sidewalks there and perpetuate the thing we're trying to get rid of. So I think it is a thoughtful solution for you all to be thinking about where sidewalks currently exist, but we might want to find some way to move forward.

>> I would say this is the fortunate thing. The making of the city, there's the regulatory stuff, there's the infrastructure stuff, you know, and so here's a case where you all have made a significant investment in your sidewalk infrastructure, within five years, 70% of these areas will have the sidewalk available. So it's one of those examples where Austin is, you know, you're not relying on your regulatory leverages to get the public amenities, right? You are putting in the public amenities, which is actually assisting you to get the land use and development that's going to help make the transit and make the corridors, achieve

[4:08:56 PM]

those outcomes that you are looking for.

>> Casar: And then my -- I didn't hear whether you said two two five or two or five. Are there transition areas that are three and four lots deep?

>> Yes, it's two two five, so it's a range.

>> Casar: Got it. And then when -- but regardless, if it is within a vulnerable area under the U.T. Study, then it is two lots.

>> Correct.

>> Casar: Or however it is you count to two. Those are my questions for now.

>> Mayor Adler: Paige.

>> Ellis: Could you talk about the quarter mile around corridors? I know some of them are circular and I wasn't sure exactly how those are measured and what that might look like.

>> So the quarter mile measurement is just that,

[4:09:56 PM]

it's kind of a blob of a measurement used to -- like tell us where to hone in and review -- say at least for transition areas mapping. So a lot of our centers are currently circles, and the initial, you know, data calculations of what's within a quarter mile of there, that will come out as a circle. And just like since our corridors are a line, it comes out as a very thick quarter mile line. So everything we're doing at least as far as mapping is concerned is using this quarter mile distance as an initial instigator for where areas need to be reviewed for different areas of mapping. He will he will then you can hone in closer.

>> Correct. That's more of the data driven aspect. What is a quarter mile, what does that encompass. That leads to the next area of the context driven more manual review that staff is doing.

>> Ellis: Great.

[4:10:57 PM]

Just to clarify, you mentioned at atlas14, I just wanted to make sure we were understanding that conversation is happening.

>> Yes, we've been working with them closely to talk about where those are and where the impervious could be.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathy and then Diane.

>> Tovo: I have quite a few questions. I'll try to stop at a good point so we can circulate, but I have more to come back to. But on that opponent could you help me understand what are transition -- I heard you say in the presentation trance -- on lots in the flood plain. Are those taking into account the new atlas -- I know you said you are having conversations around the atlas 14 maps, but by flood plain can we assume those take into account the new

[4:11:57 PM]

atlas maps and the areas coming into the flood plain because of the new maps are excluded from transition zone mapping?

>> So I can only speak to the data that we have now. I can't speak to the future specifics and I think that might be a question we have to work through with our watershed department because they have provided us the information on what is

[inaudible] Flood plain area.

>> Tovo: I think that's important. That's a question we've had a lot of are the new atlas maps, are you crafting a code that responds to the new maps. And especially since there were choices made about not -- not mapping to flood plain, I would hope that includes our new flood plain areas.

>> So with regard to the -- to the two different levels of intensity, it was the lower level is four units plus a bonus. How many units are achievable through the bonus and what is the affordability provision?

>> Up to eight units total with the bonus.

[4:12:57 PM]

>> Tovo: With the lower intensity?

>> Yes. So the plus four units and Greg might be better able to specific -- to the specifics.

>> Tovo: So the number of units in the lower intensity transition zone are up to eight units.

>> Correct.

>> Tovo: And what about the higher intensity transition zone, six units plus a bonus of how many?

>> Also plus four, so up to ten.

>> Tovo: And what is the affordability commitment in either of those? So with the four units plus the four bonus, so with the eight units, what would be your affordability commitment?

>> I think, councilmember, we would -- might have to check with nhcd on that and get back to you. We're not sure what the set aside percentage is, but --

>> Tovo: Is the same true for the ten units? Category of ten units?

>> Yeah, the same answer.

[4:13:57 PM]



We would need to check with them.

>> Tovo: So we know what the total allowable unit is, but we don't know what the affordability component is.

>> We don't know up here, but nhcd knows.

>> Tovo: I don't mean to suggest nobody knows. And is there any affordability component in the base level entitlement? With the zoning or it just kicks in at the bonus. In other words, are areas going to be upzoned into one of these two transitions without an affordability component? Sounds like the answer is question.

>> The base -- the zone includes the affordability component, but the answer is yes that the by right entitlements will go up to four and then four on top of that when participation occurs in the bonus.

>> Tovo: But if I have a

[4:14:57 PM]

tract right now that can -- on which I can only build two units, if it's rezoned for the lower intensity transition, I can build four without any affordability.

>> That's correct.

>> Tovo: Okay. And then, let's see. With regard to the -- I mean I think some of the understanding kind of how this really applies in different areas is obviously very challenging because we're not looking at the maps, but I appreciate all the work you have done to provide us with the different scenarios here. Can you help us understand how you are -- how you are adjusting, I've heard a couple times the context specific mapping, how are you -- how are you dialing it back when you have situations where you are hitting that point where five lots and five lots from either corridor is encompassing an entire -- most of an entire neighborhood?

>> Right, that is definitely

[4:15:59 PM]

one of our considerations as part of this eyes on the map process. So we are taking precautions to make sure as we manually map these missing middle Zones in these areas, that they are not -- not only not touching but not encompassing the majority of the area.

>> Tovo: What does that look like? Are you going then back to two units?

>> It does guess reduced yes. It's not a specific number, it's based on how large the area is, but it is reduced.

>> Tovo: And then how -- how are you -- I mean these lots -- all the maps and I understand the necessity of presenting them this way, but at least in certain areas of town you have very consistent size lots and in other areas you have very inconsistently sized lots. I heard you talk about a measure and I think it was 850 feet, but I had previously heard 800 feet.

>> 850 feet is the measurement that we have reached as the maximum level

[4:17:01 PM]

of transitionary depth based on the missing middle Zones. That's really where all of your criteria are met. There are no environmental constraints. You are not overlapping with the majority of the single-family area. It is really -- that is the maximum that these get to. In other areas where we're going to as lots deep or there's other implications of constraints, the depth is much less.

>> Tovo: So is it five lots or 850 -- is it sometimes more than five lots?

>> So no, when it comes to creating, and if you would like to pull up slide 17, that's always a helpful image. So the five lots, you never exceed five lots when you are looking at this parallel block pattern and the definition of defining what the transition area is. And each corridor has their different levels of these parallel block formations. Using those and creating the

[4:18:03 PM]

depth of the transition area based off those which can range in depth but not over the 850 feet in depth, using that to then as we see here on the right apply that same distance and so we can and may in many times have more than five lots on a specific block in the transition area, but to the measurement definition from this parallel block formation the transition area does not exceed five lots. Lots of numbers.

>> Tovo: Okay. I somewhat understand that. I think what you're saying is you're not going -- you're not going beyond 850 and you are not going beyond five unless five in one area is adjacent to an area where it might be eight next to it?

>> So, like, in this instance, unless the orientation in the block within that distance, let's say this is 850 feet on the left, we've measured the transition area is 850 feet.

[4:19:04 PM]

Down on kind of the bottom quadrant of the slide it is still no more than 850 feet, but can capture more lots.

>> Tovo: Okay, so sometimes it is beyond five lots.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Tovo: And then I guess my last question -- so in terms of -- is there any consideration for sizing as I started my question and then I moved around to a different one. But as you look at areas that have maybe a larger lot, then a smaller one, I mean most of them in some of our older neighborhoods are really mixed up in terms of size. Are you still doing one through five?

>> For the sake of yes, for the sake of this measurement, if on the left-hand side we had the lot adjacent to the corridor was smaller than the rest of the lots, the one, two, three, four, five, that distance is still measured. So we're still capturing the five lots, but now the distance is shorter, that transition area.

>> So -- or less.

[4:20:04 PM]

So if you look at on the left side transition area and the area on the right under transition area, so on the left side the simplest situation establishing five lots deep. And using that same dimension on the right side, it's only going throw lots deep.

-- Three lots deep. So it's maintaining essentially the depth of that transition area, which as Lacey said has never exceeded 850 feet and it's usually, I don't know, 600 feet or something like that. 700 feet. So just to give you a sense. I mean 750 feet would be a three-minute walk. So it's a pretty short distance from the -- to connect to the corridor.

>> Tovo: And so I guess my last question for now and then I do have others, but I'll wait to come back around, so you mentioned a couple times context specific mapping, and I

[4:21:04 PM]

think in your last presentation last week, it might have been you, Peter, if you were here last week. Were you here last week? Then it wasn't you. Someone made the comment it's difficult to do things on a lot by lot basis, but as you look at context specific mapping, are you attending to the fact in some of these transition Zones we already have missing middle housing, and if so are they still getting mapped with transition Zones? It sounds like the answer is yes, but I'm wondering if that's been a consideration you've taken into effect. That in mapping, you know, in mapping you would be changing the zoning on tracts that are already producing missing middle and potentially incentivizing the development of those in the missing middle now.

>> We are receiving data on where kind of the -- at per the direction you all provided of where affordable multi-family is provided and in these areas if they were

[4:22:05 PM]

to have a zoning that's lower than their current entitlements, we're not increasing those entitlements. In these transition areas, we are taking in that fact for the data where do we have, to the best of our abilities, market affordable multi-family.

>> Tovo: But that's not necessarily the four-plex a block off Guadalupe or -- I mean that wouldn't fall into that provision. We had a lot of discussion about it and I don't think we -- I don't believe that we agreed on a measure for that, though I continue to think it's critically important that we look at it. It sounds like now there has not been -- there is not -- there is not a difference that context specific mapping is not taking into account those existing missing middle.

[4:23:05 PM]

>> If there is missing middle.

>> We need to -- yeah, I need to make a confirmation what level of multi-family is considered in that data. That's a good point. Thank you.

>> And I could also say that -- I mean it's possible that there are existing missing middle that are nonconforming structures today. So that actually mapping the missing middle zone would legalize them, bring them into conformance.

>> Tovo: It may -- I think it also has the possibility of doing what I explained. And I think I may have showed some photos of this in one of our work sessions, but, you know, on a particular street and it's not an uncommon street, but in one of the examples I showed this council, you know, we had a block -- I mean a couple houses off Guadalupe had a four-plex, probably not conforming to the zoning. Duplex, duplex, eight-plex. You wouldn't know about it

[4:24:05 PM]

looking at a zoning chart, but I think there's a high chance if these get mapped with those kinds of increased entitlements, we'll see the redevelopment of the eight-plex, redevelopment of the four-plex and I'm not sure that's in the best interest if what we're trying to do is look at housing costs. Doing our best to preserve the existing structures that are there.

>> If it's four today and the new zone would apply a base zone of four, it would legalize what's already on the ground versus not conforming. If it were to redevelop because the incentive of the affordable density bonus is

[inaudible], then it might develop and then you would get affordable housing in addition to the additional density. But otherwise you would basically be applying a new missing middle zone that would basically legalize the existing -- it doesn't necessarily accelerator make it, you know, redevelop faster because it's

[4:25:05 PM]

basically the --

>> Tovo: In that case it won't. In the case of the four-plex it might not. In the case of the duplex with the Adu, it might. I think that's the complication around that. And it does sound like that's not a level of context specificity you are able to do at this stage. Well, thank you very much for your work. Again, I have more questions eventually.

[Inaudible]

>> Garza: Questions along the lines of councilmember tovo. But I just -- because I wrote these down. So the Orange and the yellow would never exceed six units, right, you said four or six?

>> Yes, correct.

>> Garza: Okay. So --

>> As a base zoning. So the max would be ten. If the bonus is taken, the

[4:26:06 PM]

max could be ten. So it's four base and then six base with four available with a bonus on each of them. So it ranges from four to ten in the zone is the range.

>> Garza: Okay. So if there's a four unit and the four unit base, it could be redeveloped, but it would mean they are adding four affordable units, they would have to be adding four affordable units? No? How many.

>> You could redevelop with four market rate units. You could also take advantage of the bonus and add up to four more. In the lower zone. In the higher zone you could do six market rate and you could add up to four affordable.

>> You told us you weren't sure what the affordability component would be. So those additional four might not all be affordable.

>> Correct.

[4:27:07 PM]

That's still being calibrated.

>> Hi, I just wanted to confirm that we're still working with consultants on the calibration of the affordable units, but in most cases it would not be that, you know, all four of the additional units would be affordable. It would be some percentage of the bonus units that would be affordable. And that's what we're calibrating.

>> Garza: Okay. And then is think you mentioned this and sorry if somebody already asked this and I missed it. I'm thinking of corridors like south first and congress that have very few blocks in some parts of it between those two. You said there would never be an instance where, like, the entire neighborhood is all transition zone; is that right?

>> Correct.

>> Garza: And how would you -- is it based on the 850 feet? What is it?

>> It's much more manual than that. It's really based on if -- what would you be going to

[4:28:09 PM]

in the first place? What we be be mapping to if we were refined or use reducing it to half a distance, it's a two if it encompasses the area. It's more reducing it so it does not encompass the entire area. There is not an as defined number as, like, some of our initial one, two, three, four, five as some of our initial criteria application, but it is just really manually looking at these areas and making sure that if a transition area is overlapping the majority of the area that we reduce it down so it does not do so.

>> Garza: Okay. And the only other question I had was is there a map that exists that shows the overlay of the four -- I guess factors when determining -- it's on slide 5. Is there a map available?

>> Yeah, and I think we'll be discussing that at one of

[4:29:11 PM]

our future meetings soon. We'll be coming with that soon so you all can understand what these areas are that we're talking about.

>> Garza: But is that map available now for people to see?

>> No, I don't think we have it online.

>> Garza: But it will be.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Garza: Thanks.

>> In the transition area -- in the transition areas, what kind of scale or volume are we looking at as we increase the number of units? Can you get up to 60 feet in height, 65 feet in height in a transition area?

>> So in a transition areas, these two Zones that we keep talking about, right behind the corridor we're imagining that that's a zone where you can get up to 45 feet in height at the most.

-- Height at the most. There is no height bonus with that zone. There's a unit bonus but not a height bonus. And then in the yellow lots

[4:30:13 PM]

behind the Orange, you can get up to -- the base height is 35 feet and that does have a 10-foot affordability bonus included as part of the affordability package, but you can never get up to 65 feet.

>> Mayor Adler: We had talked sometime in the past about residential house form. Is that still being carried through here in the transition areas? Would you explain what that is?

>> Yeah, we've talked in the past about residential house scale, and there are Zones that fall into that group. In draft 3 was the Zones up to r4 which is the four unit zone that that's considered residential house scale. That's because it's got a base height of 35 feet in the impervious cover standards and other site development standards are very close to a single-family zone.

[4:31:13 PM]

The zone that's right behind the corridor where you can get six base plus four, that can go up to 45 feet, and that's not considered a residential house scale zone, but the lower intensity transition zone is.

>> Mayor Adler: So in that lower intensity transition area that abutts the single-family homes that are being kept the same, what would be built there would be something that might have more units but it's still going to be a residential house scale. Is that correct?

>> That's correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I got asked the question -- two questions as I was coming down here. Let me ask them real fast. Is there a requirement that units that are developed in the transition area be rental units?

>> There is not. There is not. We don't -- the code doesn't speak to ownership structure.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And then is there -- we talked about incentivizing or incenting preserving of

[4:32:17 PM]

existing homes so you wouldn't tear down a home and build a bigger single-family home. Are you doing any of that incentivizing of maintaining the existing home in the transition areas?

>> We are, yeah. The preservation incentive, which I think we've talked a bit about above will exist so that if the -- the original structure is preserved on the property, additional units or square footage can be added without counting against the base F.A.R.

>> Mayor Adler: In order to preserve the existing home.

>> Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Alison. Thank you.

>> Alter: Thank you, I appreciate you initiating these updates. I think it's really useful for us to be able to understand some of the background and the context before we get to October. So thank you. I wanted to follow up on some of the questions that the mayor had. I'm trying to understand the mass and scale in the transition area.

[4:33:18 PM]

And you mentioned some stuff about the height. So I'm understanding that. The darker Orange color can go up to 45 feet. There's no height bonus. And that the Orange -- the yellowish-orange one is 35 feet, but there's a 10-foot affordable bonus and the light yellow can go from four to eight and the other from six to ten in number of units. There are other measures of building mass and scale. Can you talk about those and also about impervious cover changes and if there's also issues about lot size that we need to keep in mind.

>> Sure. So you got it exactly right in your summary. The impervious cover limits for the less intense missing middle zone, that's 50%, and in the more intense zone it's 60%.

>> Alter: What would that

[4:34:19 PM]

be now under single-family?

>> Under single-family today, the impervious cover is 45%.

>> Alter: Okay. What about F.A.R.?



>> F.A.R. -- So today F.A.R. Varies depending on where you are in the city. In the mcmansion area there's a F.A.R. Gap, but outside of that there is not. What we're imagining for the new Zones is that there will be a F.A.R. Cap and that's the leverage we use for the preservation incentive. These new missing middle Zones will have a F.A.R. Limit.

>> Alter: Of about what?

>> For the less intense zone the F.A.R. Is .4. And some of these Zones the F.A.R. Varies by use. But the -- so for instance

[4:35:19 PM]

in the r4 zone, which is the less intense missing middle zone, we have a F.A.R. Of .4. You do get a little bit more F.A.R. If you participate in the bonus by providing multi-family. So you might -- you get a bump in F.A.R. .2. And that just makes that multi-family product more feasible.

>> Alter: Okay, I'm going to have to digest that one.

>> Tovo: He started to answer your question about the more expense but I'm not sure we got those numbers.

>> I'm sorry. The more intense missing middle zone has a F.A.R. Of .8 for multi-family and then you get an additional 1.2 if you participate in the -- in the affordability bonus. And then for a duplex, the base F.A.R. Is a little bit less. It's .6. And so again it does vary by use.

[4:36:24 PM]

>> Alter: Will we be able to sort of see this and play with it because it's confusing in this setup to understand how it's translating because, I mean part of what the concern I'm hearing is what this mass in scale looks like in terms of how it's transforming and how are we understanding what we're getting with these units, what the impact is on flooding if you are increasing impervious cover. It's one thing to talk about four units, six, eight, it's another thing when you understand what is the mass and scale how do you take my single-family house and turn it into eight units when you have a -- you know, a 6,000 square foot lot and that translation isn't easy to make in one's head. And it may not be possible. You may need more multiple lots together, but I think that's part of the explanation that we need to be able to communicate to people about what this is going to mean in their neighborhood. So if we can get some of

[4:37:28 PM]

those numbers out so people can see that and, you know, taking a standard lot, you know, what does this actually mean if I have a single-family lot in an Orange transition zone, how are you going to take my lot and change it into ten units. Like what does that mean?

>> And I know that part of council's direction I believe and what staff is planning to do is come back with some models to show what that looks like, that scale.

>> Alter: Okay. And I wanted to clarify that for the bonus units the affordability, does that have to be in units or is that also fee in lieu? Because given what we've been seeing on all sorts of other developments, it's never going to be more than one unit out of the four. Or it won't pencil out

[4:38:28 PM]

according to what we're being told. Whether it could pencil out, I don't know.

>> Lauren, neighborhood housing and community development. So we still are working on the set aside percentages, as was said previously. And we are still as in draft 3 proposing to have a fee in lieu option for the citywide affordable housing bonus program, however, we want to bring forward some criteria that kind of help us determine when a fee in lieu would be appropriate as was asked by council sort of at the end of the draft 3 work sessions and deliberation that you all had last year. So we will have that in the draft.

>> Alter: I'd like to also know a similar -- similar information on the mass in scale for the corridors for the zoning that's going to happen on the corridors, what we're talking about and how that affordability, how

[4:39:29 PM]

affordability plays into that, what the impervious cover limits are, all these kinds of things. And also how it varies because we can talk about corridors, but we actually have multiple different types of corridors, and imagine Austin activity corridor and transit priority corridor that is, you know, in the middle of a bunch of neighborhoods is on a two-lane road is different. And I think we need to understand what that scale is as well. I think people are not just concerned about the transition areas, they are also trying to understand what's going to go on those corridors, particularly the transit ones that are not the corridors that people have gotten used to thinking of in that manner. I don't know if you have that today or when we will be seeing that.

>> Yeah, we can certainly bring that back at a future work session. And we'll be considering that as we're doing the context sensitivity to applying the zoning districts to the map.

>> Alter: Okay.

[4:40:29 PM]

And then my last question for right now would be about sort of street width and how that's factoring in as we talk about parking, but also as we think about these different corridors. A corridor that is essentially five lanes wide because it has a chicken lane in the middle is very different than a two-lane corridor, and we're not making good distinctions between these as we talk about them, but seems like there should be distinctions in the code because, you know, when you have that shorter distance, those taller heights feel very different in terms of planning perspective and also the amount of people you can get through in that corridor even if you do have a bus going down them is somewhat different. So I'd like to understand how that's playing into how we're thinking bit. I appreciate the desire to prioritize the accessibility and the sidewalk with respect to the parking relaxations, but there is a difference across streets in terms of their width as well

[4:41:30 PM]

as with the sidewalks. And what we experience now in some of these neighborhoods that are off the corridors is that they tend to be much narrower than in some other places and you have parking -- once you get parking that's on both sides, not only is there a question of accessibility on the sidewalks, but the cars can't move in both directions and so you've reduced mobility, you've reduced the safety, you know, in that process. And so I'm trying to understand -- I don't know if there's a correlation between our tiny, you know, sidewalk plan and how that's happening and the width of streets, but I am very concerned about how that plays into the consequences of removing the parking requirements.

>> So that's good feedback as we continue to develop that secondary part of, you know, first we want to say, okay, is it disruptive, is it logical to tie those together, and then

[4:42:31 PM]

accessibility route and when is it appropriate to still require some parking, so we'll take the width of the street into account as we consider the final recommendation.

>> Alter: And it would be interesting to know if there is a correlation because it may be that narrower streets don't have sidewalks either so you might not need to double up. The ones I'm thinking of don't have sidewalks either.

>> Right.

>> Alter: Which is part of the challenge. But there may be ones that do have it on one side or something.

>> Right, and we do have that data at transportation so these are exactly why we're talking about this to get ideas how we might look at that as we continue to develop the parking regulations.

>> Alter: When I do the maps, Ann was asking about the diagonal streets. We also have some corridors that are diagonal and I'm not being able to translate this for that.

[4:43:33 PM]

>>

>> Flannigan: Thank you again. These series of briefings has been very informative and it's really encouraging to see the limit to sticking to the council direction, but also the acknowledgments where the council direction kind of gets into trouble. And that's going to be I think where our remaining conversations lie. And where things comply with direction, they comply with direction. I know as I've said in the last briefing, there aren't things that I agree with in the direction either, but I feel very strongly that we made our compromises and I'm going to stick to what we've proved as a body.

-- To what we approved as a body, despite if I want to go farther or less far in the areas. I love the diagrams. I find sometimes, and we talked about this last year, we would get into a conversation with each other and one person is thinking about one example in their district and I'm thinking

[4:44:33 PM]

about an example in my district, and they're so different, but we're not talking the same, so the diagrams are helpful to clarify certainly at this stage, and I want to reiterate for the public what you said about the density bonus for these missing middle or transition Zones that it is not a height bonus. It is just a unit bonus. And it feels like there would be people that would leave that part out when they talk about it to their neighborhoods and they would say -- community engagement people will leave that part out. Folks that are advocates in one side or the other might leave that part out. That's an important key.

>> If I could just clarify that in the less intense transition zone there is a 10-foot height bonus that gets you up to 45 feet and there is no height bonus in the more intense transition zone. So you can never go over 45 feet.

>> Flannigan: So we're at 45 feet, which is still in my world a house scale type of development. I have new homes coming up

[4:45:34 PM]

in my district in green fill development that are three stories tall and they look like the rest of the homes in my district. So that's encouraging, but it's not a 10-story, 10-unit building, which is how some folks I

fear in the public might interpret that. And then on some of the language that I think we're using amongst ourselves I think it's important that we not get into fries like people taking their lot for 10 units. Nobody's lots are being taken away. I also think that there's a debate about street width and what mobility means if it's a little more difficult for a car to get in a neighborhood street that to me is not a mobility issue, it's a little bit of a mobility negotiation. But mobility is a much bigger system at question and I love the concept about tying some of these regulations, parking regs, to the existence of A.D.A.

[4:46:36 PM]

Accessible sidewalks, which is what I hear when you say accessible, I hear A.D.A. Accessible. So this actually will require that level of sidewalk to exist in order for these parking requirements to be reduced. And I think it will create a very interesting economy and a market pressure to developers in order to help them build those sidewalks so we're not having to do another sidewalk bond to the entire city in an increasingly difficult election cycles. And the last thing -- I don't really have questions for you. I think your presentation was great and it seemed very clear to me what we're getting to. Mostly talking to my colleagues here, which I think is what the advantages of these meetings. I'm really excited about what I'm hearing from some of you about the areas where you're concerned because I think I know where you're talking about in your districts. And when we get down to the map, we can get to those areas and really get to the nitpick in that one area.

[4:47:37 PM]

And if 80, 85, 90% of the city complies with a very clear policy direction, we're able to melee that out, then we can spend some productive time as a group getting into where that weird vote goes into an angle and where that street is and getting into where some of the north university duplexes and triplexes are and how they will be zoned. There will be a great get it past the goal post work when we get to the end of the code. I think the staff, y'all are doing a great job getting us through the heavy lift heading into the end of the year, so thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. It is 10 until 5:00. Sorry. It's 10:00 until 5:00. We were scheduled to go until 5:00. I think we could go to 5 H 30, but we should make sure we can start at 6:00 for the budget deal. If people want to extend past five.

>> Casar: Mayor, because this was a two hour work session at five, I booked myself 5:00 to 6:00, but if a majority of folks want to stay.

>> Mayor Adler: I see a lot of people around the

[4:48:37 PM]

table indicating they don't want to stay.

[Laughter].

>> Casar: It's a new culture.

>> Mayor Adler: Maybe there's a way for us to quickly air the questions if we were going to do that, that means we have 10 minutes left. Ann?

>> Kitchen: I'll air questions and then we can talk about them offline. A couple of questions that I have it goes back to follow up with the conversation about where there's existing missing middle. And in some places there may be existing missing middle that is already larger than the entitlement of four or six. So I want to have a conversation about what that means because I'm concerned about the incentive to redevelop. You might have a larger complex that's over 10 and if it's rezoned -- I would not want it rezoned in a way that was an incentive to build smaller numbers of units at higher prices. So I us just want to have that conversation. The second thing I want to

[4:49:38 PM]

talk about is some more specifics about the definitions under K. I raised a question about orientation of blocks. There's a couple of criteria around there that I would like to see how it's exactly defined, related to things like the residential block sided by a main street. The other Zones, uses or environmental features. I want to understand the definitions of those. And then I also want to understand, I think, mayor, you had raised this at a previous work session about the process. There's questions about the process for establishing tropes and applying context sensitivity to them and there's a related question about the process for the neighborhood conversations. So I think we had -- if I'm remembering correctly, we would raise the question about the process for the neighborhood conversations earlier and I'm not sure if

[4:50:39 PM]

y'all have had a chance yet to lay that out. I am hopeful that particularly in areas that involve application of context sensitivity that there's an opportunity for neighborhoods to have that conversation with you all before you release the map. I just think that that could make sure that you have on the ground kinds of information that way. But I just need to understand what that is. So in terms of when those -- I mean, I know you're talking to people now and that's great. I'm talking about when you get to the point where there's something specific. Councilmember Garza had asked if there was a map of the transition Zones yet and I understand that there isn't yet. But it would be good -- I would just like to suggest that there be opportunities to talk at that level of specificity, particularly about how you're complying

[4:51:40 PM]

context sensitivity before you get to your final release in October. Let's see, so I think -- the last one I think is just a real quick question. When we're talking about the parking requirements we are -- we're talking about the area that's a quarter mile in, right? We're not talking about parking in the middle of neighborhoods. Am I understanding correctly?

>> That's correct.

>> Kitchen:, I may have others, but I think that's -- well, I'll also want to understand better how the 850 feet was arrived at, but we can talk about that offline. Y'all have talked about that, but I just want to understand -- I have some more questions about that.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie?

>> Tovo: A couple of these may be super quick. And mayor, I was shaking my head that I can't stay until 5:30, but I can stay a little bit if people want to stay for a little bit.

[4:52:42 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I think people felt that way, so to highlight the question even if we don't really have a chance to discuss that.

>> Tovo: So the downtown density bonus program, the staff had recommended, our housing staff have recommended that we make an amendment to it because at the moment we're disincentivizing commercial projects and so it was my understanding that amendment was coming forward. I am hoping we can do that nonresidential development change in advance of this process and so that was the substance of my question. I would like to see that change happen very soon. I think it's really critical that we do. It is -- we're leaving -- I think we want those our projects to come into the downtown can be program and because that money is now earmarked because of a change that our council has made, it's not just earmarked for permanent supportive, it's also for services for permanent supportive housing, both of which are critical needs. I would like to know which subdistricts within the

[4:53:42 PM]

downtown can be are proposed for changes. I am interested in a future work session about having a discussion about areas of the cities that are subject to deed restrictions that might change what can happen in transition Zones. Some of these hearings sometimes people say there are areas in the northern and other parts of our city where there are deed restrictions that prevent the addition after house of another structure and whether there is work going on in the communities to make changes to those deed restrictions. I did read the post and I appreciate you continuing to use the blog to address kind of issues of current concern. I did read the post about what happens in the transition zone with regard to -- I'm not going to get the conforming uses, nonconforming uses, et cetera. But it still doesn't

answer for me the question of what happens to that property that may just be a single structure now. They have the ability to do an Adu, but they haven't yet. If they're in the transition zone do they have the

[4:54:42 PM]

ability to do an Adu in the future or can they only make changes to that tract if they're adding three units. So I think that's -- while the post did speak to a property owner's ability to rebuild, if they haven't taken it down -- if they haven't demolished the site to do limited renovations, it's still not clear to me sort of what the scale of those renovations would be and whether they have an opportunity to add an accessory dwelling unit or something less than the number of 4. And then my last question or comment, question/comment, when you're looking at the correlation -- not the correlation. It's been a very long day. Calculating the density bonus provisions. I hope that as you're looking at the transition zone that we're not just making that based on what it would take to get from four

[4:55:43 PM]

to eight, but what are the current conditions on that tract presently. So if we have a tract that is presently -- that has the ability to do two units and they're being rezoned in the less intense.

>> Their affordability component should be calculated based on current conditions, not on the entitlements they'll get if the zoning change goes through. The calibration. I think the calibration should be based on -- the calibration for the affordable housing element should be based on current conditions, not conditions post rezoning. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Alison, then Greg.

>> Tovo: I do have one last question and if you can answer that before we leave that would be super helpful because I have multiple neighborhoods that do fall into this category where they are in some cases 8:50 from one corridor and 850 from another and you will certainly have owe foe if all that is mapped you will not just encompass most of the neighborhood, but the entire neighborhood. I think what I heard you say in answer to my question and

[4:56:44 PM]

mayor pro tem Garza's and mayor others, at this point is you are doing those on a manual basis but there's not an across the board calculation for how that gets dialed back. You are dialing it back, but I can't say to them you're dialing it back to two or dialing it back to one lot. There's just at this point what



it would be accurate in saying is if you're between song and south first there will be a dialing back. There's no certainty about how.

>> Right. There's no calculation. It's a planning judgment at this point and it's manual and we are trying our hardest to use capacity with not encompassing the entire neighborhood. We don't have any numbers with it. Right now it's planning judgment at this point. We'll consider in the future coming back once the map develops with a different way to describe that.

>> Tovo: That's not going to impact everybody's district because some are have very long street, in the central center where it's built out to have small lots, you will have that in many, many cases.

[4:57:45 PM]

And it's an area of large concern right now.

>> And about the 800 feet, 850. That's the maximum, but as we're developing the transition Zones it's more in the range of 5 to 700 is really what we're looking at, the max is a eight around 8, 850, but that's not the most common. As those numbers are being discussed I wanted to clarify that because it seems like we keep balking it the 850 but that is not the norm. The norm is in the 500 to 700. And it's measured from front of the corridor lot and that's really important I think for the public to understand not from the back of the corridor lot. Does that make sense?

>> Mayor Adler: Alison. >>

>> Alter: So at a future work session I would like to know what is planned with respect to the parkland dedication approach. We have very strong statements in imagine Austin

[4:58:45 PM]

about the importance of our parks. And we have a lot of history in our parkland dedication ordinance and those facts should be considered in creating it rather than assumptions being made about that. I would also like to see some explanation of when you have a zoning one lot in but then you go to residential as to what happens with how we're thinking about transition Zones. So I have some of those areas in my district. And then I want to reiterate what I said before about the corridor and those entitlements. I'm very concerned about the approach where we're giving a lot of entitlements and assuming that we're going to be able to get this affordability through these bonuses and that we have undermined our ability to get

[4:59:45 PM]

the affordable units which are a type of supply that we really want to get, and we need to think about whether the base zoning that we're giving is undermining the ability to supply those affordable units, not just with respect to the transition Zones, but with the corridor near the activity centers because we have a base entitlement now and we will be going up. And the more we give them just as base entitlement, the less there is an incentive to build the affordable and those are intertwined as somebody approaches their development. And lastly, I want to just follow up on Paige's comment with respect to the activity centers. I appreciate you focusing on what you were going to do with respect to the downtown Austin plan, but one of the things we put into the direction was also the desire to do the same thing in our other activity centers and I would like to hear more about how we're going to be getting the density in those places as

[5:00:46 PM]

well.

>> Sure. Thank you. I wanted to mention one thing with regard to the transition Zones. And seeing maps. Y'all should be getting requests to come at the end of September where we're going to set newspaper executive session or somewhere in city hall and allow you 75 minutes to come look at the transition areas in our area and give us feedback prior to the release. So I didn't make that clear earlier in the scheduling, but that is part of our process with you all and then will have those one on ones and the open houses for neighborhood thought leaders and residents to come give us feedback in October leading up to the supplemental, we anticipate we will hear things on one on ones, we will hear things will you the open houses with the neighborhood residents, similar to the asmp process where we can say what those are, whether

[5:01:47 PM]

we can agree or disagree and issue that supplemental staff recommendation to the planning commission. So again, end of September we'll be able to go over the transition Zones specific to your districts with you all and then have the ability to take further impact -- input in October and perhaps make changes to our staff recommendation if appropriate.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Greg?

>> Casar: This was just a actually to clear up one question, I think, as long as you follow the direction that councilmember alter brought, you said you may bring an answer back to later, but I think we can clear it up now. I was having flashbacks to us passing the direction and found it. Councilmember alter raised the question of transition areas that are not on -- that are residential transit priority network streets, that are not commercial corridor type streets. And what we said was that if the transition area is not on an imagine Austin corridor, but on a transit

[5:02:48 PM]

priority network street that the street-facing lot should begin with missing middle zoning rather than corridor zoning. So I would anticipate then that what you would bring back would be where it says corridor if it was a residential priority network street that it would be one of those two versions of Orange facing it. Is that generally what we should expect?

>> That's correct.

>> Casar: I don't know if that answers your question.

>> Alter: I would prefer that other than being the ability that it's anything other than missing middle.

>> I think that's definition of missing middle, but we don't have to have that work session again.

>> Mayor Adler: All right.

>> Casar: And then I think the issue that we are facing on calibration I think from the document we really tried to prioritize missing middle be a good thing that we want to get and low income affordable housing is a good thing and we want to get both of those things. So I would really want our calibration to get us low income units when we can get

[5:03:48 PM]

them and it seems like we can get more of them from the corridor lots rather than some of the inside the neighborhood lots just based on the economics. But to me we have a affordable housing crisis, housing bond, they are key ways to address that, but we also want middle size and family size units so I want to see the missing middle happen and we need to see both happens. So however you calibrate it, I remain in favor of still trying to get both of those things and not -- recognizing I may not get all of them on every lot, but hopefully both of those things where we can in the city. I know that -- we will leave it to the economists and calibrators to give us the best options, but I am going to be looking to getting both things, but not always both things on the same lot.

>> Mayor Adler: Ann, more than 10 seconds?

>> Kitchen: Five. The zoning categories, my

[5:04:49 PM]

confusion, are they set yet? Do we look at draft 3 are there going to be new zoning categories?

>> Sorry, can you repeat that one more time?

>> Kitchen: I'm wanting to know if we have all the existing zoning categories and do we look to draft 3 or are you going to be coming out with new zoning categories?

>> So draft 3 is a good place to start. We're anticipating that the Zones will change a bit in name and in standards.

>> Kitchen: When will we see those?

>> At a future work session possibly? It's a work in progress right now.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I guess a better question is to my mind if we're -- when we're thinking about transition Zones if we don't know what the zoning categories are, it makes it harder to think about the application of a transition zone.

>> For the transition Zones I think for sure we can give you additional details at some point.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

[5:05:49 PM]

Before we look at the maps.

>> I think that would --

>> Kitchen: Okay. The sooner we have that the more helpful it would be to our thinking about it. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I think those are all the things that we have. It does look like there's a lot of calibration going on. I just raise that so that we have calibration expertise and I would remind everybody that we may be setting a council meeting tentatively for December 12th. We have one right on the 5th, but if we need the 12th in order to be able to consider this in December, we may do that, so everybody should be looking at that and keeping that date open on their calendar. That said, it is 5:08 and this special session of council is going to be adjourned. We will start a new council meeting at 6:00 in city council chambers and we have like 130 people that are signed up at this point. So it will be a good time to hear from the community. I'll see you guys there. We will start at 6:00 sharp if we have folks there. Bye.