

Public Safety Committee Meeting Transcript – 11/16/2020

Title: City of Austin

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 11/16/2020 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 11/16/2020

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

Please note that the following transcript is for reference purposes and does not constitute the official record of actions taken during the meeting. For the official record of actions of the meeting, please refer to the Approved Minutes.

[2:04:45 PM]

>> Flannigan: We can go ahead and get started. It is 2:04 P.M. This is the meeting of the public safety subcommittee for the council. I am councilmember Jimmy Flannigan, chair of the committee, vice-chair Cass czar and councilmember Casar and councilmember harper-madison present. Also I see councilmember kitchen and councilmember tovo is in the list although I don't see her in video. I think we're ready to go. The first item is to approve the minutes from the September and October committee meeting minutes. Without objection those minutes are approved. Let me go ahead and bring in judge statman for our next item. We will talk about parking citations issued while individuals are voting.

[2:05:46 PM]

And judge statman are you there?

>> I'm here can you hear me?

>> We can, but we can't see you.

>> I'll start it. I'm not spur if you want any. Hi, everybody. Good afternoon it's good to so municipal court we received a few parking citations that were given while people were either waiting in the long lines to early vote or they parked in areas that weren't designated for parking because all the places for voting were full, which is very exciting to hear that. We got a handful of these and we expect a few more because of the unprecedented amount of voting. And thinking about it, we don't want to create any potential discouragement or barriers to voting however small that might be. So the city prosecutors have

[2:06:47 PM]

graciously agreed to review all of these and determine if interests of justice dismissals are appropriate. But this is outside the regular scope of duty and down the road there is no guarantee that future prosecutors would choose to handle it the same way. So I wanted to bring this to your attention so we might discuss the ways of creating future continuity. I have a couple of possible solutions to throw out there for consideration. One is an ordinance that would add all of the election days to the holidays where parking isn't enforced. Of course this might require stakeholder input and some analysis on possible collateral effects, mainly by being not collecting parking for those days. The second might be adding a code similar to the one for people summoned for jury duty or judicial procedures

[2:07:49 PM]

and that would direct our parking hearings enforcement officers to dismiss the citations resulting from voting. And this is going to necessitate some determination of like the mechanisms and the criteria of how and where someone would be eligible. So the city attorney's office is the appropriate entity to research and develop potential ordinances, but of course municipal court we will provide any assistance we can to both you and the city attorney's office.

>> Flannigan: Judge Statman, thank you for bringing this issue to the attention of the council and the committee today. I would certainly support us proceeding down that road. Any questions, councilmembers?

-- Any questions, councilmembers? Mayor pro tem?

>> I was curious and I assume it was like a combination. Was your meter expiring because you were in line longer than you were supposed to be, but also I

[2:08:50 PM]

just remember trying to go to Dittmar rec center and there was no place to park so we went ahead and left and there were cars like parking on -- jumping the curb and parking. So I assume it's that combination of a ticket, which is an APD ticket, versus the transportation department. Is that what you're all seeing?

>> What we got was the transportation department. So somebody parking in a space, like a fire lane or something like that that was not designated for parking. But we also got the ones where the meter had expired because people were in line.

>> Garza: But the recommendation you made about an ordinance and maybe free parking would -- would it refer just the meter ones and not the parking where you're not supposed to park ones, is that right?

>> So one of the options is to make election day like a holiday where there's not a

[2:09:51 PM]

cost for parking. The other would be to set out some criteria. Like if somebody was parking, there was not anything that was conveniently available and were they creating a hazard how they parked. If not, then that would be something that would be dismissible. So something that the city attorney's office would have to talk to stakeholders and parking enforcement officers and come up with some language and specifics on the best way to do that.

>> Okay. Thanks. So chair, it doesn't look like it's posted for office, but I guess you could just -- we could just -- someone could do an ifc for directing the law department to come up with that analysis and a solution. But of course I would be supportive.

>> Flannigan: Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: Thanks very much. It was interesting and some good alternatives.

[2:10:51 PM]

I know we had a constituent contact our office on one of the days of early voting explaining just this very situation. I think in that the city's case he had been at a meter that had expired. So the at that point we contacted a transportation department and they -- I think it would be good to loop them into this conversation because there were some ways that they referred to handle it and so I think that I saw that there's a mobility meeting coming up. I don't know whether it's too late to have that conversation at that point as well. But they had suggested to us that on election day there would be no ticketing so I hope that's what happened. That there wasn't ticketing on election day, but that as I understood the conversation, that there would be an ability to kind of dismiss some of those tickets that had happened because a meter expired and other things like that and some other early voting. So thanks for working on handling those cases so that those aren't ticketed, but

[2:11:52 PM]

in terms of what the permanent fix is I would suggested that we loop those stakeholders in and the transportation department in particular because it was my understanding that they had some concerns about kind of a widespread policy for the weeks of early voting just because there are areas that are impacted by that that might not be ones in which people are actually early voting.

>> Other comments? Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yes. If that's something that everyone wants to do, the mobility committee could take a look at it. We can't put it on this Thursday's agenda. It would have to be a future one. But regardless of the mobility committee I do agree it would be something that would be helpful to talk with atd about.

>> Flannigan: Right.

>> Thank you, councilmember. I would suggest that should the councilmembers want to

[2:12:52 PM]

move forward with an ifc certainly directing the city manager to come back with these recommendations so research would cue us up proper -- queue us up properly for transportation as well as the law department.

>> Flannigan: Do you think an ifc is necessary? This is literally an item from staff coming from judge statman.

>> I think it would be appropriate. Certainly for the city manager to see how we might want to handle it.

>> Flannigan: I know mayor pro tem you and I have been working on this to bring to the agenda today if somebody wants to owe awe capture an ifc, that we can get something quick and dirty at and get something coordinated across departments. Councilmember harper-madison?

>> Harper-madison: I'ding happy to help co-author and I wanted to tell judge statman I appreciate that at

[2:13:52 PM]

the end because we don't want a hazard, people parking in fire lanes and other areas, but where they're impeding on people's ability to impede sidewalks. I appreciate that clarification. But I'm slightly happy to support.

>> Flannigan: Excellent. Judge statman, thank you for your attention and bringing this to us today.

>> Thank you so much. Everyone stay well.

>> Okay. Are we ready to move on to item number 3. I'm going to bring in some of our folks who are going to be presenting. Chief Manley as well. Okay. Are you there? I know it takes a second for the cameras to turn on and

[2:14:53 PM]

everything.

>> Yes. Good afternoon, everybody. I'm the chief performance officer. Thank you for having us here today. I'll be kicking off the -- the very beginning part of item 3. My part is very chief and the remaining that will be handled by Sarah and Brian because the main focus will be on the 2019 report. So thank you for pulling up the presentation. So if you're able to -- I don't know if I can take control or you.

>> Flannigan: I'm in charge.

>> Got it T.

>> If you wouldn't mind going to the next slide, please. The reason I here today is to talk about all this relates to strategic directions going into 2023.

[2:15:54 PM]

As -- you can go to the next slide. As you will all recall, back in June there was resolution number 50 that included various direct -- pieces of direction related to sb23 measures. More specifically it established zero racial disparity goals within the safety outcome and particularly today related to the motor vehicle stops, citations and arrests resulting from the stops and any use of force incidents. It also included direction for staff to use the joint analysis on APD racial profiling data to serve as the baseline measurement for a very specific measure related to motor vehicle stops within wage 2023, as well as use of force as incidents and offer involved deaths. So what was our process to address those pieces of the

[2:16:55 PM]

resolution specifically? First, we assembled leadership supporting staff from office of police overnight, equity, innovation, police department and then my team as well to collaborate on the dashboard content and visualizations that we would be including for these safety outcome measures. For each of the sc measures, we had a very specific template to the departments to use so that there's some consistency in the content and the way out for each of those measures. So we generally utilized that template in this case, but we also recognized that this measure had some special or unique aspects to it that we needed to take into consideration so we did make some adjustments to meet those needs. We also wanted to make sure we were incorporating key information from the reimagining public safety website, the various council

[2:17:56 PM]

resolution is and the racial profiling reports in this -- in the measure content. So when you go and look at the actual measure in the dashboard you're able to see all of that information, various measure bound points and then you're able to really [indiscernible] Of each of the outcomes for the vehicle stops. For example, it resulted in a hightation or arrests and also access to raw data and dig into that further. In terms of what's next, what you see is a small screenshot of what exists on the dashboard that went live today for this measure. For the next steps we will be incorporating the results of the 2019 joint analysis report which it involves not only content, but also

[2:18:56 PM]

making sure we're updating the various visualizations because that was used as the base data for the measure, we didn't have anything in terms of training analysis but we'll be able to incorporate visualizations that incorporate that trending as well as analysis and content around that accordingly. We will also use your experience in building this together as a baseline or foundation for how we can make updates and an approach to development of other related measures. So for example previously the measures about use of force in proportion to number of arrests and crimes against persons, and property. We took a look at what we

[2:19:57 PM]

can do to improve those in the same spirit as what was specifically directed for this measure within resolution 50. We middle school to work on the final measure of sd1 which is the final measure compared to race. We still have work to do, but we wanted to bring to you today where we have this measure live for folks who look at. I believe you may have been rent a series of things. I'm not sure if that made it to you or not. So in the interest of hoping that everything loads quickly and correctly, we have it opened up on three separate tabs. So this is the homepage performance, the aunttexas.gov where you can see all the measures to sb23 and if you scroll down you can see where you can stroll on the safety outcome. If you go to the next tab that's what happened if you

[2:20:58 PM]

click on the safety outcome. And if you scroll down to indicator category D, fair administration of justice, you will see in the top left corner it looks a little like the square that has information and insights for disproportionality and analysis and it looks a little different than the others. The reason being that this particular page is actually pulling together more information than our typical measures because there are so many different breakdowns for each of the different outcomes for the motor vehicle stop. We're not able to display it with that target the same way. And if you were to click on that it would open up what you see on the final tab and you see where we have all the information about the reimagine public

safety, the ability to link in to see the resolution content, the joint report and then here you see measure cards that tell you how many motor vehicle stops result in a citation or field observation or arrest. And if you continue to

[2:21:58 PM]

scroll down you will see where we have the actual disproportionality analysis where we are able to see by race how that varies compared to actual population and you will see we specifically noted the council's direction about the role or the target for each of those to be zero disproportionatety. For each of these things you're able to dig into the raw data and learn a little more about each of the individual situations that may have taken place and -- but really happy to be able to put this out here to the public today and welcome any questions or feedback that the committee or councilmembers have. And so if you do have any of those, I'm happy to take them now or happy to pass it on over to Farah to take on the rest of the presentation.

>> Flannigan: I first want to acknowledge that mayor Adler and councilmember alter have joined the meeting. Thank you all for being with

[2:23:00 PM]

us. Any questions for Kim specifically on the sd23 site and the specifics? Okay. Let's move on. Farah, are you there?

>> Yes, I am, good afternoon. Kerry is up first.

>> Great.

>> Flannigan: Kerry is first. Sorry.

>> Good councilmembers and mayor Adler. My name is Kerry o'con E the chief innovation officer and I will talk to you today about the methodology within the racial profiling report. If you could go to the next screen. So the report for the 2019

[2:24:01 PM]

racial profiling we looked at 2019 vehicle stop data from the city of Austin open data portal. To conduct an analysis of proportionality we used the city of Austin population data from the 2010 census. This data has the lowest more engine of error, which is why we used that particular data source. We also used a disparate outcomes analysis for those after a traffic stop. If you go to the next screen we'll talk more about that. So when we talk about disproportionality we're talking about the ratio between the

percentage of persons in a particular racial or ethnic group at a particular decision point or experiencing an event compared to the percentage of that group in the population. When we talk about disparate impact career describing a situation in which an outcome or adverse effect

[2:25:02 PM]

falls disproportionately on a racial or ethnic group as compared to otherwise. As when we're measuring that on decision points after a stop, such as a citation, arrest or warning, we're borrowing from legally available analytical framework where the relevant population base for that adverse disparate impact is the subset of the population that is affected by the decision. I just want to say it's to great credit to the city of Austin that we're able to borrow these legally available analytical frameworks that are normally reserved for the courts to use them instead as a performance you're where we can set these audacious goals for our city and measure progress towards them. Next screen. For racial disproportionality in 2019, black African-American drivers were the most

[2:26:02 PM]

overrepresented group in motor vehicle stops, making up approximately eight percent of the Austin population but 14 percent of the motor vehicle stops, 25% of searches and 25% of the arrests and were the only demographic group to receive more discretion than low discretion searches. Latino drivers made up more than 30% of motor vehicle stops and 44% of motor vehicle stops that resulted in a citation, but they comprised 31% of Austin's adult population. White drivers were the most represented in motor vehicle stops. Asian-american were second most in total vehicle stops. Next slide. When we talk about disparate outcomes, once someone is pulled over, white caucasian and Asian drivers receive a higher percentage of warnings or field observations at 63 and 64%

[2:27:06 PM]

respectively, black, African-American and Latino drivers received higher percentages of searches that resulted in 10% and seven percent respectively. Hispanic Latinos received the highest percentage of citations at 44%. Black African-Americans were three times more likely to be searched and approximately three times more likely to be arrested than white caucasian drivers. Next slide. Now we turn it over to director Farah muscadin for more on the data analysis.

>> Thank you, Kerry. Good afternoon. My name is Farah muscadin, director of the office of police oversight. Thank you, chair Flannigan and to committee members and councilmembers, and mayor Adler for the opportunity to present to you today. I want to thank my colleagues, Kerry and Brian oak for joining in this report, it has been an interesting journey. This -- the office of police

[2:28:06 PM]

monitor is generally done a racial profiling report but there hadn't been done since 2015 and so we thought the lens that O po and equity and innovation was important in this conversation, particular as the sentiment in the community and the lived experience of those in the community have talked a lot about racial profiling so we wanted to be able to speak to that and look specifically at what the data says. You will get a full copy of the report that will be released this afternoon, but given the time I wanted to give you a high level overview of some of the key points in our analysis and in the report. Next slide, please. So generally this slide talks about disproportionality. And again Kerry did a fabulous job explaining it when we looked at the number of stops and the percentage of each particular race,

[2:29:07 PM]

ethnicity portion of the population. In here what this chart is telling us is that for African-Americans they experience six% overrepresentation as compared to their portion of the population, hispanic Latino, two% over representation, indication three percent under representation when we look at their portion of the population and white caucasian, six percent. So we do see some change from 2019 to 2019 as it relates to African-American and white drivers, but again we still see the disproportionately particular with African-American and Latino drivers. Next slide, this slide here is explaining the exact same information in the previous slide, but we here gave you the numbers. We gave you the numbers in terms of looking at the stops that occurred in 2019 by the four most populous race and ethnicity and we gave you the percentage of the stop, of their particular stop, the portion

[2:30:11 PM]

of the population and then you can see how we did the math with over and under representation. So this is just another way of displaying the previous slide in terms of looking at the overall portion nationality of motor vehicle stops -- proportionality of motor vehicle stops. Next slide, please. This slide we put in here actually is a result of our presentation from the judicial any February. Mayor pro tem specifically asked us what are the reasons for the stop. So that wasn't included in our initial report so we made sure to include it in this report and it was a pretty common question that we got from community after that report was released. So when we look at the reason for the stops at 2019, 75% of them are moving traffic violations so what that means is speeding, stay in lanes, failure to signal and that was the primary reason for vehicle stops in 2019. And then we looked at obviously you see .2% for

[2:31:11 PM]

preexisting knowledge. That generally speaking of a warrant. Next slide, please. Here what we did is we looked at the stops that resulted in arrests and of those stops that resulted in arrests, what was the reason for the stop. So I'll just say that one more time. We looked at the arrests that occurred from a stop and we wanted to know of those arrests, what was the reason for the initial stop. And when we looked at that for 2019, 68% of them were moving traffic violations, 28% other violations of other law violation of law other than traffic and 3% preexisting knowledge, for example, a warrant. Next slide. Here's where we noticed an increase in the disproportionality,

[2:32:11 PM]

particularly as it relates to searches. We saw that there was an increase in disproportionality of searches as it relates to African-Americans going from 17 to 18% from 2018 to 2019. The numbers stayed the same for hispanic and Latino and the same for Asian and slightly increased for white caucasian from 2018 to 2019. I'll go a little further into searches in the next slide chair, you may not remember, but I remember because this stuck out to you most when we presented this to you in the judicial committee in February, we look at high and low discretion searches and let me quickly explain the difference. High discretion searches are searches that are pretty much up to the officer in terms of if there's probable cause, consent or, for example, for safety. Low discretion searches are the type of searches that because of state law, because they are required to do a search so, for example,

[2:33:12 PM]

subsequent to an arrest that is a low discretion search. Officers are able to search the person, vehicle subsequent to an arrest. When we look at this particular chart, again, it shows that African-Americans are more likely to experience high direction searches than low discretion searches and it's the only race ethnicity group that has that higher percentage of high discretion searches. And this number, when we looked at compared to 2018, this number increased by 7.7%. And so that we do know that this is an area that we need to look neurofurther and assist the police department in really addressing this concern because obviously we're seeing that African-Americans experience much more high discretion searches than any of the other race or ethnicity

[2:34:13 PM]

groups that we looked at. Next slide. Now, this is an additional analysis that we added to the report. So we looked at outcomes by each race and ethnicity, in terms of what happened subsequent to their stop. And so when we look at the Asian population, again, in the context of 2019, 34% of the time they

received citations, 64% of the time they received warnings and field observations and 2% arrest. When we look at the African-American population, 55% received warnings and field observations, 35% received citations, and 10% received arrests. Next slide, please. When we look at hispanic and Latino population, 48% received warnings and field

[2:35:15 PM]

observations, 44% citations and 7% arrests. Then when we look at white caucasian population, 63% received warnings and field observations, 33% citations and 4% arrests. So when we looked at the four most popular race ethnicity groups this is where the data showed that African-Americans are three times more likely to be searched and approximately three times more likely to be arrested than their white counterparts. Next slide, please. Now, this we did a geographic analysis, and we're looking at primarily warnings and field observations and also arrests. And as you know the police department has divided the city into sectors, so what this illustrates is that in the Adam and baker sector there are a higher concentration of warnings and field observations and then in the Edward and

[2:36:16 PM]

Charlie sector there were a higher concentration of arrests. I do want to note we're unable to track citations. The department doesn't have the geo mapping in their documentation to do that. It's something we put our recommendations because it would be helpful to see geographically how citations are mapped out that is the last slide before I turn it over to Brian, but I would like to say that I think it is really important that we look at racial profiling and the disproportionality, and I know that I can speak for Carrie and Brian that we are looking forward and want to be partners with the police department to address it because fundamentally our goal is not only to reach zero disparity, but also to have equity in policing. I'll turn it over to Brian to talk about the recommendations.

>> Thank you, Farah. Good afternoon, everyone. I'll briefly go over some of

[2:37:16 PM]

the recommendations that we have in the [indiscernible] That you'll be receiving today. Prior to the pandemic, we actually had an opportunity to host a community conversation with community members around the 2018 racial profiling report and the result. We used a lot of that feedback we got from that community conversation into the recommendations we have for this year. As he read the recommendations for this year you'll also see some of them carry over from last year. So if we can go to the next slide I'll review those recommendations with you at a high level. I will say that our first and most important recommendation that's in this report centers around acknowledgment. And

acknowledgment is important because I fundamentally believe we can not it be part of helping you fix the problem if we can't get you to admit that there's a problem. And I will be open and

[2:38:17 PM]

honest to tell you that a lot of the feedback that we received from the community conversation, from community members, was a defensiveness with our police department, in terms of really receiving the racial profiling data and the report. And one of the things that they talked about was that as a city how do we sort of unequivocally really step in and own the data that's in the report so that we can really move forward with being able to bring forth solutions to how we eliminate this disparity and bring it to zero. Another important area of the recommendation centers around the need for community engagement, and, you know, one of the principles that we are really trying to introduce across all of our departments is that as we do that engagement how do we really center the people that are most harmed, are most on the end of the negative impact, and in this case how do we really sort

[2:39:19 PM]

of engage African-Americans and Latino community members around how we actually move forward to really bring forth solutions to how we eliminate these disparities in traffic stops and arrests and searches that we see. If you go to the next slide, we also feel that it's really important for us to focus on establishing benchmarks. And the benchmarks are important because it really begins to build us a roadmap of how we actually get to zero. And in those benchmarks I would ask, what are our interventions? What are the plans that we're putting in place? How do we feel these interventions or different pilots we may try will actually help us reduce the disparity to get us to zero? So ultimately being able to establish a benchmark and a pathway so that we can actually get to meet the goal that the council set forth in the resolution 50.

[2:40:20 PM]

And the commitment is really important. You know, a lot of the community members in the community conversation we had made comments around wanting to see something in writing from our police department, in terms of their commitment to really get to this goal of zero. And then the last recommendation that we explored in the report is the need for you toes really -- for us to really get upstream and is there an opportunity within officer training to intervene early on and to really sort of acknowledge and address the role of officer discretion and racial disparity and is that an active part of our training academy where we're starting early on in terms of how we address that issue. I think that as you look at the data today, the high discretionary searches and the disparity for African-American

motorists in that area is really illustrative of what happens at those discretion points for our officers and drivers

[2:41:21 PM]

in the city. I think it's a good illustration of that. So that's a high-level overview of the recommendations that are in the report. We definitely would welcome more opportunity to probably come back and talk at length about those recommendations, as you have an opportunity to review that report. And then I think now we'll open it up for any questions.

>> Flannigan: Councilmembers, do we have questions for Brian or Farah? Councilmember harper-madison?

>> Harper-madison: I only have a couple questions. I'm more have statements of gratitude for Farah and Carrie and Brian, for the hard work I know you poured into this, producing this data and these recommendations. I really just wanted to say I thoroughly appreciate the hard work. This was totally necessary. You guys may or may not notice this but this is almost to the day the year

[2:42:21 PM]

anniversary of when we brought forward the resolution that sort of started this ball rolling. And so and then, you know, just a couple days ago the -- just over a million dollars that we asked for for auditing the academy was approved and that process is starting too so it just feels like everything is lining up just so and I really appreciate that. It feels comprehensive, and so the one question I would have had was how do we, like, one of the last benchmarks had training and intervention, and so I kind of had a how do we question? Then it occurred to me if we are specifically addressing the audit around training, I wonder if that information could help to influence the response here. But just out of curiosity, did y'all have any sort of initial ideas about how do we address it at the training and interventive level? I'm not sure who I'm asking.

[2:43:22 PM]

Anybody.

>> I think we may all chime in and have ideas about it. I think from a racial equity standpoint, looking at the strength of our training around that in our training academy and how do we really sort of emphasize that principle, even on the front end, in terms of who we select for academy is even important. I agree with you. I think that the work that the consultant is going to do on the audit with the training academy is the -- as part of that work will help us really sort of identify some of those opportunities moving

forward. And there's been some pockets of work around that. For example, my office is a part of working with the project with community members who are doing part of the equity video review of some of the training academy material and providing feedback on that as well, and so we hope that that information that comes out of that report and the review and the work they're doing will also help them

[2:44:24 PM]

form the training academy portion too.

>> Flannigan: Mayor pro tem?

>> Garza: I'm sorry if I missed this from the beginning. Is this a new report for 2019 and what we received -- I feel like sometimes a month feels like, you know, two years as a councilmember. When we asked these questions when we were in person the last time we talked about this, so it may have been two years ago, was that presentation on '18 data?

>> Yes, that's correct, yeah. So we didn't anticipate doing two reports in one year. So when we presented in -- in January we presented the 2018 data. The police department is required by state law to

[2:45:26 PM]

release their racial profiling data by March and it's usually the end of February of each year. So after resolution 50 was passed and setting the goal for zero disparity we felt it was really important for you to get the 2019 report done in this year so we could have that trend data and have another analysis. Going forward, we will do this -- we will release this report in the summer of each year.

>> Garza: Okay

>> It was not our intention to do two in one year but I'm glad we were able to do that because it's like councilmember harper-madison said, all falling in place

>> Garza: And the slide that said that 68% of arrests were from moving violations, I guess I asked a similar question that you remembered from last time, but I guess digging into that, do we know of that 68%, what the arrests were for? Like, does the data get as detailed as they were pulled over for speeding and, you

[2:46:26 PM]

know, 50% were arrested for a warrant or -- oh, no, but that was a separate -- that was an entirely separate percentage, right?

>> Yes. So what we looked at was the universe of stops in 2019. Those that led to arrests, we looked at what was the initial reason for the stop in the first place. And that number is 68% was a motor -- a moving traffic violation. So that's anywhere from speeding, failure to keep in lanes. We didn't look at what the subsequent arrest was for. We didn't look at that in this report but that's definitely something - that's why these conversations are so helpful because this report has grown from the last report because of the feedback that we've gotten. We introduced more data analysis into it. But that is something we can look into in terms of after the stop if there was arrest, what was the basis for the arrest.

>> Garza: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor pro tem, to that

[2:47:28 PM]

point, that is a critical piece of information and we talked about that last year as well. I agree if we're going to looking at the disparities we need to look at those disparities that are the result of the officer's discretion versus those that are the likelihood or the fact a warrant existed for the arrest and, therefore, it wasn't a discretionary arrest.

>> Garza: Okay. But you're saying -- I guess I'm trying to understand the two different kinds. So in the pie chart there was a percentage that it led to an arrest. Is that because -- I guess are the -- there was a percentage that said they were stopped because of a previous warrant. So was it, like, the officer runs their plates and then -- so they haven't done anything, like there's no moving violation involved, they just run someone's plates? Can we do that? We just run plates without any moving violations?

>> The officer has the ability to run plates but that .2% is most likely we were looking for a subject for a warrant and we were

[2:48:31 PM]

doing surveillance on them or maybe the officer is familiar with the person. That's why it's such a small number. The other number when we talk about the disproportionality in arrests from traffic stops we do need to do that extra layer of digging and that's what we're working on, to show those arrests, how many were discretionary versus how many were driven by the person had a warrant once they were stopped for a traffic violation.

>> Garza: Okay. So we don't know what that number is of that 68%, how many of them were arrested because of a previous warrant?

>> That is not included in this analysis, no.

>> Well, we do know because of -- in 2019, of the ones that were arrested, 3% were preexisting knowledge, which is more likely a warrant.

>> Garza: No. Of the 68% though?

>> No, no. That's of the -- all the people who were stopped and arrest -- and an arrest ensued in 2019.

[2:49:32 PM]

>> Garza: Okay.

>> Of those that were arrested, 3% of those were because of a warrant.

>> Garza: Okay. Then it's even -- okay. Then it's not a lot.

>> No, no. That's a separate category then. That's those with the preexisting. It still doesn't answer for the 68% how many of those actually had a warrant. They're two separate sets of data, so no, that's not the same thing.

>> Garza: Okay. If somebody can find that out, that would be a helpful piece of data.

>> If I might jump in, mayor pro tem, because I had a similar question on that.

>> Garza: Okay

>> Flannigan: It might be useful, Farah, because I'm hearing the data gets more complicated the deeper we go, instead of adding a lot of stuff to a full report, if we might just deep dive in a few of these areas in the short-term over the next couple months. That way it will happen narrow the frame of analysis. We can add fewer variables as we get more answers.

[2:50:34 PM]

Just for example taking the pie chart, that chart two on slide 16, and taking that 68% and breaking it out so we get a better understanding of how those -- what started as a moving violation, how they concluded. And not waiting for the next big report, but maybe deep diving on that one question might provide a little bit of clarity. I think I understand what you're saying, chief, where the preexisting knowledge are the ones where there wasn't a moving violation, they had a -- they for some reason knew, this 3%, that there was a warrant and that's why they were stopped. In the 68% there was a moving violation and it's possible a big percentage of those after the moving violation reason, it was discovered they had a warrant. Or whatever that is. But that's where the deep dive I think will be helpful. Sorry to disrupt. Please continue, mayor pro tem

>> Garza: No problem. Since you were -- you're on, chief Manley, I remember we

[2:51:35 PM]

had this discussion last time about the acknowledging part. And, you know, I a hundred percent understand you wanting to defend, you know, any actions by your officers. I totally get it. But it seemed like last time there wasn't that acknowledgment. And I'm just curious if now you believe that there is room to improve and room to change it? Because, you know, even without digging into the numbers, when you look at that map that shows different parts of town and the warnings that are given, that's kind of -- you know, that's hard to look at when you see that -- from that map it looks like, you know, southeast Austin never gets a warning, if I read that map correctly. So I'm curious if you can -- if you wanted to say anything about that last time because last time with

[2:52:36 PM]

all due respect it was a very defensive response. And I get it. You know, we're all public servants. As councilmembers, we get criticized all the time but as public servants we need to be open to that criticism and want to do better and, you know, get to a place where, you know, then if it's a policy issue we can say we'll have to agree to disagree on that. But I was just curious if you wanted to show any acknowledgment and room for improvement?

>> Well, certainly, mayor pro tem. Again, the defensiveness is not about the need to always defend my department because we're not perfect and there are issues that we are addressing and have been addressing for years in our community. I will agree that there is work that needs to be done and that work is underway and we are actively engaging to the extent we're either allowed or invited. And I am actually pleased to see although it is a slight improvement that there was an improvement made last

[2:53:36 PM]

year compared to 2018 in some of these areas of disproportionality. So I do think that we're headed in the right direction. I think that we have made progress. And I think with the continued efforts of everyone that's involved in this process we can continue along this path.

>> Garza: Okay. I appreciate that. I also just -- I'd add, you know, I often hear in these kinds of discussions people will say stuff like, well, you know, just do what you're told, do what the officer tells you to do, do -- and it's always strange to me that the responsibility gets put on the person that's not the professional in that situation, you know? When people -- you know, if I get pulled over I get nervous. It is a very valid reaction for people to not act a hundred percent, you know -- to get nervous, to get scared, especially in an environment where incredibly

[2:54:38 PM]

off things happen sometimes, you know, in traffic stops for certain parts of our community. So I certainly hope that as we try to get better that is a big part of our training for the officers, that they're the professional in the situation and, you know, as councilmembers we get called the most awful names, you know, get sent the most awful emails, but we have to be the professional in those, and I really hope that we are having discussions with our police officers as we train them and having them understand that they are public servants and I know it's a hard job. I know it is. But I certainly hope we can continue working towards reducing these what I believe are racial biases that are in our police.

>> And we are committed to that work and the only thing I'll add is at the commencement speech at our most recent graduation, as I say if not at all most of them I actually remind the graduating class remember in every circumstance you are in you are the trained

[2:55:39 PM]

professional so that is something we do reiterate and I am in complete agreement with you.

>> Flannigan: Councilmembers, other questions? Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I just wanted to see if we could get a copy of the slide deck. I didn't see it posted

>> Flannigan: I think the slides were emailed to council offices around 8:30 this morning so they should be in your in box

>> Kitchen: Hmm

>> Flannigan: That's what staff told us. I'll have my staff follow up

>> Kitchen: If you could have them follow up that would be great. I'd appreciate that. Thank you very much.

>> Flannigan: Sorry, councilmember tovo maybe

>> Tovo: Thank you. Yeah thanks. I have a question for Farah. Farah, you paused and explained, this but I'm still having trouble distinguishing between the information on slide 5 and information on slide 6. So if you wouldn't mind

[2:56:40 PM]

spending another few minutes on that.

>> Okay. Let me -- and this is the slides that talk about the disproportionality?

>> Tovo: I'm sorry, yes, the reason for the -- 15 is entitled [indiscernible] Motor vehicle stop in 2019.

>> Yep.

>> Tovo: And then on the next one is the pie chart that talks about the reason for stop that resulted in arrest by race/ethnicity. So I'm struggling with understanding those two slides in juxtaposition to one another and how they relate. Also on the pie chart on 16 in particular, I guess I need some examples of what would be violations of law other than traffic. I didn't see in the previous slide a category that might encompass violations other than traffic violations.

>> Okay. So the -- I believe this is slide 15 that talks about the reason for the motor vehicle stop.

[2:57:40 PM]

This was a question that we got in February just in terms of when we did the analysis for the racial profiling we were asked, well, why were people being stopped? And so what this slide talks about is 75% of the time when there were -- when we look at the total number of stops for 2019 there's just over 139,000. So when we looked at that number just over 104,000 were because of a moving traffic violation. So that's the universe of motor vehicle stops and why people were stopped in the first place. We looked for an example of violation of law other than traffic. I may have to defer to chief on that because we really couldn't find a good example of that to give you. It was a question that we got that we couldn't find an example for that. But when we look at the next slide, what -- I understand why it's a little confusing so let me put it in terms of an example.

[2:58:40 PM]

So we know that in the universe of stops for 2019 there were 139,000, just over 129,000. Let's say I'm one of the 139. I am stopped and subsequently arrested. We wanted to look at, okay, of those people that were arrested from that 129,000, what was the reason for their stops? And in that particular case

[indiscernible] 68% of that was for a moving traffic violation. So we cut down the 139 universe to the universe of those that were arrested subsequent to stop to see, okay, when we looked at that group, what was the reason for their stop of those who got arrested? Does that help a little bit?

>> Tovo: Yes, absolutely. Makes perfect sense. Thank you so much for spending a few more minutes on that. I really appreciate it and understand it much better now. Then my only other question, what is a field observation? I assume it's something like

[2:59:42 PM]

a warrant -- something like a warning but I'm not familiar with that term

>> Yeah, it is just like a warning. I'm going to see if I can quickly find the pd definition of it in our report. But I think it is just, like, a warning.

>> I can help if you would like, Farah

>> Please, chief

>> Sure. We require our officers to document any time they stop an individual. Let's say we stop someone and we do not issue them a citation or we stop them, say, on the side of the road and talk to them and there's not going to be any other documentation as a result of that, such as an

[indiscernible] Report. We fill out a field observation so we can keep track of who we're stopping for all of the demographic reasons and reporting that we need that information for.

>> Tovo: Thank you very much, chief

>> You bet.

[3:00:48 PM]

>> Flannigan: Other questions? Let me ask one question and then I'll go to councilmember alter. I'm curious if there's any similar analysis of police departments in other cities? Do we have a sense of how this lines up? Are there parts of this that are uniquely Austin or parts that are more kind of like policing as a concept, gives us this data issue and the resulting challenges and overcoming it? Can you speak a little bit to that?

>> Yeah, no. I don't know if it's a good thing or bad thing but this is not unique to Austin at all, at all whatsoever. Pretty much there's disproportionality for those that do this analysis across the country. There was a report earlier this year from Travis county that showed disproportionality in terms of their traffic stops. The state of California did a whole state-wide report on racial profiling, and the numbers show the same, of higher disproportionality for African-Americans and Latinos.

[3:01:48 PM]

And so this is something that I believe every single police department struggles with. You know, it's also just kind of about the systemic issues in law enforcement. But part of the reason why I'm so passionate about this work and very assertive about it is because I feel so strongly that we can address it in Austin. I really do. I really feel like Austin can be the leader in terms of turning the direction in policing so that it's more equitably

>> Flannigan: Thank you, Farah. I hold that in my mind as kind of permission to innovate. This isn't about us uniquely failing or some kind of unique failing in the way we do business as a city. These are large

systemic problems and there's a lot of cities that are seek to go address it, and I like the idea that we might be the ones to really move that needle and hope that's exactly what we're all trying to do.

[3:02:49 PM]

Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: Thank you. I don't have a copy of the slides so I'm not going to be able to be as specific to what's on the slides yet, but I think it's a good report, though, we do this type of data analysis so we understand where we're not doing well and where there are opportunities. I wanted to just clarify from the chief's comments and, you know, as we're looking at this it, all of this data is from before we started talking about it from the report that was released earlier year. So if there was improvement from 2018 to 2019 it has nothing to do with changes we put into effect once this was something that was more apparent through the data. Is that correct? Because the 2020 data is not what you analyzed and, you know, you did your report in

[3:03:50 PM]

I think it was January of this year if I'm not mistaken. Is that correct? So, I mean, what we're seeing so far, it's good that it moved in the right direction, but we don't have any data that shows that any change at this point is having an effect. Is that correct? Do I have the sequence correct?

>> If that question for me is, yes, you have the timing correct in that we received the report on the 2018 data in January of this year, subsequent to when all of the data in the report you're receiving today would have already happened. So we were already making improvements before that report even came out or the data and the -- that was already going in the right direction prior to receiving that report in January. , So yes, you're timing --

>> Alter: Sure. I want to acknowledge that. The reason I'm asking that, I think it would it be useful and I apologize if this has already been stated, but I didn't have it clearly, what steps have we

[3:04:50 PM]

taken to change the trajectory so that when we're now looking at 2020, correcting for the pandemic, however, you do that, that we can understand, you know, what are some of the things that we changed in 2020 and hopefully there will be additional changes that are happening in 2021, but we won't be able to measure those in our 2020 data. So what has actually changed? We had some discussions about we might change, but you mentioned that you've already taken steps. Can you outline those clearly for us?

>> Sure. And I think this is the whole cause and effect, where do we best invest our time and efforts to have the change that we want? And I don't know that we're ever going to get to a point to where we say a equals B. But I think the fact there's so much focus on this issue both nationally and locally, I think we have invested over the years in training whether it be the implicit bias training that we went through a few years back, whether it be the work that we've done with the undoing

[3:05:53 PM]

racism that we put a majority of command staff through and that generates conversation as well. So to me I think awareness is one issue that we have to look at and try to evaluate how much impact did that have, and then as we go forward I know this was one of the recommendations coming out of report as well is that strategic plan, and I think there's so much work being done in so many lanes right now as we look at the police department, both the reviews that we did on our training academy with our own staff, our ph.d., the external review that we did, the video reviews being done right now, and then y'all obviously just hired a

[indiscernible] To come in and do another review. I think that's where we have to focus our efforts, making sure there's a synergy there with all this work being done as we build this strategic plan so when we're talking about this next year and we really want to tie cause and effect, that we'll have something to point back to. For now I think it's just

[3:06:54 PM]

some of the training we put our officers through along with really the attention being paid locally and nationally, but to have a hard and fast data set or something we can point back to, we don't don't have that yet

>> Thank you. Then in terms of if we were to think about how these changes were being made at the cadet level versus the officers who are out in the field I heard you mention undoing racism training, what were the others things for those already in the field?

>> So the ongoing training we bring the officers back every two year cycle for training. I think the specific difference you're seeing out in the field that may impact some of these disparities is policy changes we've made both on our own and also in coordination with you as a governing body here, specifically in the area of low level enforcement of certain types of offenses. We could go as far as back as the juvenile curfew and

[3:07:56 PM]

as recent as to enforcement of marijuana law here. So I think from the officers on the street perspective I think it's more for them just policy changes we have put in place and then as we continue our reviews of the academy and our curricula, where do those opportunities lie to actually train the officers already in service. I know one of the recommendations, I believe it's in this year's report as well, specifically addresses training for those officers already in service and so we would have to look at what our opportunities are there as well

>> Alter: Thank you. I don't know this can be documented quantitatively in any way, but I do think it would be useful as part of the discussion in the reporting or whatever to be able to document what steps have happened, are in motion that might relate to that, particularly if we have an eye for being innovative and being able to provide a

[3:08:56 PM]

model for other cities as we move forward. I don't know if the report is the right place for that, but being able to try to understand these are levers that may have affected it. Obviously we're not going to get down to the fine grain of this one thing was the solution or whatnot, but having that suite of tools documented I think might be helpful moving forward. Thank you.

>> Flannigan: Farah, when we get into the full report and we're not just looking at powerpoint slides, are we going to see more slices of this data in different ways?

>> Oh, absolutely. We expanded our analysis to include gender, looking at stops by gender, and more disproportionality as it relates to African-American and Latino males. We also looked at the

[3:09:58 PM]

specific outcomes per race, ethnicity. And so we added much more analysis in this version than we did in our first round. And that was primarily from community feedback and also council feedback. And so I think that's what makes it so great, is that we're responding to the community in terms of what they -- what they're asking us to look into the data to see what it says.

>> Flannigan: Do you have some of this analysis broken down further by patrol region? Because you have the map, but what strikes me about the map that's in the presentation is that it's a raw number and not a percentage. So I don't really know, right, how those numbers compare to each other.

>> Yeah. We do have that in the report. It's broken down by number of arrests by sectors and also by I believe field observations as well, warnings and field observations

>> Flannigan: I do remember

[3:10:59 PM]

seeing some of this back when we were doing judicial committee and thinking -- my council district is entirely within the Adam sector and as much as my constituents have told me they want to see more traffic stops and more motor vehicle enforcement, I don't think they're expecting them to be warnings, unless they're the ones pulled over then they definitely want the warning. If it's anybody else they're expecting people to get a ticket so it's -- it is -- and I kind of remember thinking then that the data kind of shows the opposite of what these parts of town seem to be asking for. You've got some parts of town that in large part are wanting more enforcement and you're seeing more warnings and some parts of town where they're wanting to see more community partnership from officers and they're seeing more arrests. Obviously there's a ton of detail to dig into for those reasons, but just as a high level blush I think more --

[3:12:00 PM]

more information to dig into that report and then if I see any gaps or any further questions we can -- any councilmember of course can reach out to your office or to the chief and see if there's more info. Other questions on this report? Councilmember Casar?

>> Casar: Two questions. First on the data and to your point, chair, about addresses, we've been talking about this for a while. Every time we get one of the reports about isolating what it has to do potentially more with race or ethnicity and what does not. So I know sometimes you all check the data on stops at night versus the daytime assuming it's harder to determine a driver's race or ethnicity at night. But sometimes that information may not be that useful because we're so segregated that it might generally be able to -- regardless of whether it's day or night you're more

[3:13:01 PM]

often than not still going to be stopping people of similar race or ethnicity based on neighborhood. So something that I remember came up in our public safety committee meeting I think back in 2015 or 2016 was looking at racial disproportionality of stops, of people -- for example, people of color in neighborhoods that are segregated more heavily white neighborhoods, for example, or the other way around, in order to better examine racial disproportionality that may not be tied to the way the neighborhood is patrolled, right? There were questions of are you going to have more stops just because that neighborhood is patrolled more? Or does it have to do with potentially implicit bias? So have we gotten ahold yet or can we drill down to look at in a maintained do you

[3:14:01 PM]

see more disproportionate stops, for example, of people of color? Not based on how heavily the area is patrolled, but actually based more independently on race? If you look at that? Does that make sense? Is that clear? I feel like it took me longer to ask the question than I wanted.

>> I think I might be able to help. One of the things that we added in this report that wasn't in the last report is we created a dashboard where you can go in by zip code and traffic motor vehicle stops by race, times, intersection, so you can type in your zip code and see kind of what the stops were and I think we had to clean the data a lot to be able to put that together. And we wanted the community to be able to see kind of in terms of motor vehicle stops, what's happening in their community. So I'm looking forward to feedback on that because it is a new edition to the report that we added. Just so that the community themselves can drill down to

[3:15:01 PM]

see what's happening in the particular neighborhoods

>> Casar: I think that's exactly what I was asking about. Then the follow-up question is does the disproportionality that we -- that y'all are reporting, does that generally hold from neighborhood to neighborhood, regardless of whether there's major roads people speed on, regardless of the overall racial makeup of the neighborhood, does that disproportionality continue to hold across neighborhoods? Or do you see it dip and flow in different neighborhoods?

>> Yeah. I think it's one of those things that chair Flannigan talked about that we can drill down in. When I take a step back from the report because there is a lot of data in there, drilling down by neighborhoods, I really want to drill down on the high discretion searches because that was a red flag and also what mayor pro tem talked about, in terms of -- and also chair Flannigan talked about drilling down to determine what was the reason for the arrest, what

[3:16:01 PM]

people were arrested for post the stop. I think those are three critical areas we could drill down and look into and come back to the committee to report what we find.

>> Casar: That would be really useful because my hope is that we go from here to a set of -- to an action plan or to a set of recommended steps to address this, whether it's how it is we're patrol in particular areas or what -- you know, what it is that we're emphasizing stops for or whatever it is that the next steps are, I think it would -- we're probably goof to drill down to a deeper level of information to get to that. My second question was about high discretion stops. If I remember correctly, a few years ago when we got this report, consent searches were actually a really small portion of our number of searches. But based on this data it looks like that may be on the rise or maybe I'm

[3:17:03 PM]

misremembering. Have we -- I see you shaking your head, please let me know. Is there a difference between consent searches and these high discretion searches? Have we been seeing any sort of change in the number of high discretion searches we do over a period of time?

>> Yeah. And I do think that's a very important point as you asked me. Because what you do consider a high discretion search? What's included in that are -- one of the categories is contraband in plain site. If an officer stopped someone and there's contraband in plain site, firearm, drugs, something like that, does that officer really have discretion whether or not they're going to search for that. I would think the community's expectation is if we have contraband in plain sight we're going to act on that. Similarly what is considered a high discretion search is a probable cause search, meaning the officer has probable cause to believe a crime has been committed so that's included in that large bucket of high -- of high discretion searches. I would think that the

[3:18:04 PM]

community would want an officer that has probable cause to believe a crime is being committed to conduct that search. But we have to be aware to make sure bias isn't playing into the belief there's probable cause. It is important to highlight these high discretion searches are much, much more than the consent search, where an officer is just asking to search someone because they want to search someone. I don't remember the absolute number in this year's report but it's very, very low because we've set the bar very high for all of the there should an officer has to meet before they can do a consent search so I do think that's important as you're looking at all the data to realize what's considered a high discretion search is a very wide range of categories

>> Casar: That clears that up, thanks. I remember that number being very low so good to understand and here high discretion search is different than consent search. I think of most interest to

[3:19:04 PM]

me from this report is how we get to action steps that are shared by -- that opo and equity office feel good about it and A.P.D. Feels good and are ready to work on based on sort of -- I think the top line data helps us acknowledge the overall issue but the drilling down I think is what's important for us to then be able to know what we can agree on as steps of what to do about this. Thank you

>> Flannigan: I found the tableau, I think, Farah, you were referencing, if my laptop will share it. Does this look right?

>> Yeah that's it

>> Flannigan: So I just for example, say, clicked on my own zip code, 78729 and you can see across the bottom the very low percentage in

[3:20:05 PM]

2009 but significant larger bar in terms of motor vehicle stops. There's clearly a disparity there. It doesn't have it by percentage. It's just raw numbers. But you can dig into this data. Really interesting stuff, even distribution of stops by day, which I think councilmember Casar was something you were kind of referencing as what might be different in different zip codes. But really interesting data. It was not easy to find in the report. It was, like, buried in a paragraph. It was on -- anyone who is in that PDF will find it on page 25 linked in the middle of a paragraph, but you can find it. Other comments or questions? Councilmember harper-madison

>> Harper-madison: Thank you. This is one that I actually earlier -- acceptable benchmarks. I had a question about that for the chief. There was a section under benchmarks where it talks

[3:21:06 PM]

about what the community is asking for in writing is also something along the lines of acceptable benchmarks. I'm very curious what sort of things you might off the top of your head being willing to pose as benchmarks for progress that the community is asking for. That was one question. And I'll wait and ask the other after.

>> Oh. So as far as benchmarks, I think that's part of the work that I hope that we're going to continue to do with opo, equity and innovation as we move forward, but I do think they all need to surround this issue of disproportionalities and then as we get better at working with the data to understand those disproportionalities that are driven by officer discretion, that that's when we start setting those absolute metrics and goals that we need to work towards towards eliminating any disparities, any disproportionalities that are the result of officers' independent actions by use

[3:22:06 PM]

of their discretion. So as we continue to work with the data, then that's exactly what we need to be benchmarking, and I think working with the group that did this report along with Ms. Oliveras I think we will be able to put together benchmarks that track that. I also think hearing from the community and I know there's work being done by the reimagine task force in this space as well, hearing from them what is important in regards to this topic so that we make sure that the benchmarks that are beneficial to us

as the administrators over the organization are either inclusive of those that the community wants or supplement those that the community wants.

>> Harper-madison: That's sort of my concern, that last bit of sentiment you shared, that's my concern. You said beneficial to the administration and/or supplement what the community wants. When I hear "Acceptable benchmarks" I really just -- I'm looking forward to something tangible. I certainly don't want to ask you to come up with that now, but it's something I'd like very much to be able to

[3:23:08 PM]

follow. And I think in theory, if you think about the practical application of, like, a community request, it's not supplemental. You know, it's working in direct conjunction with, it's a collaborative effort. It's not like one gets the benefit, the other gets the supplement and that's kind of how it sounds. So I just want to make sure that's not the sentiment. Then the other question I had was about racial profiling and the training academy. Is there a module? Is there some coverage of racial profiling, its effects and -- in the training academy?

>> So I will say, yes, that it's covered, but without getting over my skis on this I would prefer to follow up and give you specifics on exactly how it's covered and where it's covered so that I can be specific to what the curricula is on that topic. But right now I can tell you it is something we do cover with the cadets, but I can get you more specifics once

[3:24:08 PM]

I follow up with the instructor

>> Harper-madison: Yeah, I'd be curious to know how it's covered, where it's covered, how much time is spent on it, is it something you spend a half hour on and keep moving? I'd be curious about that. I'd also be curious to know if this data that folks are working so hard to produce will be included in future cadet class considerations, you know, just so they can sort of see how we got here and see where we're trying to head. I think it would be beneficial to include this data in these kind of reports, the Tatum report, the audit that's going to come out. I think they should know, you know, the department as it was, you know, so when we do get future cadets they see where we were and where we're headed. I think that would be beneficial information

>> Certainly.

>> Flannigan: As we continue to do this work, you know, and I know those of us on the committee are going to keep digging into this,

[3:25:09 PM]

obviously working with the chief and Farah, Brian, is the equity office kind of actively participating in this report moving forward or should we keep looping you in as councilmembers do this work?

>> We are actively participating, but always loop us in

>> Flannigan: Okay

>> As well. And just to give you some insight into some of the other areas that we're working on, is that we are working to complete -- to get out our first report on the first five divisions of A.P.D. That have gone through the racial equity assessment process, and one of those divisions is the training division. And so it could be a really good opportunity for us to come back and discuss some of the findings and have some conversations around some of the results so the first equity assessment tool which I think really connects well to the body of data that you're looking at, too, and how we start to make those connections between it all.

>> Flannigan: Thank you,

[3:26:10 PM]

Brian.

>> What was the timing of that, Brian?

>> So we're hoping to have that draft by the -- out by the end of the month or the first week of December.

>> Flannigan: Any further questions on this item? Okay. Thank you. Okay -- councilmember Casar

>> Casar: Sorry, just to close it out on this because you pointed out the tableau thing and I've been clicking on it a little bit for a moment here. Something I think would be really useful when you look at the map, I think it is -- again, I've only looked at it for two minutes but I think it is shaded to highlight where there are a lot of black and Latino stops. However, I don't think it's actually shaded -- I think you have to click through to find where there's higher disproportionality of black and Latino stops relative to the population of that zip code. So I think it would be

[3:27:11 PM]

really useful -- I'm not going to call out any particular zip codes here because I was so quickly looking at it, but there were some zip codes where it seemed the black and Latino population was very low but the number of black and Latino stops relative to that really low amount was considerable. It wasn't so many compared to, say, a black or Latino neighborhood because obviously there it's primarily those folks living

there, but I think it would be really useful to have a map or some level of information about how disproportionate the stops are relative to the people that live there.

>> Flannigan: Thank you, councilmember. That would be pretty fascinating to dig into this and realize perhaps the disproportionality is not happening where we think it's happening. That's really interesting. Okay. Thank you all for that. Thank you, Brian and Farah and Kerry and Kim, for all of your excellent data analytics work. Let's move on to item number 4, if my laptop will

[3:28:13 PM]

participate and not lock up on me. We were sent on item 4 we were sent the policy changes early this morning. Unfortunately, I was hopeful that we were going to get that information at some point in the last week so that committee members would have an opportunity to review and ask questions and get a little more clarity so that this meeting could be more productive. Since that did not happen in time, then I would entertain a motion to postpone this discussion to what might be a special called meeting before the end of the calendar year so that we can dig into this when we have all had sufficient time to review. Councilmember Casar, you make that motion? Do I have a second for that motion? Councilmember harper-madison. Any discussion on this, on postponing item number 4?

>> Casar: Sure, I'd like to

[3:29:13 PM]

talk about it briefly

>> Flannigan: Please do

>> Casar: You know, the resolution does require that we have council feedback before these changes are made. It's unfortunate that we can't give that feedback today so we can't make changes, but we need to be able to have public discussion and for there to be public discussion the public has to have the opportunity to read it, frankly the council has to have the opportunity to read it. I'm, I think, it is frustrating that we would get it -- get those policy ideas here today because that gives inadequate time for the dais to review them and, frankly, makes it close to impossible for anyone in the public to review it. At a recent public safety committee meeting, the same issue occurred, where I believe we received a memo at 11:00 A.M. When we were having an early afternoon council meeting. And I think that all of our

[3:30:13 PM]

departments should be capable of getting the information to the public and to the council in time for us to review these issues. This was a resolution we think it is important for us in December to give feedback so that changes can be implemented. But at the same time, I think and hope that this department like others should get its -- get its documents out to the public and in time for adequate review. I think it's a perfectly fair expectation and that's why we should postpone this item.

Flannigan: Any further discussion? Then without objection, we will postpone item 4 to a future meeting. And vice chair Casar, we'll see we want to do that before the end of the year or not since we don't have a committee meeting scheduled in ds.

[3:31:14 PM]

December. It might be something we want to do in a work session from one of our last two council meetings too. That is an option. We can figure out what is best. Okay. Let's move on to our final item, discussion on the police department staffing plan. Chief, why don't you start us off and we can have some conversation.

>> Certainly. I'm mindful of the time so I don't hit the high points here so that there's time for questions and I don't eat it all up. So just as a way of where we're at right now, the authorized strength of the Austin police department prebudget was 1959 and now we're at 1909. 1809 positions is our strength. We have roughly 45 vacancies in the department right now based on the increasing numbers of retirements and resignations that we have been seeing. To give you a sense of what that looks like on average our attrition rate at the police department was moving

[3:32:15 PM]

around 7, 7 1/2 due to retirements, resignations or terminations. We've seen it spike to 15. The average year to date is 13. This isn't just a recent past couple month issue. We've seen a much higher attrition rate. Obviously that challenges us as we move forward into next year, as you and I talked about last week, that if that attrition rate were to continue and if we were able to get this March cadet class under way as everyone is working hard towards, hard towards, we would have eight months without additions to the department. During that off 12-month period we could see any with from 150 to 180 additional vacancy it is we don't see that rate taper off. So that's something that we're very conscious of right now. Our -- I guess when it comes to the staffing level, I know we talked

[3:33:16 PM]

about how do you know what is the right number of officer to have out on patrol. How does a community make that decision without spending the entire presentation on history on anything, onics

we used to do two officers per thousand but we got away from that. We went to the community engagement time. No 20167 we received a report from the matrix corporation on staffing. I think that's important because they are the ones that have probably done the most recent deep dive into the data to look at staffing. They actually pulled all of our cad data for every call from versus from March 1, 2015, to February 2920, 16. They pulled a year's worth of data, all the calls and mapped it out as far as how much time officers were spending on call, therefore how much downtime did they have, how much time did they have to conduct community policing. And with that minimum threshold that they said

[3:34:16 PM]

should be at 35%, that became our benchmark. So that was the methodology they used is by analyzing a year's worth of data to see where are we spend owrg time and where might we have extra time and where might we have time that unfortunately calls our exceeding the demand. They did do a staffing study in theirs and what they had down was the staffing recommendation they had for to 16, the year they were hired, was that we should have 797 positions on patrol based on their analysis of call load. And then they did forward projections through the year 2020. Without wasting time year by year, when you get to 2020, their estimate based on the growth of the city and the estimated growth in calls was that we should have 863 positions on front line patrol and we currently have 773 positions assigned to patrol. So we're doing what we can with what we have. We're 90 short of what they think we should

[3:35:17 PM]

have on patrol but that emphasizes the need for us to do what we put in place a few months ago and that is rotating officers back to patrol so that we can maintain at least the staffing level of 773 to keep up with call load, call response times. As we move forward with the reimagination process, if we do see some of the work that we do now moved elsewhere to somebody else's area of responsibility, then we might see that need for officers in one way or another decrease. But that has not yet happened. So we're just trying to ensure that we keep enough officers on the front line. So we did eliminate 150 positions from the department from all those specialized units that I know you all have been made aware of and when we eliminated the 150 positions that freed up 95 officers because some of those positions were vacant obviously. So those 95 will go back to patrol just to keep us at that level of staffing so that we can

[3:36:17 PM]

handle what is our primary responsibility and that is responding to those emergency calls for service. If this attrition rate keeps at the level that it's right now I expect we will transfer more officers back to patrol in those months leading up whenever we can get another cadet class to graduate. We're paying

very close attention to those numbers. The methodology we used when we decided where we were going to pull officers from, the first thing that we did was looked at those areas that were performing functions although very important to our community, they were functions a patrol officer could perform. We have an issue with drinking and driving and fatality crashes in our community. We've had a large dwi contingency here at the department, but what we did is ended up cut that unit in half since on-duty patrol officers can also enforce dwi laws. Using the similar methodology we looked at the park police. Although it was a very

[3:37:19 PM]

important function every park lies within a patrol district that has a patrol officer assigned so that officer can respond to calls in the park or as and if time allows do proactive work in those parks. So that was the first area that we looked at really were those area where's officers were conducting work that patrol could pick up the workload if they had to. We then looked at those areas that are important but that could be maybe conducted by somebody else, such as securitied a men nis pal court. They want to have Austin police officer in the courtroom and understand that but that is work that could done by a private security firm or other security personnel since we so desperately need the officer tons front lines. We then went through that next cut of where do we have officers doing work that someone else could be hired potentially to come in and do that work. And then it really got to, now we've just got to make the tough decisions of where else are we going to pull officers from. And the district representative unit was a very difficult one for

[3:38:19 PM]

us because in this day when we're focusing on community policing, that is one of our key area where's we're doing that. But the matrix report back in '16 had recommended that we do this and we didn't do it because we didn't want to, but what we're going to do is we actually implemented a program where although we're going to reduce the number of people in the Dr unit as we hire cadets into the department, and as they're waiting for their cadet class to begin we're going to work to offer them temporary jobs in the Dr unit so that they will be exposed to the community policing side of the department working with our community outreach groups before they ever even reach the academy. We won't be able to do that for all of them but that's just a way we're going to try and at least make enhancements out of some of the changes that we have coming our way. So let me wrap here just real quickly because I want to make sure I'm on target with what you want to talk about and leave time for questions. We're paying close attention to where we're head we'd the vacancy rate and attrition rate

[3:39:21 PM]

we're seeing to make sure we are able to respond to the 911 calls for service in a manner the community both deserves and expects. And as we work through the reimagination conversation, if workload shifts away from the police department to other either city entity or groups, then that might minimize some of the demands on us and then we would make adjustments accordingly.

>> Flannigan: Thank you, chief. I appreciate you laying that out. There's often a lot of media coverage about every little decision being made. And it's reassuring to know that just because a unit was shifted to patrol it does not mean that the name of that unit is no longer being policed. It's just being done through patrol resources and different methodology. Specifically, you know, we were seeing reports that, oh, they're not going to do dwi enforcement anymore. That's not true it just happens as part of the patrol work. So that's very reassuring to hear. I'm kind of excited to hear you talk about the

[3:40:22 PM]

matrix report because I came on to the council right in 2017. It was almost right after that report came out. And I spent some time reading through it. I'm rereading it now to make sure I haven't forgotten it a couple of years later. The community policing target at 35% is as said in the matrix report, the dashboards that staff -- that 23 dashboards they gave us shows the 2019 rate was 28%. So it's less than 35% but it's not 0%, like we're not doing that bad when it comes to that kind of community engagement, if that's the question. I think there's going to be some ongoing work I want us to do and we'll probably do some of it, probably you and I one-on-one and other council members one-on-one. But getting a better understanding of what officers -- what it is that they do during that 35% of time or the 28% of time according to the

[3:41:24 PM]

2019, so that it's clearer to me that that uncommitted time, is that supposed -- is that better done during the day because more people are around and more people to engage with, better overnight because it's a patrol function eyes on the street? Information gap for me about what the actual work looks like during that time. And then the other piece that was in the matrix report that you and I talked about -- I remember -- I don't know if you remember, we had this conversation in 2017. It's one of the times I can remember having a meeting in my office. Seems like a million years ago. But there's a new classification of responder called a community service officer that's identified in the matrix report as a civilian. And I remember you and I talking about that and there being some kind of work to be done around what those roles could be in the context of state law and it's not quite clear if the matrix report accommodated state law

[3:42:24 PM]

in their analysis or recommendation for those civilian positions. Even then I think it was 12 to 15. It wasn't like 100 civilians.

>> Manley: 12, yeah.

>> Flannigan: That's the type of thing I'm interested in renewing a conversation around. Because obviously that is going to be an area of recruitment that is a little different and a little more streamlined than recruiting and training and launching sworn officers. That's more work for us to do. But I think what I'm hearing you say is that there's somewhat of a guiding principle rooted in the matrix report. And that helps me kind of understand the -- as I'm doing my work and we're all doing our work and you're doing yours, as I often have to remind the public T, the chief does have independent authority in state law so we have to be partners in this work because it's not a typical organization where there's a boss and everybody works for the boss. That's not how government works.

[3:43:24 PM]

We've all got to work together. So that part makes me feel better, that a lot of the officers or some significant areas that I think was getting a lot of media attention, it's not what -- the way it was being reported in that -- and I'm certainly willing to try and expedite getting cadet classes provided we can get the training we like and the processes and all that stuff figured out. Whether or not that's in March, I think you'll find a variety of opinions about the likelihood of March but that's where my head is at. And I think we'll be spending more time digging into call diversion as a myth metric in your decision-making process. That way as we're making our decisions on the budget side, we can make sure that we're -- more as predictable as possible for each other, which I think is just an essential way to move forward so that we can be -- as we work with staff, as we work with folks on where the money is going to come from, that we can have some level of predict it with

[3:44:25 PM]

predictability with how that's going to impact the department and other departments. Anyone have questions for chief? Council member kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Thank you. Chief, I wanted to talk more about the drs. And I wanted to understand a little bit better your thinking about -- if I heard you right, that there was some reduction in the drs, not reduction is not the right word but some moving out of drs into patrol, if I understood that right. So I want to confirm that. Also, I want to speak to that some because -- and get your perspective. From what I've seen that the Dr role is a critical role with regard to community policing in the sense that the D.R.S are the point of contact for neighborhoods about what may be more systemic that's going on in their

[3:45:25 PM]

area. So I'm very, very concerned about thinking that the D.R. Role is one that could be done by patrol officer, and it may not be what you said because I'm not sure if that's what you said. But I hear what you're saying in terms of the rationale for the other areas in which there was a move of officers back into patrol. I just don't see that as the same for D.R.S. But why don't you help me understand what you were -- what the thinking is around the D.R.S.

>> Manley: Certainly. We did cut the D.R. Unit in half. This change will reduce it in half. And it's a very difficult decision to make but we were forced with having to make very difficult decisions because it's not as if we had officers performing work that was not important to our community really anywhere in the department. And so I was looking at those areas where we had officers performing work that does not front line responding to 911 calls for service and once we got through those first

[3:46:26 PM]

two tiers, the first tier being work that could be done by the on-duty patrol officer and although the on-duty patrol officer will be able to do it, not having dedicated officers to do it will impact that service level but it can still be done. And then the second level, work that could be done by others such as municipal court, security as I talked about and other areas. We had to look at areas of the department that are critical. And the district reps was one but we actually, when you're looking at the list that we had with looking at our criminal intradiction unit, narcotic, gang officers, things like that, there's only so many places we can pull officers from. And with having to remove 150 positions from the department, we had to go into these units that are very important to our community but that we unfortunately had to remove positions from. So the matrix corporation, if you remember back in 2016, that was one of their recommendations, was to cut our D.R. Program in

[3:47:27 PM]

half and to hire civilians into those roles because some of the work that D.R.S do needs to be done by a commissioned officer but some could be done by a civilian. We didn't want to do that in 2016 because these positions are very important to us and very important to the community. And so we didn't. And we've held on to those positions all the way through the current, but again, for the reasons I stated, we're now in a position to cut those in half and we will do everything that we can do to continue the functions that those D.R.S were doing. We're going to, as I said, supplement them to the best that we can with incoming cadets so they get the opportunity to see that service-oriented mission that we really do have before they even get into the academy. But that was the reasoning behind pulling those officers.

>> Kitchen: I want to ask some follow-up questions. How many positions out of D.R.? I don't have it in frpt of me.

[3:48:29 PM]

Front of me. When you say cut it in how many positions is that?

>> Manley: The D.R. Units are done in the regions, eight per region and we were reducing four per region.

>> Kitchen: Total, is that about 16 people or so? More than that.

>> Manley: Should have 18 by the time we're done.

>> Kitchen: So about 18 spots that we're moving out of D.R. Into patrol. Is thatle right?

>> Manley: I can give you the exact number to be sure. Yeah, 18 are getting pulled from the D.R. Unit.

>> Kitchen: So I have another question for you. So you pulled 150 because you were trying to reach the -
- get 95 to patrol?

>> Manley: We pulled the 150 as a result of the budget that passed in October, we had 150 positions removed from the department. So I had to remove 150

[3:49:31 PM]

positions out of the organization. So this was not just to put officers back on patrol. Even if we weren't needing to put officers back on patrol I would have had to eliminate 150 positions.

>> Kitchen: Here's my question, chief. So my question is, the thinking about 90 needed on patrol is based on a projections that the matrix report made? If I'm understanding correctly?

>> Manley: Also based on -- I think there was a belief by some if a position was vacant it wasn't needed. Even though we had a large number of vacancies when the budget passed we were backfilling many of those positions most of nights with officers on overtime. THAs just to handle the call load just to keep up with with response times. These 95 are just to keep patrol at a level where the community and officers are safe while doing their jobs and we are having appropriate response times and adequate coverage.

[3:50:32 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay. That's what I wasn't understanding and would like a little bit more about, is that -- is that what is the data that is driving the numbers that you -- that you moved into patrol. So at first I thought you were saying it was the matrix report's projections. But I'm hearing you now say that it has to do with keeping up your standards on response time? Is that what it is?

>> Manley: So the matrix report I was speaking with --

>> Kif Chen: Wait a minute, chief.

>> Manley: I was speaking with the chair about the may treks report for establishing a baseline for why it is we say there should be a certain number of people on patrol. Matrix did a very in-depth analysis of the data to show how much officers are needed out there just to handle the calls. I'm choosing the 95 as a result of there are so many vacancies on patrol that that's where we have to move the

[3:51:32 PM]

officers to and with eliminating the 150 positions that we had to eliminate, those 95 then filled out there on patrol so we have enough officers again to respond to the calls. I'm sorry. You're on mute.

>> Kitchen: I don't want to take up any more time because I know others have questions but I may follow up afterwards. Here's my question, I really see the d.r.'s role as very important in the community. And I see them -- and I'm not quite convinced yet from -- because I'm not understanding the exactly which data you're tying to to in terms of the number of officers that are necessary to move into patrol. So I'll send you a question about that and you can let me know. I mean, obviously we need to keep our standards for response time in the community that the patrol officers are responsible for. But I wanting to make sure that we're -- that

[3:52:33 PM]

these decisions, particularly when you're talking about moving officers out of D.R., that these positions - - that the positions you're moving in are necessary to meet the standard and are not just based on a projection related to population. So I'll follow up with a question. I don't want to take up more time because I know people have -- other people have questions.

>> Flannigan: Thank you, council member kitchen. If you look at the matrix report, it's towards the end. Like page 165, I think, where it talks about dropping maybe six sworn D.R.S and replacing them with 12 civilians. I think that's what the may treks talked about matrix talked about in 2016.

>> Kitchen: I'm familiar with the matrix report. I appreciate that. It could make sense to go ahead and move in that direction, you know, with some non-sworn officers. I'm not really commenting on that. I just think that those

[3:53:34 PM]

position need to be filled because they make a big difference in neighborhoods to -- and we work closely with D.R.S on a whole range of issues as you know in the neighborhood. So -- so, chair, maybe that's another conversation that we should be having is about there are some dollars in there for civilian positions that we need to look at.

>> Manley: Sorry for the confusion, I was mainly letting the public know where the information is on the report.

>> Kitchen: That's fine. Thank you. Mayor, go ahead.

>> I don't know how much depth to go in here, probably not that much. I didn't know this was the conversation we were going to have today with respect to the decisions, and when needed to be done. As I read the work you had done back in August when you laid this out, chief, you had talked about taking 150 spots out of the units and moving them into patrol, which you just talked

[3:54:35 PM]

about here. And over a third of those at the time it was happening were already not -- already not filled. And so my understanding was is that -- that while a third of the unit positions weren't filled at that point anyway, you were able to backfill in patrol and backfill into the unit positions by using overtime, or -- and/or you were backfilling into vacancies in the patrol with the overtime that was available to you. And you were working both with the number of officers you had as well as with the overtime allotment that you have. Is that correct?

>> Manley: Yes, mayor. That's correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Part of it is in terms of how many people you need to move and depends to a certain degree how much overtime you have to be

[3:55:35 PM]

able to backfill and that kind of thing. My understanding is when you did this there were two significant pots of money that the council had earmarked for overtime that you didn't think you had access to or was not available to you or you diplomat want didn't want to use. One of those when we put off the cadet class, the council had discussed as we went through the budget process, about using some of the spots that would be filled up by that cadet class with officers that could be moved to patrol. And another one was overtime, second source of overtime that the council had intended for you to be able to have access to. Specific dollars that were earmarked through overtime and were parked in the reimagining component of the budget,

[3:56:37 PM]

that third tier. Is that right? Those two pockets, you didn't think you had access or availability to?

>> Manley: Correct, 3147,000 in the reimagination fund we believed was for the whatever the reimagine efforts were going to be and another 2272,000 that was the equivalent of the cadet instructor salaries with the belief that we would just move all of those cadet instructors back into patrol given that there weren't to be any cadet classes. Those are the two areas you're talking about, yes, sir.

>> Mayor Adler: A little over \$5 million in over time that the council had intended for you to have access to. When I went back and looked at the record and the transcript in this, some of that stuff was discussed explicitly. And the council said, hey, take these money, we're not going of have a class, move people out to patrol. And then we put into the rider, if that doesn't

[3:57:37 PM]

give you enough overtime to be able to function then come back to us, so I would have anticipated and would have hoped that if that's dollars you can't put into overtime that that would be something you would come back to the council to talk about. With respect to the over \$3 million that was put into the reimagining fund, the reimagining fund consisted of things that the council didn't discuss at all about whether or not we actually wanted to continue them or not. We created a bucket of things that we said, hey, let's take a look at these things so we can decide whether or not they should be cut. By that T language about whether or not was specifically added in the rider that we passed when we were doing the budget. So I think that -- and then the question more specifically did you have access to that \$3.5 million to be able to use presently, to be able to use as you needed with respect to

[3:58:38 PM]

overtime and that the request of the council, city attorney's office, I engaged council man Casar in a discussion to that to make sure that over \$3 million was available to you. So my question is, is that in August you gave us a staffing plan that had people moving out of patrol -- out of units and into patrol. Recognizing some of those people were moving out weren't filled even at that time. But some of the assumptions with respect to what you needed to do in part depended on how much overtime you had available and once it was corrected and reminded that the council had specifically said that over \$3 million of that was available for overtime and presently available for overtime, doesn't that give you more flexibility than you

[3:59:38 PM]

thought you had back in August when you were doing this the stf R staffing report?

>> The access to that for overtime gives us some flexibility but with the vacancy rate we have right now of roughly 45, the increased attrition rate of 13 to 15, if we didn't transfer all 95 of these officers on January 17th, I believe we would be transferring the balance of them by March or we would have to extrapolate that to look at it because we're seeing such a high attrition rate that we're trying to keep up with -- we're trying to keep up with that the. And then those dollars are also needed for many other functions within the police department such as officers that need overtime for going to court, officers that get held over on late calls. So there's a lot of other uses for those dollars.

>> Mayor Adler: I have the work that you did in August, you laid out in pretty significant

[4:00:38 PM]

detail. What it was you needed to do based on the assumptions that we were making at the time, based on when you perceived to be the vacancy level per patrol shift, at which point you would then need to actually move people out of units because you didn't have the overtime to be able to backfill. What I have not seen is that same analysis that would have been done in August. I think it's been pointed out to you that the council specifically earmarked an additional 3 to 5 plus million dollars for you to have available for overtime. And when that information -- pointed that out to -- to -- to assistant city manager Ariano and the manager together with some of my other colleague on the council, because if I gave additional time to be able to do stuff from mid January into mid March or beyond, that

[4:01:40 PM]

got us into the position where the council would be doing as we set out today to do, that mid-year kind of re-evaluation. So that could be impacted by that work that is done. Significant difference between a January -- mid-january to mid-march in terms of the council being able to take action as part of that review. And since in the rider we specifically said, you know, we've now given you an additional \$5 million for overtime, and we think that that's sufficient for you, if for whatever reason that's not sufficient, we said in the rider, please come back to the council and tell us that the overtime budget that you have is not sufficient so that the council could consider taking action. And you haven't come back to the council yet to do that. So I don't need us necessarily to work through this at this meeting that's going on right now. But I think that there's a conversation to be had

[4:02:41 PM]

with respect to the staffing plan that was introduced in August based on the faulty assumption with respect to the overtime dollars that were available, corrects that with what the council actually did and

allowing for the circuit breakers that we allowed for when we did that budget might lead us to a different place. And that's a conversation that I know that I've been asking for and several of our colleagues have been asking for and I guess I'm not just directed toward you but toward assistant city manager Ariano and to the manager -- to the manager, that's a conversation I think we need to have because apparently there was a mistaken assumption with respect to the overtime dollars that were available. And then there was also fail safe or circuit breakers that we built into the system should

[4:03:41 PM]

that overtime not be sufficient, none of which have been -- have been exercised. So just because this conversation came up and I haven't anticipated it was going to be coming up here.

>> Sure. Just one response. I do believe the 3.174 million in the reimagination fund is accessible to us but the 2.272 million was a removal from our budget. So those -- that 2. -- that 2.272,000 was a one-time removal from our budget but the 3,174,000 is dollars we should have available to us to use for over sometime as well as other cost-drivers that we have with late calls and court costs and all of that.

>> Mayor Adler: By the time you doing your budget in August you did not think that was available.

>> The 3.1 million, no, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Flannigan: Did you have something to add?

[4:04:41 PM]

>> Yes, just, in fact, we've certainly heard these concerns whether it's the D.R. Ors any ofs or the other units that the chief has had to make some significant decisions around. As I'm understanding most of these decisions were changes happening in January. I'm not sure that the D.R.S are ones that are currently in place. But one of the things that I know in conversations with the city manager is now that we understand that that 3.2 million in the reimagining fund may be available to us, I think he's been working with the councilmens, with you and other council members to see how best to normalize that, if needed. And then he's asked the chief to prioritize with that funding, you know, how might we mitigate some of the changes that he's had to consider.

>> Thank you. I've been part of these conversations with mayor Adler since August and I'm pleased to hear chief Manley recognize

[4:05:42 PM]

that \$3 million was made available and was the intention through the budget process for overtime if what was in there was not sufficient. And I believe that Mr. Ariano said that they're working on a plan. I just want to make very clear that some of us have been asking for this plan and how it modifies things for quite some time. And I would really like to know when we are going to have that plan because those extra couple months really do make a big difference in the context of the broader policy and budget discussions that we are having. And I understand that the attrition rate is higher than what was anticipated this back in August when we had raised this, that might not have played out in the same way. And I just -- I'd like to know from chief Manley, you know, when we would have that plan

[4:06:45 PM]

because there are also differences, you know N terms of -- I wasn't also aware this was the full discussion we were having today so I don't have my notes on hand for the exact numbers numbers but there are other elements to this, too, the mayor mentioned the 55 positions already not filled so you're really moving 95 positions and then there was out of those 95, you were already, before we did our budget, moving 40 to 60 folks. So the marginal difference is not the magnitude that we're being told and that is frustrating. But I would like to know when we're going to get the plan. We built in those circuit breakers with respect to over. Time. We also built into the budget a budget rider where we would be looking at the cadet classes and moving forward as soon as the training was revamped. And that is also something I would continue to like us to

[4:07:46 PM]

see moving forward, if we can get those curriculums changed as needed.

>> Council member alter, to your question, we are prioritizing those positions that, front line officers can not conduct and identified 47 of them. The cost to do those 47 full-time year-round on overtime is going to exceed \$6 million and on any given year we're going to spend between 12 and 14 to \$15 million in overtime. With the \$3.2 million I believe we had in our budget this year plus the additional \$3.1 million in the reimagination fund, we're at about, say, 50% of what we would spend in any year on overtime just trying to operate the department with all of the overtime driver, whether it's late calls, court cost, backfill and the like. So we're trying to be reasonable and I understand the concerns

[4:08:47 PM]

with moving officers and what is the possibility of not having to move them if we add some overtime dollars. But our overtime expenditure in any given year, again, is going to be that 12 to 14, \$15 million and right now even using the reimagination funds we're in the \$6 million range. So it's a large delta to

have of cover. And as officers continue to lead, if that attrition rate continues, then that's going to drive the need to potentially move more officers.

>> Since I don't have the numbers in front of me from my notes right now, but I believe there are also portions of that overtime that were in that, you know, 11, \$12 million overtime budget which we started from that were from things that, you know, are not -- that are special events and other things that are part of that budget. We just would be careful what we're counting. I don't have the numbers so I don't want to get in debate over the numbers but I think

[4:09:47 PM]

there are pieces of this that are not spongeable, I agree with that but I don't think the numbers add up to the 15, 16. That's not what we saw last year in our budget. We looked very carefully when we were reviewing things to understand the choices you were making at what the overtime levels were and where it -- tried to understand where the miscommunication had happened and narrowed it down to the fact that you had decided that you needed to keep those officers training people even though there were no cadets there as well as concerns over whether you had access to the \$3 million and we did very carefully in the budget riders provide an opportunity for you to come back to council to talk to us about the overtime. And there's not really a question there. I just wanted to clarify that.

>> Manley: Just for your information we're keeping the instructors at the academy because there's so much work being done right now on

[4:10:47 PM]

reimagining training and doing training they need to be an active part of that and they need to be there to update lesson plans to be a part of the work of designing the academy of the future. They have to be out there several months in advance of a cadet class ever beginning just to get clerk lum, plans and other things like that in place so that's why they were left in place.

>> Alter: I hear that and that makes sense and I think that should have been raised by you during the budget process.

>> Flannigan: Council member tovo and then council member Casar.

>> I think she's indicating she's going to call in. She's on the phone.

>> Okay.

>> I don't see a phone number calling in yet. Do you want to ask your

[4:11:47 PM]

question while Kathie calls in?

>> Casar: I think it's a broader point but I'm happy to have it confirmed torch here confirmed to everyone here, while 24 discussion is important it might send the impression that any of these numbers or officer positions or changes have been -- are certainly going to happen, and my understanding is that none of what we've discussed here has been approved by the city manager yet. I believe that there were reports and documents that, you know, were being circulated and as people worked on this. But my understanding very clearly from the city manager's office is that in fact while we're talking about all of these numbers, none of this has actually been finalized or approved. Is that correct?

>> If I may, I would say that's correct. Again, there's this opportunity now that we understand clearly that the \$3.2 million in the reimagine fund is

[4:12:48 PM]

available. To ask the chief, to see how we might prioritize the changes that he might be able to return back to service and, council member alter, we haven't had a chance yet to determine when we might be able to meet and make those decisions but I know the city manager is trying to get that done as quickly as possible so if there's certainty certainly for the council and the community and for the police department.

>> Thank you. I understand that Kathie needs to be unmuted by the av people, she believes. She's having trouble.

>> If you're called in I don't see you as an attendee as a phone.

>> Can you unmute her from --

>> She's not on the list, is what I'm saying.

>> There's no call-in person on the list.

>> What about her video? Are you able to unmute her video?

>> I can unmute her here.

>> Yes, thank you. That's what I needed. For some reason my computer is not unmuting. Thank you.

>> Okay.

>> Do you mind -- Kathie, do you mind if I

[4:13:48 PM]

finish my point?

>> That's fine. I'll keep it quiet on my end.

>> I will handle the mute for you, don't worry about it.

>> Thank you, Kathie, sorry about that. No, I think, again, for everybody watching or for press folks writing about this, it is important for us to have a discussion about what the plan might be but I think that sometimes the way that it's been presented or debated here it sounds like we're debating what has been decided for January but my understanding from the manager's office is that there is not a finalized plan for January or March or what have you and so what we're working on here is what that discussing this in draft form but not discussing anything that's been finalized because nothing has been approved yet and I think that it's helpful now that everybody is on the same page about increasingly on the same page about what it is that we passed back in August. Assistant city manager thinks that it was -- it's in black and white and in the transcript,

[4:14:49 PM]

what it is that we did and I would want to -- I think that we laid out the right template there and do look forward to everyone talking about what it is that the final draft looks like because I think everything currently remains in draft graft form.

>> Tovo: Thanks very much. And this follows along nicely with what my colleague said. I would like to suggest, mayor, we have a conversation, I think this is a question and conversation many of us have been having with the manager and the chief and certainly one that our community has expressed interest in as well. So I would like to follow up on this as a full council. A couple quick things. One is, chief, I thought I understood from our conversation along with the manager that the overtime -- part of -- part of -- or one

[4:15:49 PM]

element in this whole puzzle is that the overtime budget typically, and I think you referenced this, the overtime budget that appears as overtime has not been sufficient for several years to really cover the full overtime costs of backfilling those positions. Am I understanding that correctly?

>> That is correct, councilmember.

>> Tovo: Could you please provide us with some information what the gap has been over, say, the last four or five years? I think that would help us understand what that number is. I think councilmember alter asked -- you know, was speaking to that information as well. About getting some more details on that, on what that gap is.

>> Certainly. Our financial staff can put that together. In years past we've off set that with salary savings so there's always been a delta there with the reduction in the department and salaries reduced as a result of that. That delta is not going to be there, but we'll full a five-year history for you and show you what our

[4:16:51 PM]

overtime expenditures have been compared to what we were budgeted.

>> Tovo: Thank you. That would be really helpful. To get back to the idea whether we're all on the same page. I understood from my conversations with the manager that he was conversations with each of us on the dais and there may be different impressions about whether -- whether the police department can access that \$3 million, and that there was a need for clarifying. The manager is not here, I don't know acm Arellano if you can speak to that, but that too suggests we really need to have this conversation as a full council. It's not clear to me whether we all do have the same understanding about that 3 million or not. And if we do all have the same understanding, why it is that doesn't seem to be put in place. Again, when I asked the manager, the answer I thought I understood back was because there's not a consensus on whether the

[4:17:51 PM]

money should be available to the department. Perhaps I'm misunderstanding. That was the understanding I took away from the conversation with the manager. I think that's my last -- probably for the moment, my last comment. Acme Arellano if you want to follow up.

>> I think that is from my conversations as well with the city manager there is some uncertainty as to what that understanding is and in my conversations with him and his conversations with you, he is trying to determine how best to formalize the accessibility of the [inaudible]

>> Tovo: One of my colleagues said a minute or -- again, I may be misinterpreting what was said, but I thought I heard a colleague suggest that there was, you know, an understanding that the department should have been able to access that all along and that just isn't the case. So what -- so what is the

[4:18:52 PM]

manager waiting for? What do you need from the council in terms of a resolution to this issue? You need the council to discuss and deliberate and make a decision about that?

>> So I'm unaware of that level of decision-making or process based on the conversations you have with the councilmembers. I'll be sure to go back and determine kind of how best he wants to proceed on that. I know as councilmember Casar just stated in terms of the way the budget amendment was brought forward, it seemed to me

[inaudible], but yet again certainly from the chief's perspective when the budget was initially passed, it didn't seem as clear as we're having the conversation now.

>> Tovo: And it hasn't seemed clear in the months intervening. I know as councilmember alter mentioned, several of us have been having these conversations now in the months that have happened since that -- it sounds like most of us probably have

[4:19:53 PM]

been having these conversations with city management and with our police chief in the months since we've learned about the draft patrolling -- changes to patrol and the draft plan. It seems to me imperative we get to a resolution of this issue quickly and if the manager is waiting on a response and a decision or deliberation from council, then I would really suggest we schedule that right away so that the chief knows whether [inaudible] That 3.2 million or not.

>> Mayor Adler: I know in conversations that I had and obviously none of us with talk to majority of the council open meetings record, I know councilmember alter and councilmember Casar reading it the same way I did and the intent during the time of the budget as requested by our

[4:20:53 PM]

city attorney was to clear that up and basically gave us a script to do that which we read into the record. Also to make sure the chief had access to -- I think it's an important conversation for us to have. As I sit here now, I don't think there is additional deliberation that needs to happen for the chief to be able to do that, but without reciting that question, I'll make sure that we get the opportunity as council to all address this during our work session. The first opportunity.

>> Tovo: Thank you. Thanks, chair. Thank you, mayor. You know, that's the way I read it as well, but, again, the manager, it's my understanding the manager in his individual conversations is not -- is understanding that not everybody who voted on it understood it that way. So I absolutely think it's important for that

[4:21:53 PM]

conversation. So thanks so much for scheduling it.

>> Mayor Adler: As part of the conversation, chief, I know timedt mid January because of not having the overtime available and the question is if we had an additional three to five million dollars to spend, what does it cost buy mid January to mid January or mid February to mid March so the broad conversation could ensue in our midyear budgeting as well as the specific invitation to come back to the council to discuss over time was insufficient. So we can make that part of the conversation that we had at the work session.

>> Yes, mayor, we can try to break it down to what it

[4:22:53 PM]

would cost to save those 95 positions if potential on an overtime basis and again the reason for the January 17th date is it takes that long to make this happen. We have to identify the officers who are going to be moved, we have to give them the opportunity to exercise their rights under the contract for hardships and grievances and give a 28-day notice before we can transfer them. This is a very involved process. We had to start the process of making that happen.

>> Mayor Adler: But if the key date when you were running out of money was January 15 and you need to act some months before that, if the key date was not January 15 but February 15 or March 15 or April 15, the date by which you need to do act gets pushed back or moves up further, so that there would have been a chance to do this perhaps and impact some of the attrition level that officers are seeing because you had to back up to August to tell people that there

[4:23:55 PM]

would be movement out of units into patrol whereas it might not have been required for you to start that as early and you could have come back to the council. And the other numbers as we're just kind of highlighting things to talk about, my understanding is that of the 150 folks in the units, 150 positions that are moved, 55 were vacant. And as of the end of September, my understanding is without regard to our budget decisions which took place in October, that there were a significant number of unit folks that were already rotating through patrol. Another -- I don't know, 70 or 80 officers at the end of September that were already rotating. So with the 55 and that 70, we already add 120 some some-odd of the sue that

[4:24:57 PM]

were not -- of the 150 that were not currently staffed in units as you were moving people. And I think that goes to what councilmember alter was saying a second ago that the number of actual personnel changes was substantially less, the impact, than hearing as we heard in August that there was 150 folks being moved or people that's what they heard. I know that wasn't the wording because you are talking about spots and the like, but there was a belief in the community that 150 people were being moved. So better understanding how many people were already in that position as of the end of September, the end of last fiscal year I think would be helpful for the community to put into perspective.

>> I'll have that information as well. We were doing officers on a rotational basis. This is just a more peanent plan given the fact that we don't see any relief for at least a year

[4:25:58 PM]

with the cadet class stoppage and before we can get more officers. So I'll have that information for you, mayor.

>> Renteria: If it's true, we might have been able to since you had 55 that were not filled and another 65 rotated through, we might have been able to preserve that same system that you had for another X number of months without having to make substantial change and just continuing the existing practice. And the cost to be able to do that and extend that for another month or two or three or four might be the number that we would have been looking at if that's something that had been ruled out to us. But not too late. Maybe there's a chance for us still to be able to do that. And that's I think a conversation that councilmember tovo is asking and others have asked that we kind of bring back, and I'll work with assistant city manager Arellano and city manager and your office to make sure wee tee that back up.

[4:26:58 PM]

-- We tee that back up.

>> Thank you.

>> Flannigan: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Sorry for rewinding, but back to the mayor and Kathy's discussion for work session, I'm okay with and ready to talk about anything with he want to talk about, but just to update everyone, my most recent conversations have highlighted that I don't think there's a single member that reads our budget differently than the way we described it and I don't think there's a single member that has that -- has raised any objection in part because it's not logical. If the reimagine fund were inaccessible, there would be another \$50 million hole we would be talking about. It isn't logical, so I'm fine to discuss it, but I don't -- I find it a little frustrating and confusing about why it would need further discussion because it doesn't make sense if you read the budget the way we

[4:28:00 PM]

passed it. Happy to talk about it, but my understanding is there isn't a member that has different understanding than what it is we passed.

>> Flannigan: Other questions? Well, thank you, chief, and everybody for participating today. You know, my hope in the staffing conversation as it continues is to really, really hone in on the methodology and I'm glad we got to have a little bit of that conversation today. We talked more about the pressing issues than I expected, but, you know, we'll continue, chief, you and the committee to hone in on how these decisions pull which levers over time and as we achieve call diversion, as we've started to achieve in mental health and where opportunities might lie we can make sure we're dove-tailing. Also good to keep in mind the changes you make have this months of lead up

[4:29:00 PM]

because of police contract issues or other process matters, that's a good thing to keep in mind. Thanks to all my colleagues for being in the meeting today. We don't often get to have a process conversation because of Toma and one of the better reasons we do these committee meetings and thanks for non-members for showing you and allowing a robust conversation. Mayor, you can be in charge of the meeting.

[Laughter] I think that's the last item on the agenda. Give everybody 30 minutes back. Thanks everybody for a great meeting. It's 4:29 P.M. And this meeting of the public safety committee is adjourned.

[6:10:55 PM]

>> To order. I'm call the roll. I'm Terry I'm the chairman hand for those of you who are online listening right now I'll explain our procedure as soon as I call the roll. I'm here. Ben.

>> Here.

>> Whit?

>> Present. Matthew Jacob? Is absent at least -- here he is. Matthew Jacob is here. Kevin cook is here. Kelly little is here. Alex is here. So is his daughter. I saw him, hi. Beth.

>> Present.

>> She's here. And Caroline. We're unanimous.

[6:12:00 PM]

For those of you who are online and for the commission as well I want to explain a few things about our procedure. All of the speakers on all of the cases that come up tonight will have three minutes each to speak. And all of the -- all of the speakers will speak at the beginning of the public hearings not when the case is presented but applicants may stay on the line to make clarifications on matters on the application. Before we start the meeting -- before we start the public hearings we have two presentations. One on historic design standards

[6:13:06 PM]

standards.

-- Before we start the public hearings. When we start the public hearings we'll go through the agenda. We'll pull items from the consent agenda if someone asked to pull them from the audience or from the commission. We will have a postponement agenda and then we will share the remaining items on the agenda in the order that they are on the agenda. We have four sections. Section A for initiation of historic zoning or historic districts. Section B, discussion and action on applications for certificates of appropriateness. C for applications for permit within national register district. And D, discussion and possible action on applications for demolition. Or relocation.

[6:14:07 PM]

We'll be taking those in order once we approve the consent agenda and go on to the regular agenda. Are you ready to give a presentation?

>> I am. The floor is yours. Take it over.

>> Perfect. Thank you. Elizabeth can you pull up the presentation please?

>> There's a delay. There's four things.

>> Sorry. Who is this speaking?

>> Please identify yourself whoever was talking about the four things.

[6:15:09 PM]

>> That was a citizen.

>> I've got my phone on mute.

>> You are supposed to be on mute while other people are speaking. Right now you are listening to a briefing before we go on to the public hearings. We will get to the public hearings after sharing two briefings.

>> Sorry for the confusion everyone.

>> Stay on the line. That's why we're taking speakers at the beginning so you don't have to stay on the telephone line all night. Go ahead.

>> Sorry for confusion to everyone else. Commissioners it's an honor to be here talking about historic design standards. That the commission established in fall of 2018. We are very close to the end of a two-year process with numerous stakeholders and tremendous

[6:16:09 PM]

potential benefits in Austin. I want to acknowledge historic preservation, tools to is steward change. Next slide. Also that design standards provide a clear and objective way to evaluate proposed changes. Design standards are an essential tool for property owners, designerrers, city staff and historic landmark commission members to have common ground when proposing and evaluating projects. Next slide. This effort to create a single set of historic die sign standards is important for a number of reasons. First, to increase equity in the historic district application process. Righted now community applicant teams must create their own historic district design standards which adds a lot of time to the process. Most applicant teams have opted to hire a consultant which is great, but also adds cost. Preservation Austin does offer a

[6:17:10 PM]

design standard template which was beginning basis for these standards. But some expertise is still required. A steep learning curve as community members don't already have experience in historic preservation. Historic design standards will also increase predictability for property owners and know from the beginning what designation entails. It will take a common sense approach by recognizing common underlying principles so all eight of our existing historic districts created their own design standard based on secretary of the interior standards for rehabilitation of historic properties. And 95% of those standards are the same with just a few variations. Having a single set of design standards will remove the need to have nearly identical design standards developed through a very long process.

[6:18:10 PM]

Next slide. Historic design standards will also provide clearer standards for historic hand mark owners and national register district property owners who use the secretary's standards for rehabilitation right now. That is a great set of ten standards we'll see them in a minute. But they're also pretty vague when figuring out what is appropriate in terms much specific projects. Historic design standards will provide an educational tool for all historic property owners or property owners of old buildings as you hopefully have seen in reviewing them the standards include a numerous illustrations of good practices and illustrated glossary. In the past we haven't been able to require individual historic district applicant teams to include illustrations sibs it adds cost. That's not something we as city have been wanting to additionally impose on process that already requires a lot of community resources. One set of historic standards

[6:19:12 PM]

will provide consistent standards for project review by commissioners and staff. At least for historic landmarks, national register district properties and future historic districts. To be clear existing historic districts will be able to adopt these standards if they choose otherwise same standards will remain. Finally one set of historic design standards follow good practices and preservation. Something that many other preservation programs across the country do including leading historic preservation program. Next slide please. As you likely know the secretary of the interior standards for rehabilitation of historic properties established foundation for historic preservation program across the country and as I mentioned also formed basis for these historic design standards. Next slide. Because secretary standards include a lot of words that can sound similar to each other I like to boil them down to few

[6:20:13 PM]

overarching principles these apply throughout historic design standards basic lie preserve buildings as they developed over time. Maintain repair historic materials if you have to replace, replace in kind on limited basis. Finally for new work additions or new buildings it should be compatible with differentiated from historic building. Next slide. Here is the chapter outline of the historic design standards. We're going to blaze past this. Next slide. I'm going to try to only hit the highlights of the proposed -- recommended standards that basically those three overarching principles and secretary standards as a whole form the foundation of historic design standards as applicable to each chapter. Next slide. Now the highlights. Working group prioritized making standards easy to use for

[6:21:13 PM]

everyone no matter what their level of experience. Because the standards apply to contributing and noncontributing properties in different ways, there are charts at beginning of each chapter showing

which standards are required and which are recommended for each project type and for each property type. There are also charts illustrating historic review process and what projects qualify for administrative versus commission review, which is a subject -- can be a subject of great confusion. The standards use accessible language have clear graphics and consistent symbols to help people navigate the document. Two shown here represent sustainability measures, the green sun. And additional standards and notes for historic landmarks which is yellow star. And PDF of the file includes hyper links to help people easily get around the document for cross referencing also to get outside resource websites

[6:22:16 PM]

like national park service. Next slide. Briefly into specific chapters covering overarching goals hoped for outcomes. Modern codes and energy efficiency to address how historic intersect with accessibility codes. This section also tries to broaden the perspective from short term fixes like window replacement in couple of ways. First by acknowledging the long term sustainability benefit not only of just keeping building standing but preserving high quality historic components. Second, by focusing on high impact, high rate of return energy efficiency measures which are typically not with replacement. A special subsection on windows and energy conservation in the window section of the repair and alteration chapter since we know that many people will go to the straight section that relates to their project. We want to make sure they are

[6:23:16 PM]

understanding this information as well. The repair and alterations chapter has a few goals. A big one is to help people better understand their buildings as you can see flipping through that chapter a little bit here on the screen, the chapter includes a lot of diagrams showing building parts and roof, window and door types. Most sections in the chapter include short discussion on maintenance which is supported by the maintenance and preservation of historic chapter toward the end of the document. Also wanted to provide diverse examples of buildings to broaden people's understanding of what a historic building looks like. For example, the two photos on bottom left part of the screen illustrate discussion on porches. Buildings of very different vintages. Next slide please. There are separate chapters for residential and commercial additions but their goals are similar to provide diverse set

[6:24:16 PM]

of good examples to clearly illustrate the standards both what is recommended in green and what is not recommended in red. Next slide please. Likewise there are separate chapters for residential and commercial construction but also have new construction, also have similar goals. The working group and

downtown commercial focus group that was convened to focus on commercial building standards felt that it was really essential to acknowledge market realities and local priorities around density. This is shown in the residential standards through discussion of house scale multi-family buildings and ads and commercial standards with arc a knowledge that new buildings may be much larger and taller than surrounding historic buildings and guidance how to address those situations. Next slide. Include an illustrated glossary that we hope will help people not only to better understand the standard but also get to

[6:25:17 PM]

know their buildings better, whether it's parts of a window or different materials used for siding. Next slide. Finally I want to go over the process of developing the historic design standards. As I mentioned as many of you know and remember, historic landmark commission formed the design standards working group in September 2018. That fall staff worked with a UT graduate class on historic preservation to survey national best practices in design standards. Then early 2019 working group convened did a deep dive into those best practices that were identified by the students. Small subcommittees of the working group created draft chapters that were knitted together and reviewed a couple of times. Then in June of 2019, draft was released for community review. We received more than 175

[6:26:20 PM]

comments on the draft from community stakeholders. Over the last 16 months the working group has revised standards, graphics have been added the document was laid out and formatted. Working group has formally recommended historic design standards for hlc satisfying its charge and now it's up to y'all if you would like to adopt a resolution recommending that council take up historic design standard for consideration and adoption. If you do make that -- if you adopt that resolution, staff will do similar presentations or briefings at related boards and commissions, the design commission, planning commission and zoning and then go to council which will make the final decision. As I mentioned before if council adopts standards they will apply to all historic landmarks,

[6:27:23 PM]

properties on advisory basis. And all future historic districts. Which if they choose can adopt a supplement to the historic design standards with more specific standards. Finally, next slide please. Finally the design standards working group has powered this process since 2018, it's been a long road. I just want to give all the folks in the working group tremendous credit. A few commissioners at this meeting have participated very actively in this process and more people who are probably watching on

atbn. Working group members were selected through application process with the goal of having all sorts of stakeholders at the table. And members showed outstanding dedication through the process of Kroft willing, revising, reviewing, revising again and reviewing again at staff we feel honored to have been able to facilitate the process and we feel confident in putting forward these standards because

[6:28:25 PM]

they were developed and for the community. That's all I have. Do you have any questions for me?

>> Would you like that resolution at this time.

>> If the commission is willing I think there also is one member of the public who wishes to speak on historic design standards maybe you can ask per normal -- if you have any questions for me then that person could speak the commission could have a discussion, does that sound --

>> I saw commissioner's hand.

>> Compliments to the staff and working group this is very timely and very impressive even quick overview you gave us really do appreciate that. If I could also add downtown

[6:29:28 PM]

commission to your check of commissions, I hate to make more presentations but I think that group would also be very well informed as we've raised the issue about threat to historic properties in the area.

>> That's a great idea. Thank you for making sure that we didn't overlook that. I'll add them to the list.

>> Any other questions? Kudos to Cara for sheparding this through even though she's moved on to another department. And she was really the force that pushed us along here. I would entertain a motion to draft such a resolution -- resolution?

>> Thank you very much. Let's -- maybe we can --

>> I'm sorry.

>> Then return to the -- I like the direction you're going, though. I don't want to stop you for too long.

>> While we ask the person to

[6:30:30 PM]

Speak, be thinking of resolution. Is there a person from -- on the line who would like to speak to the design standards.

>> We only have one speaker, Allison.

>> Allison. It's your turn now.

>> Can you hear me okay?

>> Yes.

>> Thank you. This is Allison Magee I serve on the board of preservation Austin. I am speaking today to respectfully support Austin's historic preservation office's proposed historic design standards. We commend the time intensive and community focused work of the working group and historic preservation office. We believe that the design standards will increase equity and accessibility in Austin's local process. We've adopted under represented heritage as fiscal year '21 advocacy priority in our organization we see city wide design standards as way to encourage many groups who do not have time or money to develop

[6:31:32 PM]

unique standards for their proposed districts. We're optimistic that design standards will lead to new local historic district applications in under represented areas of Austin. At the same time these design standards will streamline historic landmark commission process for city staff and advocates alike by providing clear and consistent standards. That will create more efficient and effective process for the benefit of all. We believe that the standards support preservation of our city as diverse heritage, people much Austin in way that is compatible with increasing density. Preservation Austin knows how crucial density is for Austin's future and appreciate that the standards do not discourage density but rather recognizes that it can occur alongside preserving our historic neighborhoods. We encourage historic landmark commission to support the proposed historic design standards. We know they will be an asset to our city for years to come. And we once again want to recognize dedication that went into creating these standards

[6:32:33 PM]

and hope to see them adopted. Thank you so much for your service.

>> Thank you miss Magee. I would now entertain a resolution based on the comments of miss Magee to send forward to the other commissions and city council to approve or support design standards. Vice chair?

>> I will move approval of the design standards as presented to us with extreme urgency to the city council that this is a tool we really have needed for a while and this will be as was presented a significant resource that will assist preservation for a very long time to come.

[6:33:38 PM]

>> May we use staff comments and miss Magee's comments to have draft such a resolution?

>> Absolutely.

>> All those in favor?

>> We need a second.

>> We need a second. Alex? Seconded. Is there any discussion? Don't everyone speak at once. A lot of people who are right here on the commission now have been involved in the design standards in one way or another. You are familiar with them and the rest of you please take a look if you have any issues don't hide them. But I think it's time fog forward with this. Can we have a vote on this. All those in favor please signify by raising your hand. Any opposed this none. Unanimous.

[6:34:40 PM]

We support the design standards.

>> Thank you. Thank you. Do we have the Austin economic development corporation folks here to brief us at this time?

>> Yes.

>> David, go ahead. Explain what the corporation is about and give us your slides. I would say that there may be a delay between what you're saying and what we see on screen there's a little lag time.

>> Okay.

>> Please go right ahead.

>> I'm getting a lot of feedback.

>> Let me ask all those who are on the line to please mute yourselves so that we can hear the speaker. Thank you.

[6:35:42 PM]

>> Thank you very much, chair and board for having me here this evening. Also for making space to get through this presentation quickly. I know that you have a very long agenda I'll try to be as quick as possible. You should have copy of the slide deck that we provided for the Austin economic development corporation. I can't see the screen I'll do my best to describe what it is I see in terms of the slides hope. Ly we can stay on task with the discussion. If there's any point in time that, please fool free to stop me. The first slide that we'll to go background points out resolutions and council ask that was where mayor and council to bring forward recommendations for the creation of an economic development corporation. You may be familiar with the

[6:36:44 PM]

work in other communities around economic development corporation existing, they were more focused on having a partner available with the community that was outside of the city of Austin that could work with us in more of a collaborative and holistic fashion to achieve more inclusive economic development. Slide three. What we have essential lea created October 1 by approval of mayor and council are by laws and articles of incorporation. One that can move quickly, it is outside of the city of Austin, but has shown interest in being able to support the value sets that have been articulated by mayor, council and community as well as achieve higher degree of value within development project or other development in which the city may not have a direct connection over a period of time. This is not something that is

[6:37:45 PM]

new by any stretch of the imagination. We looked at 17 peer and aspirational cities that that had this type of relationship with an outside entity that could help to achieve more of holistic economic goals. Next slide. Organizational structure and family of the organization. So in looking at the Austin economic development corporation even some of the founding council action we were asked to bring forward an assessment. Different entities that already existed within the city. Within that assessment and more specifically within our feasibility study we were able to point out that the city created a number of these entities over an extended period of time as a city. High number of them were created -- or entity designed to support a particular project. City has not -- we've seen able to provide more of an

[6:38:47 PM]

overarching entity that was more collaborative in nature. So what we recommend mayor and council to do so by being able to draw toga family of entities that creates this organization. Next slide. Look at existing entity, great example industrial corporation one that has gone dormant over the years it does have particular bonding authority hundred the development corporation could use to be able to address

the financial gap in the particular projects that were negotiating. To achieve more of inclusive outcomes mayor and council looks to achieve. But economic corporation transportation which allows us a pretty high degree of flexibility in terms of what we're looking to achieve it also has 501(c)3 status when we start to look at creating new

[6:39:50 PM]

entities like the trust that is talked about widely by mayor and council and will talk about a little more through this presentation. We can create that entity under economic development corporation and we do have ability to do -- raising of funds to be able to support those initiatives. Many people own ask what would the economic development how is it going to work with this institute. Of course redevelopment division within our department has been working for number of years in fact how economic development department was started. We had number of city owned assets and still do that we were looking to bring town commerce. The economic development department the redevelopment division will continue to serve as condude as this entity will have in agreement that will be articulated between economic corporation and city ever Austin that they will be --

>> Excuse me. David.

[6:40:50 PM]

David. I'm sorry do interrupt. You are breaking up. And your volume is very low. I'm not able to hear you clearly or distinctly. I don't know if that is an artifact of the phone or what. Maybe speak closer to the phone. Go ahead please.

>> We can hear you fine just try to speak louder.

>> I'll go to next slide looking at our organizational chart. Which is slide six. Again there will continue to be oversight and interaction or engagement with mayor and council as -- will be appointed by mayor and council then

[6:41:52 PM]

president and CEO that is selected with the board's input will be responding back to mayor and council with the president on an annual basis that is one of the terms within the agreement between this entity and city or within foundational documents for creation of the entity where we will be coming back to the city on an annual basis to review the programs or project that have been executed and then other is forthcoming in the next fiscal year. You can see here degree of skill sets or expertise that will be within the economic development corporation and particular interest especially for supporting more of the

collaborative bandwidth because we can see number of these professionals supporting variety of other projects around the in institutions that don't necessarily have the skill sets. We'll talk about that more extensively in the next slide. Next slide please.

[6:42:53 PM]

Governance of the ABC board do fines each of the existing places that have been approved by mayor and council for the board. Since mayor and council created that blue ribbon board they are looking to two different nominating bodies within the community to development nomination that they would approve to the board. You can see plus one through 20 here. First six places in red font are those seats that already been filled and serving our interim board members. The remaining places are kind of mixed. Some have already been named in terms of the institution that will be the nominating body. Others we're still working with. What you'll see on this list is placing a team, local historic preservation. That is a -- that we'd like to have nomination from the historic land commission

[6:43:55 PM]

supported. Now when you are to the nomination we're looking for -- a number of different lens or filters. The first is for this individual have strong understanding and background of historic preservation as well as the community that exists within the city for historic preservation and different services or facets of the community. They need an intimate knowledge of the space that you all serve. Then next filter to think through are the actual skill sets, background or expertise that that individual brings forward from their professional work maybe within real estate, planning, more infrastructure development or public-private partnership. Of courts historic preservation. Within that first paragraph we take you through some of the different filters as well. Next slide. Looking at governance part two. You can see here underneath real estate project three types. Pretty clearly articulate

[6:44:56 PM]

different types of activities in which your nomination will be seen from a board level. And looking to approve or help support because this is going to be very much a working board rather than one that is politically agile or as to be able to work politically. So that person will be seen how it is we define transaction support and public development. We ask that you also think through how does your nomination would be familiar of this space helping to provide some points and input or feedback. Slide nine, proposed project list, this is outdated list by far but serves as a good inventory of potential projects in which this entity could support more collaborative bandwidth. If we move to slide ten which seeks to, for example, from that project list I can take few moments to also dial in to some

[6:45:59 PM]

of those projects so you can understand interaction between entity and supporting these projects. We see as a prime opportunity to sustain and support this entity and being catalytic project for institute for queers to come. This economic development corporation must be self sus establishing in fact mayor and council only approved up to three years of initial funding to support this entity. We announced they would be seeding this will not be enough to sustain for long term period of time. So entity that serves to support transactions that are very unique. Which is larger district-based area that has a number of different property owners, promotional, residential, private, also nonprofit. All within that space city has limited resources or assets within that area where there's number of different tools or

[6:46:59 PM]

resources that are needed to be able to realize the opportunity for inclusive development within south central waterfront this could stand as partner to the city to be able to negotiate with those potential development, is that will take place to incorporate the values that we seek. No one great, was ability to work with university like houston-tillotson that was creating master plan to help them capitalize but also secure values of their university, with their student and community that is 'vase went or surrounding the university that is important to them. This entity could bring forward skill sets and expertise to support them through the process and or axes and transaction itself. Just between those two projects. As well as creation of a cultural trust which is top nine

[6:48:05 PM]

sustainable -- especially impacting the creative sectors of Austin well before covid now even more because of covid. Another area looking more specific engagement or infrastructure that is not available in certain parts of our city with the early childhood education and development. On high quality child care that needs to exist with uncertain parts of the city especially as correlates today with first development efforts being able to put families back to work by everything static infrastructure available in certain parts of the community. Slide 11 looking at next steps. Outlines our next steps as we look to bring forward the creation of very fast paced. I will tell you we are continuing to work with a consultant through this process and we are bringing on board

[6:49:08 PM]

specialties to start project development immediately. Actually we have started those project development meetings over the course of this week. We are everything these types of connections going through this information with different nominating bodies but we're going to look to bring forward for approval december 23rd.

>> We can hear you, let me do your -- that information will be made public hope. Ly by the end of this week as we look to bring forward staff recommendations for filling those different nominating bodies on the board have to then update by laws. But at that point in time following3rd we -- each one of those bodies to support their nomination process. So we can land on a nomination --

[6:50:09 PM]

>> Please mute yourselves.

>> We can look to support that process can land on nomination by end of January more specifically January 22. Goal to get information on each of the nominees to bring forward for mayor and council to approve. So we can move off our first board meeting and immediate action that we'll look to take formation of certain authorities on the board to be able to look to hire on first president and CEO. So final slide just helps to layout the commission selection criteria. Slide 12, goes through some of the information that I've already included and -- the acting director for economic development here to also support you in terms of the process that would would like to help to

[6:51:10 PM]

support for the commission, is that are supporting this nomination all to have streamlined version of the process. Especially for initial year, because the nomination you bring forward will serve only one-year term then will need to be reselected or bring forward new nomination who will go on three year term. We're looking to stagger the terms and one of the first would be our commission base which would be longer period of time. People often ask amount of time that this individual would be working. I thinking say here you can anticipate at least one hour per month to be able to connect with the full board for board meetings but of course this would be a working board. As most board you will have executive suite to the president or secretary, others who -- if

[6:52:13 PM]

the person who you nominate is interested in serving in that capacity anticipate additional time. Also have a number of working committees. I mentioned the cultural trust one committee. Also looking to have south central waterfront and I'm sure there will be others that will come over a period of time. If your nomination is inclined to work in those particular spaces, that would be additional time that they

would be serving within that capacity as well. That is my formal presentation. Brad is here to help you to better understand the process, with the music and arts commission. Feel more confident to achieve our goal by end of January.

>> Thank you, David. As David mentioned we have met with chair Myers earlier this

[6:53:15 PM]

week to streamline have consistent process we'd recommend that each commissioner bring forth recommendation and that the commission develop a working group to vet the resumes and application. Then bring back one or two recommendations to the full landmark commission for approval. But again for landmark commission to develop a working group, to analyze nominees brought forth by each one of the commissioners, one or two in the month of December hopefully, vote in January to take that nomination to council in February. So we will be getting the chair a one pager again on those criterias that David talked about so that each commissioner can have it. And have thought about who they would want to bring forth. It could be a commissioner that is on your commission. That you want to bring forth but

[6:54:17 PM]

that is the streamline process that we are hoping that you will select to use.

>> Would the speaker please state your name for the record.

>> Acting director of economic development department.

>> Thank you.

>> Commissioners I wonder -- this is Cara I wonder mentioned working group if that would be role for preservation plan committee to meet on an ad hoc basis.

>> That sounds like a good idea. If anyone else would like to join that committee for this -- what we're doing is everyone on the commission can think of people who might be suited for this position. It would be a permanent position. It doesn't have to be from the commission. It can be from someone outside with the qualifications that

[6:55:17 PM]

they presented and then we will -- there will be an application and we will review the applications and recommend someone to -- from the historic landmark commission to be the permanent member of this

economic development cohort. Do I would need to do anything further at this time or can we discuss this later after the public hearings? Does anyone have questions?

>> I think this can be done afterwards this is a briefing that doesn't require any action this evening. Information to take into consideration if y'all want to do something I would suggest that we get public hearings

[6:56:18 PM]

underway put this at the end.

>> Thank you.

>> You muted yourself.

>> Somebody has to do it. We're going to go ahead with the public hear haings I will go through the agenda quickly. We have a number of items up for consent to those who are on the line listening there are number of properties -- cases that for consent if you have not already pulled them and wish to pull them and you're registered spooker please do so. With that we have item a1 discussion of -- 2816 San Pedro.

[6:57:19 PM]

A2, baker school. That is discussion item. A3, 4509 drive that is discussion item. A4, 1304alt vista avenue, discussion. A5, congress avenue disquick. Next section B discussion is applications for credits of appropriateness. B1, will go on postponement agenda at the request of the applicant. B2, that was item -- Miller C. House. B2 has also been requested by applicant to be postponed. That is the Jackson house at 2406 Harris boulevard. B3 postponement request by applicant, maverick

[7:06:05 PM]

19, and E 1. Is is that correct, staff do I hear a motion to approve the consent agenda?

>> Commissioners?

>> So moved, madam chair, I think commissioner Valenzuela, did you have a question? You were trying to get attention.

>> Yes. I was just making sure madam chair, you said D 1 was on the consent but I believe it is on the postponement consent agenda. >>

>> D 1 isn't on the consent

[7:07:05 PM]

agenda, D 2. 11, 13 was 22nd and a half. Okay. D 1 is not on the consent ag agenda.

>> Okay. Commissioner heimsath, is there a second?

>> Commissioner Mcwhorter second it is motion, all those in favor please raise your hand. Any opposed?

>> Okay. The consent agenda passes. For those of you who are waiting on the phone, if your item was on the consent agenda, it was just approved and you may leave your telephone now. You can go watch television or do something else, but that is over. We now have, will now take up the postponement agenda.

[7:08:06 PM]

And this is consent postponement applicant initiated, we have B 1, 5,400 freidrich lane, B 2, 2406 Harris boulevard, B 3, 910 popular street, C 7, 816 congress avenue, and D 1, 4714 Rowena. Now, I think we had one that was to be added to the postponement or was that a scheduled postponement? Steve?

>> -- There is a request but we

--

>> Discuss it?

>> We need to take, this yes, we need to discuss it, yes.

>> Do I hear a motion to pass the postponement agenda?

>> I will make that motion.

[7:09:07 PM]

Would anyone second it? >>Ly second it.

>> All right.

>> Alex papavasiliou seconded the motion. All those in favor of the postponement agenda please cig tie by raising your hand. Thank you. It was unanimous. The postponement agenda passes if you are waiting to hear a case on postponement those items will be postponed to our next meeting. Unless otherwise

indicated on the agenda. Okay. Now, I don't think we have any discussion postponements. The items that were pulled were pulled for discussion. So let's go ahead. We have item a 1, this is a discussion of possible action on application for historic zoning. This item is for 2816 San Pedro street, the applicant is cater

[7:10:09 PM]

Joseph? Are you on the line to speak to this application?

>> Yes, ma'am, I am.

>> Go ahead. You have three minutes.

>> Good evening, commissioners

-- I am requesting the demolition permit be granted to the property at 2816 San Pedro. The current improvements are an exceptionally poor condition as has been indicated on the provided engineer's report. In addition, I have included a check certified residential inspectors report that further details the condition of the home. 2816 San Pedro was most recently operated as a tra ten at this house however that ended when one of the members of the fraternity was found dead in the home in 2005. Sense that time the house has not been occupied and has been minimally cared for. In addition to the property's age and large amount of time it has been vacant, severe degrading issues have attributed to its poor condition. The oversight front yard into

[7:11:10 PM]

the pier-and-beam foundation which in the front of the home is sitting just at grade level. As a result of this the foundation is in need of complete replacement. I have been in construction contractor for 15 years and in that time I have worked on numerous landmark properties. On receiving this research for this home, I attempt to modify plans that incorporate this house into the project. These plans included options where the house could stay in its current location and the house would relocate -- the common denominator for all options resulted in a house with very little of the existing building being Sal stradged, among the items that would need to be replace ready the windows, doors, rotten framing which there is a significant amount of, stucco, the foundation, roof, gutters, mechanical electrical plumbing system, so on and so forth. One such -- one such measure, once such measures were taken to make the structures safe and sound there

[7:12:11 PM]

would be little to know historic fabric remaining and the house would be ineligible for historic zoning. While the house would maintain its original form, there would be no originality besides the shape of the structure. As a result of the above mentioned items it is my opinion that the property's condition is beyond reasonably sat advantageable. To my knowledge, there have been a number of changes made to the structure, these included, included ad doors, street -- side of the roof, side addition on the south side of the home, a rear addition and various replaced added doors and windows throughout the home. Considering all of these current affordable housing crisis I believe it is worth noting the project plans replacing the existing home would be built in accordance with Austin's affordability and -- program and would provide three much needed affordable housing units around the university at 60 percent MMI, I sincerely appreciate your time and consideration and I am

[7:13:11 PM]

available to further discuss the property and my request for demolition. Thank you.

>> Mr. Joseph, I just want to reiterate for those who are waiting online, we are not taking up these cases right now. We are sharing all of the speakers in the order of the case as is on our agenda. So we are hearing the speakers and then we will go back and start with these cases to have staff presentation and deliberation. Is there anyone else to speak to this application for historic zoning for 2816 San Pedro?

>> Commissioner chair this is Angela gallaudetly moderate the speaker list, if that is helpful.

>> Okay. Go ahead.

>> No one else is signed up for 2816 San Pedro to focus a 2,

[7:14:12 PM]

3908 after few B.

>> Avenue B. >>

>> Okay. Great. A-- I am going to try to make this brief. Baker school was originally built in 1911. It is one of the crown jewels of the Hyde park nncd and purchased by Alamo drafthouse in 2018 to turn into their corporate offices but but they have done an extensive historic rehabilitation, including federal and state tax credits. When it was originally zoned, because it never had been zoned before because it was a school, the city zoned the back portion of the campus for 50 neat height and a provision that 25 percent of that would be affordable. However, earlier this year, the

[7:15:14 PM]

city reached an agreement with Alamo to buy that land and use it as a detention pond. So we would like to rest of the campus to be prepreserved in its entirety. I have provided backup showing the areas that are currently parking lots that would be the only area that you could possibly redevelop. However, there isn't enough parking on the site and unless you include all of the parking around the building to park the existing structure so if you were to build anything new on this campus, other than the fact that it is anything you would block the historic building and there is already a 75-foot setback on the front of the rot. So we would ask that the entire site be zoned historic. However, I have provided a compromise document that removes the two parking lot areas from the historic zoning and if you

[7:16:15 PM]

choose that as an alternate recommendation or approval then I would just ask that you use the setbacks in the documents that I provided to the preservation office which is basically 30 feet off of any of the structures. And then the zone -- the zoning setback on the front that is labeled B.

>> And that's it.

>> Thank you. The next speaker?

>> Susan mosas.

>> Susan, you have three minutes.

>> Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

>> Yes.

>> Hello?

>> I am Susan speaking in support of historic zoning for the historic site. I have been in Austin 40 years, 30 in Hyde park and the current secretary of the Hyde park contact team. I have already e-mailed you on this item so I am just going to briefly recap. First, historic stoning would not preclude affordable housing

[7:17:16 PM]

on this site as you may have mistakenly been told. Historic zoning would only affect the building exterior and grounds, 66,000 square feet interior could be reconfigured for affordable units in the future. Hyde park strongly supports foodable housing and residents have identified areas throughout the neighborhood where it can be readily incorporated but it is a false choice to pit historic recognition of this one of a kind landmark against affordability. Austin is capable of doing both as Richard just noted in 2019 the rear of this site, baker field was rezoned with neighborhood support to allow five stories of residential development, 25 percent affordability, however in March 2020 the city instead decided to buy baker peeled for the regional detention pond question of course is also a public good but not what

we had hoped for. Fortunately there are many large apartment complexes near Baker suitable for converting to

[7:18:17 PM]

permanent deeply affordable housing and in fact most of these older complexes right now provide market affordable housing for the renters who make up over 70 percent of the neighborhood. Baker was built in 1911 on the site of the Hyde Park pavilion and named to honor Dewitt Clinton Baker who helped establish public schools in Austin and served as a school superintendent 1872 to 1887. It is a traditional three story brick building with large windows, details on the upper facades and the ground contains historic trees that were likely provided to provide shade for the young students. Baker was directed during the superintendency of A. M. McCallum whom McCallum High School is named after. The neighborhood plan lists Baker as one of five neighborhood sites that should specifically be considered for historic landmark status. In 1911, Austin public schools were completely segregated and Baker was built to be an all white school.

[7:19:17 PM]

However, it later played a critical role in the long over due integration of Austin schools in the 1970's when Baker became one of a handful of campuses designated as an integrated sixth grade center finally opening Baker's doors to all students of every race and ethnicity. So after more than a century of school use Baker is now headquarters of an iconic Austin business, the Alamo Draft House which has done a wonderful job restoring the buildings and grounds. I strongly urge you to preserve this important piece of Austin history by recommending historic zoning for the Baker school and the site and I thank you for your service.

>> This is Susan. We have --

>> Before we have another speaker, I just want to ask speakers who are find up to talk to, not to repeat information. If you can. We welcome your comments and we

[7:20:18 PM]

want to know that you support or that you oppose an application, but please don't repeat previous information. Thank you.

>> Madam chair -- request of staff, I have a text from commissioner Featherston who got kicked off and now you have to transfer him back over or else he won't be able to come back in.

>> I just moved him back into the meeting. Okay.

>> Okay. Go ahead, Angela.

>> The next speaker is Karen McGraw.

>> Welcome back.

>> Karen, are you still with us? >>

>> Hi. I am sorry. I didn't hear.

>> Karen, go ahead and speak, you have three minutes.

>> I am speaking in favor of historic zoning for the bankers school, I have been in this neighborhood over 40 years. I have learned many, many things

[7:21:18 PM]

about the school and about the neighborhood, I sent you a letter, I hope you all got my letter. It did not appear in your backup, but I sent it to all of the commissioners and I included a copy of the zoning ordinance that the neighborhood negotiated with Alamo draft house own sores I hope you have that, because we did, the most we could short of actually getting the historic zoning by prohibiting any building to the front of the school and limiting any side buildings to 30 feet in height. Having done that, I would really hate to see you carve up this site. This site has been one site for one school since 1911 and there are many wonderful stories of the principal ringing the Belton front porch trying to get all of the students to get there from all over Hyde park and it has

[7:22:20 PM]

been a long time since it was really Hyde park school, but it is a very important landmark and I really believe it would be a mistake to cut off pieces of this site, and say well those aren't historic. The whole site is historic and so I encourage you to please look at the whole thing such that if anything else is built you will look at it as one historic site. And I also mentioned in my letter just that while we hope Alamo draft house is there a long, long time, they have done an amazing job, they are, they may be under a different owner the future so we would just want to continue the really excellent level of preservation that has occurred there so far. And I am going stop right there.

>> Thank you very much.

>> Thank you, Karen.

>> Next is --

>> Next speaker.

>> Betsy --

[7:23:21 PM]

>> Hi. This is Betsy clevon and I lived in Hyde park for over 20 years and currently O copresident of the Hyde park neighborhood association and I am calling to support the proposed zoning changes to designate the former baker campus as a historic land park. I did send a letter but I just want to recap as well, that in December 2017 after extensive input from community members and neighbors hpnn members unanimously supported the zoning changes and variances acquired by Alamo to restore the banker school campus as use of their corporate headquarters as part of that agreement we understood Alamo would be seeking historic landmark designation for the campus and that any future proposed structures would have to receive a certificate of appropriateness from the historic landmark commission. While addition to the front of the building aren't. Any in addition to the sides of the should be reviewed as part of the Austin historic landmark status for this important site as well as its status as

[7:24:21 PM]

contributing to the local historic district. And I think everybody else has covered my other points so I think I will stop there. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Next is Linda Anderson. >>

>> Hello, I am Lynn da Anderson, I am speaking in support of the highways storying zoning. Liz lives on avenue B for 48 years I had the privilege of teaching at baker when it became an integrated sixth grade center and very much aware of what the school looked inside of it when I a had the wonderful opportunity to go in and see what Alamo drafthouse had done to restore baker school, it was actually very emotional for me to see that school come back the way that it actually was. I feel like that baker school ask an integral part of the historic Austin and I also feel like it is long over due that the buildings become a historic building. Thank you.

[7:25:24 PM]

>> Thank you.

>> The next speaker, please.

>> One second.

>> Elizabeth --

>> I am sorry.

>> Yes. Can you hear me?

>> My Mike was not on previously.

>> This is Elizabeth from the historic preservation office staff. I have shown a map that Steve Sadowsky just forwarded and we wanted to prompt Mr. Wise if he is still on the line, this is the counterproposal that you have for a potential reduced historic zoning, if it is not the entire site. Site.

>> I am looking there is a delay in the video. That is correct. That would be the counterproposal. However, again I would like to strongly advocate that the -- hold on.

[7:26:25 PM]

>> Yes. That is correct. Those are the setbacks that would maintain the best views of the building staff, could I have a quick question?

>> A quick question to clarify.

>> Yes. Go ahead.

>> To the left, which I assume is the western segment, is that area of the detention pond at this point?

>> Yes. That's the area that was purchased by the city, correct.

>> I am sure we will hear more during the presentation. Thank you.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Okay. Angela, we need go on to the -- to the other cases.

>> Yes.

>> Those are all -- items so move to a 3, 4100 -- balcones, we have Nick Deaver.

>> Good evening, can you hear me?

>> Yes. Commissioners. This is commissioners this is Nick Deaver and I will keep this

[7:27:26 PM]

short. We met with the architectural review committee to review the proposed addition to this David graver the residence and just briefly the material that I sent you, I was asked to take look if we could save save some of the existing material near the north end of our approximately where we were

proposing our at addition addition. I did take a look at that and we are proposing to reoact an original window and a deck in there very similar location to our transition to our addition, and we think that this will be a nice transition and also preserve more of the material and that's really all these drawings show. The only other thing I wanted to say, just asking for is to be allowed to proceed with our addition and I believe my client is here to speak in regards to the landmark status.

[7:28:29 PM]

>> Thanks, Nick. Next we have Carla.

>> To this is Carla Tremblay, the owner of 4509 balcones drive and I am here to speak of the landmark preservation of our house in parallel with moving forward on the addition.

>> And that's all I have. >>

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Next is item a 4, 1304 Alta vista avenue and we have Casey Jordan.

>> Yes. In hello.

>> Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead.

>> Okay. Thanks.

>> I prepared the application for 1304 Alta vista, it is the murder son house, really nice example of revival of

[7:29:31 PM]

architecturally, modify most of the addition and cages are on the rear. It has been impeccably maintained, and it has an association with Mr. Murder son who is the longest serving school board member in Austin has a middle school named after him, up in north Austin, and he was really a prominent humanitarian, citizen of Austin in the early 20th century. He lived there, he lived there for most of his life and after retiring from the school system he became a probation officer and dedicated his life to helping generations of young Austin men. So it is a great example of architecturally and has a really strong tie to a really great Austin fight. It has full, austinite, .. Full support from the owner who is happy to landmark his very nice house.

>> Thanks, Casey. Next we have Paul Wilson.

[7:30:33 PM]

>> Hello, commissioners. I am a resident of the Travis heights -- national registered historic district. I Hartley support the applicant's request to change the zoning to historic for 1304 Alta vista, the murder son house, the home and garden is a contributing property to a historic district. It is a highlight of our beautiful and historic neighborhood to be add fired both Austin residents and visitors who walk our tree-lined trees, the applicant has put in volunteer hours to reserve this area of our unique city, especially around nearby Adie bird lake, considered the crown jewel of Austin by many, enjoyed by all. His access to the lake by the public is due to the efforts of volunteers like Mr. Koch who a ladies and gentlemen of the jury percentage of austinites supports the waterfront and oppose buildings, 60 feet around

[7:31:33 PM]

ladybird lake. Austinites chose quality of life over development. She certainly a person that is significant, pain murder son Koch house. I am happy to organize a letter of support from our neighborhood association of about 5,000 households might be helpful.

>> Thanks, Paula. That's all we have on that item. Next is a 5, 905 congress avenue. We have Austin Nelson. Yes. This is Austin Nelsen. I represent ownership of 905 congress avenue. We believe that historic zoning on this has been a long time coming as it is one of the better examples of art deco architecture on congress avenue and we are very excited about this recommendation for historic stoning and appreciate your consideration. >>

>> Thanks, Austin.

[7:32:34 PM]

Next we have items C 3, 1406 Etheridge avenue, we have Roy Jensen.

>> I think we have robin Bruce and the architect registered to speak on behalf of this home.

>> That is correct, sorry. I also had Roy but he is not here and skip him. Go ahead, robin.

>> Okay. Great. Well, first of all just thank you so much, committee for taking the time to put together the research that you did on the home. We purchased the home back in April and have been incredibly grateful to learn about its legacy of warmth and inclusion through reverend high tone's 25 years a -- at the home in presenting such an incredible example of the city through his leadership of the university of Texas, methodist church, you know, a big reason we were drawn to this home was its history as a parnage, up until our purchase of it.

[7:33:35 PM]

And it is something, you know, faces something that is very important to our family and we very much look forward to raising our children with that history and sort of the bones of the house really enliven that spirit. The updates and renovations that we are hoping to make to the home are really in the vein of wanting to extend the life of the home and extend its life and warmth into the community and I know our architects will speak a bit more to the features of the home but the front for N particular is one that for discuss really emblematic of the spirit of the former occupants and something that we think will continue to build on further engagement and neighborliness as we live in the home for the next many, many decades so thank you again to the commission for really bringing this history and detail to light to us and outlining the details of Reverend High Tone's incredible legacy in the city and we are grateful for your work and service.

>> Thanks, Robin.

[7:34:36 PM]

Next we have Sam. Sam Birch.

>> Good evening this is Sam Birch. I just want to quickly clarify a couple of the items on the project specifications that are incorrectly stated. The garage is existing on the property with built in 2004 and approved by the HLC at that time. We are simply proposing to renovate the garage, re-- new garage door and we are actually converting existing attic space. So we are not changing the roof line as is stated. The addition that we are proposing is actually in place of an existing addition built in 1994, it is the terrible shape, was built poorly, and we are pruning essentially the same footprint that is there thousand. At the time that this addition was built in 1994 all of the

[7:35:37 PM]

center on the back of the house was removed and no longer present so our addition is going in roughly same footprint and not extending any further on the left and right of the house and will not be visible from the front of the house. And furthermore, I think the addition that we are proposing are really enhancing the existing house rather than detract from it. While we are proposing a front porch addition as Robin said, the proposed is more in keeping with our culture and our climate as opposed to the existing porch that is there. While it is a clone Krall revival style porch, I don't think simply the aesthetics of it are, merit reason to keep it. We are proposing to replace windows and doors, that are single pane need to be replaced or energy efficiency reasons and of course as many of you know,

[7:36:39 PM]

when replacing windows and doors you have got to renewed mason I are to make that possible to waterproof them properly. We are concerned about the mortar being mismatched when we do replace it, that's the reason for smearing the stone, be, because otherwise we will get scarring to look like a hodgepodge. And, you know, lastly I would say I don't, in my opinion believe the existing house is of any architectural significance or a fine example of crone quality revival style. It is -- it has a red metal theme house which is not original, I believe originally it originally had a wood roof on it and I don't believe the stone on the house as it exists is a fine example of the style nor a fine example of craftsmanship, so I believe that's all I have got. I appreciate your time and thank you very much.

[7:37:41 PM]

>>

>> Okay. Thank you. Next we have Sean o'brien for item C 6. 506 congress avenue. This is Sean o'brien, on 506 congress, what we are proposing is a new art mural installation on 506 congress and working with Ruben Sanchez, a renowned Spanish artist that works in large and small scale murls, sculptures and prints. Our proposal is for the Mueller to be, murder value .. This.

>> Mural when the building was remodel, their set pa sad was remodeled and replaced with a numb aluminum .. Ca glass at that sad that runs along the front.

>> Mueller Mueller.

[7:38:43 PM]

>> Mural. Retains sufficient to be a contributing building. This building previous to the 2002 remodel did not adhere in the local or national registers. Furthermore in the 1978 application to the U.S. Department of interior for the congress avenue district this address is not mentioned as a contributing structure at that time.

>> In order to understand how this building fits into the review process I went to the -- I am sorry. To understand how buildings that are in a historic district but not contributing to, up to the city code and preservation website from what I can find this does not address temporary changes such as art, however the preservation website states that while buildings exist inside a national historic district does not carry a zoning change historic review is advisory only. This type of artwork is supported by the daa, similar efforts have been made, there have been cleated by the daa via

[7:39:45 PM]

writing on the wall. Furthermore this work does not require approval by art and public places and its own private property and we are asking for approval to bring a vie perhaps and temporary addition to our downtown district. Thank you. >>

>> Thank you. Next are items D 3 and D 4, 25

--

>> Excuse me. I have a quick question of the speaker.

>> Sure.

>> The last comment you made you said a temporary addition. Is this not to be painted on the facade or is there somehow a temporary installation only?

>> It will be painted. It just, as with I guess most paint jobs it can't last forever, so --

>> Okay. So it is painted on the facade. All right. Thank you. Appreciate it.

>> Okay. Thanks.

>> Okay. Moving on to 2505 and 2507 park view commissioners would you like to ask that commentary go to both items speaking or want

[7:40:47 PM]

to address them individually?

>> I would hope they could comment on both at the same time. If there is a difference they can call attention to it in the interest of time.

>> Okay. The we will go ahead and do it that way. So first we have don at this Quebec, the applicant, yes this is Dominique. I have the hearing report for 2505 parkview and 2507 for 2505 parkview. I will just highlight that the foundation is in terrible condition. The engineering -- the issues

[7:41:47 PM]

clearly and I won't go into that necessarily right now. You can read the report. I am hoping that the owner of the house would like to chime in and make any comments of further about the process for him. This is Tim.

>> Tim Packard, go ahead.

>> Obviously speaking about 2505 parkview, just I think we stated last time on this call some of our concerns about the overall condition of the property considering the drainage and thousand the structural engineer report to actually support our original view of the property is that it is not structurally sound in order to do a remodel addition to the property. So I would strongly encourage the council to consider putting this on the concept agenda and go ahead ahead and let us move forward with demolition of this

[7:42:48 PM]

property and also would like to take the time to object to the overall process we are going through with this. I feel that the way that we have to do this process where you are letting all of the applicants speak at first, and then the city gets to comment on these demolition permits without the applicants being able to respond is not fair and I propose that we change the process moving forward.

>> A comment since we don't have our chair right now since she must have kicked off we agree with you, there has been a lot of discussion about this but we are beholden to the city's process thanks to covid and this is what they have given us and so we are trying to make it as fair as possible.

>> And there again, issuing a demo per pit and the owners are for it. The city's recommendation we headed a proposal with over 27 signatures speaking in favor of our proposal to get this demo

[7:43:50 PM]

permit, that wasn't even considered I think on the last time and, you know, we have had to rally support and I think you will hear a lot of people moving forward that will speak in favor of issuing the demo permit. It seems there is overwhelming community response that is in favor of this and it seems like to council is postponing us indefinitely and we would like to see some closure.

>> Mr. Packard one thing I will say is you can certainly stay on the line but when the case comes up if there are questions, we do have the ability to still refer to a caller by asking a question. So that may be a possibility if such a thing comes up but as I said, the process we are working under is, has been dictated by the city, and the city's staff and the legal department and all commissions have to operate under this so we are trying work within that system. Why don't we continue with the peekers.

>> Next is John Allison. >>

>> And John is not available at

[7:44:50 PM]

this time.

>> Okay. Thank you. Next is stu nine nick:yes. Hello. I am sue -- and I have lived in Austin since 1978 and 2504 parkview drive directly across the street from 20 the if 05 -- 2507, I have lived in this area for more than two years. As much as I have been in -- I have had three sons and raised them here and I actually knew former owners of 2505 and 2507 parkview drive and they experienced flooding and drainage issues, plumbing, and landscaping, French drains, et cetera, I familiar favor of the demolition of these homes. I trust that the builder Dominique robisque will replace

[7:45:54 PM]

these with fine homes and I appreciate the quality he brings with the houses he builds. Thank you.

>> Thank you. And next is Jackson Roche.

>> Commissioners, my name is Jackson roach and I am in favor of the resident just a few houses down from 2505 and 2507 parkview. And I just would like to echo to comments that have already been made in support of the demolition permit just to say I support approval of the permit wholeheartedly.

>> Thank you, next is Ms. Moyes.

>> This is Andrea Moyers and calling in support of the demolition permits for 2505 and 2507.

>> I live at 2506 and

[7:46:55 PM]

catty-corner from 2507 we have been the owners and occupant of our house which is also an air conditioned village house for 20 years, also grawses of UT school of architecture so we are aware of the significance and desirability to be modern but still support the demolition for the reasons previously stated. I think it is important to note that you cannot visually identify the air condition village -- if I were to drive someone around nasco and ask them to point out these houses they would not be able to do so. There is no identifiable shared style beyond the generic mid century and examples of this style are being demolished regularly in the neighborhood. There is also no -- community in air condition village in my 20 years of living here. I think reasonably consider the air conditionville lamb to be a clever marketing strategy to promote air conditioning, the research done is well documented and accessible to the public and no research is really possible for this.

[7:47:56 PM]

So its historic value is basically finished. One-third of the original houses have already been demolished and most of the rest of them have been extensively remodeled and are in considerable disrepair my own house also has nodding issue with substandard structural systems at this point. I bring suggestion to the applicant to keep the existing at that sad and add on behind but that to me implies the facade is what is significant about these houses which is really not the case at all. The fact that my 65-year-old house is named after an air conditioning machine doesn't seem juveniles for restricting property rights to modify or demolish the structure like the houses, like the house as few houses down might be able to. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Next is azime ashar.

>> Hi. Thank you. This is azimer, Aja refute, I am a lifelong austinite and I live

[7:48:57 PM]

at 2601 parkview drive just nearly next door to 2507 and 2505. I was really glad to hear some other homeowners that live on the street, write up the flooding, that is an issue that takes place in my house as well. And I think it is just stromely common for the homes that were built on this street on tight budgets in order to appeal for a market from a marketing perspective to -- hopeful air conditioned environments. I think that as a neighbor and someone that is building a people on this street, it is seemly exciting that Dominique is a builder on these two demolition applications. I consider this a best-case scenario for the city and our neighborhood, everyone you heard speak already lives within probably 200 feet of one

[7:49:57 PM]

another. We know each other personally. We enjoy spending time with one another. And the financial hardship that would be put on you as disasters take place or just as time goes on, I think is an unrealistic expectation that the city should withhold the ability to build what is best for you, and best for your appeal going forward. So I do just kind of want to express my support for both of these permits and be another positive voice on a positive path forward with a builder that takes into account the environment and the aesthetic of the neighborhood. Thank you. Thank you. Next is James Watson.

>> My name is James Watson and a resident at 2508 parkview drive. I live directly across the street from 20 the if 05 and 20

[7:50:59 PM]

the if 07. I am in support of the homes being demolished and being rebuilt. I think Dominique will build a very high quality home. Like many residents on my street I am one of the original air conditioning village homes. All of the air conditionings that were installed in these properties making it air conditioning village have been removed. None of them are currently in the properties. And I do not support the historical landmark designation for the homes for that specific purpose. I discovered many years ago 17 or 18 years that my house is conditioned with a slab and drainage prevents me from being able to successfully add on to the property, so like many homeowners here we have been forced to have to redemolish and build a new home, and that's basically it, thank you.

>> Thank you. And in open organization we have

[7:51:59 PM]

Hannah stark.

>> Hi, yes, I am Hannah stark representing preservation Austin. We are dismayed at the proposed demolition of 2505 and 2507 parkview drive in the air condition village we urge the commission to consider historic zoning for these shall not properties, we submitted last month high delights reasons for the architectural historic and community values and ask you to go over them again. The air condition village has been too many demolitions at a rapidly increased rate over the past several years, only 15 of the original 23 homes retain integrity, every loss brings us closer to losing any chance for historic district to honor and protect these buildings, we urge the historic landmark commission to oppose this permit and offer preservation support to help protect this irreplaceable piece of Austin's history. Thank you for your co consideration.

>> Thank you. The applicant does have the opportunity for a rebuttal.

>> Yes.

[7:52:59 PM]

I would like to comment on -- speaker this is Dominique again. In reference to preservation Austin claim that these houses are important, if indeed that is the case, the rent sale of a house that -- at 276 tone Garrity, which ask a house built in the same time period 1953, was sold by Clayton bullock. And then demolished. So if you look at an aerial photo of air condition village you have from the top you have all of the original air condition village, you have Addison going north, and Garrity. All built around the same time. If none of these houses were historic or if they were all built at the same time, why weren't these houses all considered historic?

[7:54:00 PM]

And I find it very interesting that the president of preservation Austin Clayton bullock has the right to talk out both sides of his mouth if she selling houses that are built around the same time, why can't he also preserve them? Because that house is demolished in the last month or so. So I don't understand why he has a claim for preservation, preservation Austin has a claim on the air condition housing for preservation yet they can profit individually off of the sale of other house sales at the same time. >>

>> Okay. Thank you. Those are all of the speakers for item C 3 and D 4 so we will go ahead and move on to D 6, 910 west Elizabeth street. We have the applicant, Gabe

[7:55:01 PM]

Joseph.

>> Mr. Joseph, are you here?

>> Yes.

>> Do you want to speak on the item?

>> No go ahead.

>> If you don't want to speak we will go focus to the other items signed up on opposition. We have Pam Gibb Lynn.

>> Yes. Pam Gibb Lynn, yes, go ahead.

>> He name is Pam -- and I tone property next door to the property that he wants to demolish. I have lived in Austin since 1965 and what he is proposing is going to take out a really nice house that is, you know, is part of Austin's culture, which is acute, a cute downtown central

[7:56:01 PM]

area property, and if he wants a few build, he should go to the subdivision as opposed to trying to buy something in the Bolden area and taking out a house that is going to change the culture of that neighborhood. And so I am very opposed to it. He has never reached out to the neighbors. I have never heard from the applicant to discuss what he plans to build there. If he were allowed demolish the house. So I mean, I think that, again, it is going to change the whole culture of that neighborhood and I oppose it. >>

>> Thank you. Next we have Cheryl Chandler.

>> Yes. Thank you very much. As a tenant here at 912 Elizabeth next door I would also lke to speak the opposition to the Democrat licks of the rot. Also with Ms. Gibb Lynn to the agricultural of Austin being

[7:57:02 PM]

stripped with every demolition in the neighborhood. This beautiful little house, stonewall is 83 years old and is a wonderful representation to the heritage of this neighborhood. One of the appeals of the neighborhood historically it has this terrific little accessory dwelling unit which allows for the middle income class to be able to affording with close to the downtown area. And with each destruction it is completely changing the economy verse at this of this neighborhood, having those rental options removed. Also there are concerns about the trees in the yard. I believe there are live oak trees, six or seven, maybe more, they have green ribbons tied to them and we don't know, are these to be destroyed or does it mean that they will not be harmed? Because they do provide a tremendous canopy with the property as we as the residents 912 next door. If they are to be removed this is a concern as central Texas Summers can be you tall, but

[7:58:02 PM]

brutal and if this is removed what will this be do to the environment more energy used in the summer. What is the intention of what is to be built there? Is it a single family home? Is it two-story? A duplex? A four-plex, will it be structure affect the privacy of the yard and we very much like to learn what these, what the attention is thanks for allowing me to speak and allowing us a platform to do so. Thank you, next in open organization we have Paula co cosan.

>> Hi. I am a own a historic property in Bolden a few blocks from this home and I echo the sentiment of the two speakers before me in opposition. To this application. I also have an issue with the application, it states they plan to demolish one structure, does it plan to keep the one bedroom, one bath structure? As stated Joseph -- has not approached the neighborhood regarding its plans, and some of

[7:59:04 PM]

the issues that we think that might be a problem as well is if a larger house might protect the lawyer in that area or the propensity for flooding as some of the other Joseph builder structures might see during in some other areas of the Bolden creek neighborhood. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Mr. Joseph, you have the opportunity for rebuttal, if you would like.

>> Yes. So a couple of things. The property on Elizabeth, the trees are yes, so a couple of things, the trees were marked because we had a tree survey done to specifically identify which would be reserved and which removed. The larger heritage ones of course will not be removed, it's in keeping with the character of the neighborhood to keep as much of those as we can as often as we can. The plan is to do a single family home, garage facing

[8:00:05 PM]

the alley. Two story house. It's set back and complies with all of the side and front yard set backs. There is a large tree in the front yard we think is going to really kind of help keep the character of the street intact. I have no idea what -- whoever that was that was talking about with other properties we've done flooding the neighborhood. I don't think that's factually accurate. I also don't -- don't recall specifically the section of the demolition application regarding how many structures were on the site, but the plan is, let me be clear, to completely remove all of the buildings that are there and put up something new. There's nothing historically significant about this house as far as I know, none of the research has borne out anything that would indicate any event, ownership or architecture that is worth preserving. The house is in disrepair, it's falling down. Nothing in it works. As she said, it's 83 years old. Although it has some very nice rocks on the front of it, that doesn't make it a safe or habitable place to live. So barring any real reason

[8:01:06 PM]

why demolition permit shouldn't be approved, I would insist that we approve it tonight so that we can move ahead with this along with a couple dozen other projects in Bouldin. It's a little bit in poor form to suggest that any one person gets to dictate the culture of a neighborhood. Joseph design build we feel very frankly by incorporating -- strongly by incorporating a lot of different styles and we enhance the culture of the neighborhood by not allowing it to be so homogenous and so identified by whoever moved in five years ago and decided they were the history of the place. That's what I've got to say.

>> Thank you. Next we'll move to item D 7, 1400 drake avenue. We have the applicant mark ahren. Okay. If mark is not here, we'll move on to the opposition.

[8:02:06 PM]

Paula Cosman.

>> Hi, again, as stated I'm a resident of the newly approved Travis heights fairview park historic district. We asked for a postponement to discuss -- the applicant has not been in touch with us. The house provides an affordable rental for a family with walking distance to area employers. Furthermore, by replacing these smaller houses with larger properties waste materials and impacts climate change which opposes Austin's goals to save the environment, more energy to cool and heat, more traffic and more wasted materials in our landfill. I also question my bad actors with a history of thwarting ordinances and city directives continue to get permits. Several neighbors have had issues with [indiscernible] Who seems to be associated with this property for public data. Moore Tate has had multiple

[8:03:09 PM]

residences in 78704, has felled protected trees, has built more than allowed

[indiscernible] And has been cited for using a forged architectural seal --

>> Madam chair, may I interrupt the speaker for a moment.

>> Chair: Yes.

>> I think we just need to -- to enforce some decorum. The point here is to listen to the merits of the case. Really not to debate efficacy of one applicant or another.

>> I agree.

>> Ms. Cosman, please continue and don't undermine the applicant. Personally. Thank you.

>> I'm sorry, I was speaking on their history of -- of their work in Austin. So we will be voting at our south river city central citizens general meeting tomorrow evening to get the

[8:04:10 PM]

[indiscernible] Approximately 5,000 households. Please postpone so that we can have this letter for the commission. Thank you for your consideration. Are there any questions?

>> No, thank you.

>> You are welcome.

>> That's all for that item, we have move to D 8, 1208 west 22nd street, we have James cosar.

>> Good evening, chair, commissioners, can you hear?

>> Yes. We can.

>> Good. My name is Jim Cowser, the attorney for the owner of this property who is applying for demolition permit. I will briefly provide you some background information and then architect Barnaby Evans will address the architectural criteria for landmark designation and why we don't think this property meets it. This property has been in the Radke family since it is the late 1930s until the 1950s, it was the residence of professor Oliver Radke in

[8:05:14 PM]

the late 50's they bought house across the street. Professor Radke actually lived there until 2000, a great deal longer than he lived at 1208. In the early 2,000s after Ingrid Radke lovingly restored her parent house at 1305 it was purchased by Tim and Kerry league who live there now. In 200-7130 [indiscernible] Was a historic land Mac of the goto Radke house. Barnaby the architect will discuss whether 1208 merits architectural preservation, we don't think that it does. It's a very ordinary 1920s bungalow. I hope that you saw the photographs included in our statement to the commission. I would just personally say that if you want to UT since the 1960s, you probably have been in dozens of west

[8:06:14 PM]

campus bungalows that were more distinctive than 1208. It's currently in terrible condition due to neglect by a long-term tenant. It has a rear addition that the structural engineers and the architects say cannot be rescued. In addition any work that would be done on it would require a new foundation. We think if not for the association with professor Radke there's no way this property would be proposed for landmark status. But professor Radke is almost commemorated by a genuinely distinctive house across the street where he lived twice as long as this property. We think naming an inferior structure as a landmark would not really honor him, it would probably diluted the significance of the Radke house across the street. In closing we've been advised there's no opposition from the two affected neighborhood associations.

[8:07:16 PM]

We assure you Ms. Radke has agreed to preserve all large trees on the site if the demo permit is granted. She will also happily cooperate with a

[indiscernible] She has an excellent record of respecting the neighborhood's architectural tradition, both in her preservation of her parents house at 1305 and the preservation of what's called the hunting lodge down at the end of 22nd street. So we would respectfully request that you release this demolition permit and I will stick around for the -- for the staff presentation should you have any questions then or now.

>> Thank you. Go ahead, Barnaby Evans?

>> I'm Barnaby Evans, an architect in Austin, I was asked by Ms. Radke to look into the possible renovation of that house. I think that was before she

[8:08:16 PM]

and I had ever been in there. Once we went inside the house we determined it was really uninhabitable condition. The foundation wasn't level. Many of the windows didn't function. It needed completely new plumbing, electrical, mechanical equipment. Drainage issues in the basket. The overall structure I believe is 1270 feet roughly. The original part was 942 and the addition of 336 feet at the back was built too low to the ground and so it floods every time there's a significant rain event. And then in -- in wandering -- so we went and had estimates done on what it would take to do that, restoration. And that came up to about \$240,000. So that seemed like -- that it was more of an undertaking -- you wouldn't wind up with -- with good value there. And so we suggested perhaps she look at rebuilding it. The house itself is a -- is

[8:09:19 PM]

a fairly typical bungalow, one of something similar to many that I have restored. And worked on in my career doing renovations and additions. Not very distinctive. I suppose it could be considered craftsman style by the hint of an archway at the front porch, perhaps those two front columns but that's probably where that ends. So to say it has distinguishing characteristics, that's probably a stretch. I don't know that it exemplifies any technological innovation in design. It's a fairly typical framed residence from that era. I see no indication that it would display high artistic value. It seems architecturally similar to many, many structures that I have worked on in the past. It wasn't constructed by anybody that contributed to significantly to the development of the city.

[8:10:21 PM]

It doesn't seem to be any sort of a one of a kind. It's very common for homes of that era. And then in terms of historical associations, as Mr. Cowser said, professor Radke is associated with that structure and certainly his daughter Ingrid lived there when she was young, but they moved across the street and that's the one that's been saved and preserved really in his name. We don't know of any architectural criteria. Community value is pretty standard for what's over there in that area. There's a lot of diversity in that area. And then the landscaping wise it's pretty simple. Just really flat lot like those adjacent to it. So ...

>> Thank you. Next we'll move to item D 9. 815 west 11th street.

[Background noise]. First is very much kin Kevin Flemming.

[8:11:23 PM]

>> I am here. I am one of three partners that are looking at this house at 815 and -- and we have put the house under contract with the current owner who agreed to -- to submit for a demolition permit on the

property. Knowing that we would raise the structure -- raze the structure and take it to a new level. Commissioners, we unfortunately do not see that reparations would be beneficial on this house. We have looked at it numerous ways and the condition of the home unfortunately is not in great condition. And to bring it up to standards that we would like to have to meet energy codes and other modifications would be too costly. We have -- we have a consulting firm. We love being in the downtown area. And the zoning for this property is for business use. And it would be used for our

[8:12:25 PM]

offices and perhaps one tenant. And we are trying to follow the guidelines of the city that are trying to increase density at some locations. And even proposed zoning in the future had it for even higher density than is currently allowed. Again this would be a small business. In this area. We would use it only -- it's used Monday through Friday, 8:00 to 5:00 and when we went under contract, we -- in order to even present this to the historic landmark commission, we had to pay arrears in taxes that were owed on the property of three years to be able to get to this point where we can even present it to you. So our commitment to try to make this work is pretty significant and we feel like if we can do this, we will be able to develop and design a structure that is -- that compliments the

[8:13:28 PM]

neighborhood in some way that bringing modern technology to the area with energy efficiency and that sort of thing . We believe that we would like for this permits to be released so we can move forward with this. We have looked at many factors trying to understand the complexities of this site. It's narrow, but we think that we can make it work with a new use for the property that is in line with the zoning and we have not seen any indication of any significant historical evidence making the project or the building to be retained as it is. The use is -- I think, is over for what it's currently used for and future use would be office use. We will stay on to answer any questions that anybody has, but -- but that's our -- our presentation,

[8:14:31 PM]

thank you.

>>> Thank you, next is Stephen bell.

>> He's not on.

>> Okay. Next is Randy bell.

>> She's not on, either.

>> Okay. Next is Ben Schneider.

>> Yeah. I would just like to follow up and point out that this was on consent to approve the demo. So I -
- I just want to support that approval.

>> Okay. Thank you. Next we'll move to opposition. First is Vivian jeneeser.

>> Hello, good evening, my name is Vivian jeneeser. I've lived in the house for 42 years, the structure was built in the 1880s, one of the oldest houses in the city of Austin. The property also has many large trees, including the

[8:15:32 PM]

heritage oak tree and I feel that the house currently fits in with the neighborhood. And a three-story modern building with parking underneath is not in -- congruence with the current neighborhood and I would like to oppose the demolition. And that's all that I have to say. Thanks.

>> Thank you. Next is Pam Giblin.

>> Yes. This is Pam Giblin. My husband and I moved the old Moffett house from Hyde park, which -- our house is right across the street in 815. And we renovated the house with a tremendous amount of care and this would just really change the character of that neighborhood. When I hear oh, it's so difficult to renovate old houses. Yes, it is. But it's well worth it and

[8:16:32 PM]

as I said, we moved the Moffett house to this site across the street in this house. And the idea that this 100-year-old house across the street from us is going to go away and be replaced with a modern structure is just -- you know, it's hard to fathom because it will change the entire character of that area. My husband was born in Austin. I've lived in Austin since 1965. And it's -- it's just heart breaking to see people who buy old houses and aren't willing to put the labor and the love into fixing them up. Because we've done that with a number of houses and, yes, it's not the easiest thing, but it is well worth it. So I oppose that demolition because it's going to really change the whole character of the neighborhood.

>> Thank you. Next is Sheryl Chandler.

>> Hold on. Whoever is not muting,

[8:17:32 PM]

please mute yourselves.

[Feedback]. We are hearing background noise. Go ahead.

>> Sheryl Chandler. Okay. Perhaps Sheryl is no longer here. We'll go to [indiscernible] Rowe.

>> Good evening, commissioners. Before I begin, may I have confirmation that you've had an opportunity to see the two backup documents that I presented? One is a map and the other is 20 photographs. Hello, hello? Hello?

>> Can you hear me.

>> Yes, I can hear you, I think the commissioners can all hear you.

>> Okay. I'm asking before I begin

[8:18:35 PM]

can I have confirmation that you've been able to see the 20 photographs and map that I have presented, I have filed with you.

>> Staff [indiscernible]

>> We will work on pulling that up on the screen, you can go ahead and start talking. Thank you, my name is Carl Anne Rowe, I'm a native Austinite. I grew up.

>> Hyde Park, I attended Baker School all the way from first grade to ninth grade. I walked to and from school and I would pass Old Lady Moffett's house on Avenue F. When Hyde Park Baptist -- Hyde Park Baptist church was demolishing, the house was moved to -- 808 directly across the street from the property. I moved my office to the second floor in 1980. I have been there for 40

[8:19:35 PM]

years. I have provided you with 20 photos and map for location. Please elementary school. Look at all of those holes. They have all been repumped while maintaining their original structure. The only residence that I recall being totally demolished was 813, but even then the appearance of the rebuild was extremely similar to the original residence, they just rebuilt as a two story. Demolition made sense because the old 813 structure was in very poor condition. But that's not true of 815. I have been in 815 many times through the years. Vivian and I share a love of border collies so I visited. It has high ceilings, nice hardwood floors, hardwood trims, transoms and a

[8:20:36 PM]

massive attic. The interior has been sheetrocked. We once talked about chip and Jo Ana gains in Waco. She laughed Jo Ana would be in ship lap heaven if they were to restore her house. I can't imagine why the applicants even thought about buying 815 if they didn't plan to restore the residence. It was called an historic home in the listing. Everyone assumed it would be repumped into -- repurposed. If I were younger and looking for a place to office and rent out, that's what I would do. So condition is not an issue. If your applicant has decided it cannot make a profit without demolishing the house, it still has the option to walk away from the deal and it should. Demolishing 815 would be a tragedy. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Next is Donna Carter.

[8:21:39 PM]

>> Good evening. My name is Donna Carter. I have an argumental firm and our offices are at 817 west 11th and I'm one of the owners, which is directly west of the subject property. And I am in opposition of the demolition. I won't repeat everything that my neighbor charlanne talked about, because I think she gets to the character of the street. As you go towards the courthouse, it's mainly business, but there's still a few residences. And a few multi-residence properties, but they are all by and large, with the exception of a few, that street scape, what you see as you walk down that street is -- is intact. And I think it's ironic that we're speaking about this when we're talking about guidelines. Because -- and I did send you all a memo and I hope that you will be able to

[8:22:41 PM]

read it. That some of the things about street scape is we can't take away all of the different parts and talk about bricks or talk about a low wall or a fence, we need to talk about what frames that whole kind of outdoor space. To take this away, we will lose that vista on this street. We have already lost it with the building that's directly to the west on the opposite side on the north side of the street. And it's a real shame. We also have to balance and the problem is if we put 13 cars on that lot, you have to get rid of the property. But if we could say eight cars could go there, then you can -- you could actually add on to the building, you could connect to the attic and use the very large attic space, but you would keep the front and the street and the feel of

[8:23:41 PM]

the building. This is just a quick cartoon sketch showing that. I have actually offered to even use my driveway and have an easement so that perhaps we only need that one curb cut on 11th street. So if nothing else, I think -- and I know -- I've talked to the applicant and I really do feel for the situation they

are in. But I think that if we had a little bit more time to balance what we needed with the trees, the parking, the street parking, the street facade, and somehow repainting that building, I think we could come up with a compromise. The city would have to work with it. The applicant would have to be amenable. And the neighbors I think would have to get-together. There's some other issues. The alley is not really -- it functions, but there's a drainage issue. The city acknowledges that. That would I think have to

[8:24:41 PM]

be worked through. But to demolish this without a site plan, without a clear image of how this is going to affect this historic neighborhood, I think, is a shame. I would also hope that the historic landmark commission would start to look at not only guidelines but what it means to have these transitional neighborhoods with the downtown, what it means to be incremental in terms of your densification and how we're going to do that and have a sense of what Austin was and how related to that original kind of platting, its relationship even to the schools, we have Pease and we have ACC. I do urge you to consider this because we'll lose this neighborhood one property at a time and it will always be

[8:25:42 PM]

because we're too close to downtown, and we need the density, without really thinking about how that's going to play in the future. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Donna.

>> The applicant has an opportunity for rebuttal if they would like.

>> Is the timer working for individual speakers?

>> Yes.

>> Okay. Hello, this is Kevin. Flemming. Back for I guess rebuttal, whatever. So we did talk to Donna. We understand there may be a path forward, but economically, unfortunately, at the price point for this property, we're just -- and I know we're not supposed to worry about that, but we're just trying to fit all of this into a box. The owner, when we approached her, she was willing to sign the demolition permit so that we could agree to it so that we

[8:26:43 PM]

could move forward with this. If that's not going to be the case, then I guess this building will be designated as historic, which -- which I find maybe a challenge to do. Timing-wise for us, we need to find

a path so that we can complete the demolition and also we'll be coming up with plans. We've looked at things of how to work on the site and we agree that Donna has approached us and some of those things may work or they may not work. And in order for us to -- to move forward with this, and I dare say that the zoning that's in that area allows for -- for the square footage that we need, unfortunately, to make it economical. Other people may have ability to purchase that and not increase the square footage, but I think the density of downtown and the

[8:27:43 PM]

property values are such that you have to do something that's more economical than to designate it as a historic structure. So I would appeal to the historic landmark commission to allow us to move forward with this. So that we can -- get on about plans and find a way and path to make this work. Appreciate your time.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you. We will move to item D 12. 514 academy drive. First is Hugh Jefferson. Randolph. Sorry. Hugh Randolph.

>> Yes, hello. Good evening. I am the architect for 514 -- of the house proposed for 514 academy. I don't know staff can you all see the rendering of

[8:28:44 PM]

what we are proposing to have built there?

>> Yes, we can see that.

>> Okay.

>> Can you get it up on the screen?

>> Okay. I didn't see it in the document attachments in the list. But so I'm on behalf of my client who is moving back to Texas, and it will be his residence. So his primary -- his only residence. And we've done a number of -- we've been -- been in business now for over 20 years, practice here in Austin and we do a combination of historic renovations and additions as well as new homes, much of our work has been in the Clarksville, old west Austin neighborhoods, tarrytown, and so forth. And even with new houses we try to be very compatible both in scale and character. And as you can see, the proposed design, one of the big features is having a large [sound cut out]

[8:29:47 PM]

>> I think we lost you.

>> Portion set back from that as a way of kind of integrating it in terms of the scale and massing with the neighbors. It will be primarily a stone house and we are exploring different kind of patterns with stone. You know, keeping with the stone cottages and larger homes that are in that area. And so I just wanted to kind of add that while it is nice to keep the character and we do try to keep old houses in many cases, in this particular case it is our intent to keep the capability, you know, so the pitched roof, the porch and the overall character of the scale of the openings and so forth is meant to be compatible with the surroundings. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Next is Dustin Kyle.

[8:30:48 PM]

>> Hi, this is Justin Kyle, I'm a long-term Austin resident here. I would like to second the comments for Mr. Randolph here. The existing house does not qualify even within the requirements of historic house per the findings of the commission and the new proposed house is well within the character and the look and feel of the neighborhood. This is also a residence for a -- a person that is coming back to Austin. That has lived here before. And he's looking to settle down in a neighborhood that he's familiar with from the past and we are building him a house that is, again, fitting within the nature and character, as is his interest as well to -- to be a part of the neighborhood. And thank you for allowing us to speak on behalf of this project.

>> Thank you. In opposition we have Paula

[8:31:49 PM]

Cosman.

>> Sorry to speak so much, but Travis heights is under siege. I will try not to repeat myself. I request a postponement in order to work with the applicant. Their architect did reach out to us a few days ago with which we appreciate, we appreciate that they will try to build something that meets with the scale and compatible with the other houses on the street, we wanted to talk about options

[indiscernible] To demolition. Academy drive is a very important street in our historic district and this house is currently a contributing structure. Thank you.

>> Thank you. The applicant has an opportunity for rebuttal.

>> I respect -- this is Hugh Randolph, again. I just wanted to add that we will be keeping the structure that is in the back. Academy is a very interesting street. Portions of it. Because it's a through block

[8:32:53 PM]

lot which goes to sunny lane to the north. So it's a relatively small property. But there is an existing corrugated metal shed and that will be repurposed as the garage and workshop, he's an avid bicyclist. I wanted to add that we are certainly in favor of keeping structures when we can, when they can be repurposed in a manner that suits the sort of changing of times and changing of needs so that's something that we love the eclectic field. Again both in scale and character and the rendering doesn't quite show it, but the stone work in particular will be something that -- I have walked around the neighborhood over the last few weeks looking at the different stone patterns and so forth. So -- but I do appreciate that stretch of academy does have some really nice homes. Our goal is to kind of

[8:33:55 PM]

retain that character and not come in with something that -- that perhaps might be better suited to other newer neighborhoods. Thanks again.

>> Thank you, we will now move to item D 14, 605 Barton springs avenue. We have the applicant, Phil Moncada. Phil Moncada are you here? Guess not. That was the only speaker for that item. So we will go ahead and move to D 15. 1811 drake avenue. The applicant, Gabe Joseph, would you like to speak?

>> Sure. So 1811 drake is a custom home for a family, long-time Austin residents. What they have planned I think very much in keeping with what's been, you know, redeveloped on that street. There's a lot of new

[8:34:57 PM]

construction. Fairly modern lot, mid century vibes, very cool house. So far very positive feedback from the neighbors that they have spoke to. There's a couple of trees that were heritage on the site. We plan to protect them. We have already talked with the arborist about that. Feeling pretty good about it and welcome any discussion on the subject. That's it.

>> Thank you. Next in opposition we have Paula Cosman.

>> Oh, my goodness. Here I am again. Speaking for opposition and the reasons stated previously. We just want developers to understand we have a new historic district and those properties that are contributing structures we would like to keep them as contributing structures. If this house were taken away it would no longer be contributing. So we would like to reach out to the owners and applicants to discuss options to total demolition. No one has contacted us so

[8:36:00 PM]

far for that discussion. Thank you.

>> Thanks, Paula. Mr. Joseph, would you like to offer a rebuttal?

>> Yeah. I mean, it's -- the house is under a thousand square feet, not in great shape, not presenting any architectural significance. I don't know what it would be contributing to another an example of a very small house from like 60 years ago that nobody wants anymore. I don't think the owner is interested in adaptive reuse or picking it up and moving it somewhere else or doing anything else. For a the although of reasons, economically it doesn't make sense. Character of the neighborhood, I don't think that's really in step with it, frankly the street has sort of moved on from whatever historic district may be nearby, I know there are several. So happy to discuss it. But don't really feel like going through the brain damage of delaying any of this because ultimately nobody is interested in keeping it. Thanks.

>> I would like to respond to that. This is a contributing

[8:37:03 PM]

resource in a brand new historic district that people worked on for 15 years. So I just wanted to -- to mention that to the applicant.

>> Yeah, looks like a lot has changed over there in the 15 years they were working on it.

>> Go ahead, Angela.

>> Thank you. That's all for that item. We'll move to D 16. Which is for 416 west 12th street. We have Michael whellan, would you like to start.

>> Thank you, Michael whellan on behalf of the applicant. I would like to speak to you about 416 west 12th. I wanted to open up the discussion at a high level. At its core, I think this case is about two things. First I think about how we balance our priorities as a city, including putting forward thoughtful designs and plans while also meeting our goal, our growing housing needs.

[8:38:03 PM]

Importantly, I also think that it is about the way in which our land use policies as a city often catch folks in unsuspecting bind. We know Austin has significant housing needs and downtown is critical to meeting those needs. It is one of the areas in the city in which there is a broad consensus that increasing housing is both appropriate and embraced and in which properties have the opportunity to participate in the

downtown density bonus program, like this one. Which has been a key funding source for the city's homelessness efforts. At the same time, downtown is also the oldest part of Austin. Thereby creating this tension, the city has looked to ensure this growth is accompanied by thoughtful design that creates a vibrant street level space and commemorates the property's long life. This is the balance that our downtown projects look to provide. And that is the balance that we believe we have met with our proposal for the delta

[8:39:05 PM]

capita gamma society. The society, international, as you may know, is a woman-led organization and their current office building is the subject of today's discussion. Although dkg is operated out of these offices for many years, it is not their original location. Instead we are here today because of the second point that I mentioned earlier, the way in which our land use policies as a city often catch folks in unsuspecting binds. This site is on the national register of historic places. It was placed on there through the work of a UT architecture student. She approached the delta kappa gamma to take it on as a class project and they wanted to support her growth and development. It was not clear to dkg at the time that a process they saw as celebrating their organization could later end up impacting their ability to make strategic decisions about their resources. And ultimately endangering their ability to deliver on their mission and vision. In fact, dkg specifically

[8:40:06 PM]

asked in writing the national register coordinator for the Texas historical commission who wrote back to them as follows, "Listing in the national register imposes absolutely no restriction on private property." No restrictions was in all caps in that correspondence from the national register coordinator. This is a critical junk if you are dkg, they are looking to expand resources in ways that expand their membership and deliver on their mission. This case is a critical part of that plan and we would ask that you support delta kappa gamma's ability to go forward with that plan. We believe this plan strikes the right balance, both for dkg and for the city. It would empower dkg to continue to grow and thrive and would provide increased housing in Austin's downtown while also ensuring a vibrant secret scape that

[8:41:06 PM]

incorporates -- streetscape that incorporates define elements --

>> Please wrap up, your three minutes are up.

[Overlapping speakers]

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you. In place of the next two speakers, we have a short video to play. I believe the voices that you will hear are from Nita Scott and Becky Sadowsky.

>> [Indiscernible].

>> One second here, we're figuring this all out. ,

[8:42:10 PM]

>> Sorry, commissioners, bear with us for just a minute.

[Audio difficulties].

>> Are there other speakers that we could hear while you are working on the technology?

>> Yes. We can go ahead and move quickly to item D 20, 1414 Alameda drive and we will come back to item D 16 when we have our videos ready. Sorry about that. For item D 20, we have -- the applicant Eduardo.

>> Here.

[8:43:10 PM]

>> No, [indiscernible] Speaking on his behalf.

>> Jason friar.

>> Thanks. You can go ahead and speak to the item.

>> Great. We are looking at a demo permit for 1414 Alameda. We are aware that the srcc has recently been designated a historic area. We are very excited for that. Looking forward to working with the neighborhood. We reached out to the neighborhoods committee, reached out to a number of people on the scrr talking about design standards and how to fit better in the neighborhood. We have been in conversation with them since mid October. So we are looking now to demo the current structure. We understand that it was a contributing structure, but in our research we found that the original structure built in 1932 was actually buried beneath a much later addition. The owner is proposing to remove the existing building. It has pretty severe foundational problems that they are concerned with as far as adding on and

[8:44:11 PM]

renovating the structure and doing so in a safe manner and currently looking at rebuilding the structure to also move the existing building outside of the shared [indiscernible] Zone of the trees, there are several protected trees on the site. The goal is to remove any construction that is in the

[indiscernible] Zones out of that Zones and to build the structure that responds to the trees on the site. The historic nature of the neighborhood and, of course, the design standards of that neighborhood. It is our goal to continue working with the neighborhood as we go forward. I have heard Paula talking about sending them design standards and

[indiscernible] As we continue to develop it. The owner is in the early stages of design. He bought the house for his son who is moving into the neighborhood with his family. And looking forward to putting down roots after the next many years as possible.

>> Okay. Thank you. And in opposition we have

[8:45:13 PM]

Paula Cosman again.

>> Okay. Last time. Once again, I wanted to thank the architect for sending me plans this afternoon, but I have not have had a chance to look at them. We would like an opportunity to discuss options to total demolition and I want to applaud all of the people that worked on the wonderful design standards that people will be able to use and apply and help people to understand how some of these remodels of some these older houses can make them fit modern life but retain historic character. Because actually there are a lot of people who want to live in those types of houses. Thank you.

[Retain historic character]

>> The applicant has an opportunity for rebuttal if they would like.

>> Absolutely. We are very aware of those factors. Unfortunately the owner doesn't feel safe raising his family in a house with a compromised foundation.

[8:46:13 PM]

And so his goal is to take down the structure, especially the non-conforming structure in the front to build something that does honor the historical nature of that neighborhood. He, before we get too far down the line, he's requesting a demo permit to really get into the actual design before it turns out that he is not able to live in this neighborhood where his parents have grown up.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> We are still waiting on a video to download. I do apologize. If you can just hang on for a minute, we will -- we will have the video up as soon as we can for item D 16.

>> We're getting on here. It's 8:46. And we haven't taken up any of the cases yet.

>> Are there other speakers signed up for the same item?

>> Come on buddy, we have

[8:47:16 PM]

Michael whellan signed up to speak and the other speakers are speaking on the videos. Unless -- unless Michael, you would like to -- to change the order of things?

>> No. We had the video done specifically in the format that -- that you told us we would like to show it. It has the architect you are talking, the chair of dkg along with the executive director.

>> Can we go ahead with our agenda. Can we go ahead with our agenda, when you have the technical difficulties figured out, have that come in and interrupt the agenda?

>> Yes. We will go ahead and do that and --

>> Speaker, would we be able to speak on our position without you going forward on the agenda so we don't have to wait any longer, the members of the public?

>> It needs to come up -- I

[8:48:18 PM]

guess we could. We could have you speak. We had two people give up their positions speaking to have this video; is that correct?

>> Yes.

[Multiple voices]

>> This is Michael whellan. We have five people on the line that are present and had prepared the video for them spoke use the video as their speaking format.

>> Okay. And -- can we listen to --

[overlapping speakers]

>> Can we listen to the people who are ready to speak?

>> That's fine. There's others in opposition that want to speak, that's fine if you want to take those up while they are working on it.

>> Can we take up the opposition.

>> We only have

[indiscernible] Allison

[indiscernible] Signed up in opposition. Allison if you are ready please go ahead.

>> Can we have the person

[8:49:19 PM]

with the dog mute yourself.

[Dog barking].

>> Mute the dog. Okay. Go ahead. Allison.

>> Thank you. This is Allison Mcgee, I'm a board member of preservation Austin. We are opposed to the proposed demolition of 416 west 12th street. The delta kappa gamma society international headquarters building. We encourage either an alternative solution for the property or that the historic landmark commission support historic zoning for the significant property. In addition to already being listed individually listed on the national register of historic places, the property also meets two of the local criteria for designation. Both historical associations and architecture. The society was founded in 1929 by a university of Texas professor, Dr. Annie Blanton. To encourage equal opportunities for women in education. She was the first female

[8:50:19 PM]

state superintendent of public instruction, making her the first woman elected to a state -- Texas state office. The delta kappa gamma society played a large role in women's history. As an organization founded by women to support women at a time when such support was scarcely found elsewhere. Women are typically left out of historical narratives and underrepresented amongst protected heritage sites locally and nationally. The 1955 building is annexal lent example of post war modern design by cune brooks and bar. The women of delta kappa gamma sought to accommodate a diverse range of functions that their ever growing organization demanded. This national register listed building also -- has also been recommended for individual landmark status and recently completed historic resources survey of downtown Austin, a project sponsored by the old Austin neighborhood association and certified by a government

[8:51:19 PM]

grant received by the city of Austin and a matching grant from preservation Austin. We supported the community's hard fought efforts with the 2020 preservation merit award this fall for their public service. The city really must stand by its historic resources surveys to protect our significant buildings and landmarks. Austin cannot afford to lose this piece of women's history or afford to lose another potential landmark. Local landmark. Thank you for your service and all that due to protect Austin's heritage.

>> Thank you, Allison. Angela, are there other speakers in opposition?

>> There are no other speakers in opposition, we are waiting for the video to download and need about 60 seconds.

[Background noise].

>> [Echoing]

[8:52:20 PM]

>> Go ahead and do the rebuttal. Please.

[Indiscernible].

>> Michael whellan again.

[Feedback]. We will hear in a moment from the dkg leadership and they will tell you that the founder, Dr. Blanton, unfortunately never stood foot in the building. The organization university of Texas [indiscernible] They will also tell you and concur that supporting women and -- in history is vital and important.

[Beeping] Legacy of that Dr. Blanton left. Also talk about Dr. Blanton's legacy of

[indiscernible] [Audio distortion]. The application is being brought on behalf of dkg, has a -- as a way to ensure that they can continue their mission in a go-forward basis. So, again, as I mentioned,

[8:53:20 PM]

the national register coordinator when asked specifically in writing whether -- this is from dkg, back in 2011, can you tell me what restrictions or impact this would have on the property, what are the advantages of having this distinction? The national register coordinator for history programs division of the Texas historical commission

wrote: Listing in the national register imposes absolutely no restrictions on private property. The advantage to your organization would be the formal recognition of your organization and its headquarters significance by the national park service and the Texas historical commission, period. So

again we would ask that this not be recommended for historical designation and the demolition permit be released. I guess that's my rebuttal and I'll wait for staff to -- to queue up the video.

>> Thank you. Is the video ready?

[8:54:21 PM]

>> First one is ready.

[Echoing]. Sorry about that wait.

>> Let's go.

>> All right, you all, can you see that?

>> No. There's -- there's nothing on the screen yet.

[8:55:36 PM]

>> Okay, we are seeing something.

>> Finally.

>> Chair -- vice chair, commissioners, my name is Becky Sadowsky and I am president of the delta kappa gamma society international. We are professional honor society founded to support women educators around the world. I recognize that much of the conversation today will likely be about the building. That we have worked in for part of our time as an organization. But I wanted to spend just a few moments introducing you to delta kappa gamma as well. As you know, delta kappa gamma is currently located on west 12th street. But we were actually founded at the women's faculty club on UT's campus in 1929. By a strong woman trailblazer, Dr. Annie Webb Blanton. At a time when women faced

[8:56:38 PM]

extraordinarily high professional barriers, Dr. Blanton earned her doctorate, became the third woman ever promoted to the rank of professor at the university of Texas, and became the first woman ever elected to statewide office in Texas. As the state superintendent of public instruction. She was both a leader and a trailblazer. And with delta kappa gamma, she wanted to try to keep that door open for other women educators. To support their professional growth and achievement. She also never had the opportunity to see the structure that we're talking about today. We moved into it over a decade after she passed away. I mention all of this because I want to share with you who we are. And that

organization is more than a building. Our organization is the vision that Dr. Blanton had to develop and empower women

[8:57:39 PM]

educators around the world. And it is the work that we do every day to make that vision a reality. And this project is key to continuing to achieve that vision. We are at a critical point in delta kappa gamma's life. Our organization has shrunk from roughly 166,000 members in the 1990s to below 60,000 today. Which makes these decisions about how to strategically deploy our resources so important to our future. I, along with other leaders, am actively working on efforts to revitalize delta kappa gamma so that we can continue to deliver on and a critical piece of that has been our decision to partner with the applicant, not just to

[8:58:40 PM]

sell them the property, but also to think through ways that the project can honor the legacy of Dr. Blanton .. And the women who founded delta kappa gamma at the UT women's faculty club. We are proud of that legacy. We are proud of the work our predecessors have undertaken and with this project and renewed financial strength we are looking forward to honoring them by building on their legacy and delivering on their vision. Thank you for your time today. I greatly appreciate it.

>> Chair, vice chair, commissioners, thank you for allowing know join you today. I am any at that Scott executive director for the gamma kappa delta society international as my colleague Becky Sadowsky discussed Dr. Blanton founded delta kappa gamma at the UT women's faculty club on UT's

[8:59:40 PM]

campus in 1920 fin. And since then, our organization has been focused on delivering on Dr. Blanton's vision of empowering professional female educators. Our current offices were built over two and a half decades after our founding and over a decade after Dr. Blanton passed away. We have enjoyed working from this office space but the cost to maintain the building increases every year and we are sensitive to prioritizing our member's dues on efforts directly related to our mission and vision of supporting women educators. I also recognize this structure ask listed on the national register of historic places and would like to provide some additional context of that application. This actually came from the same desire to help women grow and develop professionally of

[9:00:41 PM]

preparing the application. It seemed like a natural fit. We are proud of our legacy. We are proud of the work we have done. And supporting the ability of young women to take initiative and develop professionally is core to that work. Our leadership viewed the application within that context. I don't think it was clear to our organization at the time that what we screwed as a celebration of the value of our legacy and the work we do would actually become a discussion of the value of our office bu building. We understand much of the cryer the focuses on the structure itself, but I also wanted to make sure I can share that context with you as well. As Becky said earlier, delta kappa gamma is more than a building. It is our vision, our mission, our members, and the work we have done and will do, we would like the move forward in a position that best helps us deliver on that vision while

[9:01:41 PM]

visiting with a partnering who respects swleat done and incorporate ways to honor that legacy. I think the project we have put forward is the best way to meet both of those goals. Thank you and I appreciate your consideration.

>> Is that it?

>> Good evening. I am Claire -- principal with sbr architects, it is always evaluate to hear Becky and Anita's vision for dkg, I will take a moment to step back and give you a little bit more about our vision for the project itself. Our cities are -- of the past and both an active and subtle ways, those architects we like to think of each era as its own chapter the reality is that each moment blurs into the next day year and decade, where architectural designs are inspired and influenced by those solutions that came before. We are at a moment where we have the promise of an architecture

[9:02:42 PM]

design to be influenced and inspired by success of a strong woman looking for a voice and support in her own time.

>> Amy Blanton was driven by ambition and achievement and empowered other women through her actions and her organization. Ann at this was not looking for a trophy through the building that ultimately housed her group after her death, rather, she wanted to see her pierce achieve and be, peers achieve and recognized I see new project as an opportunity to pay tribute to one of Austin's past influencers. Our vision for the site is to open it up to the neighborhood, create a respite of reflection for those who come to visit where the organization began and for expanding the neighborhood resident's local amenities. Annie is our muse as we seek to create a carefully curated building along with a reference to the past organization, thes gathering spaces, champion of

[9:03:44 PM]

community and activate the ground floor. The images in front of you on page 2 seek to elicit the mid-century modern, open up to soft gardens and places of gathering that lead to activation of the street, ground floor and neighborhood. I turn it over to Kelly Summers who will provide a summary of how we propose organizing the project as illustrated on page 3.

>> Thanks, everybody I am Kelly Summers, project manager at kgb, building on that vision this plan seeks to balance reuse of the existing building materials and commemoration of dkg's history with thoughtful arrangement of program elements to comply with the city of Austin's urban design guidelines. To achieve these goals we are proposing active uses along the two major street frontages. Retail would anchor the corner of the site shown on this diagram in purple. This would help reinvigorate

[9:04:44 PM]

12th street as vibrant pedestrian destination not similar play commuter boulevard that prioritizing vehicular traffic. The residential lobby shown here in yellow is tucked around the corner off of quieter San Antonio streets providing a more intimate front door for residents. All of the service and support functions for project are located along the alley maximizing the amount of frontage available for active pedestrian uses along the major streets. On the plan you can also see we are proposing the integration of materials from the existing building. We are indicating in red where there are opportunities to reuse the existing marble and brick as both interior and exterior feature walls carefully woven into the new design. Finally, because we know that Austin is a city that loves its outdoor gathering space we are proposing a variety of landscaped areas that support the broader design goals. At the southeast corner of the site we are showing a quiet exempt native garden that offers a spot for the public and dkg

[9:05:47 PM]

members to gather and reflect on the history and ongoing mission of dkg. At the busier corner of 12th and San Antonio, a retail terrace and cascading steps provide another opportunity for residents and visitors to linger and enjoy the neighborhood. With that I will turn it over to Justin Peterson to present our design for the facades.

>> Thank you, everyone my name is Justin, I am a project design we are sbi architects on this slide we see a rendering of the proposed L street new gathering space at the corner. This initial concept we are maintaining spirit of the existing dkg building by adopting the mid-century modern language of a strong horizontal lines, while prioritizing topping corner of the site to a more community minded active and transparent use. In the foreground on the left we can see a large terrace where the neighborhood can congregate and in a shaded and sheltered outdoor room. At the center of the image the repurposed tan brick and pink marble of the existing dkg

[9:06:49 PM]

building is visible in the interior retail space. As Kelly mentioned the dkg commemorative garden is located to the right of this palming, and we anticipate designing this as a quiet shaded sanctuary space for reflection, buffered from the bustle of 12th street and more active public terrace of the corner on the left. On the next slide, we see an initial concept for the San Antonio elevation, where again we are prioritizing public engagement by anchoring the neighborhood with an open terrace at the corner to the right. The that gently flows toward north with a series of elongated steps again we are intentionally echoing the existing dkg building's mid century modern language of strong horizontal lines and canopy structure that contains a more intimate pedestrian scale at the ground level while creating a soft or more community minded street presence. At the center of the image the repurposed hand brick of the existing building is again visible on the exterior and to the right the pink marble is visible on the interior of the

[9:07:49 PM]

retail space. To the left of the image we are creating a new residential lobby and outdoor rival room as a quieter and more quiet space buffered from the active public spaces at the corner of 12th and San Antonio. And finally on the last slide we have the preliminary massing elevations illustrating the overall residential program intent for this site. We thank you for this opportunity to present this exciting project and we look forward to hearing your fe feedback. >>

>> Okay. I think yes heard all of the speakers and we asked the rebuttal .. Can we move on?

>> Yes. That it was end of the two videos and the end of our speaker list. Please move forward.

>> Okay.

>> Madam chair. Madam chair.

>> Yes.

>> My count says there are 18 cases ahead of us. We have less than an hour before

[9:08:51 PM]

our 10:00 o'clock, if that is right that is about three minutes per case. Even if we two for another hour that is only going to be six minutes per case. So I do think that if we can get a presentation that is expedited like last time and if we can come to a quick understanding of what our action might be we should take the case and finish it. Otherwise I do think we need postpone.

>> Okay.

>> Again.

>> I will take that under advisement. Yes. Commissioner Valenzuela.

>> -- Invitation if we could go past 10:00 o'clock if we had a motion to extend past 10:00; is that correct?

>> We take that motion at 10:00 o'clock. Or --

>> And document it before 10:00 o'clock.

>> And how long past 10:00 can we extend?

>> Staff --

>> I think you extend the meeting for as long as you think necessary. That's what I thought.

[9:09:55 PM]

Yes:so we can -- we can go on for a marathon.

>> If you want.

>> I think another hour is probably about all I can stand but let's see what we can do.

>> Okay. Well, we have gone on until 2:00 o'clock before, but not in front

-- not on zoom. Okay. We are going -- we are back to the public hearings a 1, 2816 San Pedro street. And we have had the applicant speak to this. Please, staff, expedite your presentation as requested.

>> Certainly, commissioner.

>> Item a 1 is an application to demolish a circa 1924 house, the commission initiated historic zoning back in September so we are going make this very quick, as far as the presentation goes. 2816 San Pedro street was constructed for the wise wise

[9:10:55 PM]

family around 1924, he is a promise they weren't writer, editor and business owner Austin, she edited the society section of the statement and gossip advertising in 1911. By the 19 twenties, gossip had broken into a house old name. In addition to owning and operating successful business, which was an extraordinary accomplishment for a woman in the early 20th century, wys. E use her charisma to reach tout other writers, the, other varied marketing and advertising communities targeting toward women.

>> Wyse was honored for her role the planning and selecting the Austin municipal flag design in 1912 and her his mother edited gossip before moving on to found the Austin advertising club, heading up the

merchant school during the mean 30s and establishing his own broadcasting company in Kansas in the 1940s.

>> The estate also often hosted

[9:11:57 PM]

Ellen wise sister Margaret a founder of the Austin heritage society as well at her husband Waymon Adams who was a world renowned portrait painter, U.S. Presidents other politicians, famous artists and authors there around the world. Upon retirement, the Adams moved back to Austin but unfortunately their son's studio gowrnd the burnt to the ground in 1976 and Mrs. Wise passed away in 1947, like her late husband she requested that her funeral service be held at the estate they both loved, known as -- and ten later shortened to Wyse acre. The staff recommendation on this property is to recommend historic zoning. However, should the commission choose not recommend designation, staff recommends encouraging rehabilitation and adaptive reuse and relocation over demolition and then finally releasing demolition permit upon completion of city of Austin documentation package. Thank you.

[9:12:59 PM]

>> Thank you.

>> Do I hear a motion on this case?

>> Commissioner cook.

>> I move to recommend historic zoning. Do I hear a second?

>> Commissioner Valenzuela seconds.

>> Okay. We are open for discussion. Commissioner Koch, would you -- give us a reason in.

>> Seems to have a high level of integrity, we have a prominent with equipment which is unusual in a historic association in an early date and so many cases tonight that we are not going to be able to recommend I think whenever we see something that qualifies we should act on it and recommend.

>> Commissioner Valenzuela, do you have something to add?

>> I agree.

>> I agree too. I will support this motion. I think this is a wood wonderful property. Commissioner Featherston.

>> Does this zoning have the support of the current owner?

[9:14:00 PM]

>> No.

>> Okay.

>> Anymore further discussion?

>> Okay. The motion is to recommend historic zoning, all those in favor, please give a thumbs up by raising your hand. I think we will have -- okay. All those opposed. Please raise your hand. We have two opposed, commissioner Featherston and commissioner papavasiliou, we have a majority, the item passes and recommend historic zoning.

>> Going on to a 2, the banker school, staff presentation.

>> Yes, good evening.

>> I need to excuse myself, I need excuse myself from this case.

>> Yes. I'm sorry, commissioner Wright has recused herself from the case. Programs you could turn your video off.

>> Go ahead, Mr. Sadowsky.

[9:15:02 PM]

>> Sure. Commissioners this is second time baker school has appeared on our agenda and as Mr. Wise said earlier in the evening this is a gem of the I'd park neighborhood and clearly, Hyde park neighborhood and clearly qualifies as a historic landmark, it is contributing to the Hyde park historic district which means that anything on this site will need a certificate of appropriateness for modifications or removal or new construction. So Mr. Wise and I talked earlier last week about a compromise for the historic zoning that really puts the school building front and center. And that is what you reviewed this evening. I know it is not Mr. Wise's first choice, but it is one that he agrees to and seems to make sense to limit the historic zoning to celebrate the school building rather than the entire parcel that consists of a lot of

[9:16:02 PM]

parking lots at this point. So staff's recommendation is to recommend historic zoning for the banker school on the reduced parcel that includes the school, the two other contributing buildings and the

buffer zone that Mr. Wise and I have decided is appropriate for maintaining historic context and protect the school. And celebrate, focus on the school building itself --

>> Mr. Sadowsky, we had two different representations. One from the applicant with the compromise and one from staff that makes it look like the two ends of that 70-foot buffer are cut out of the historic zoning. Of that would be correct. Yes. The 75-foot front stoning does not need to be zoned historic to protect its integrity.

>> Okay.

>> Give us the last slide that

[9:17:03 PM]

showed the oblique angle of the building, please.

>> . So we you would not be able to see that because that could be developed right there. >>

>> Yes.

>> Away. I am correct.

>> Okay. Go on.

>> That is that ends my presentation. Like I said this entire site is contributing to the Hyde park historic district. So to limit the historic zoning does not affect the authority of the commission to review any changes anywhere on this site and understanding that the school building is the focal point in bringing that out in the historic zoning limited parcel.

>> Okay. Do I hear a motion on the case?

[9:18:05 PM]

>> Commissioner heimsath?

>> I would like to move the entire site as zoned historic. As was requested by the applicant.

>> Commissioner little. Are you seconding it we have a motion to approve the whole site with a second by commissioner little. The motion is by commissioner heimsath:the section that is identified as a that is kind of pinkish colored, that has been

-- the city is going to develop that as a water detention pond, so would that still be included in the -- in your motion?

>> That is no longer part of the parcel.

>> Okay that is no longer part of the parcel. So your motion is to include the whole site?

>> Yes. As proposed by the applicant, yes.

>> Okay. I would plea with the motion. I think it is really important. It made the rest of the site may come under the purview of the

[9:19:06 PM]

historic district commission, but as we are told frequently, historic landmark needs to have more careful consideration and I think that this site is worthy of that consideration. So I will support the motion. Any further discussion?

>> Commissioner Featherston?

>> I just -- I would like to know if the stoning is 0 growing grhd and ccnp to grhdhncdmp that alphabet soup is not equitable. Clearly the banker house is worthy of historic zoning, I would rather have supported the zoning that was of the reduced parcel that is recommended, but, you know, I am not going to vote against this. I just want to say that the zoning is messed up.

>> I think one of the things, the reason I wanted to go back to that slide that shows the oblique of the campus, if you

[9:20:07 PM]

have encroachment, if that is not part of the historic zoning, if that is not part of the H zoning and could be developed, we would not have this view shed, pedestrian or, you know, people driving by. I think that site warrants this consideration. Is there any further discussion? >>

>> Let's call it to are a vote. All those in favor of historic zoning for the whole site please raise your hand. All those opposed.

>> Commissioner papavasiliou is opposed. Shall we move on to 4509 balcones drive?

>> The 1959 house and initiated historic zoning last month to

[9:21:07 PM]

which the property owner has agreed. The applicants have adjusted the proposed addition placement and are using a -- Perry architectural review committee suggestion, as the applicant noted in their comments so I won't go through that again in the interest of time. The house is natural materials, is --

continuous ex-pases of class and Japanese inspired Dale, contemporary or mid century modern tile. Which makes this house significant. It was constructed in 1959 by architect David Graver as his personal home. Graver joined Brooks and Bar in 1957 and when they began consulting for University of Texas in 1962 Gruber led the design team for all new university buildings for the next four years. He established his own firm in 1978. Notable projects include the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library, the Johnson Space Center in Houston,

[9:22:08 PM]

the US Consulate in Mexico City and pro Bono work around town at the Paramount Theatre, the Long Center and the Austin Convention Center. He participated enthusiastically in the revitalization of Austin downtown as well. Through a philosophy of continuity to the conflict he championed urban living and moved his feel Sixth Street in 1967, restoring a landmarking in 19th century stone building. He served on the boards of the Texas Society of Architects, the Con Street Association and other civic minded planning organizations. In taken six fin he also chaired the Governor's Conference on Urban Affairs and later initiated the Congress Avenue Tree Planting Program. The staff recommends, the Commission recommend historic zoning based on the house O's architecture and association with Graver, staff also recommends release of the new construction plans for the addition as proposed by the applicant with the committee changes implemented.

[9:23:10 PM]

>> Thank you.

>> Okay. Is there a motion on the case? Commissioner Koch?

>> I focus approve the plans and recommend historic zoning on the property with the addition as dined based on architecture and historical associations.

>> I will second.

>> Okay. Commissioner Featherston did Y you want to second or --

>> No. I will third.

>> Okay. They came to the architectural review committee and took our recommendations, it is a wonderful building, I will support the motion, all those in favor, unless there is further discussion, all those in favor please raise your hand. Any opposed. Okay. It passes.

>> We are very lucky to get this house at this time. And in this shape and how lucky we are to get a good owner for it as well.

[9:24:10 PM]

>> Kevin.

>> I just want to comment that we have yessinged addition and side yards and front yards of other landmarks that have a more formal relationship with the street but the architect here has taken that into account, it is a difficult property, he took the presentation to the street into account in designing this side addition so it is a little unusual but well done.

>> Thank you. For that. Yes. He did. And he really incorporated it into the landscape and sort of out of -- it doesn't compete with historic house. Okay. We have 1304 Alta vista avenue.

>> Yes. Commissioners. This is an owner's application. Ms. Jordanas already given you a very, very good and succinct description of the architecture and the significance and suffice it to say this house was built in 1931 and it was dined by the

[9:25:11 PM]

owner's son who was an architect and draftsman in Austin at the time. Went on to be an architect in Houston after that. It is an excellent example of revifl architecture. It has got the false half timbering, the stone elevations, stone and the -- tutor, Tudor revival list state this is one of three on Alta vista as it intersects with Avon Dale road which is really the estate section of Travis heights. It is the only place in the spire neighborhood where throw large houses were built at similar times and the context of this house is still very much intact. The house is built for and by Eugene a murder son who was on the Austin school board, murder son middle school is named for

[9:26:11 PM]

him. His contributions to education in Austin are numerous. Including helping Austin teachers get higher wages, creating the first pta in Austin and advocating for an rotc program in the early 1940s for World War II. After he retired from the school board, after serving as the longest serving president of the school board he became a probation officer which he was employed until 1948. During that time his philosophy was to help the troubled youth of Austin live a clean life and was quite successful in that, he received many awards during his lifetime and was a true humanitarian and civic leader in the city so this house qualifies

[9:27:12 PM]

for a landmark designation under, for its architectural significance as Tudor revival estate and for its associations with the murder son who lived here for the vast majority of his life.

>> I would add I surveyed this house 15 years ago and thought it was already a landmark. I was surprised to find that it wasn't. It is a tremendous house. The photograph doesn't do it justice. Is there a motion on the case? >>

>> Kevin.

>> Commissioner Koch.

>> I move to recommend historic zoning based on oork tech agricultural and historical association with Mr. Murder son.

>> Do I hear a second, commissioner Valenzuela.

>> And a third there commissioner Featherston.

>> Any discussion?

>> I just want to -- not just the house but the setting, the sit and the estate section as

[9:28:15 PM]

Mr. Sadowsky mentioned is as important and anchoring this neighborhood.

>> I think one reason that the photograph doesn't do it just justice because it really is on this wooded site. It is almost as if it were in the forest or something. But it is a beautiful house and won refusal construction.

>> The any further discussion?

>> All those in favor, please raise your hand. Any opposed?

>> It is unanimous. We recommend historic zoning. Okay. Then we have a 5, 905 congress avenue. Another application for historical zoning, deck know downtown Austin and it was the at that sad that we see now was put on the building in 1930. This is a 19, 19th century

[9:29:15 PM]

building that had a neat facade designed by huh Poe Kuehn any in 1930 and Hugo Kuehn any and replaced the red brick facade are from the 18 seventies underneath. The building had a long history of being home to a shoe shop, a confectioner, all kinds of businesses until the mutual deposit company took over the building. They started in the 19 twenties at 819 congress avenue and then moved into this building in the late 19 twenties. The mutual it started off as building and loan fund and the significance

of these types of businesses, these building and loan funds were to allow Austin homeowners in particular to deposit money and then get loans to build houses.

[9:30:15 PM]

Build their own houses so that they could pay a cash price for the property and receive a discount. So it did several things. It encouraged people to save up and provided them a good dividend on their savings while they were doing so, but then when they needed the money to buy the lot that they wanted, they were -- these building and loans were there to help them out as well. Another thing that I can remember not with this one, but in general, I think most of our

-- I mean people of my generation can remember a school children's savings program that was established by businesses like this where school children could deposit nickels or dimes or whatever they could and build up savings and it instilled thrift, and, in and will children that would help them for the rest of their lives. This facade has undergone some

[9:31:16 PM]

changes, it is not the exact 1930 art deco facade that Kuehn any designed but it still retains a very high degree of integrity and the art deco on this building was truly a statement of the stability of the business, remember this was done in 1930, during the height of the depression as well as providing a sheik and elegant place that said something about the banking institution inside. So this building at 905 congress qualifies for landmark designation for its architectural significance as well as historical association for patterns of home loan businesses and the ability for Austin to grow with the development piece in the city.

>> Thank you, are there any

[9:32:18 PM]

questions of staff?

>> Hearing none. Do I hear a motion on this case? >>

>> Commissioner Koch.

>> I move to recommend historic zoning -- [indiscernible]

>> Commissioner little.

>> Any further discussion?

>> Commissioner Koch.

>> I just want to -- there are some integrity I issues with the

-- some loss of detail that the other -- integrity I think this property meets in spades it is a great example of art deco on congress avenue in relationship to the other historic periods and the state art deco buildings around the corner, I think this is the epitome of a landmark.

>> I think it is also important because it shows the significance of later addition or later modifications that because of their age have

[9:33:20 PM]

achieved significance of their own and this is a good example for future reference, I think.

>> Further discussion? Okay. Let's call a vote. All those in favor of historic stoning, please raise your hand. .. Any opposed? It is unanimous. I would say for new members or old members, we just passed five, recommended five properties for historic zoning, we haven't had very many in a while, so if you think that our cup runneth over maybe we are just just making up for some lost time. I think these are all good properties. Moving 0 on, our next case, I believe, is C 31406 Etheridge avenue, this, they want to

[9:34:21 PM]

demolish and reconstruct the front apply a mortar wash, construct rear and garage addition, replace windows, doors and siding.

>> Staff has asked that we a consider initiation of historic zoning or refer it to the November 30th meeting of the architectural review can committee. >>

>> Item C 3 is proposal to demolish and reconstruct the front porch, add a mortar wash, the existing masonry to match, reconstruct the rear and garage addition and replace the windows, doors and siding to match. This house was built in 1939 for the reverend Edmund Heinsohn he was pastor of the university methodist church for over a quarter of century, for the longest in a single congress face for a methodist minister a trustee of southwestern university for nearly 40 years

[9:35:22 PM]

and chairman of the board of trustees at till lot son for 30. He served on the Texas state library and archives commission for 25 years. In 1958 he was honored as city's most worthy citizen which the Austin president board for, real estate board for his career and ministry and service to Austin.

>> His legacy is rooted in anti-war and anti-segregation activism. He spoke up for American new value at this and opposed Nazi oppression and the methodist commission on world peace. University methodists became one of the first historically white churches to accept black Parisian in other words 1957. Later mind son chaired the commission on human relations in a be toyed prevent violence against civil rights protesters during sit ins. The reverend austinites of all cedes from, cedes, cedes staff

[9:36:33 PM]

recommends the commission consider historic stoning based on the associations with mind son, hind son, to the meeting of the architectural review committee but should the commission decide against initiation and referral, staff recommends that they comment on the plans, suggest keep the main tanks the front facade and upon documentation package.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you. Do I hear a motion on the case to start discussion? Commissioner Koch?

>> . I move that we postpone the case to December 11th meeting and refer the owner to the architecture committee meeting on November 30th.

>> Commissioner Koch --

>> December 11th or December 14th? For that next meeting?

>> Is it the 14th? Okay. I thought I had been bouncing around, to the 14th was over booked I think, wasn't it? Yes this is Elizabeth just to clarify we don't have final

[9:37:34 PM]

confirmation from the clerk's office yet but it looks like we will likely be able to retain the original December 14th date for that meeting. If do we need to change to December 11th due to just the crunch of board and commission meetings around the holidays, we will certainly communicate that to the public through the historic landmark commission web page as well as directly to the commissioners.

>> Okay.

>> I will second that motion.

>> Well I think commissioner Featherston seconded it.

>> Oh.

>> This time. So --

>> You third it.

>> -- Came in before I could recognize him.

>> Commissioner Koch.

>> -- We are hearing a number of cases we will not be able to say this one has definite historical I think we should act when we can and the applicant stated their respected for the character and history of the house so hopefully the review committee will help them further those interests.

[9:38:36 PM]

Commissioner Wright. I think the it is fairly minor modifications to the front of the house.

>> Well, if it goes to the architectural review committee, maybe we can soften some of that, so --

>> [Indiscernible] Really quite -- >>

>> I praise that.

>> Yes. Good, bed for you.

>> Okay. Any further discussion? The motion is to refer this to the architectural review committee. Which is November 30th, at least for now.

>> Okay. All those in favor, please signify by raising your hand.

>> Any opposed?

>> None opposed. It was unanimous. It is recommended to the arc.

>> Okay. I think our next item is C 6, 56

[9:39:40 PM]

Congress Avenue. Request to paint a mural on the building.

>> Yes. An application to paint a mural on the entire building. There is the old Jarding store so it is between two landmark buildings, one at 504, the Robinson Ross never and then Scarborough building, the annex to the Scarborough building is just to the north of it. This building has had some modifications. But for the host part it retains a lot of its integrity from when yarring did this makeover on the building. There have been additional windows added and never a determination back in 2002 that this building was contributing or hand his, historical significance. The changes were approved by the landmark commission and the store front was added, some windows upstairs were added but

[9:40:41 PM]

staff, staff had originally recommended postponement of this case for several reasons. First of all, a mistaken believe that aipp had jurisdiction over any published murals that are in downtown Austin. They do not. So that, the commissioner could actually make a decision about it tonight. This is, even if this were considered or considered contributing to the historic district, your review here is advisory. Staff's real concern here is that this is a very vibrant mural between two very historic buildings. Now, this commission does not have the authority to say no to this. But could make some recommendations as to the extent of the mural, staff fully is

[9:41:41 PM]

sympathetic with the concept of lining up congress avenue but this seems a little disrespectful of the context of the congress avenue historic district.

>> Mr. Sadowsky, I agreeing and I would entertain a motion to refer it to the architectural review committee to try discuss it further with the applicant. While this is a gone contributing resource it will have a strong impact on the rest of the district and I would entertain a motion to that effect.

>> I would like to make that motion.

>> Okay. Commissioner I'm stat do I hear, heimsath do I hear a second?

>> Commissioner Jacob?

>> Let me ask if it is also possible that it could be even though it is not a jurisdiction fall review, that the arts

[9:42:42 PM]

commission also, would be able to help by advising up on this. .. Perhaps we canin violate, indescriet a member to the architectural review committee can we ask staff to see if we can arrange for that.

>> Yes. I can do that.

>> To reach out to them?

>> Yes.

>> Would that serve your purpose, Mr. Heim Saturday?

>> Yes. Heimsath and I want to reiterate what staff has said. I think it is a laudable idea but, you know, for a very sensitive area .. There are many parameters to keep in mind, not just whether one artist with one exuberant mural is contributing as appropriately. So the more learned conversations we have I think better the end result will be.

>> Okay.

>> Any further discussion?

>> The motion is essentially to postpone it to our next meeting but refer them to the

[9:43:43 PM]

architectural review committee on November 30th. All those in favor, please raise your right hand.

>> And any opposed? It is unanimous --

>> [Indiscernible]

>> It is referred to the architectural review committee.

>> [Indiscernible]

>> Yes?

>> Go ahead.

>> [Indiscernible]

>> Go to the arc?

--

>> So we can talk about it --

>> So we can try to -- we can mitigate some of the impact on the rest of the district.

>> I understand --

[indiscernible] Postpone and come back to a month can't we just move on to arc? If it is an advisory role, the dash [indiscernible] I don't see why it needs to come back. I need a timeline.

>> I understand your timeline. This is just, this has just come to us and we haven't had -- we haven't had time to really

[9:44:44 PM]

review it and we will have the arc is an informal committee that, where we can discuss it in further detail. It is possible that the -- if we come to an agreement at the arc that we can allow staff to approve it administratively. At that time.

>> Okay.

>> Okay?

>> Okay. Okay. Thank you.

>> Okay.

>> Next item.

>> Air conditionedville lamb, D 3, and D 4. With your indulgence let's take these both at the same time. The argument is exactly the same for both of them. Both of these outstandings are in the air condition village. But they don't rise to the same level as the one across the street at 2502, which we had on

[9:45:45 PM]

our agenda recently. That house was much more intact architecturally than either one of these two. So staff is sympathetic to the property owners, definitely sympathetic. They are dealing with houses that have significant issues that they have now provided a structural report that documents those. We didn't have that last month so it was more difficult to make a fair and impartial determination as to whether these houses could be rehabbed, whereas the house at 2502, there we had that information at the beginning of this discussion that, yes, there were some major issues with that house as well. But nothing that couldn't be overcome. And as I said both of these houses are very significant and last month I argued they had -- they had proposed a quote

[9:46:46 PM]

unquote new mid century modern houses for these sites and staff's reservation about that was but you have got the real genuine article right here and when we requested the postponement to further explore whether rehabilitation of even the facades of these houses would be -- would be feasible with the construction of an addition and new mechanical systems in the house, maybe new grading to help alleviate some of the flooding. We have that information now and while staff still strongly recommends that the applicants continue to consider ways of maintaining the genuine article here, neither one of them in all honesty, and I hate to say this,

[9:47:47 PM]

neither one of them qualifies individual landmarks but I am very, very concerned that the proposed national register nomination for the air condition village is in a lot of danger of failing if we still, if we allow demolition of these houses. >>

>> Are there any questions for staff?

>> Do I hear a motion on the cases?

>> Commissioner Koch?

>> I move that -- the applicant to maintain existing house to the greatest possible and but release a permit pending a Austin document package.

>> Is there a second to that motion?

>> Commissioner Featherston?

>> Discussion?

>> Commissioner Koch?

>> I had some -- [indiscernible]

[9:48:51 PM]

Outside of the district they don't seem to be outstanding examples of their style -- I actually drive through neighborhood and saw several others that had high integrity that hopefully the word is getting out the owners who might want to come forward and present application to landmark an individual house and definitely consider that but landmark the, we can't landmark the entire district. In my mind we would have to --

>> Others? Weigh in.

>> Okay. The motion is, yes, commissioner heimsath. I want to clarify we actually have combined both into one motion but the action pertains to both properties individually.

>> Yes.

>> Okay. Thank you.

>> I think the staff's reasoning and I agree is that they are both very similar in their appearance, condition, alterations and historic

[9:49:55 PM]

associations. Commissioner Wright, do you have anything to say on this?

>> Okay. I hearing no further discussion, all those in favor of the motion to release the demolition permits with the stipulation that city of Austin documentation packets be prepared not for both of them together but for each of them. I am interpreting that so all those in favor please signify by raising your hand.

>> Any opposed?

>> We have one opposed that is commissioner little. Oh. And commissioner Featherston?

>> Okay. Okay. We had one opposed that was commissioner little. Commissioners it is now 950. We need to take a vote to see if we go on past 10:00 o'clock. Commissioner heimsath.

>> Yes, I would like we extend the meeting for another hour.

>> Okay.

[9:50:56 PM]

But with nine remaining cases at the pace we are on we should be able to achieve that by 11:00 o'clock.

>> I am nothing if not fast. Commissioner Valenzuela.

>> Second that?

>> Second the motion.

>> Okay. The motion is to proceed on for another hour. And we can take another vote at that time or commissioner heimsath can leave, whichever comes first. So -- all those in favor, please sig tie by raising your hand.

>> The motion passes. We will carry on for another hour after, to 10:00 o'clock. Okay. The next item, past 10:00 o'clock. The next item.

>> To 11:00 o'clock.

>> To 11:00 o'clock. I am sorry. To 11:00 o'clock.

>> We have D 6 I believe, 910 west Elizabeth vet.

>> D 6.

>> This is the second time it has been on our agenda as well

[9:51:58 PM]

for a 1937 stone faced house at 910 west Elizabeth. And I agree completely with the women who testified about this. This is really an excellent example of vanishing breed in Austin. These Little Rock

vener houses were fairly common, especially in -- and they are rapidly disappearing. This house I can tell has structural issues having visited it. And I hope that the applicant, Mr. Joseph recognizes that people like these types of houses and to perhaps think about a design that incorporates some of the elements in the masting and the materials of these houses. Unfortunately, this house does not rise to the level of landmark designation.

[9:53:00 PM]

So staff must very reluctantly recommend release of the permit with the city documentation package.

>> Do I hear a motion on the case? >>

>> Commissioner Koch?

>> [Indiscernible] Recommendation to encourage rehabilitation and -- documentation package.

>> Is there a second?

>> Commissioner Jacob.

>> And commissioner Featherston is third. Commissioner Koch.

>> I just want to take this opportunity to put a plug in for local historic districts -- still be listening in this case, local historic districts are our best way to save the neighborhood context we are talking about here when an individual property does not meet the very, very early standard of an individual landmark you can have a local historic district that is one block face, we will have the

[9:54:01 PM]

city wide design standards hopefully soon that will be much easier and I encourage them to

-- preservation office for assistance in developing an application because it has to come from the grass roots and the grounds up and from the owners otherwise our hands are tied and if we can't landmark it individually which is very high standard, there is nothing else we can do as a commission, unfortunately.

>> Yes. I can concur. I conducted a reconnaissance survey of all of Bolden creek neighborhood associate about five or six years ago .. And in the course of the survey we lost 200 historic properties, so I would encourage people in the Bolden neighborhood if you still have historic fabric left and you want to save it, go for a local historic district. Commissioner Koch.

>> [Indiscernible] Outside of this commission and the its motion to try to

[9:55:03 PM]

prevent demolition. You have to be proactive in the and the historic preservation office can help.

>> Okay. All those in favor of the motion to go with staff recommendation and do the Austin city of Austin documentation package for archiving, all those in favor, please raise your hand. It is unanimous. Okay. D 7, 1,400 drake avenue.

>> Commissioners, this is off, also a very difficult case because this type of house really tip toys residential patterns in Travis -- and south Austin in general. This is a 1937 house, it has got -- it has got aspirations for

[9:56:03 PM]

colonial revival. But it was a working class family house. And as such it does have historical significance, and staff recognizes that. Unfortunately, staff does not believe or just really can't make the case that that significance rises to the level of an individual landmark designation in order to preserve this but again as I asked of the previous applicant, I will ask of this one, Mr. Hearn, understand what you have got here. This is a vanishing resource. And this type of house maintains the character of Austin neighborhoods, Travis heights is on its way to becoming a historic district and this would very much -- this is contributing to the district. So if there is a way that you would consider retaining this

[9:57:04 PM]

house and rehabbing it rather than demolishing it that would be in staff's mind the best possible action here. But I cannot in god faith say that the house qualifies as a landmark, so my recommendation is to encourage rehabilitation and adaptive reuse but release the permit upon a city documentation package.

>> Thank you, Mr. Sadowsky. I would like to entertain a motion to postpone this to our December meeting. The plans just came to light today or Thursday and I would like to have another opportunity to revisit this, possibly have the owner speak to members of the neighborhood association who have worked 15 years to get this

[9:58:04 PM]

national registered district, it is a contributing resource and I will be asking the same of some other properties that are coming up a little bit later in our agenda. I would just really like to have one more opportunity. This is actually at the this is actually at the gateway right at the circle where it meets drake right at the entrance to the Travis heights fair view park historic district and I would just really like to

have a little more time to consider for the neighborhood to be able to meet with the owner. Commissioner Heimsath made the motion. Would anyone second it? Commissioner Cook. Any further discussion?

>> Let me just speak briefly. In addition I think that the house -- [echo on the line].

-- Appears to have a lot of integrity. And I do believe also compared to some of the others that we've been

[9:59:09 PM]

considering it's very likely quite adaptable a number of different needs. I would say based on its condition and the potential for some flexible opportunities here to preserve a contributing structure is certainly worth the time.

>> These folks have just worked so hard I would just like them to have the opportunity. And I understand the owner's position, but maybe we can come to a compromise or something on that. We can allow additions, other modifications, but this is really a statement property right at the entrance to the new historic district. So all those in favor of postponing this until the next please raise your hand? Any opposed? It's unanimous in favor of postponement. Thank you.

[10:00:09 PM]

Should we refer to arc.

>> The architectural review committee. No, that's true, there's not a project let so we'll get the neighborhood do their work first.

>> Thank you. Let me catch my breath. Okay. D8, 128 west 22nd -- 1208 west 22nd street. Demolish a 1933 house.

>> Commissioners, d8 is another demolition proposal 1208 west 22nd street was built by [indiscernible], after serving as a rental property for several years it was purchased in 1939 by Oliver H Radkey. Dr. Radkey was a school teacher while

[indiscernible] Was a professor of Russian history at the university of Texas. Radkey work on bole which he vicism received numerous

[10:01:10 PM]

accolades.

[Echo on the line]. As the most important of its time and the first definitive study of the socialist revolutionary movement in Russia during the 1917 revolution. Throughout his career he lectured at universities around the country in the impact of Russian history on the cold war era foreign policy. The CDC family lived there until at least 1959 best 1960 they moved to 1305 west 22nd street as we heard from the applicant in the communication. Staff recommends that the commission consider initiation of historic zoning since radkey's influential work and thus it meets the criteria for historic association. However, a building bearing radkey's name already exists in the neighborhood. Should the commission decide instead to release the permit P staff recommends completion of city of Austin

[10:02:10 PM]

documentation package prior to release. Thank you.

>> Any questions of staff? Is there a motion on the case? Commissioner cook?

>> I move to encourage rehabilitation of

[indiscernible] And the city of Austin documentation package.

>> Do I hear a second? Commissioner Featherston? I will support the motion. I think it's -- it's our general manner of business is to have one property associated with a person. The most -- the strongest significance for this building is its association with Dr. Radkey and there's

[10:03:14 PM]

already a house associated with him. I hate to see the house go. When we talk about densification and affordable housing, we on this commission see more affordable housing going away than anyone, I think. And I'm sorry for that? Any further discussion? All those in favor ofry leasing the demolition permit on condition that the applicant fill out a city of Austin documentation packet for archiving at the Austin history center, all those in favor please raise your hand? Any opposed? It passes unanimously. Okay. Our next item is d9, 815 west 11th street. Demolish a 1911 house.

>> Yes, commissioners.

[10:04:15 PM]

This is also the second time it's APD on your agenda so a postponement is available for you if you'd like. I originally had said, well, the applicant had requested the postponement on this, not realizing it was actually the owner of the property who testified this evening that had requested the postponement as she was opposed to the demolition. This is a 109-year-old house and it's had some modifications to it.

It's got permastone siding. But it's intact. I think some of the drawings that she provided for you all this evening showed that there's a possibility that this building could be used for a new purpose with the requisite parking and I'd say it could even go up a story in the back as this is

[10:05:17 PM]

a through lot. This neighborhood of west 11th street is really special. This is one of the most intact late 19th century residential neighborhoods in downtown Austin at this point. Everything else has been permeated by new commercial construction or new multi-family construction which is certainly fine. It is downtown. But it is having a very serious effect on preserving the character of old Austin and these late 19th century, early 20th century houses that can be reused for offices. It's done all over the west end of downtown. So staff would recommend postponement two counts. First of all, to see if we can satisfy the discrepancy between the owner requesting

[10:06:17 PM]

the postponement because she's opposed to its demolition and the sew owe secondly to -- secondly to see if there's a design that the buyers of this property could achieve what they want to you while still preserving this house. So staff recommends postponement to December, and perhaps a referral to the arc on November 30th.

>> Perhaps we could invite Ms. Carter to that meeting if we deciding to that route. Are there any questions of staff? Do I hear a motion on the case? I would entertain a motion to postpone it to December and refer it to the architectural review committee.

>> So moved.

>> Commissioner cook moved. Do I hear a second? Commissioner Jacob? I think that this -- I think

[10:07:20 PM]

that some of the sketch that Donna Carter, who used to be the former chairman of the Texas -- of the state board of review for the Texas historical commission, might be able to assist us a little bit since she has a place right here on the street. I think that it might benefit from a visit to the arc so I support this motion. All those in favor please raise your hand? Any opposed? Okay. We've postponed this and asked the applicant and invite the owner to the arc meeting.

>> Chair?

>> Yes, sir.

>> I think that [echo on the line]. That one of the presenters makes a very strong case is this is an historic district and if we could once again editorialize a little bit, but if those who are listening, those of you who

[10:08:23 PM]

put effort into the this, this tool would be so much more effective and that case that Mr. Sadowsky just made, this is a prime candidate for an historic district.

>> I agree. Commissioner little, were outrage to weigh in?

-- Were you trying to weigh in? You're muted, I believe. Can you speak up?

>> Garbled audio.

[Inaudible].

>> So demolish somebody else's house? Point well taken! For those who may not have heard, commissioner little supports the motion and

[10:09:25 PM]

concur with commissioner heimsath and she thinks that it's a good idea to figure out if this is against the owner's wishes or not before we demolish her house. Okay. Did we vote on that? Sorry.

>> It was unanimous.

>> D10, 1117 lien den, did we have that on the consent agenda?

>> That was a consent case, yes, ma'am.

>> Okay. I have in my notes discuss, pape, no backup, staff report? So a little confused. Okay. Moving on to d12, 514 academy drive. This is another contributing resource in the Travis heights district.

>> Item d12, application to demolish a circa 1929 house.

[10:10:26 PM]

One story, asbestos siding with a gabled roof, partial with side covered porch, triangular braces, exposed rafter tails and exposed windows. It was built in 1929 by tc steiner. The first owners, William and Rosa post operated the post office after Faye at one 19th and a half west sixth street. In 1935 until the end of the decade a [indiscernible] Rented the house.

[Unmuted microphone]. Construction worker mash continue C Warren and his wife Bessie occupied 514 academy for the rest of the 1950s. Let's see, according to the thc, commissioner Myers said 514 academy has been contributing to the pending national registered historic

[10:11:26 PM]

district. It has passed a state board review, but it is not yet an official national registered district. We hope to see it in early 2021 and in the meantime staff will reach out to the thc to confirm just in case they're able to list it sooner.

[Laughter] Recommendation is to release the permit upon completion of a city of Austin documentation package. Thank you.

>> Any questions of staff? Again, I would entertain a motion to postpone to the next meeting and ask the applicant to meet us at the arc, at the architectural review committee. We have five buildings all contributing up for demolition in Travis heights

[10:12:29 PM]

tonight and it seems we need the neighborhood to weigh in. Do I hear a motion either way? Any way?

>> I'll [indiscernible].

>> Do I hear a second? Second from Caroline ray. Any further discussion? All those in favor of postponing it and inviting the applicant to the architectural review committee please raise your hand. All those opposed? Any opposed? Okay. It passes unanimously with commissioner Jacob maybe off the dais. Off the grid.

[10:13:30 PM]

Okay. Then we have d14, Mcphail's florist, 605 Barton springs road.

>> Yes. We didn't have testimony in evening, which is surprising because I know that there are code violations on this property. This is a property that I think anyone in Austin who has been in town for any number of years knows it's a virtual landmark. Mcphail's was in business for 70 years, probably 80 years at this location. And the Mcphail family was very instrumental in the floral business throughout the city, but the branch of the family who owned this also delved into other ventures. Mr. Mcphail had a grocery store called the hokey

[10:14:32 PM]

pokey at 709 east sixth which is in a landmark building today. He also developed the sunken gardens, which I'm not sure exactly where they were, but they were on the site of the wayside florist and the wayside gardens. And this building here was known as Mcphail's wayside florist. Mr. And Mrs. Mcphail APD to have separated-- appeared to have separated if not divorced at some point and Ms. Rosa Mcphail took over the business, still a very bold move for a female entrepreneur at the time that she did this in the 1940s and 1950s it was very unusual still for a woman to be the head of a large company like this. The architecture is unique. It's got arches, it's got greenhouses, it's got a two-story section where Mrs. Mcphail lived upstairs

[10:15:32 PM]

above the floral shop. Mr. Mcphail traveled the state. He was also the chief inspector for the Texas department of agriculture and the chief floral inspector and he would go out very much like Mr. Ramsey at Ramsey's Austin nursery up at the north end of Hyde park. He would find new plants and cultivate them here in Austin and then sell them. He developed his own hybrids. They had a catalog. They grew a lot of their own flowers and Mcphail's wayside florist along with a brother's Barton springs florist really epitomized what Barton springs road used to be in the mid 20th century. This was an area of flower farms and truck farms and floral shops on the way to Barton springs. It was certainly not the thoroughfare that it is now.

[10:16:34 PM]

Staph felt that this was worth consideration as a allergic. It is -- a landmark. It is really the last vestige of the old character of Barton springs road and staff's recommendation is to either postpone to the December meeting or to initiate historic zoning and see if there's a way to rehabilitate these buildings so that maybe if there's never a florist shop there again, least they can be used for something else. The buildings are completely secured, so even though there's code violations, it doesn't appear that people are able to get in and cause any vandalism or other damage. So I think we do have the time to postpone it if that is the commission's desire, without incurring serious liability for the property owner for trespassers and vandalism on the site.

[10:17:36 PM]

>> Are there any questions of staff? Do I hear a motion on the case? Commissioner heimsath?

>> I guess I'll go ahead and make a motion to postpone based on staff's recommendation, but for the very reason that I think also is there any additional architectural information about the origin of the building and the extent to which the current status of the building maintains relative integrity? I think that's something we could ask staff.

>> We need a second before we can discuss it. Commissioner Valenzuela, are you offering a second?

>> Yes.

>> So we have a motion and a second to postpone. Go ahead.

>> That was my statement.

>> Okay.

>> [Inaudible] So we can understand the condition of the building.

[10:18:39 PM]

>> I will do what I can to get that to you, commissioner.

>> All those in favor of postponing it to December meeting, whenever that is, raise your hand, please? Okay. It passes unanimously. And the next item is d15, 1811 drake avenue.

>> Actually, before we move on to d15, I just -- I wanted -- I think it's okay to say postponed to the December meeting or to our next meeting, but that is most likely going to be the 14th, and I would really not want to have any sort of complication arise through saying whenever that might be. Our postponements need to be to a date certain.

>> Okay.

>> If we could just rephrase that motion I think that would be much safer for us.

>> To the December meeting?

[10:19:41 PM]

>> Yes or even December 14th. And if that turns out not to be the date --

>> I think the motion was to the December meeting or to our next meeting, which is in December.

>> Right.

>> Okay?

>> Yeah.

>> All right, commissioners. D15 is 1811 Drake Avenue. This is a proposal to demolish a circa 1936 house. One-story with horizontal wood siding, two to two, paired and single aluminum replacement windows and composite roof shingles. A partial porch and a central entrance. The house was constructed in 1936 by Louis and Rena Hall. The Halls alternately occupied and rented out the home until approximately 1947 and afterwards it was occupied by Samuel Williams and his wife Lucille. Williams opened and air

[10:20:42 PM]

conditioning company and lived at 1811 Drake until at least 1957. Staff recommends the commission release the permit upon completion of a city of Austin documentation package.

>> Okay. Commissioners, any questions of staff? This is another Travis Heights contributing resource. I would entertain a motion to postpone to December 14th or to the December meeting. And invite the applicant to the architectural review committee. Do I hear a motion for anything? Are you pondering it? Commissioner Featherston.

>> I'd move to release the

[10:21:44 PM]

permit upon completion of the city of Austin documentation package.

>> Okay. Is there a second?

>> I'll go ahead and second that.

>> Okay. There's a motion to release the demolition permit and a second. Any discussion?

>> Well, I may just weigh in. I think the architectural integrity here, the staff says it's moderate. I think probably is a significant detriment to the house. It certainly will not rise to the level of a landmark. I think also as much as it pains me, this one probably is also less adaptable, perhaps, than some of the others. So I think we'll have our work cut out for us with the ones we've already postponed.

>> I think if we postpone -- if we postpone this until December we'll have an

[10:22:45 PM]

opportunity to review and comment on the plans for new construction. So right now we have a motion to release the demolition permit and a second. All those in favor please raise your hand? Six in favor. All those opposed raise your hand. Okay. Commissioner Wright, Myers and Valenzuela oppose. We have -- what do we have, six in favor. That passes. So the demolition permit is released upon the completion of

a city of Austin documentation package, photographs of all facades and a narrative history for archiving at the Austin history center.

[10:23:48 PM]

Okay. I think our next item is 416 west 12th street. The proposal is to demolish the 1956 building that is listed individually in the national register under criterion C for architecture and citian a for historic associations with the organization. Do we have a presentation? We've had a presentation already. Do we have more presentation?

>> We had a presentation.

>> We had more than a presentation.

>> Staff moves to either post tone to December or initiate historic zoning. Our city code allows for recommending historic zoning if the property is listed individually in the national register of historic places and this one is. It also qualifies under two

[10:24:51 PM]

of our designation criteria for architecture and historical significance. This is a difficult case because staff is certainly sympathetic with the organization's need and desire to redevelop this property. This building has -- it has served its purpose for them. It's expensive to maintain. And staff was listening very closely to the presentations given. And is very sympathetic, but -- and also too that --

[unmuted background

[unmuted microphone]. And also the Texas historical commission that there would be no impact on their private property rights. And that may be true from the state perspective, but

[10:25:53 PM]

that's not true from the city's perspective because its designation is almost an automatic way to landmark designation for this building. I am not sure that it is appropriate to initiate historic zoning on this case right now. I think the better approach would be to postpone and to continue the dialogue as to how development of this sight can occur that -- of this site can occur that respects the building with better than the plans presented and not saying that this isn't a very handsome building, but I don't think that it does enough to preserve the existing significant building. And staff's recommendation to postpone is based on the availability hopefully of more conversations.

[10:26:53 PM]

In all honesty, the new proposed building, while it is very handsome, there is absolutely no resemblance to what's there now. And I think that that is the goal that the applicants and the -- and the architects should strive for is understanding that they've got a building with demonstrated significance. What can be done to incorporate it into the plans to a much higher degree than is being presented today. So staff's recommendation is for -- it's for both, but believing that postponement is the more appropriate avenue at this point.

>> Commissioner Valenzuela.

[10:27:56 PM]

>> What is our

[indiscernible] For postponement? We've seen this case many times and are we up against -- [indiscernible].

>> I think we can postpone it for six months if it's a national register property.

>> It's an -- you've seen it in the committee. The applicants have come to the architectural review committee twice now but this is the first time that it's been on the full commission's agenda.

>> Is that right?

>> Yes. So it would be -- you do have 75 days to make a decision.

>> Do I hear a motion on the case? I think we know a lot about

[10:28:59 PM]

@this building. Commissioner cook.

>> For the sake of conversation I'm going to move to initiate historic zoning based on architecture and also historical significance.

>> Is there a second? Commissioner Tollett.

>> And I think I see it listed on our -- no, that was a different Tollett street. I apologize. I appreciate staff's interest in postponing, but honestly I don't see how we can have any choice about not recommending a nationally listed property and discussing how they can preserve that before they do that and we can discuss it before we initiate it or before. And I feel for the applicant, but this is a

potentially huge project. I don't see personally how we can not recommend it. I am more in favor of just moving the ball down the road and still referring

[10:30:00 PM]

them to the architectural review committee to talk about the controlled development patterns if the recommendations go through, but I don't see postponing and initiating

[indiscernible] Benefiting anyone.

>> Commissioner Valenzuela?

>> I agree with that approach. The architectural review committee have seen it several times and have not seen a change in the design. It's been consistent with what we saw at the beginning. And I do just want to emphasize that as Mr. Sadowsky mentioned, stay on the national register does not come with those strings. It is honorary, but because it is within the city, we have review authority. But even if it was not already listed individually on the national register we would have seen this and it would have -- we would have arrived at this same point had it not been listed on the national register. So I want to put my support

[10:31:02 PM]

behind the national register listing and just this process would not have changed had it not been on the national register.

>> I'm glad you brought that up. I agree completely that it isn't necessarily because it's listed in the national register we would have come to that decision independently as a commission, I believe. I wanted to ask commissioner Tollett if he wanted to address his second to this?

>> [Garbled audio].

>> I've been familiar with the property for over 30 years. I used to own the building across the street, had a business there. I've been in the building. It's extremely well taken care of. I understand that there's some -- may be some hesitation on the commission that because the owner is opposed to it, but to me

[10:32:03 PM]

this is our mission. I mean, this is -- you read the national register narrative. That's what -- it touches all the bases. That's what we're here for. I don't think it can be considered kicking down the road. I had like

to see it go with our representation down the road. I would like to see all of us on board on this one. And it is an important property. 12th street is not the waste land that's been described. 12th street is a nice boulevard. It comes off the capitol. I was -- I know we're not particularly focusing on what's coming next, but a 31-story office tower there with five parking podium five levels, I mean, folks, that's horrifying as far as I'm concerned. I actually own property right down the street from

[10:33:03 PM]

this so I have a piece of paper here for my -- that it's going up for rezoning. Anyway, that's the reason I'm supporting it, that's the reason I seconded it. I think this is -- to me this is what we're here for. Did that come out? Yeah.

>> Commissioner Myers, you're muted.

>> Terry, you're muted.

>> You came out, I didn't. Commissioner heimsath?

>> Thank you. I also am very concerned that we -- for what you might call take a stand for this property because it is the perfect illustration of the mish-mash -- of the mismatch between the historic structures in this extensively permissive zoning that many of these properties are up against. And the fact is that if we don't rein this in in some reasonable way so that owners can benefit from some value to their land, but the

[10:34:04 PM]

only course of action is not just demolition or a 30 story building. And we're not offering them anything but that right now. So there's yet another case there, no different than the masonic lodge case. And this is a serious, serious threat to historic preservation in the city of Austin and we need to start addressing this.

>> I'd like to add something. When we saw the video and the folks were talking about we thought this was to highlight our mission as a group, it's the national register of historic places and it was listed under architecture and for its historic associations. And I feel a little bit now that some time has passed and perhaps they've gone in a different direction, but I think it had to have been known at the time it was being nominated and listed

[10:35:05 PM]

in the national register as a place, as a building where it exhibits this wonderful architecture and it reflects the values of the group. And again, I really feel that the commission would have come to this conclusion on its own. I don't want to throw it back on the national register -- I'm sorry, on the national register coordinator or the national register department because they said the truth, this was -- this did not put restrictions on them -- on private property, but by initiating historic zoning I think we concur with their analysis that it's an important property and we can go forward with

[10:36:06 PM]

recommending historic zoning. So I would support the motion. Commissioner Wright? You're muted. Your mic is muted. It's not working? There we go.

>> [Garbled audio]. In the video the women talked about the organization was founded elsewhere. It was not founded anywhere. And they kind of intimated in that sense that they don't feel like this building is an important part of history this N that sense because they didn't begin here. But I think that's

[indiscernible] Of this building reflected the success of the organization, the growth of it and the

[10:37:06 PM]

importance of it at that time.

>> Thank you for that. Commissioner little? >>

>> I wanted to reiterate what others [inaudible].

>> Thank you for that. That's entirely correct. Anyone else? Okay, hearing no further discussion, all those in

[10:38:07 PM]

favor -- what are we recommending?

>> Initiate --

>> Initiating historic zoning. I didn't know if we were initiating or recommending. We're initiating historic zoning. All those in favor please raise your hand. Any opposed? It's unanimous. And I think the last item on the public hearing is d20, 1414 Alameda drive.

>> [Garbled audio]. Side gables, composition shingle roof with exposed rafter tails and a full width porch. Parse 1414 Alameda was constructed around 1932 by George barheart. It served as a rental

[10:39:08 PM]

property until 1939. Months later a local lawyer purchased the house and lived there until his marriage to Mildred Edgar in 1947. By 1954 he was part owner of the [indiscernible] Restaurant at 12th street and Lamar. After that the house remained vacant until 1955 in the Lucas family purchased the property. Staff recommendation is that the commission release the permit upon completion after city of Austin documentation package. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Any questions of staff? This is another contributing property in Travis heights. I would entertain a motion to postpone to the December meeting and refer the applicants to the architectural review committee. I think we might have more

[10:40:08 PM]

room to discuss this item than we did the last. There was some consideration by the -- I'll quit talking. I'll ask for a motion on the case first.

>> I'll go ahead and move postponement based on the suggestion that the applicant meet with the arc before the December meeting.

>> Do I hear a second? Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. Featherston thirded. Okay. Any discussion?

>> Yes. This is [[echo on the line]. The merit is architecturally going to be certainly

[10:41:10 PM]

something of an issue if we were to try to initiate zoning on this. Not to mention that research might show very little association. But I do -- the contributing structure makes all the sense in the world. They would have to see what they could do to preserve the house.

>> I think if the applicant is still on the line or listening in, I think there was some consideration that the building had been altered but the alterations I believe occurred during the historic period. The historic period for this district ended in 1970. So I think that -- I think that any alterations occurred before that time that this house does resemble what it looked like in 1970 in the historic period. So we would like to refer it to the architectural review committee. Is there any further discussion from the commission? Hearing none, all those in

[10:42:12 PM]

favor please rise your hand? Any opposed? Okay. It passed. It's postponed to the December meeting with a referral to the applicant an invitation to go to the architectural review committee and discuss it further. We passed item e1 was passed on consent, no further action, no new updates on the Sebron Sneed house. On to commission and staff items, are there any committee reports? Commissioner Valenzuela would you like to comment on the [indiscernible] Committee?

>> We met and

[10:43:12 PM]

[indiscernible]. I think that always helps with our conversation. It looks like we'll see a lot of other cases from this meeting in our next meeting at the end of November.

>> I think we had 1806 Travis heights, we discussed. And I think that we got a lot of consideration from the property owners insofar as not whitewashing the stone, the natural stone on the house. And I think that was a big deal. The fenestration will change, but many have the French doors going out to a terrace so it might reduce its ability to contribute, but it's still capability with the district -- compatibility with the district and I think saving the stone was a real good compromise that we got from

[10:44:13 PM]

that. Has the operations committee met? What about grants? Preservation plan? We saw the design standards tonight. I would like to say the presentation that we had earlier from the Austin economic development corporation, they were asking -- I couldn't -- I don't know about you, but I couldn't hear his presentation very well. And what they're wanting us to do is think of someone who has preservation experience or preservation background as well as perhaps as well as some development or real estate background to be a permanent member of the board of this economic development corporation to make sure that preservation doesn't come as an afterthought when think come and present their plans to us and we say wait

[10:45:15 PM]

a minute, maybe you could have done this and we'll have a seat at the table. It doesn't have to be a commission member. In fact, they had asked us to think about people who may not be on the

commission, but may want to volunteer their expertise in another way. So they've asked us to think about people that we might put up for recommendation. They're going to have an application form, so think of your friends and relatives. You could give it to them as a gift for Christmas.

>> Yeah.

>> Yes.

>> The whole checklist of things that they were talking about are very consistent with why I volunteered for downtown commission. So I do see that is something that's really interesting. Obviously the commission will have to see what other applications might be coming in.

>> You have to fill out an

[10:46:15 PM]

application, Ben. Yes, commissioner Valenzuela?

>> Is there any action that we need to take. It sounded like the nominations would go to the preservation planning committee and then we would go through those and come up with [indiscernible] At the December meeting?

>> That's correct. And I think that -- but we might -- we just threw that out to the whole commission. If there are people that you think might be -- might be interested in serving or that you think would be a good match, let staff know and we can discuss those at the preservation plan committee. We don't have to take action on that now. Okay. Are there future agenda items? Does staff have anything left? We got through a pretty big agenda tonight with all those postponements from

[10:47:16 PM]

last time with 15 minutes to spare. So I entertain a motion to adjourn.

>> So move.

>> Commissioner mcwho are made this motion, I think tonight. So can we get a second from commissioner heimsath? All those in favor please raise your hand? This meeting is adjourned.