

Land Development Code Advisory Group Meeting #14 Minutes

February 24, 2014 at 4:00 pm One Texas Center, fifth floor, Room 500 505 Barton Springs Rd., Austin, Texas 78704

Members in Attendance: Chris Bradford, Mandy De Mayo, Stephen Delgado, Jim Duncan, Will Herring, Jeff Jack, Melissa Neslund, Stephen Oliver, Brian Reis, Beverly Silas, Dave Sullivan.

Agenda

- Update on schedule and process. Dan Parolek and John Miki from Opticos Design (via telephone) presented a summary of the major work products, their relationship to each other, and the schedule. There was discussion about the need to have detailed conversations about the major issues to that the remapping of zoning districts does not come as a surprise. Also mentioned was the need to define policies of Imagine Austin more completely and to take affordability factors into account.
- 2. <u>Presentation on commercial corridor case study.</u> This item was postponed to a later meeting.
- 3. <u>Discuss structure</u>, <u>organization and chair of Advisory Group</u>. The group discussed the need for more structure in order to become more proactive. Subcommittees or work groups for various topics were considered, including affordability issues, preparation of a work program for the Advisory Group, review of the consultant's work products, and conducting Code Talks. A work group for review of the Envision Tomorrow model being developed by Fregonese Associates was formed, consisting of Chris Bradford, Jeff Jack, Dave Sullivan, Steve Oliver, and Mandy De Mayo. There was a consensus that other work groups should be tied to the consultant's products and that they should be formed after the reports become available. Discussion on the chair of the Advisory Group was deferred to the next meeting.
- 4. <u>Discuss work product type and goals for Advisory Group.</u> Steve Oliver discussed a draft of the work program, with major concerns being the transition to City Council districts, the development review process, and remapping of zoning districts. Will Herring distributed a draft document on organization/restructuring and digitalization/technology investments. Jim Duncan and George Adams stated that restructuring the development review process

was not part of the code revision process and that the City first needs to know what the new code is so that the review process can be aligned with it.

- 5. <u>Update on development review process.</u> George Adams discussed the City's effort to address improvements to the development review process in two stages. The first stage will involve the issuance of a request for proposals to assess the current process and identify near-term improvements. The second stage will be focused on aligning the development review process with the new code. The second stage has not been fully fleshed out but will require close coordination with the CodeNEXT consulting team.
- 6. <u>Update on ongoing regulations efforts.</u> A memo previously distributed to the Advisory Group was discussed.
- 7. <u>Update on outreach activities.</u> Advisory Group members discussed their outreach activities.
- 8. <u>Agenda for next meeting</u>. Advisory Group members identified these possible topics for future meetings:
 - Update from Project Connect
 - How to more fully engage renters in the CodeNEXT project
 - Structure, organization and chair of Advisory Group.
 - Advisory Group's work product
 - Presentation on the commercial corridor case study
 - South Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan and its relationship to CodeNEXT
 - How requests to slow down the Code revision process would affect our contractual obligations
- 9. <u>Public comments</u>. Public comments included: concerns about the flow chart presented to the Advisory Group and how the parts fit together, slowing down the process so that the new City Council acts on the Alternative Approaches, questions about how data collected in the process is being used, the need to define goals in simulation modeling, the concern that more intense development beyond activity centers and corridors is needed to accommodate future growth, and a concern that more infill won't solve affordability problems.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 PM.