

Land Development Code Advisory Group Meeting #15 Minutes

March 17, 2014 at 4:00 pm City Hall, 1st floor, Room 1027 (Executive Session) 301 W. 2nd St., Austin, Texas 78701

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

1. <u>Discussion and action on structure, organization and chair of Advisory Group.</u> Sheila Balog discussed three possible options for the structure of the Advisory Group. The first would continue the use of a staff facilitator only; the second would have both an elected chair and a staff facilitator; and the third would have an elected chair only. On a motion by Dave Sullivan and a second by Beverly Silas, the Advisory Group by consensus chose the second option. The Group then selected Dave Sullivan as Chair and Brian Reis as Vice-Chair, by consensus.

The group discussed forming a subcommittee to address issues of affordability and families with children, and then tabled this item.

- 2. Presentation and questions on Envision Tomorrow. John Fregonese and Alex Joyce of Fregonese presented (via telephone) an overview of the Envision Tomorrow model and how it will be used in the Code revision process. They emphasized that it is not a predictive model but a scenario-testing model that shows how different options perform. There were questions about whether the model could be applied to the ETJ, not just the city limits, and how affordability issues would be addressed. The Advisory Group's working group on EnvisionTomorrow will be meeting in the near future to discuss the model in more detail.
- 3. <u>Briefing from Opticos.</u> Dan Parolek and John Miki from Opticos Design discussed the major work products in more detail and explained what they would like from the Advisory Group on each report. They also addressed frequently-asked questions on issues such as neighborhood plans, missing middle housing, the community character analysis, and how comments received from the public are being used.

- 4. Briefing and feedback on proposal from City Council's Comprehensive Planning & Transportation Committee regarding Code Approach Alternatives. George Zapalac explained that the City Council committee had discussed CodeNEXT at their March 3 meeting and had heard requests from the public that they should delay consideration of the Code Approach Alternatives report until at least January, 2015, instead of October, 2014, as presently scheduled. The Committee expressed a desire to stay with the current schedule but to give the new Council a chance to reaffirm any decisions on the Approach Alternatives in 2015. The Advisory Group agreed that it was important to brief the new Council on the Code revision process. It was also suggested the Comprehensive Planning & Transportation Committee be briefed regularly on the process and that members of the Advisory Group attend those meetings on a rotating basis.
- 5. <u>Update on outreach activities.</u> Advisory Group members discussed their outreach activities, including the Families With Children Task Force.
- 6. <u>Agenda items to consider for next meeting</u>. Advisory Group members identified these possible topics for future meetings:
 - Briefing on the Listening to the Community report
 - Report from the Envision Tomorrow work group
 - Report from the Families With Children work group
 - Introduction to the Community Character Manual
 - Milestone report from the Advisory Group

It was noted that the Advisory Group may need to meet more often than once a month.

- 7. <u>Public comment</u>. Public comments included: allowing more time for review of the adopted neighborhood plan summaries by the Neighborhood Plan Contact Teams; the need to validate assumptions of the Envision Tomorrow model; the need for more public review of the Listening to the Community report and the Community Character Manual; and the need for every neighborhood to be contacted to participate in the Community Character in a Box exercise.
- 8. <u>Code NEXT team response to public comments.</u> The team discussed the importance of maintaining the overall work schedule and the need for comments on the neighborhood plans to be submitted in writing.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM.