



IMAGINEAUSTON

Our Plan for the Future. In Action Today.

Land Development Cody Advisory Group Draft Meeting #20 Minutes

June 16, 2014 at 6:00pm
Carver Public Library
1161 Angeline St., Austin, Texas 78702

Members in attendance: Beverly Silas, Chris Bradford, Melissa Neslund, Dave Sullivan, Mandy De Mayo, Brian Reis, Will Herring, Jim Duncan.

Members absent: Jeff Jack, Steve Oliver, Stephen Delgado.

1. Approval of minutes. By consensus the Advisory Group approved the minutes of the meeting June 2, 2014.
2. Public Comment: This meeting was dedicated entirely for hearing public comment. The following provides a brief summary of what each speaker articulated.
 1. Frank Harren:
 - Preserving SF3 zoning in central Austin is a mistake.
 - Density is necessary and can help affordability.
 2. Sammy Easterday:
 - Some neighborhoods are completely built out and contain a variety of housing types.
 - Consideration for these neighborhoods is necessary, they provide a residence for young families.
 - Seems like the focus is destroying and displacing the treasures that these neighborhoods have, uneven code enforcement exacerbates this problem.
 3. Eleanor McKinney (presentation accessible online) :
 - Imagine Austin includes integrating nature into the city, alongside becoming compact and connected.
 - American Society of Landscape Architects would like to be proactive with this mission and carry forward Austin's environmental legacy. (Tools outlined in presentation).

4. Andrew Bucknall:
 - The city should not be designed around transportation, mass transit should be flexible.
 - Need for more frequency and smaller buses (not less frequency and big buses).
 - Neighborhood plans should be a touch stone to determining which layers in the current Land Development Code are extra and which need to be simplified.

5. David King
 - Imagine Austin is the touchstone and does not override neighborhood plans.
 - Overcrowding neighborhoods would lead to a change in character, less affordability, and more expensive taxes.
 - The new code must include neighborhood plans, McMansion, Waterfront Overlay, SOS, Capitol View Corridors, and Hill Country Roadways.
 - Neighborhood interests on the Code Advisory Group are underserved, suggestion to consider adding two additional executive members of the Austin Neighborhoods Council.

6. Nancy McDonald:
 - Constituencies include commercial developments and developers.
 - Remapping is the priority; please take careful consideration about getting into this process and assess transit-oriented developments, neighborhood plans and compatibility.

7. Amy Hartman
 - Is the change to the code good for renters (those who comprise the majority of the city)?
 - Is the change to the code good for households who can't afford to buy a home (also majority of the city)?
 - Does the change in the code promote a compact Austin, or does it add to sprawl?

8. Patrick Goetz
 - CodeNEXT should not take neighborhood plans into account because they codify the existing status quo.
 - Neighborhood plan processes are undemocratic , outdated, and are used as an avenue to prevent change from occurring.

9. Stuart Hersh
 - Renters need to be taken into account.
 - There is a need to do a neighborhood planning data inventory and see what the code is not achieving now and make that happen.

10. Kevin Pape

- Need to look at how Austin Water and Austin Energy are coordinated and how this relates to inner city redevelopment.
- Transportation issues need to be addressed; moving away from being an auto-centric city is not the solution.
- Need for density in the inner city area, zoning should not be restrictive.

11. Joyce Basciano

- How will this public input information be used by the CAG?
- CAG is stacked and does not adequately represent people participating in the process.

12. Michael Gorse

- Need to address counterfactuals: what will happen if we do not add housing in central Austin? Will that lead to sprawl and additional infrastructure costs overall as well as longer commute times, etc.
- Need to think and plan with foresight. Driving will become less feasible over time, and younger generations are driving less. This leads to increased demand for more central housing.

13. Steven Yarak (presentation available online)

- Residents are being forced to the edges because of single family zoning constraining the core.
- Austin has a solid urban foundation and has the demand for more dense development.
- Need for residential and design standards to find appealing ways to create more housing, not focus on tearing down existing housing.

14. Cory Brown

- Compatibility issues have created less functional development in communities that have varieties of housing and public spaces and good transit (example: Crestview).
- Neighborhood plans are old and limiting.
- CodeNEXT needs to encourage diversity as the city grows.

15. Alex Papavasiliou

- Focus needs to change toward solutions instead of complaints.
- Density is more affordable; sprawl will affect the region as a whole and not just Austin.
- People with professional skills and expertise have a difficult time working around the Code.

16. Caroline Reynolds

- Have little encouragement to trust staff or consultants.
- Neighborhoods require a balance of benefitting the young and elderly, and providing a family friendly environment that fosters community. Intensive development would ruin this.

17. Richard Ferris

- 12st Revitalization process was diluted. Nothing has been done and 11th and 12th streets seem to have developed as a housing corridor.

18. Julio Gonzalez (presentation available online)

- Current policy is enabling sprawl.
- Missing middle is a beautiful and politically viable solution to ensuring compactness where the market dictates the need.
- Transportation must lead.
- List of solutions can be found at the end of presentation. Among them: lower parking requirements, enable secondary apartments, missing middle base districts, invert choice architecture.

19. Jerry Balaka

- Please focus on making new developments compatible and not enable bad character with compatibility standards.

20. Marcus Denton

- Need to move people in and out through mass transit and alternative forms of transportation, not focus on car infrastructure and accommodating the automobile.

21. Elaine Goodson

- Loss of impervious cover is a critical issue to consider.
- Drainage needs to be addressed with new development.

22. Leslie Currens

- Suggestion for homeowners to have more flexibility in use of their lot because of increasing property taxes. More people being in an accessible and enjoyable area is not a bad thing.

23. Edward Reyes

- Encouraging to work together with community members in South Austin who will not understand the discussion we are having.
- Let us use our community and work together to find solutions.

24. Den Keshet

- Future residents of Austin need to be taken into account.
- Parking requirements create an equity issue for residents that do not own a car.
- Proximity oriented development needs to be considered instead of corridors, so that there is a destination in every direction.

25. Andrei Lubomudrov

- Current parking requirements will not work city-wide. Some neighborhoods have abundant parking, and requiring additional parking in order to build additional units becomes a barrier.

3. CodeNEXT team response to public comment:

- Great appreciation from each staff member and entire advisory group for the community members who gave their time to participate and engage in this meeting.
- Regarding remapping: before we can get to remapping, a new code has to be in place. Before a new code is in place we need to have an approach. We are still very early in this process and remapping will come in the future.
- CodeNEXT is not in itself a planning process. It is an implementation tool because it is a code. It is meant to implement plans that have been adopted.

Code Advisory Group was very thankful and appreciative of everyone that came to participate, as well as the diverse set of opinions that were captured in this meeting. Discussion will follow in the future about whether to have additional meetings of this type.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45pm.