



CODENEXT

SHAPING THE AUSTIN WE IMAGINE

Land Development Code Advisory Group
Meeting #52 Minutes

August 22, 2016 at 6:00 pm-9:00 pm
Waller Creek Center, Room 104
625 E. 10th Street
Austin, TX 78701
www.austintexas.gov/codenext

Members in attendance: Melissa Beeler, Roger Borgelt, Guy Dudley, Jim Duncan, Lauren Ice, Pat King, Eleanor McKinney, Terry Mitchell, Susan Moffat, Dave Sullivan, Colby Wallis, Kevin Wier, Nuria Zaragoza, Mandy De Mayo, Rich Heyman, Liz Mueller

Members absent: Jose Valera

Chair Duncan called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (6:00-6:05)

6:01 Minutes are approved from July 25th.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION: GENERAL (6:05-6:20)

- A. Hannah Frankel spoke about cooperative housing, which is a method of housing based on tenant ownership. She believes that parking minimums are prohibitive to rental residential developments. She would rather spend costs on amenities that further community benefits instead of cars. La Reunion Co-op has 70% car ownership, only filling up 60% of the parking lot. Also the fact that housemates share duties, cars are less needed.
- B. Ryan Nill spoke about why car ownership is lower, mainly because it's shared housing with shared responsibilities. 35 residents live there but one person shops once a week, thus replacing around 20 trips for one trip. Co-ops specifically take measures to reduce the need for cars. 21st St Co-op has a partnership with the Yellow Bike Project, in which they assist residents with bike maintenance and commuting courses. Entertainment exists naturally due to the large amount of people that live there and does not need to be sought after in a vehicle. Overall there is a large need to reduce parking minimums for uses that have "shared" systems.
- C. Sharon Blythe spoke about living near Spicewood Springs road and the lack of meetings that take place in north west Austin. She believes that 1/3 of the city is excluded to attend because of the meeting location. She also did not like that Spicewood Springs road was restriped for bike lanes without contacting the neighborhoods, in addition to pedestrian facilities not being included. She wants these and other meetings/ actions to be more inclusive of the neighborhoods.

- D. Frank Aaron wanted follow up on ensuring that a variety of all types of housing can exist in all neighborhoods. He provided a list of 15 reasons why all neighborhoods need a diversity of housing. He gave an example of 21 units per acre being developed in Terry Town 70 years ago. Also new developments like The Grove have that variety of housing. He does not understand why certain neighborhoods need to be limited to people of a particular income, and believes that current zoning exacerbates that problem.
- E. Daryl Stuart spoke about his tiny house meet up group and wants to know if citizens can live in tiny houses on wheels or period. He asks that we address this issue for ADU uses. He states people want to live in town, in tiny's.
- F. David King spoke about parking in the Zilker Neighborhood and thinks the RPP works and is necessary. The residents have requested it and the City has followed through. He believes that Zilker already has a variety of housing and does not need to change in order to meet the code. He believes that The Grove is not diverse as it restricts single family. He is interested in making single family homes affordable to middle income families. He's worried about densification policies, and that it does not lead to affordability and can decrease livability.
- G. Lauren Creswell spoke about being multimodal and a home owner. She favors more intensified and diverse land development patterns. She wants a program for developers to be incentivized for safety street roadway improvements. She wants shared driveways and for the City to control alleyways. She is worried about waiting for an updated TCM. She also supports the elimination of parking minimums and unbundling from housing.

3. OLD BUSINESS (6:20-7:30)

1. Report on Outreach Efforts since last meeting (10 minutes)

Colby Wallis visited the Co-op and researched the parking situation and costs of adding landscaping and trees to the area.

Kevin Wier has sent out messages to his area.

Eleanor McKinney spoke to AIA and focused on redevelopment and compatibility. The AIA expressed concerns about compatibility and the need for a stakeholder group; concern about the mapping process and honoring neighborhood plans; concern about how affordability gets factored into the code and the view of land trusts as a tool. She also mentioned that Steve Adler spoke about ad valorem tax going back into the neighborhood.

Lauren Ice spoke at ANC about concerns and optimism after last consultant visit.

Jim Duncan highlighted major findings on Speak Up Austin.

Dave Sullivan has been working with stakeholders about mobility and food policies.

Patricia King had a follow up meeting with Del Valley ISD Board and De Garza's staff in regards to food deserts.

Roger Borgelt gave an update to Trinity Title Company and stated that most comments had more to do with process and development review issues than the code.

Susan Moffat met with Eastwoods Neighborhood association and their main concerns are losing the residential parking program. They do not feel like they are abusing the situation. They also feel like

they already have a mix of housing, yet none of it is really affordable. She believes we need more tools than diversity of housing.

2. Feedback on Mobility Prescription (60 minutes)

9 out of 17 people responded to the survey created by the Mobility Working Group. 6 prescriptions have good support (multimodal with sidewalk connectivity, sharing parking among businesses, review new development apps for safety, updating AMATP as a strategic mobility plan, context sensitive rules in regard to utilities, simplifying parking requirements, requiring safety review throughout process).

Nuria Zaragoza does not see how loosening compatibility standards equates to more affordable housing. She believes that until we have something specific to replace compatibility it remains too hypothetical. She wants to see language that must require affordable units if it would not be compatible with nearby uses.

Terry Mitchell was very supportive for affordable housing and increased densities along corridors. Jarred Walker recently spoke to the Cap Metro board and suggested increasing frequency over coverage as it results in increased ridership.

In regards to reducing parking minimums, some CAF members voiced their skepticism that the saved cost could still be passed down from developer to the user and that an enforceable mechanism must be used.

Guy Dudley is interested in finding or conducting a study that shows the cost of commuting. Liz Mueller actually did a sample survey that showed there would be a cost savings of moving to central zip codes and commuting by transit compared to living the suburbs and commuting by single passenger vehicle.

Susan Moffat agrees that remodels should be required to provide connectivity improvements like sidewalks. Roger Borgelt does not think that accessory dwelling units (ADU's) or balconies should trigger improvements. A model to look at would be the Cherrywood Neighborhood sidewalk plan. A proportional dollar amount to the remodel would go into an overall fund for neighborhood sidewalks. However, Nuria does not believe this method is very efficient.

Roger Borgelt also supported most prescriptions at some level, but wants to make the code easier to work with so variances are not as needed.

Colby Wallis believes that incorporating safety into the site plan review should already be a part of the process. He also supports parking reductions and believes that density isn't solely about achieving affordability but walkability.

4. NEW BUSINESS (7:30-7:40)

a) Update CAG Work Plan (10 minutes)

Added events on September 19th and September 26th.

5. STAFF & CONSULTANT BRIEFINGS (7:40-8:55)

a. Consultant led discussion and presentation on Building Types as addressed in the draft. Includes a detailed discussion on various building types and how those can be applied across various Transects (25 minutes)

John Miki presented on building types, lot sizes, and densities currently available throughout Austin. The scale of buildings was discussed and how densities can be similar but houses can be different sizes. John also discussed different maximum footprints of each type of building.

Eleanor McKinney wanted to know how impervious cover is being accounted for with setbacks and other building form standards. John said testing was performed during sound check and a vast majority of building types that fall under missing middle, the impervious cover range will be similar to what exists today. So missing middle should be able to handle storm water management at a reasonable expense. John suggests that policy needs to be used in concert with new code to solve storm water issues.

Nuria Zaragoza is concerned that no transect during the Soundcheck event mimicked SF-3. She is afraid that it would incentivize the demolition of SF housing and would also cause new housing to come at a higher cost.

b. Consultant led discussion and presentation on Land Uses as addressed in the draft. Includes a summary of land uses (25 minutes)

Catherine presented on land uses and how such are being streamlined, combined, and improved versus what is in the existing code. 155 land uses exist and will hopefully be brought down to 115 or less.

Dave Sullican asked why conditional zoning was part of the zoning, but its part of a site plan. Conditional use permit would still be a site plan (very expensive), however required at a later date. Dave also presented evidence that form based code reduces the need for variances.

Nuria Zaragoza wants the consultants to talk about the zoning side of procedures to crack apart the discretionary piece from MUP & CUP.

c. Staff-generated discussion and presentation on Mapping options. Staff will present general approach to mapping strategy and what that looks like in terms of structure, timing, resources, and relation to the code (25 minutes)

Jorge presented the building blocks of a mapping strategy in order to prepare the CAG on what will inform the mapping and potential mapping strategies that will be decided upon in the future. Staff is trying to have the coding and mapping overlap, as it is a best practice. The activity centers and corridors would be great early candidates for mapping transects of the new code.

Dave Sullivan reminded everyone that Bill Spellman introduced an amendment for consultants to do a few form-based corridors and then staff would test a few form-based corridors. This would be evaluated when the mapping plan would be brought to the CAG.

Dave Sullivan questioned whether we should we be thinking about doing small area plans instead of neighborhood plans. Because now we do not have plans focused on town centers, regional centers, etc that support Imagine Austin.

Richard Heyman asked what the role of the public and neighborhoods will be during the mapping process? Not a definitive answer was provided, but Peter will come back to answer, cities he has worked where there was a strong mayor system.

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (8:55-9:00)

1. Discussion and presentation on Compatibility as addressed in the draft.
2. Staff-generated discussion and presentation on Subdivision standards. Includes a presentation on emerging Subdivision standards and approach to changes in the code.

Jim wants to report on best practices for different issues also wants the status of small area plans. Nuria seconds the need to talk to density bonus system.

Motion to adjourn at 9pm.