

City Council Special Called Meeting Transcript – 9/6/2017

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 9/6/2017 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 9/6/2017

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:40:52 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: I think we have a quorum. For this morning's work session. Today is Wednesday, September 6th, 2017. This is the special called meeting to get a briefing and to discuss codenext. The time is 9:40. We're going to have a hard stop today at noon. This is to discuss codenext. We also have two other things on the agenda, one is hurricane Harvey. I don't know if there's anything to be added to it. >> There's nothing, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: And then also a resolution declaring September 26 as Barton springs university day. Which is something that showed up on the agenda here -- what? For an event on -- I'm sorry? This is something from councilmember troxclair so we'll hold on this until she's here. >> Kitchen: Mayor, my understanding is that councilmember troxclair will not be here today so she asked me to answer any questions about that one. I'm a co-sponsor on it. There's a number of the co-sponsors that are here. So whenever you want to get to it. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. What is this? >> Kitchen: Basically we do this every year and basically this is the university day that S.O.S. Does every year for the Barton springs university. For some reason -- and I'm not certain why -- this didn't make it in time for our early September meeting. So since September 26 is coming up before our next

[9:42:52 AM]

meeting it was put on here as an emergency item. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there a second to this? Yes, councilmember Garza. Does anybody want to discuss this? >> Houston: Well, I do because we just voted on something that was two years old so I'm not sure why this was an emergency. We could have voted on it after the fact. But that's just my comment about it. The other thing is I saw in the backup that it's going to cost -- it's a half a day closure or-- free half a day or all day? >> Kitchen: Let's see... >> Tovo: I believe it's usually all day. >> Kitchen: This is something we've done every year. With regard to cost I would have to ask staff. >> There is no additional cost, it's just lost revenue and I believe the estimate that I heard earlier was \$2,300. We'll just absorb that in our budget. >> Houston: Somewhere I thought it said half a day, but that's fine if that's what it is. >> Mayor Adler: We have just seven people on the

dais. Is anybody going to vote against this or abstain? >> Houston: I'm going to abstain. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Then I'll call for a vote. Those in favor of this resolution, please raise your hand? Those opposed? It passes six to zero to one. Ms. Houston was abstaining. The others presented voting aye. Kitchen, Renteria, Garza, myself, the mayor pro tem and Mr. Flannigan. That resolution is approved. >> Houston: And mayor, it's not that I'm for it. It's not really an emergency. We're beginning to define emergencies very interestingly. >> Mayor Adler: I understand. All right. Let's now go to the only

[9:44:53 AM]

other item remaining on our agenda, which is the codenext presentation and discussion. >> Mayor and council, I'm Jerry rusthoven direct either of the planning and zoning department. For the staff portion of today's agenda regarding codenext we'll first have a presentation by John Mickey of opticos design and he's going to provide us with a preview of draft two which you know is coming out next Friday. And following John will be John fregines and he will provide us with an update on the housing policy that we've been working on for draft two? >> Mayor Adler: Are we also going to today be able to get to any of the watershed issues. >> Yes. We have committed to take up no more than an hour and 45 minutes of time from the staff side and then we'll move on to the other portion of the agenda for the other topics that were listed on the motion board. >> Mayor Adler: When you say an hour and 45 minutes does that include council asking questions or are you looking for an hour and 45 minute presentation? >> Our presentation was a half hour total. >> My presentation is about 15 minutes. >> Mayor Adler: So about 45 minutes total presentation. Okay. That works because we want to leave time for council to be able to ask questions. Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: I just wanted to confirm with Mr. Rusthoven when he talked about the topics on the message board I had suggested several topics. One was watershed, that was toward the lower end of it, the top end priority items were talking more about the process of revision and how the comments were integrate and also the process of -- what the process will be in here in terms of engaging the community, but also communicating information back to council. >> We'll be prepared to speak to that. I'm not sure if we'll be able to get to the watershed

[9:46:54 AM]

portion of it, but we'll try. >> Tovo: Thanks. In my opinion the first battery of questions because of the timeliness, are probably what we should try to hit. >> Mayor Adler: [Indiscernible] The beginning of it. But if it's not we need to be sure that we get that in. Okay? Ms. Houston? >> Houston: And I'm very concerned about watershed and flood mitigation so if that's not a part of this presentation I would really like to hear that. >> Mayor Adler: And we've set that up. The way that we listed this when we agreed with what the mayor pro tem had was we are set today to hit the watershed elements if we can and

we're prepared to do it if we get there, but on the 20th we said watershed was upfront in the event that it was not reached today. Your floor. Welcome back home. >> Thank you. [Laughter]. >> Thank you. It is great to be back in Austin. I think I was here six weeks ago so it is nice to be back. My presentation is about 15 minutes. It's really to give you a preview of things that will be coming out in draft 2 and to continue some of the discussions we had last time I was here six weeks ago. Again, the -- all the efforts that we're doing are really based on imagine and implementing all of the core principles of imagine Austin. And in terms of timeline we've been working on this since 2013 with the first draft being released in 2017. We are really excited about the new draft coming out and being able to talk to you about that draft in two weeks. The top 10 issues that came out of the code diagnosis are still relevant and still major issues in the code updates.

[9:48:54 AM]

I'll be talking about the draft preview, the zone district organization so you get a sense of what the new spectrum of Zones are and talking about some of the points of contacts both for staff members -- for councilmembers and who specifically are the staff members that you all will speak with. And I'll hand the presentation over to John who will present some of the vision tomorrow work and what's been done in updating the model and understanding a preview of what's coming in draft 2. So draft 2, in 2015 the city gave us direction for a hyper code. The hyper code led to two different Zones being used, transect Zones and non-transect Zones, but there were a lot of questions about how do these two systems relate to each other. How do I know that a T 3 neighborhood relates to an mldr. So we heard a lot during the public redraft that there is a desire for more consistency across all the zoning districts and across the land development code in general. They wanted more flexibility and there was a desire for a single spectrum so that's a pretty big change from the hybrid system that had been proposed. So the two draft 2 we are taking a more consistent and more flexible approach to the actual standards and the actual standards of the code are more consistent across all the zone districts. And we have a single spectrum. So that's a big change. So now it will be easier to understand the relationship between each of these zone districts regardless of the -- whether they have more form of controls or less form mall controls. The zone districts are organized into categories. In your existing zoning code today you have residential zoned districts, industrial districts, commercial districts. The new code will still have categories and I'll talk about those categories in a second. But there are also then groups of zone districts that share common tints

[9:50:55 AM]

of O -- intermediates of development. Here's an example of residential house scale districts. These are the kind of the former sf 1 through sf 5 zone districts. It also includes the rural residential and the lake Austin residential. But so it's in this category of residential house scale because they are all of a scale of residential that are the size of a house. They're grouped into R 1, R 2, R 3, R 4, and those groups relate to the intensity, the number of units you can get on a lot. And there are a series of zone districts that each allow typically one unit on a lot so they're kind of organized here in this chart you can see the different zone districts in the last row of this table. And we'll talk more specifically about each of these categories in a second. We also heard in terms of the consistency that there was -- for things to be clearer and more consistent. In particular with the form of compatibility standards. So in draft 1 we were taking the variety of different tools that you had in existing land development code, cleaning those up, trying to integrate those into the base districts as we best could. The concern that we heard from draft 1 was that we had multiple tools and multiple approaches across zone districts so it was hard to track exactly how each of those tools were being used and which Zones they were being used in. So draft 2 you will see a more consistent approach to the Zones. And the standards themselves have also been recalibrated. We've tweaked them a little bit more and we anticipate between draft 2 and draft 3 that we will continue to do that. But the key takeaway here is that we're using one approach across all of the zone districts so it's more consistent across them. The uses. There was a lot of discussion in the new draft to try to -- we cleaned up the use tables and we introduced a lot of new zone districts. In that process we also

[9:52:55 AM]

introduced some districts that were allowing potentially more retail or bars and restaurants in places that we heard very clearly needed to be refined a little bit. So we have additional Zones that are still allowed limited retail and allowed retail in other uses, but are saying let's be more careful about the use of retail and the location of bars and restaurants. So we've made refinements to use tables and where certain uses are allowed. Flexibility. And I think the importance of the flexibility was this discussion about really the goal of the code update is actually maximize conformities. Let's bring more of the existing ones that you have today that are conforming or non-compliant into actual conforming uses. At this point we are looking at simplifying the height standards. We felt in draft 1 we had simplified some of the height standards from the existing zoning code, but also introduced other things that were making things more complicated. We're simplifying the height standards and the way in which lot dimensions are measured. We're making building placement standards more flexible across the districts. And in particular in the last one is the form standards. And I think we've talked in the past that a lot of the transect Zones we had looked at individual blocks within your different neighborhoods in your city and we found a pattern and we said 90, 95, maybe 98% of the houses on that block fit into this pattern. We looked at the blocks around it and we said that pattern still holds up. That worked really well when we were looking at a block and the blocks surrounding it, but as we looked at applying the zone districts more broadly across the city, that percentage of buildings that were really conforming and fit into those

standards fell off. It dropped quite a bit. So what we've done is in the new draft is we've revised our approach to the way that we're dealing with footprints in the form of transect Zones to be more similar to the way that the existing zoning works and the non-transect

[9:54:57 AM]

Zones work. So there will be more flexibility in accommodating for the diverse situations that happen in Austin, particularly in houses that have been -- additions that have been done to in the last 20 years. The important point to note in the new zoning code is we provided more opportunities for housing and more Zones and so in particular where this shows up most is in the commercial districts from the first draft. They had a zone -- the base zone district generally didn't allow residential, but there was a open subdistrict that allowed residential so that worked very much zoning does today in your commercial districts where generally speaking the commercial districts you can't build commercial unless you have the mu overlay or the dmu overlay. The draft 2 proposes to allow residential in the vast majority of the commercial districts much in the way that mu allowed it. So there is the ability to provide more housing. And meet the housing goals and meet the intent of imagine Austin. It does two things by doing that. It lets us get more opportunities for housing, but it also -- one of the things clearly was expanding housing outside the city, so it allows for additional housing across the city. Jumping specifically to the zone districts' organization, again just emphasizing that the Zones are grouped in categories and then groups. The categories are residential house scale. These are your rural residential through R 4 districts, your rural residential to sf 5 districts that you have today if you want to think of it in relationship to title 25. But residential multiunit, which are the former mf zone districts and we have mixed use districts that are

[9:56:57 AM]

formerly the commercial districts. We have main street districts, which were the former main street Zones from draft 1, so there's a clear tie there in terms of if one wants to think of draft one anything that's in main street has been carried forward and moved into this category of main streets. So the T 3 main street, th and T 5 have been carried forward and renamed, but that's an easy way of tying them back to draft 1. Regional center Zones, your downtown, your commercial core, and T 6 has been placed there. Commercial industrial there are a few commercial districts that I'll talk about that don't allow residential. And then the industrial districts. Then we'll talk about the other. So again the importance of the house scale was this conversation that occurred during draft 1 of how do I understand how a transect zone relates to a non-transect zone, how does T 3 neighborhood relate to others? So the big effort here was making sure all the zone districts whether they had more form controls or less, so you could understand how they relate to each other. It reflected the number of units you could get and the

approach to the mcmansion intended lot size was consistent. The other thing to note here is the Zones are now applicable citywide. So in draft 2 in the non-transect Zones you had lmdr replacing district 3. But if you're in the urban core you had these standards. If you're outing the urban core you had a different set of standards. What that meant was that those kind of standards that were providing some of the scale and massing protections that this were the core you couldn't really use outside the core without changing the boundaries of the core definition. We've taken those and split those into two zone districts so new development that happens outside of the core or those areas outside of the core that would like

[9:58:57 AM]

to use those additional form controls can use them without having to modify the urban core boundary. So that gives us more flexibility about where we can use each of the zone districts. So this is the table. This is very similar to the table that I presented six weeks ago. Across the top we have the zone groups, rural residential through zone 4 and below that in the second row you can see all the zone districts that happen under those groups. The typical number of units and here you can see the height. For residential house scale it is about the typical number of units is the primary differentiator between all of these zone districts. The heights are generally -- they vary a little bit across those groups and the building cover and impervious cover also that you can see there. Residential multiunit, where do those missing middle product types fit within the Zones. The Zones that trigger capability, that -- the residential house scale trigger compatibility upon. So these are zone districts that have additional set backs, additional height requirements pa based on their proximity to the residential house scale districts. And again, very specifically, being more standardized in the approach to lot size. Here one can see rm 1 through rm 5 and then in the last grouping the mobile home zone district. Outside of residential house scale, the primary differentiator between the groups is height. So as we go through the next set of categories you will see that heightens to be the things that these zone districts have most in

[10:00:58 AM]

common. So here one can see the variety of districts that are provided. And the height, how it goes from 35 feet to 90 feet across the different groups of Zones. The mixed use districts, so these are the former commercial districts that now allow residential. On subchapter E standards have been more refined and more the standards applied to the zone districts. Consistent approach to compatibility is both triggered and the standards that are being used for compatibility. And more consistent approach to the way that height is being handled across these districts. And here one can see mu 1 through mu 5. And again, height is the primary differentiator here in terms of the zone groups. In the main street as I mentioned

before, these are the transect Zones pulled forward into a new zone category that we've named main street. The importance here is with the consistency is the compatibility lot size and the lot of the building form regulations are made while they are all of these are main street zone districts, the way that we're approaching those standards is more consistent with all the other districts. So a lot of the way in which we presented the form controls are going to be different than what you saw in draft 1. So they would be more consistent with the approach used in the other zone districts. We heard a lot of conversation about we had additional building depth regulations in t3 main streets, t4 main streets so those standards have been removed, but we still feel like they will be good form controls in terms of height and width of the buildings. Regional centers. These are Zones intended to implement imagine Austin's regional center so this is your commercial center in the downtown core. We have a new zoning district called urban center, which is the former txi zone, -- T 6 Zones consolidated into one district and they

[10:02:59 AM]

have been brought into more commercial center and downtown core. So here one can see the table of the main street zone groups and the regional center groups and the zone districts that are implementing those. And again, generally speaking it is height that is the differentiator between the major groups here. Commercial and industrial, primarily these zone districts remain the same as zone 1, where things have changed is again just the consistency and compatibility and there have been refinements to the land use table. So commercial recreation, commercial warehouse, these two districts were in the last draft. These two districts do not generally allow residential, we allow work-live within these districts, but there's not residential generally in these districts. And then the industrial districts and the research and development. Primarily they are the same as draft 1. They're just -- there are some tweaks to capability and land use capabilities. Important in the other zone districts, generally they remain the same as draft 1. The primary difficult slanters are there was a zone district called open space which was intended to cover a variety of different kinds of open space that you have in the city. It has been clarified in terms of its intent and broken into two categories, conservation and lands. The conservation lands are intended to remain natural and have very little recreational within them. And parks, which can be anything from very active to less form mall parks. We wanted to more clearly define the types of open space and the Zones that are titled 25 which will handle zone districts that remain in title 25. So here one can see the different range of types of zone districts. We don't list all the standards that have been below them because they vary dramatically across

[10:05:00 AM]

all of them but they're a grouping of various zone groups. The last thing in my presentation it just points of contact, so each council district has a staff member that's assigned to be kind after point person or a lead for questions or concerns that might be raised, items that you might have, questions -- want clarification on. And we've also listed on these slides the pz and zap members that were appointed and they're listed here and in the backup and for anyone following this presentation to know. That's the end of my presentation. We can break for questions or have John fregenezi give his presentation. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: This may be a question for Jerry, I'm not sure. We had talked before the break about -- let's see. I posted and we talked about the small area plans and we had talked about coming back with triggers for small area plans in the code and also looking at additional -- addressing areas along corridors and stuff like that. Are we going to get that in our presentation today? >> Councilmember, no, we're not going to have that in today's presentation. Our plan was to have that when we come out with the draft 2, which would be next Friday. Have that information and we'll be presenting it to the council on the -- let's see, I think it's the 20th of September when we're before you again with a briefing. I will tell you, though, that we have been in discussions with the corridor planning office about that and one of the important considerations, of course, we're considering was the mobility bond projects,

[10:07:01 AM]

and they have informed us that the list of projects from the mobility bonds will probably not be coming from their office until February or possibly early March. So we are a little bit concerned about the fact that we don't have that list right now to work off of. One of the ideas we had I believe ternally is perhaps it would be better to wait and come out with the potential small area plan areas in February when we come before council with the first reading as opposed to coming out with that list next Friday, but we will be prepared to come out with it next Friday. It just will not have the benefit of having the mobility bond projects firmed up as a part of the consideration. >> Kitchen: Okay. Another aspect of that developing and defining the criteria for when the small area planning process would be employed. So that was -- I hear what you're saying about designating specific areas about corridors. And we did of course talk about the importance of aligning that with the mobility plan process, but another thing is the mobility bond process is an iterative process with this process. This process is not an end reaction to the mobility bond. So one of the things we had talked about is when they're establishing criteria for the places along the corridors that have priority, the consideration of -- I'll use small area planning for lack of a better word, but those factors related to housing and other aspects of planning along those corridors is a component of which parts of those

[10:09:03 AM]

corridors would be identified as first priority. So I don't think that we should be -- I was assuming that we were not waiting for the mobility bond to come out with a list and then we're going to say whatever they come up with with the list is where we're going to do small area plans, it's an iterative process. So -- and we did talk about having the -- you know, those areas identified and perhaps more importantly the criteria for what triggers a small area plan in the process by the time of this iteration. >> We will be prepared when we come before you next time on the 20th to discuss proposed criteria for future small area plans. It's just that I'm sure that one of those criteria are going to be mobility bond projects and I'm a little bit concerned about identifying the areas at this time until we have that project list, but I can tell you that we will be prepared on the 20th to discuss the criteria. >> Kitchen: Yes. I'm not hearing -- I'm not hearing from you the iterative process. If we're just reacting to -- if we're just reacting -- if the mobility bond says, you know, this aspect of south Lamar is what we're going to be working on, and they're going to say that in isolation without understanding the small area planning process or the factors related to housing and the other factors related to the code, that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about an iterative process where they may sit down and say based on what we're doing, based on looking through the transportation lens, this seems to be the area of this corridor, but then the other part of that conversation is looking through the land development lens, maybe we adjust that a little bit. And that's not a reaction process. So waiting until February doesn't make sense to me. We need to be having those conversations right now with mobility

[10:11:03 AM]

bond folks. And if there's -- and I know you guys have had a whole lot on your plate. I respect that. And if there's something else that needs to happen to make sure that that kind of iterative process occurs, then just need to let us know if there's something else that the council needs to do to make that possible. But waiting until February is not an option. Doing it as a reactive to the mobility bond is not an option I don't think. That's what we've been saying. And the other thing is I would like a head's up before September 15th of what's going to be in there in terms of the small area planning triggers. So I'll stop talking. Am I understanding -- I'm looking at the mayor. That was my understanding of what our conversation was. >> Mayor Adler: I think so too. I wasn't even sure when we were going to get to identifying specific areas with small area plans. I think the more important thing was to talk about how we're going to do small area plans and what are the criteria so that people in the community could see in a very real way now what happens next. One of the challenges or comments I hear as I go around the city is that it's central Austin focused. Where is the component that takes us outside of that? Takes us to the additional city areas or other areas, which is the small area plan, but there's nothing produced that speaks to that. It needs to be apparent on the maps or in the code or in the materials so that it's not an afterthought, but that it's really shown as an integral part of this. And then I also agree with what councilmember kitchen said that it shouldn't be reactive. That planning needs to tell the people doing the corridors where planning things that the

[10:13:04 AM]

corridor work should be done. And again, I don't want transportation to be totally reactive to the planning department either, but you have no less a vote on that than they do, or not a vote, but your input in that is no more or less important than theirs. And that's the iterative process I think that councilmember kitchen was talking to. That was my understanding as well. >> Kitchen: So before September 15th I'd like to know what's going to come out in terms of the criteria and then we can have further conversations about how to make sure that that the process is sit up as iterative as you work towards identifying areas for small area plans. >> We'll be in touch with your office. >> Mayor Adler: >> Alter:? >> Alter: Thank you. I wanted to get a little bit of clarity on the aspect that we talked about in prior meetings, which was in the former transect Zones whether we would have an F.A.R. Limit on how we were handling those questions. >> Yes, there will be F.A.R. So we have introduced F.A.R. In what were formerly the t3 and t4 districts. So I know we had a lot of discussion about the concern that there was a desire to potentially allow -- if we're going to allow a four-unit building to be built that may have a larger footprint that we're not inadvertently allowing a very large single-family house to be built. So we have looked at that and we have introduced F.A.R. As a tool to help with that. So we will have that in the draft. >> Alter: But that's not in what we have a glimpse of today? >> We have not introduced that in the matrix we have primarily because the matrix is primarily presenting the zone groups because each zone group has different F.A.R. Numbers. When the code comes out next Friday, each zone district will be presented in the same fashion so that you can see very easily what the

[10:15:05 AM]

F.A.R. Limit is across multiple districts. So that will be coming out next Friday. >> Alter: Okay, great. Thank you. I missed the very beginning so I'm not sure if we talked about when we were going to talk about the process. >> Mayor Adler: Today. >> Alter: I'll hold my questions on that until later. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: I just had questions about on 22 and 24, you said that there were minor changes to -- I don't know if you said capability or what word you use, but my question is did any of the front setbacks here on page 22, did those changes from the first draft? >> They have. So in the first draft the non-transect Zones, many of the front setbacks were reduced to 15 feet. Those have been reset back to 25. With the -- with the addition of the allowance of front yard averaging which you currently have today. We've updated that. In the transect Zones as well those numbers have been adjusted, the front setbacks have been adjusted. So you will see that as a change in draft 2. >> Garza: Okay. And why was that change made? >> So the 15 was set back to 25 because that was generally speaking what was built. So while -- as long as you maintain the front yard averaging there's the ability to adjust based on neighboring properties or if your building happens to be closer to street than 25 we

have plenty of [indiscernible] That way. We also have some zone districts which allow 15-foot front setbacks so you can get [indiscernible] Like Mueller where a lot of the buildings are closer to the street than 25 feet. >> Garza: Okay. I would say I have some concerns about what I feel is a step in the wrong direction, but -- so as -- on page 24, are any of those front

[10:17:05 AM]

setbacks, those -- is there a way to get this chart and show what the first draft -- what the first draft allowed and then what the changes to the second draft? >> We can produce a table that does that. It will be based -- again, this is based on zone groups. It will be a much wider table, but we can do that. We can provide a reference as to what it was in draft 1 and what has change understand draft 2. >> Okay, thanks. >> Flannigan: Can you tell me the difference between public park and conservation land? Slide 33. >> Conservation lands and I apologize if I get these slightly wrong. They're really the habitat preservation areas that exist within Austin. Many of those are -- sometimes they are zoned public, sometimes they actually have other zoning and they simply have a deed restriction or other things. So by having a zone district that is called conservation land it's more apparent on the zoning map that the intent is those remain as habitat. Park is a zone district that's being used to allow various city of Austin parks to be identified as parkland. There is a discussion about some parks may remain public, remain labeled as public versus park, but I think that's still a mapping issue that was being worked through. >> Flannigan: So if I had plots of land owned by an hoa, not owned by a government agency, what would they be zoned if they were intended to remain either a privately owned park or privately owned open space or how would we expect that to be zoned? >> Councilmember, I anticipate we would go with conservation land for that. I think either conservation land or P public would be most appropriate.

[10:19:05 AM]

P public doesn't necessarily have to be publicly owned property, although it kind of makes sense for it to be that way. I think that the parks, what we're trying to get at is more of an active use as opposed to say a greenbelt within a subdivision. So I would anticipate we would probably be applying that the conservation land category to those greenbelt strips. >> Flannigan: All right. I've got, as you know, examples in my district of fairly large plots of land, separate plats owned by hoas that are sometimes active parkland, sometimes they're just open space. One is an old golf course that they're not redeveloping so it would be good to kind of think about how the uses might be applied differently. >> I think we might have to make some tweaks because we're remapping the whole city a all at once. And when we hear from people when we come out with the latest iteration of the map, I know we will be doing retweaking of that and it's kind of hard for us to tell sometimes looking at a map how active the

use is so we might be tweaking that as we go. >> Flannigan: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Thank you. Mr. Mickey, can I ask you a question about how you guys are ensuring that all the corridors and centers are mapped equitably to share equally in the responsibility to accommodate the growth that you're looking at? >> So again, I think, councilmember, one of the keys here I think is in working on the -- on only commercial districts and allowing for commercial residential that's going to allow the city to accommodate housing in more variety of the corridors within the city. I think John Fregines' analysis is going to help in a number of different parts of the city. In his presentation he will talk about some of the outcomes of the changes that we are going in draft 2, both in relationship to the existing zoning you have today and to the draft 1 that was released. So there's some pretty

[10:21:06 AM]

good findings in John's presentation. >> Houston: So the growth in not just one part of the city will be addressed in his presentation? >> I think some of the changes that we've made some some of the districts and John's presentation will also help us understand what those changes meant. But a lot of the changes affected the entire city as opposed to just being within the core of the city. >> Houston: Thank you. >> Tovo: Thanks very much for the presentation. On page 20 when you were talking about how things match from our existing code from the first code draft over, I just want to confirm what I heard you say which was residential and multiunit is former mf zoning and single-family 6? >> Correct. >> So the residential house scale as it appears on 22 is anything from rr to as proposed R 4. >> Correct. >> Tovo: Can you give us some sense of how that maps to existing -- to zoning categories within our existing zoning? Rr is of course the same. >> Sure. Can we pull up slide 22? >> So R 1 district here, I'm just going to check the cheat sheet real quick. They are R 1's are generally sf 1 and sf 2.

[10:23:10 AM]

And there's -- there's R 1 a is generally what was sf 1. R 1 B is what was sf 2. And then R 1 C is sf 2 which happened within the core of the city so it had the mcmansion regulations apply to it. So that's where the R 1 districts came from. >> Tovo: Before you move on to the next can I make sure I understood R 1 C is the mcmansion area of -- >> Sf 2. >> Tovo: Okay. >> So that's an example of -- >> Tovo: I think you said the cox but that's actually a pretty broad swath if you take some of district 2 and some other areas. Okay, thanks. >> The R 2 districts are sf 3, sf 4-b and sf 4-a. So sf 4 were the small lot zoned districts that you had. R 3 is a combination of sf 3, some of the transect Zones that we had proposed in the last draft. And then R 4 is primarily transect Zones so that we had proposed in the last draft. Again, the regulations you will see are -- have changed even in the transect Zones so that they are more closely related to the non-transect Zones we had proposed in the past. >> Tovo: But where does R 4 exist in our current road?

What does that map -- what is the zoning that's currently on tracts that are being proposed for R4? >> Councilmember, it's a variety of different existing zoning. I would say that there is not an existing category that translate into R 4 and the existing code. Obviously the 4 translates to the number of units and right now as you know, our code basically has sf 3 which is up to two units and anything after that is a

[10:25:11 AM]

multi-family category. I would say the closest thing to it would be a multi-family category, mf 1 through something, but there is not equivalent to R 4 today in the existing code. >> Tovo: So is R 4 being mapped on existing tracts, tracts with existing mf or is it being tracked on to tracts that are currently -- >> Both. Mostly mf, but both. >> Tovo: Both mf as well as single-family? >> Yes. >> Tovo: So with four units is being mapped on to single-family, what is currently single-family 3. >> Yes. >> Tovo: And R 3 I heard you say was also single-family 3, so currently two unit mapping it to R 3. -- >> There are criteria. It's that's -- with the three units there would be criteria. You talk about a situation where we could have a duplex and an Adu or a multitude of thing, but that are criteria that it would not just be necessarily three units out right. >> Tovo: Okay. I just want to get clear on if we're trying to help people understand what the corresponding current zoning category is that you are mapping R 3 and R 4 to existing single-family. >> In certain places, yes. >> Tovo: And I don't know if now is the time to talk about map changes. Probably not, but at some point after your presentation as we talk about the process and how you integrated the concerns and the comments and the questions that you received, I want to talk specifically about mapping changes. So there is actually a pending question on our Q and a that is I think relevant to this conversation and that was can you do an Adu behind a duplex in lmdr. And I'm pretty sure there was a question that councilmember alter submitted back in July. I'm pretty sure the answer to that was yes much in the proposed code that you could on an lmdr tract have as

[10:27:11 AM]

many as three units, one of which would be an Adu, a duplex plus an Adu. How does that translate into the zoning categories that are before us that are identifying the number of units by one? Is R 1 assuming also one unit plus an Adu or is it just one unit total? >> I believe -- this is getting into a level of detail B right now the proposal would be in R 1 it would be a single redundant so when you look at had some of these R 3's they would be a duplex with an Adu. >> Again, we were -- I think in previous presentations we described it as one unit by right and we realized that the by right term wasn't correct. So in R 1 you typically get one unit only. There are even in today's sf 2 and sf 1 ways of getting an accessory dwelling unit. You have a variety of different names for it. You have caregivers, you have accessory apartment,

but those are really -- they have very specific requirements for them. So if I remember correctly, one of them requires a 15,000 square foot lot so you can't get it on any sf 1 property or sf 2 property. It has to be a certain size. Then in terms of the accessory apartment it has to be for someone who is either senior or disabled. So really specific requirements that typically most people aren't applying for. I think one of the things that just we didn't look at specific numbers, but I think generally staff felt like both of those have almost never been taken advantage of, very seldomly have they been taken advantage you can still get those in the code. Most people aren't taking advantage of those. >> Tovo: But just in terms of, I'm just thinking back to the Minneapolis, a whole lot -- maps, a whole lot of the city would have allowed a duplex plus an Adu. In this version a lot of sf1

[10:29:13 AM]

and 2 will go to a one unit max. >> Correct and sf-3 will be split between r2 and r3. Sorry, sf-3 in the translations as we move forward can either be r2 or r3. >> Tovo: How about r4? I think I heard Mr. -- We can talk more about it with the mapping, but if sf-3 is primarily falling within 2 and 3, does that mean we will see none in 4? >> No, there will be some in 4. Not a lot, but there will be some in 4. When we come out to the map it will be easier to show it to you and explain it. We do have some areas of existing sf-3 that would be r4, but there's not a lot of it. >> Tovo: Thanks. And I understand that some of this will be clearer with the mapping but because of the time frame I just want to get as much information today as possible so we can be prepared when we see the maps. Let's see. I think I asked that question. So I think this is probably something I'm going to want to talk about tomorrow during our budget session too, but I just want to get a little bit clearer about small area planning. Small area planning is really akin to neighborhood plan, right? Is it more or less akin to a smaller area? >> I would say neighborhood plan is a type of small area plan. Typically the city has -- we've been doing the neighborhood planning process since late 90s, early thousand. I would define it as a type of small area plan. What we're trying to get to in the future is to broaden the scope of what we consider to be a small area plan. And not necessarily do neighborhood plans the way we've done in the past which is take a pre defined area, a

[10:31:15 AM]

neighborhood set and go through neighborhood by neighborhood and do plans. We're trying to come up with criteria for future small area plans and then maybe an area that's -- what triggers the need to do a plan would not just be who is next in line but a set of criteria we're working on we would be presenting to you in a couple weeks. And they may take a different form. May be a corridor, an area surrounding a activities center in imagine Austin or they may be a part of the planning with the mobility bond project. But to not just simply do them as neighborhood plans as we've done in the past. Kind of a

broader scope. >> Tovo: Losing track of where neighborhood plans kind of fit within this conversation. The more recent past they were multiple neighborhoods. I mean they were larger -- larger -- larger plans. So this is just the small area plans, I just want to be really clear that we're talking about neighborhood-like plans. They are just the geographic area that we're defining is a bit different. It may not be a neighborhood, it may be around a corridor. >> The criteria for what we decided to next and the type of plan we decided to next would be different than what we've done in the past. >> Tovo: Thanks. >> Mayor pro tem, I apologize, Greg Guernsey, I had a dental emergency I had to address. The -- yes. We still have Rosedale next because council has not given direction to deviate from the course that we're on so we're finishing up North Shoal Creek, then Rose Dale neighborhood would be the next one. If council gave a new direction we would be looking at that new criteria. After Codenext is completed, we will have two different teams that can work on the small area plans that could be along a corridor, could be at a node, could be at an area of

[10:33:15 AM]

just concern because there's a sudden amount of growth in a certain part of the city. The bond program as the projects are identified, that might be an area that we would go back, even though there may have been a previous neighborhood plan before because we see better infrastructure into that area or more growth and that might be more growth in that area. >> Tovo: That's helpful. I hope tomorrow as we talk about the budget, the shift would be -- I really want to probe this discussion about whether, you know, it sounds like you had a plan. I just wanted to be sure there wasn't like a whole parallel tract of small area plans going on at the same time we had neighborhood plans so there would be a need for a new -- we can talk about that tomorrow. >> Our plans are do a reorganization after Codenext and shift staff resources. >> Tovo: Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Whether we needed to have consultants brought in, we brought consultants into the plans. I think the intent was not to create any kind of second or different path, but to make sure you have the resources in order to be able to do what I think is going to be a pretty significant need and request for these small area plans. So we do have a placeholder in the concept menu for that. It's not needed, that's great. But if there needs to be a consultant or money put aside now would be a good time to surface that. >> And we'll bring more details back on the 20th. >> Tovo: To the extent that we're -- to the extent that we need your feedback on the budget item, we'll need some of that discussion tomorrow. >> Sure. >> Tovo: Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Real quick, also one of the things that I think you guys are going to be taking a look at was legally nonconforming uses. Uses that existed and now with

[10:35:17 AM]

the change in code might find themselves where they were properly legally conforming to find themselves in a legally nonconforming way but still being able to add a bedroom or something like that. Will this new code remove the obstacles for something that was properly zoned, might not be properly zoned being able to still be able to make those kinds of improvements to their property? >> So I think the new draft, the second draft will probably be better at not making properties nonconforming. We're hoping actually more properties would be conforming. There's some unusual circumstances that exist under the current code that allows certain properties, although they might be grandfathering their old codes not to expand. And we would allow basically those properties to expand in the future where they are compliant and there was a concern that was actually raised at the zoning and platting commission, planning commission meeting last week about keeping some of the provisions that we have that you could add on parallel to a property line, even if it's not compliant, and those are being retained in the code as well. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. More people to speak on this. We have also another presentation from Mr. Fregonese. I don't know if we want to pause and hear that presentation, a really pressing question. Mayor pro tem, if you could take over for just a second, I'll be right back. Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: On slide 22, on r2 under building cover and impervious cover you are referencing D and E but they are not under the zoned districts up top. Should we expect to see more zone districts under these categories or groups than we're seeing in the grid?

[10:37:19 AM]

Or is that -- >> Apologies, councilmember. The slide appears to have truncated the last two so there -- >> Flannigan: We'll see more zone districts emerge. >> Correct. >> Flannigan: But I wanted to reference what councilmember Garza brought up about the front setbacks. It looks like what I'm seeing is the only way that a property would have a 15-foot setback is if they were able to build three units. There's no space for 15-foot set setbacks. Am I reading that correctly. >>> The draft that will come out next week there are no districts in r1 or 2 that have 15-foot setbacks. If you are in a neighborhood where they are closer than 25 feet you will be able to use the front yard averaging. >> Flannigan: What is that? >> In your neighbors are closer than 25 feet for you to set the building closer to the street as well. >> Flannigan: Why don't we want to have one and two unit Zones that allow 15-foot setbacks? What's the problem with that? >> That's something we can talk about when the new draft comes out. >> Flannigan: Excellent. >> Tovo: Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. Mr. Guernsey, as a followup maybe we can have a conversation also with councilmember pool's office about appropriate next steps for rosedale and the planning process, that's a community that's pretty exhausted from various planning exercises and I think that there may be a variety of reasons to relook at that and I'd like to understand better some of the decisions in that so we could think about future direction, but I would like to have a conversation about that with you. The other thing that I wanted to ask was how big are the

[10:39:22 AM]

ads under draft 2? >> That was a conversation we were having just yesterday. >> They are carrying forward the standards that the city council passed in 2015. So it's a maximum of .15 F.A.R. Or 1150 square feet, the more restrictive of the two. >> So on a lot size of [inaudible] I think the maximum size of Adu you can construct is 862 square feet, if I remember right, on a standard lot of 5750. As the lot gets a little larger, the unit can get a little larger. >> So Greg, your number was correct, 862 is the maximum size you could build on a 5750 lot. You cannot build a 1150 square foot Adu until you get approximately 7700 square foot lot. Nod that needs to -- in addition to that that needs to fall what exists on the parcel. Many of the sf-2 and 3 lots you have today are already at F.A.R. Existing of .3, sometimes .4 and some cases are above .4. Each of those parcels would only be able to just the difference between the overall cap of .4 and what exists today. In many cases that 1150 square feet would be very hard to reach in terms of building an aud of that size. >> Alter: I would generally like to err on the size of smaller adus, the houses in many neighborhoods are only 1100 square foot and I think that would encourage for affordability. >> Councilmember, if I may, one of the things we have

[10:41:22 AM]

talked about as a team is as draft 2 comes out is raising the questions we think need [inaudible]. This is a -- in particular the size of an aud has been a conversation point throughout draft. So we recognize that's one that will need additional discussion. We will have kind of a punch list of those items that we think still need discussion. >> Alter: Great. Thank you. And I understand you are trying to codify existing code and I was sort of trying to find exactly what you brought up there. I want to go back to a point councilmember Flannigan was asking about the designations for parken public. He was specifically asking it with the hoa and I just want to clarify that land that is public park will be public parkland because that zoning is different, you know, in terms of if it's designated and zoned park, then you can't change that. Except by a vote of the public. And so we don't want to be rezoning things different than park if they can't be changed by law. >> Councilmember, if I could point out that there is a difference between the zoning that a park has and what's called dedicated parkland. Dedicated parkland is what you were referring to, if it were ever to be used for private use requires a vote of the people. That's a state law issue where the council designates as parkland zoning is a separate issue. We do have dedicated parkland zoned a variety of things and the law applies triggering an election. Some parks never received perform zoning, we've never had a park category before. I want to point out those are two different things. They are not directly related, but we're trying to fix it right now. >> Alter: And where do we track that it's dedicated parkland if it's not in its zoning category? >> That is something the parks department maintains a list of all the dedicated parkland. >> Alter: And that's

[10:43:23 AM]

something that your office -- I'm not understanding how you follow those -- >> We also have parkland, frankly, that's not dedicated parkland. That is used as parkland but never received that formal declaration from council that is dedicated parkland. So we have both, but we have been working with the parks department to identify all the parcels that they own and to make sure they receive the proper zoning through the remapping exercise. They are two different things. The zoning is one issue and the dedicated parkland is a separate issue and the two are not necessarily linked as far as the law is concerned. >> Alter: Okay. Thank you. >> Tovo: So one last quick question. I heard you talking about 5750 or Mr. Guernsey was. That's our existing standard lot size. The proposed draft I talked about a 5,000 square foot lot size. Where did you land in the revision? Are you continuing to propose that the standard lot size reduce to 5,000? The numbers you were giving for the Adu were track to go a 5750. >> I think we may have to come back and answer that because there's a a little bit of a discussion regarding that right now that we're having with the consultant. >> Tovo: I see. Okay. Thank you. Why don't we move on to our next presentation with Mr. Fregonese. We'll do the same thing we did in the first piece, we'll let him get through the presentation or get to some natural stopping places and then take questions. >> Thank you. And the purpose of this presentation is really to look at the impact the zoning would have on the capacity in Austin and to figure out what potential development could be there. I want to understand that we have a capacity is potential, potential is how much could be used. We're going to be talking about the forecast from your strategic housing plan and how it compares to basically

[10:45:25 AM]

existing zoning, draft 1 and draft 2. Draft 1 in the next presentations will drop off as that's yesterday's news, but you really want to compare existing zoning to the draft 2 since that's the project moving forward. I think we've gone through this before, but what we do when we do this is that we actually build a series of prototype buildings that we then use to calibrate the model. We basically -- rather than just put units on the ground, we have a prototype building and one or more buildings are used to populate each zone. So for the existing zoning code 1 and code 2 we have a series of buildings that are things you can actually check against the code and then mixtures of those buildings based on what's permitted in the code goes into each of those districts. That allows us to be able to look with more detail about what the impact is. We started with your existing code to try to understand and build a model of it in 2014 and 2015. Your current code has 31 districts, but with so many combining districts and overlays and so forth, there's about 400 individual categories. And we did model all that, put together a model of your existing code. We went through and constructed a buildable lands layer which really looked at what was buildable and vacant. Starting with built parcels, identifying vacant parcels, taking on environmental constraints which included flood Zones and steep slopes. Of course now the 100-year flood plain seems -- after hurricane Harvey so cautious, so under weaponing but we ended up with vacant and unconstrained land that went forward both into the analysis

[10:47:25 AM]

done then and the analysis we're doing now. What's different is how we are estimating redevelopment. In 2015 the city used a method of kind of looking at attractiveness and the ratio of build to go land value. We are -- this time we're actually doing a specific proforma approach where we apply and look at what's permitted in the code, what is financially feasible based on the assessed value of the property now. So about 5100 parcels that made the grade. So let me go through the -- the updated model that we had last month. We basically did this tipping point analysis where we went through and measured -- measured the feasibility of each for redevelopment of each parcel. We started by taking out what had been developed, so we looked at our 2014 vacant land. We looked at as of may 2017 what had been developed. About 3700 acres went out of the vacant land inventory in that period of time. We then -- we have information from the work that echo northwest did of the -- the rents in the different parts of Austin. So we built a rent model for Austin that looked at the different parts of the city and then we constructed basic rent Zones. So in each of these areas we have an average rent for various products. We then went through and the seven building types, everything from a single-family home to a main street mixed use, we went through every parcel in the city and we said basically what's the assessed value, how much does it cost for me to buy it, how much does it cost to build one of these seven

[10:49:27 AM]

buildings, actually build all seven on every property, and then is it feasible. So that was the test to go through and say this is the -- when you go to build something, when the market goes to build something, if costs are greater than revenues, it's not feasible. You know, no one is going to do that. If [inaudible] You've got a positive result. We're using this and as you change the zoning you change height, parking requirements, you change setbacks. It will affect the feasibility. So this kind of gave us a test of feasibility, and out of all these parcels we got about 5700 representing 2150 acres of land that were feasible to redevelop. Last month we came and actually were focused on the imagine Austin centers anchor doors, and in the reviews that we had were critiqued and essentially councilman Casar in your office you're saying you are really interested in the holes we had there and that's a really good point, we want to look at the whole city and especially western Austin. So we removed this mask and ran all the parcels in the city and to see what was feasible for development in that. So we updated the model to expand beyond centers anchor doors to look at the whole city. The centers anchor doors we used for the zoning but we looked at the other parcels. Allow mixed use on commercial property which the new code extended beyond the -- you didn't have that two tier, you didn't have the euclidian zoning. We limited the redevelopment ratio to one or more so the

[10:51:28 AM]

feedback we got from the development community was we like your process, but don't go below one because you are showing us stuff that isn't feasible for development now. Show us the stuff that's feasible for development. Then we had a lot of feedback that Robinson ranch, a fairly large capacity in vacant land would not be available for development in the next ten years and we should remove that from the inventory. At the end of the day, this is the vacant land. We've already taken out environmental constraints. We start with the vacant land and we took out what's developed since 2014. So this is accurate as of May 2017. We include all the puds, which is pretty substantial, about 30,000 units coming out of those puds except for Robinson ranch. Puds are about 55,000 units of capacity. When you take Robinson ranch out, it takes out about 24,000 units. So we left that off for this analysis. We then added all the redevelopment parcels that are greater than one. In other words, that are feasible. So 5700 parcels, 2500 acres. So what you're seeing there is kind of your capacity in the city. It's about 17,000 acres, 15,000 vacant, 2100 acres of redevelopment. In terms of councilor will Houston you were asking about whether it was coring, you can see the centers and the corridors, but you can see properties all over the city that are being lit up as being feasible for development. We applied, again, the new mixed use Zones which allowed in prior commercial only areas the potential for multi-family. And then we built -- we built -- we got the new zoning a week ago Friday and applied

[10:53:28 AM]

version 2 to this. And I should say these are draft versions we're going through quality control, but I'm pretty sure about these results. So we applied this new -- this latest version of buildable land to your existing zoning to code 1 and code 2. You can see there's about a two to one difference in terms of capacity between existing zoning. The bulk of it comes out of what quelled call missing middle and multi-family. That's where the new zoning districts have expanded opportunity. And in fact you are -- you have more capacity than you need for the next ten years. I would recommend removing that because a lot of that is redevelopment. It's a lot iffier that things like that would happen even if it's economically feasible, there's a person with a business there, they are perfectly happy and they will continue on even though we could sell their property. They are not in the real estate business, they are in whatever they are. Classically used car lots, even though they have very little value, they always show up at redevelopment. They tend to stay for a long time because that's a person's business and living. So -- but we do have basically a little bit extra, so just in terms of comparison of what is in terms of the mix, you'll notice if you take out the excess multi-family and cap it at 135, you've got an interesting comparison between the target and the codenext 2 in that you have a similar amount of multi-family, you have less single and large lot and small lot single-family, you have a lot more of the missing middle,

which is townhouse, duplex and cottage kind of construction. So what we see is that although your target market still wants single-family

[10:55:28 AM]

large and small lot, you don't have any room for it. If you look back at that, you only have 15,000 acres. It's not feasible on the redeveloped property. The puds are a large part of that. They are already kind of set. What this code north Texas 2 does is it -- codenext 2, it provides more of the missing middle, more of the higher density owner occupied townhouse, duplex, cottage home that gives people something in terms of the city that's like a home, but at a higher density and something that's more feasible for the amount of property you have left in your city limits. You could change this if you could annex some more vacant property, but the large lot single-family is going to be developed on vacant property and you don't have much left and your existing city limits don't have much left. In terms of redevelopment this is basically at scale. You are getting about 10,000 units of redevelopment as opposed to 7,000 under your current code. This is almost all multi-family and we want to look at where that's happening. We haven't applied the affordable multi-family but we are not targeting areas that are existing affordability and incentivizing that with the zoning. Again, we're providing, I think, the ownership-type options substituting somewhat for single-family with more missing middle, higher density ownership options. This is just the housing mix. You can see the housing mix with the raw and the -- then with the oversupply of multi-family taken out. Not too far off the target in the total. This is just the kinds of units you've got. Your existing zoning. Again, you'll see 28% is

[10:57:30 AM]

standard single-family, 56% is multi-family, 7% is town home, duplex or row house, cottage, missing middle. If we just skip to 2, you can see 60% multi-family. Not much different than your current zoning. The big difference is the shift in small and large lot single-family into the missing middle. And again, that's what gives you the capacity that you -- your target capacity, 135, is the ability to shift that kind of over. We checked new employment capacity and you do have about the same amount in codenext 1 and 2. A little bit less than your current zoning. It does keep your same jobs housing ratio about 1.2 so you are able -- there's room for economic development to occur even though you are allowing some growth on commercial lands, it is actually makes some of that stuff more feasible to redevelop to have a mixed use product go in, provides commercial on the ground floor increases some of the redevelopment there. This next one is looking at some early indicators. This is housing close to transit. This is total so you can see now that your -- you've got about -- let me read this here. You've got about 381,000 housing units in terms of being within a half mile of transit. Probably the best indicator here is the quarter mile

to a bus stop. This is just the change and you can see that codenext 2 gives you about 112,000 more units close to transit. Your current zoning does about 60,000 units. So that will move the needle on your vmt and your transit

[10:59:32 AM]

ridership and walkability. This is employment. You don't see as much of a difference between the different zoning schemes probably because a lot of your employment is the same in both, it's the downtown, it's the office parks and so forth where you have a lot of employment. So it didn't change that much employment close to transit. But you do have a substantial increase, about 120,000 more employees within a half mile of a transit stop and about 95,000 within a quarter mile. So what's left to do is we're going to be looking and pulling out of this. The housing costs that come out of market opportunities with both your current zoning and code 2 to see if there's a change in affordability. We haven't done an estimate of ads and that's somewhat not a capacity issue. Most Adu -Z are added to an existing unit so it's not a traditional redevelopment. We're going to be doing some tests for where does it make sense for a person to do that. I can tell you from my hometown of Portland we've had ads for 20 years. We had about 60 a year until last year the council went through and provided a lot of incentives, they reduced fees, they did whatever they could to increase it and last year alone we had 600 ads. So it depends somewhat on other policies other than zoning to have ads what that's going to be. We wanted to look as feasibility -- affordable units both by natural affordability, lot of affordable units and affordable units through the density bonus program.

[11:01:33 AM]

Again come in with more economic indicators, taxes and income and the other indicators which included transportation, impervious surface, things like that. That's where we are right now. >> Mayor Adler: A lot of information. Ms. Houston. >> Houston: Thank you, sir. This is a lot of information to try to absorb in one time, but -- and you don't have any numbers on your slides so where we're talking about housing capacity, updating buildable lands and then housing within a quarter mile, half mile and one mile of transit, did you do any correlation between where the buildable land is and where the transit options is? Where the buildable land is in my district there are no transit options. That needs to be coordinated so we see that linkage. You can have buildable land but there's no transit. The transit options are closer into downtown. But did you correlate that at all? >> Well, I think the zoning some of the opportunity; otherwise you wouldn't have had so much additional housing near transit. But the buildable lands is just a fact. We can't control it. It's either vacant or redevelopable. >> Houston: That's what I'm saying, if it's on the map it's vacant or redevelopment. Then you talk about all of this being

close to transit. >> Right. >> Houston: Where it's placed on this map is not accurate. Because there is no transit where I'm seeing if it's the green parcels, and, of course, it's very small and I'm squinting to see it, there's no transit in those areas so I'm not sure what you are

[11:03:33 AM]

looking at when you are making those assertions. So I need more information about that. >> Sure. I think it's because a lot of those units are pretty high density so you get a lot of units on small pieces of property that are close to transit. But we'll have -- we'll include a map of the transit and where the units are and give you better information in a couple of weeks. >> Houston: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: On the way that puds are included in this calculation, as I look at the map as we're zoomed out on it, some of these puds are already built out and some of them are not. Help me understand how that was used in the calculation. >> We've gone through and only included the capacity of the remaining puds that are -- that are left. So we have reviewed it with the city in terms of what's left in the existing puds to be built. >> Flannigan: So even if I see a pud highlighted that's fairly massive, I know Avery average which is in my district there's only one little egg isment left to be built. It's a large land area but there's not -- is that taken into account? >> Yes. We can double-check that, but -- >> Flannigan: Okay. >> Avery ranch didn't show up. Whisper valley, wild horse -- >> Flannigan: It's colored in on the map, but that's an important one just because it's pretty massive, but it's already built so I don't want that to get included inappropriately. Then on the transit chart I think as a suggestion instead of measuring one mile from a rail stop, it might make more sense to measure one mile from a park and ride. The functionally there's not a lot of people using the downtown stations to go north to work because once they get north there's no transit to get to work. So it's more the other direction and so one mile from a park and ride which would include two rail stations, Howard and lake line, but also

[11:05:35 AM]

pavilion park and ride and some other ones. That might be a more valid. >> If it's a park and ride and people are going by car, we could expand the area. The one mile is a 20-minute walk. >> Flannigan: Functionally that it is -- they are park and rides and express buses as well as rail that runs from those stations. So from an access to transit perspective that might be a better way to look the at it. >> Kitchen: I was going to say that's the current situation and I agree with you on that. But I wouldn't want to limit our analysis to only what's possible with the current -- you know, when you say reverse commute and that kind of stuff, I wouldn't want to limit that analysis to that because it's possible with land that's being built in the north area that could be -- I mean you could have people commuting to the north to work in the future. >> Flannigan: I would love to have that train full and not just in the one direction it is

now but in both directions. So maybe instead of changing the one you have maybe there's a fourth bar that's, you know, three miles from a park and ride that could show what that looks like. >> Kitchen: I hear what you are saying and wanting to see that, but I wouldn't want to limit it. >> Houston: And I want to follow up on something councilmember Flannigan said. You mentioned two of the puds, planned unit developments in district 1 where there is no transit, wild horse and whisper valley. Those are the kinds of concentrations there is no transit. I need to see how you computed that. >> Sure. We'll show you the transit lines and the housing that was included within that. And I don't believe we used any new transit lines. We just used existing routes. [Inaudible] >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter, then Mr. Casar. >> Alter: Thank you. I wanted to follow up on councilmember Flannigan's question about the puds and the capacity and what's in here. Can you provide us a list of all the puds and the remaining capacity and a

[11:07:37 AM]

designation by what district they fall? >> Yes. I have it right in front of me. >> Alter: And then how do we understand why Robinson ranch with a right to develop 24 how units is not going to be ready in the next ten years to develop it? 45-year development agreement with the city. When the patriarch pass a couple years ago, I think there are three or four principal heirs and maybe 13 others that are involved in making the decisions. And what kind of goes on in the property. Characteristically they have released small parcels that are along existing roadways, but they have not come forward to us with any plan to show any major redevelopment. They have the ability to do so. You could probably build a couple downtown Austins in the middle of Robinson ranch. Having the two rail lines cross mopac and the red line but I think there are family issues that deal with how the property is released through time. And we have not seen a great deal of land being released ensigns the agreement has been signed in the mid 2000s. >> Alter: So tell me again the total increased capacity that's coming from the puds. >> All the puds together is outside -- minus Robinson ranch is 34,000 units. >> Alter: That's constant across all the types. We basically said it's going to -- >> Right. That's constant through all the -- >> Alter: Is there a way to see since the puds constant across all of them. >> To put it on the bottom and just say -- >> Alter: I don't want to

[11:09:37 AM]

take away because I think it's useful to have the multi-family, the single-family, 0 charts that tell us this is the puds and this is constant across the three and this is the type of housing -- >> To show you where theness theness -- where the capacity, pud, residential zone, something like that. We'll be able to do that easily. >> Alter: Beyond these charts being small and it's understandable they are small and repeated over and over again, it is really hard to understand how this translates to capacity because a

lot of these puds are already at capacity and so if we're trying to see how this plays off -- plays out across geography, it's very difficult to see. And then I just -- I don't know if it's too late, but the multiple yellows that we have for our pie charts with, like, like with large lot estates and standard single-family homes and town homes are really difficult to distinguish on the charts because they are very close. I know they are meant to look -- >> In the same family. >> Alter: In the same family, but maybe some slightly starker differentiation would be helpful to help people or put next to colors so we can decipher it. That would be helpful. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: Thank you for the really thorough analysis. No surprise I'm happy to see how this impacts our citywide goals alongside all the specifics. I wanted some clarity on the -- since there's not page numbers here, the charts here where you've got the housing estimates. First on definition of terms by housing estimates, you

[11:11:38 AM]

don't mean zoned capacity, but you mean under your model in an economic forecast what percentage you think would be built out of these different housing types. >> Right. And exactly it's not a forecast, it's an estimate of capacity. Most of this comes from vacant land. A lot of it is vacant land. Again, there's 15,000 vacant acres in the model. The redevelopment tends to be at higher density, tends to be mixed use along the corridors. That's where a lot of the housing close to transit comes from. >> Casar: Wait, so -- say that one more time. So this is -- this is analysis of what the capacity is broken down, not a forecast what you think actually will -- >> The forecast supposedly is 135. The capacity is what could be built. If the vacant and redevelopment land built to an estimate of what your zoning permits. So you've got three zoning schemes, your current zone 1 and 2, and this shows you what would happen if that land resource was developed based on the existing zone -- on the proposed zoning. >> Casar: I'm trying to figure out with everybody here what the word is for what we think will happen. What we think will actually happen. What's the best word for that? >> I would say what we think will happen and my best estimate is this one here where you are not going to build all that multi-family because there's not the demand for it. But there's a demand for the other kinds of housing. And that's the 135 that is in your strategic housing plan. That's the closest we have to an estimate of what the demand is and what you'll actually do over the next ten years. And given the capacity of the zoning, if you have more capacity for a certain type of housing, more than market, it just will remain. It won't redevelop. Or it don't develop. >> Casar: Got it. So in this case, you know, I'm

[11:13:38 AM]

pleased to see that the proportion of missing middle and not really big steel multi-family or large lot -- small single-family is greater proportion under codenext 2 then under existing zoning or the codenext

scenario so I think that's a good thing. I'm interested in hearing either today or in a future presentation what code changes or map mapping changes occur that helped us drive to that point of having that you feel like were the most major changes that got us there. And councilmember kitchen, I thought maybe you said it's -- >> Kitchen: There's one thing I thought was that but I may be wrong so -- >> Casar: I would be -- because I think that would be really helpful to see what knobs turned, what things you changed that got us to the place where you have so much more of the -- more affordable and oftentimes more, you know, everyday family friendly housing type so I think that would be helpful. I don't know if you want to answer that now or if that's something for future. >> I think John could talk about where the zoning changes from. It's basically the r3, rm1, rm2, which is lower density kind of -- it's the lower -- we call it ground related in that you walk out the front door and you are on the ground floor, you are not in the building. But it's those kinds of Zones, the lower density multi-family Zones and the higher density single-family Zones that's providing the bulk of those units. So you're looking at in those zoning districts in terms of the missing middle you are looking at about 12,000, 13,000 units coming out of those new Zones. I don't think that was in the first draft exactly. >> Casar: Is it that we made

[11:15:39 AM]

it easier between codenext 1 and 2 to under the code to develop that missing middle under a code change or is it we are mapping more areas r3 or 4 or some combination of both or will we find out next week? >> We don't know yet but it's something that can be found out and can be reported. >> Casar: Okay. >> Kitchen: Could I follow up? >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Kitchen: What I was reacting to, councilmember Casar, it sounds like I wasn't thinking of the same thing you are. I was reacting to this page that talked about some of the changes, which said expanding beyond centers anchor doors and allowing mixed use on parcels. Did those changes contribute to what councilmember Casar was asking about in terms of more capacity I guess is the term? >> I don't know about the missing middle part. It did contribute to more capacity -- if you look at the raw capacity here, you've got a lot of multi-family. That's happening because we're developing primarily in the commercial only districts went to mixed use. And their capacity becomes mixed use. But it's farther out on north and south Lamar is beyond the loop. So you are out in those areas that are in the imagine Austin corridors, but before were limited to commercial only development. >> Kitchen: So maybe these two items contributed to the overall capacity, maybe not to the specific housing types that you were talking about. >> Casar: And I think part of the reason that would be helpful to understand is that anything that comes to this council and to planning commission, but definitely to council we tweak and it would be helpful to know what things

[11:17:39 AM]

we could tweak if we wanted to continue to -- if there's community desire for that missing middle -- between codenext 1 and 2 seems like the missing middle component grew and I would like to know what did that so we can figure out if we need to continue to do that work to keep it growing. I have a similar question around the transit -- around the transit numbers. It's good to see that that number went up between codenext 1 and codenext 2 and again it would be useful to know what sorts of changes happen between codenext 1 and 2 that got you that delta so that we can continue to -- so we can continue to turn those knobs in the direction that seem appropriate. And I also, while I appreciate knowing how much more housing units we would anticipate near transit, I think you put this in your work to do section, but I imagine 6,000 more people being half a mile from a bus stop of the 120,000 new folks doesn't seem to be that big of a change, but I'm sure there's good research that helps us understand what a higher number of people near transit actually means for vmt and means for ridership. And those numbers I think would be more meaningful for me at least and I think for community members not just to say, well, there's going to be 95,000 more people living with half a mile -- within a quarter mile of the bus stop. I think it would be more helpful to know if there's 95,000 people living that close to a bus stop, what does that mean for ridership so we can translate if ridership goes up that much does that mean we're going to have a more frequent line, does that mean that the transit authority will be able to change their fare structure. It's not that interesting for your common day person to know there's x10000 people living near a stop. >> This is an input into that model that gives us the walk,

[11:19:41 AM]

bike and transit differences between these and existing. So we'll have that. It takes a while to run, it takes several days and it's crunching away. In a couple weeks we'll have those results actually in vmt. But in terms of the knob you want to turn to make that, this is the knob to turn to make those numbers go up or down. So it's an important indicator to look at because that's your input into the model that gives you the vmt. And those are units. Those aren't people, those are units so -- >> Casar: So it's bigger. >> It's a big number that you are getting, another 120,000 units, 200,000 more people who could walk to transit if they wanted to. So that's -- that has a correlation to how much people ride transit. >> Casar: That would be really helpful because, you know, we hear all the time from the -- from cap metro how we have lots of jobs near transit but not that much housing near transit and really being able to translate what changes we're making here to how that could affect the transit system is important and, of course, in a climate change conscious community like ours. I'm really still -- really anxious to see the affordability analysis work. We've been talking about that a lot at almost every session. Especially how many new income restricted units we could get and what the calculation is on market rate affordable units lost by gentrification because you guys did a really good job on codenext draft 1 to show those shifts between the status quo and codenext and the improvements we've seen a missing middle and transit. I hope we get similar improvements on that metric but if not we need to work to

[11:21:42 AM]

get that up to. >> One of the nice things about having this lump of multi-family capacity, a lot of the stuff that is pushing into the 10,000 units of probably affordable is some of the multi-family. You've got more than you need I would say and you can turn that dial down. It may be possible to do that, that you can look at some areas and maybe not zone them so that redevelopment is incentivized. If we can bring down that redevelopment percentage to less than one, then there's no incentive to redevelop, we might be able to do what we can to sustain affordable units. >> Casar: Getting some of that large scale multi-family there's just existing commercial uses or get those used car salesmen to finally sell, that would be much better than replacing mf with mf. So -- and if we can get the units through whatever it is we did to get the missing middle number up, we're starting to hit the goals I think are really shared by lots of folks on the dais, so thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Thanks. I want to talk a little about the numbers for a minute. I thought the number last time was around 3790 for t3 and t4. I'm seeing -- I'm not completely seeing it mapping. Mapping to this. But in any case, I think I'll leave that for now, but what I did want to -- I did want to ask you I think when we had a similar conversation back in April with the mapping, we had asked, several of us asked at that time for information about where these new units were being achieved, by council district but also by air. At the time you had said you had that information, were going to get it to us. It was one of the first questions I submitted a month later in may, but we have yet to get that information.

[11:23:42 AM]

I understand the code -- I mean the names of those zoning districts have changed, but I really believe it's important, I remember councilmember Houston asking a question about it, councilmember kitchen, I did. As we look at those new units and especially those that are redeveloping, I think it's really critical that we see where your forecasting that will be by area. So that we have a very clear picture of where we're anticipating seeing redevelopment in our neighborhood. >> We have a draft. We just need to have the staff review it for quality and have it for you in a couple weeks. We can do it by council district. We can do it by any polygon. If we want to do it by council district we'll be glad to do that as well. >> I know what we asked for was council district, then when I submitted the question in may, I asked for it also tweaked by some other things, by correspondence with under enrolled schools as they've been identified by aid for possible closure, historic preservation districts, other metrics especially given analysis of the redevelopment rates for a category like t4 and whatever it becomes in the new configuration, r4, I guess. I think it's really critical we understand where that redevelopment is projected to happen based on some of those other variable -- I mean other geographic locales. The other question I asked as part of that that I'm keenly interested in is how these projects compare to the capacity study

the city did. As I look at -- at your numbers, the existing zoning under the existing zoning we can expect about 7,000 units, under codenext 2 we can expect about 10,000 units. You know, as I look back at the capacity zoning analysis that was done by the city, I think in 2012, maybe it was updated later, I'm not sure,

[11:25:43 AM]

Bolden creek was forecast to have an additional with the existing zoning an additional almost 1500. Allendale was projected to have the capacity and the current zoning to do an additional 2500. So I think, you know, especially if you are mapping zoning changes to areas that according to this capacity analysis already had the zoning to accommodate, you know, almost -- I mean in the case of Bouldin creek, 50% more units in their area, we really need to understand -- understand how these different capacities and analyses seem to be driving it. Based on my read the existing zoning results in more units than you are projecting with codenext 2. Again, those are questions -- maybe different methodology, I'm not sure what the different there, but those are questions I submitted back in may under the old nomenclature, but I think the questions carry over as relevant to now. And then I have another question will lot size, but it looks like -- >> If you look at the capacity is 91,000. The capacity we did was 130s, 140s. But it was a more liberal estimate of -- first of all there's 3700 more acres of vacant land. There's more liberal estimate of redevelopment it wasn't as accurate as this and it included Robinson large at 34,000 some-odd unit and that make up some of the difference between that number and this one. If I know what that capacity estimate was and I think the one that was done in 2013 -- >> Tovo: I believe I'm looking at the one that Paul franks did. >> Yes, 2013, I have that. >> Tovo: I would appreciate understanding the divergences there. I'm also seeing 110,000 units for the pud numbers compared to the 55,000, I think that's right.

[11:27:43 AM]

That too I think -- I know that councilmember alter I believe asked you for the names of the puds. Some of them may have already developed and that's why it's not included in your figure. Dwelling units I'm seeing total 110,881, that includes Robinson ranch, but it's still significantly different than what you're saying. >> What we have for remaining capacity is 35,000 plus the 24,000 we're down to 60,000 or so for puds, including Robinson ranch. >> Tovo: It's almost 111,000 with Robinson ranch. >> The Paul frank analysis? >> Tovo: Yes. And we look at the project names and that may help us understand. But I'm thinking it's still divergent enough by 50,000 units that not all of those projects are online and accounted for. The capacity analysis that you did initially earlier last spring and then you came back and did some reconfiguring and some other things, can somebody tell me where those are online? I'm having difficulty

finding those. Mr. Rusthoven? They were on the codenext site and I had asked they all be on the codenext site, all the different iterations. And assistant city manager Lumbreras said they would be with explanations of how the methodology had changed but I'm now not able to find any. >> The methodology. >> Tovo: The envision tomorrow analysis? Can you remind me where those are on the codenext site? >> Can you give me one second >> Tovo: Sure. You talked about the 10,000, moving to a 10,000 square foot lot

[11:29:43 AM]

size. And I think we had kind of a vigorous discussion on that day about whether that was an appropriate shift. So I wonder if we could just look at that page. Well, I don't know what page it is actually. The one that talks about what you remove, stable single, develop parcels under 10,000 square feet. I think this has -- you know, at the time several councilmembers raised questions about it, and you had said you would go back and think about it. And I will say that in the time since lots of community members have raised this point as well. I mean, what we see in the urban core is the redevelopment of tracts that are less than 10,000 square feet all the time. So I'm not understanding why those parcels would be removed for reconsideration. I think there's an extremely good argument based on what we're currently seeing, but also the entitlements on tracts with smaller lot size will -- your first analysis showed that it would have a redevelopment rate. >> We were removing those from R 1 and R 2. And we'll go back in and do a look at that. We found is even the ones over 10,000 square feet, the large parcels are often parcels that extend into open space. You can't resubdivide them. There's reasons why they're large. So we wanted to do that as a separate analysis. We basically redevelopment starts at R 3 and up. If R 1 and R 2 are primarily there just for vacant land and not development. >> Tovo: I see. So with R 3 and R 4, are you factoring in lots less than 10,000 square feet? >> Yes.

[11:31:44 AM]

We factor all the properties that have development potential and that we're using the economic test on those. >> Tovo: Okay. So the R 3 and R 4 are not being excluded if they're beyond 10,000 square feet? >> That's right. >> Tovo: So that is a shift as I remember from your last envision tomorrow analysis. >> Term taking all the single-family out and now R 3 and up we're doing redevelopment there. >> Tovo: Thank you. That is a really important clarification. Can you help me understand how you define stable single-family either in that category or in other categories? >> We're using the new zoning districts and the R 1 and R 2 districts are the ones that we -- they cover a lot of land and they don't have a lot of -- a lot of it is developed. There's not a lot of new capacity there. So we are wanting to look at that separately and do a test on whether it makes sense to tear down a building and add a new one with that redevelopment

under the code. But we haven't done that yet. We didn't feel that it made sense to do the economic analysis for small lots in the R 1 or R 2 when you talk about one or two units. The only thing you can do there is resubdivide. And we did a run and tried to find the big properties that you could resubdivide in R 1 and R 2, and when you actually look at the configuration of those -- configuration of those lots, they may be big, but there's something odd about them. They're extending into a big wooded area so they might have in an R 1 zoning might have 20,000 square feet, but it's clear that it's part of the subdivision, they were getting part of an open space as part of their lot. So it's not resubdividable or it's such a configuration when you look at it there's no way that you could get street frontage to create more lots. So we put that aside for now to look at it and we'll have something more for the R 1 and R 2 in a couple of weeks.

[11:33:45 AM]

But for now we do have redevelopment in the R 3 and up. And we can tell you it looks like there's -- in terms of the units that will be affected, about 858 units in those Zones that are -- did become feasible for redevelopment. >> Tovo: So with regard to the R 1 and 2, and I have to think through this a little bit. I'm curious about how the design site -- the design siteability factors into the R 1 and 2. Before we move too much beyond the conversation we just had, so stable single-family is defined as R 1 and R 2. Is it also -- >> Yeah. >> Tovo: Is that a category -- is that a mode or description you used for R 3 and R 4? >> The ones that are the development feasibility is less than 1 are also stable so because they're not already redevelopable because it's not economically feasible to redevelop. But most of the R 3's and 4's my guess are fully developed rather than vacant land. >> We are showing some R 3 C, we're showing some stuff that's pretty clearly on vacant land. So there is some stuff that's showing up as vacant. Just in the R 3 C. >> Tovo: So R 3 C was something mapped to vacant land? >> I don't know about primarily, but there's Val Verde county land there. There's about 390 acres of vacant land in R 3 C. >> All right, thanks.

[11:35:47 AM]

>> When the maps come out it will be clearer where all that happens. >> >> Tovo: I guess I'm really trying to understand the stable single-family and how it's factoring into your -- it's not clear to me whether that's a description you're using to describe -- it seems to me a stable single-family is to some extent a product of the proposal as well as what you're seeing on the ground. >> In other words, the zoning is making it stable or the analysis is calling it stable when it's not necessarily. >> Tovo: I'm not sure. That's what I'm trying to get at, whether you're calling it stable and that guides the choices or it's just not clear to me yet how that term is factoring into the presentation. >> Everything from R 3 up was applied -- had the same economic test applied. We did take R 1 and R 2 out of that economic test and

wanted to look at it separately because it's quite different than the other Zones in terms of redevelopment, feasibility. When we did look at it, it looked like there were a lot of other factors coming into why -- what would make something develop or not. >> Tovo: I know one of the terms that comes up in this process is kind of market feasibility and how that guided some of the choices with regard to mapping or market desirability I think might have been the term. To what extent is that still a component in your -- in some of the application of different Zones, zoning classifications. I guess is that what makes something feasible when we're talking about feasible we're really talking about its -- are we talking about market disability? >> Yes, I would say that's one of the factors that we use when making the mapping decisions? >> Tovo: So has that continued into the next round of drafts, the market feasibility is still guiding the zoning zone choices? >> Yes. >> Tovo: Well, let me register my concern that we're still making

[11:37:48 AM]

mapping suggestions based on where the real estate community wants to build rather than on our imagine plan which clearly guided that in certain ways. We'll see more I think when the map comes out, but as I've said a couple of times in this setting and others, I can recall the -- I don't recall the council ever providing direction that said we're going to adopt a code that changes the zonings in areas that are profitable to build. >> And I do think, councilmember, real quick, that is also a two-way street. There's been some push from some people to increase the zoning in some of the outlying areas as an attempt to try to lure development to that area. And we've heard from our consultants that that would equally be an unwise decision because the zoning by itself does not drive the market. Market forces drive the market. So we have not applied zoning in some instances because the market feasibility and therefore apply to a lower district as opposed to a higher district. >> Tovo: I understand, but that wasn't really what imagine Austin and our growth concept map directed. Anyway, thanks. >> Mayor Adler: It's 20 till and we still haven't gotten to the first two things for the map rescission so we can go through the process and the timeline for community outreach for second drafts. So we probably want to narrow it down. >> Mayor, if I could answer mayor pro tem's answer real quick on where to find the vision tomorrow stuff. You can go to the about tab on the top, it will take you to the next page and you can click on the question I want to learn more about codenext and it will take you to the same place. >> Tovo: I appreciate it. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: I think with respect to market feasibility I hear a lot as I go out into communities and I hear that described lots of different ways. So I need to better understand that component as it guides

[11:39:49 AM]

things here. I've heard it described in some places as putting things where developers want to build and being responsive to that. I've also heard it being responsive in where people want to live and making sure that people have opportunity to be able to live where they want to live. So at some point the criteria for how you place zoning classifications, why you put this element, some statement on planning as to what were the planning principles would be helpful and if there's a difference between putting something where the development community would want to build and versus where it is that we want to live in our city and trying to be responsive to that, if there's a difference between the difference of relationship between those two would be a helpful thing for the community to understand. Ms. Garza? >> Garza: I just had some quick clarification questions. For example, the transit employment. Because these numbers add up to more than what our population is. So I'm trying to understand -- what is the transit? >> These are jobs that are coordinated with the quarter mile, half mile or one mile of a rail stop. So in the case right now there's 426,000 jobs and the next one is just the delta is the change from now to the future based on existing -- existing code, code 1 or code 2.

[11:41:55 AM]

It's again a quarter mile, half mile and one mile of a transit stop. So they may not live in Austin, they may be coming from outside. It's just where the jobs are relative to the train stops. >> Garza: Still a confusing number because even if that includes people that don't live here, our population includes people that can't work, 16 and under, we have a huge young population that wouldn't even be it seems high. >> It's not just people, it's jobs, it's employment. So we're using the employment numbers that are in the capco model showing where existing payroll is. >> Garza: So the other one is the housing. I have the same question. So is that saying that the second draft will provide housing with -- okay. Those numbers just seem really high. >> Well, this is transit housing. Right now there's 252,000 housing units. So roughly half a million, 550,000 people currently live within a quarter mile of a bus stop. >> Garza: So what was the projection on when these numbers are realized? The codenext draft 2? >> That is after 10 years and you hit the 135,000 target market and they build according to the zoning permissions that are in draft 2. That's when that would hit. >> Okay. And I think everybody has touched on this, but I would be curious to know if where we're seeing any additional housing, mayor pro tem hit on it. Where is that additional housing. And it looks like I saw a number, it looks like 10,000 would be attributed to redevelopment so then it sounds like the

[11:43:55 AM]

remainder would be vacant land and the majority of our vacant land is on the outskirts of the city so I would like to see some information on what more are we going to be able to build that is within a

certain distance to grocery stores and our rapid transit? >> So this is probably for today, this is the best thing to show you is the transit map. But we can do that. The '10 thousand unit in there is the number of existing housing units that would be lost to redevelopment. They would be replaced. The units of redevelopment is more than half. It's about -- I can get you that number. It's about 60% of new units are from redevelopment even though it's on a small portion of land. And that is distributed throughout the city and along corridors and so forth, but I'll be glad to get you that information in a couple of weeks. >> Garza: So the units that are partially redeveloped, that's saying that 10,000 -- that's 10,000 single-family homes that would be redeveloped to like a four-plex? >> No, there's properties -- these are properties that are feasible to redevelop. Most of those are old apartments that would be torn down and redeveloped. >> Garza: Okay. And the last question is the different charts that show, you know, how much more multi-family versus -- I guess I'm having trouble putting these two together because this one it looks like it says one percent of the large family lots goes to zero percent under draft 2, but the allotment here doesn't seem to go to zero%. So is that because this gray also includes -- the descriptions don't line up. >> They don't. They're separate things. These are building types

[11:45:56 AM]

and the other one is more of a general category. This is really -- we did this to see how many people are living in the towers versus in the mid-rise versus in the single-family. So what happens is large lot estate homes does go to zero so the large lot goes to zero. There are standard single-family that are in the large single-family category in the other one. So there are two separate configurations. One divides all the building into four types. This has six types. What we were focusing on here was frankly an issue that council person Casar raised, how much of this is towers, how much of it is missing middle. So that's why we pulled out that analysis. >> Garza: In my opinion its proximity to transit and services and health clinics. It's not close to grocery stores, not close to bus stations and I don't think that's where we should be building. >> We'll have more on that in a couple of weeks. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen? You had. >> Kitchen: On the transit, connections 2025 is the part for transit so I don't know if you had access to that when you made the comparisons on transit to housing? >> Probably not. Because they don't have stops. >> Kitchen: You're right, they don't have stops. >> We can create some stops and generate this situation based on the new transit system. >> If you think there's enough data to do that that would be helpful. >> We've done that before where you had a new line and you put stops out every quarter mile and see what happens. >> Kitchen: Okay. And the last question is

[11:47:56 AM]

at the end of the day -- first off, this is really very interesting in-depth information for us. At the end of the day the mapping and stuff, will that be available online so that way we can look at it a little closer? >> Sure, of course. >> Mayor Adler: Last three and then we'll go on to councilmember alter, Ms. Houston and go on. >> Alter: Thank you. So I just want to clarify. What we're having in here in terms of maps is not the map of the new zoning, it's just maps of parcels that you considered in your analysis as you walk through each step of the way so we look at one of these final maps and it talks about the numbers, it's not actually telling us where the changes are going to be. It's just the picture that's going along with the slide, is that correct? So if someone was out in the public and they're trying to understand where is the man, where is the map? We don't have that map as of today? >> We don't have the new zoning map. The new zoning map will come out in the zoning text next week. >> Alter: But what we have is something that simply tells us what the vacant land is, where the [indiscernible] Are and a few feasible parcels. >> We amplified a new -- we applied a new draft zoning map to this. And when they made changes this is informing the zoning map, among other things when they update that we'll do it again and our analysis will be available at the same time -- well, a few days after the zoning map comes out to show what the capacity estimate is. >> Alter: There's a lot of things that people are trying to track. There are a lot of changes from the first draft and I want people to understand that we don't have a map of what this is going to be and it's some of the pieces that went into the analysis and it's not going to correspond to where necessarily that additional capacity is.

[11:49:57 AM]

>> But the next time it will be based on the draft map and it will come out. The numbers will probably be more real to those folks that are trying to figure out how many units of where, what type? >> And then I wanted to go back to mayor pro tem's questions which were really interesting but I'm not sure that I'm following them fully. So on our slides you said you excluded parcels that were less than or equal to 10,000 square feet. And that means that they were not part of these -- I'm just trying to understand. So R 1 and R 2, I have a lot of lots that are less than 10,000 square feet so this analysis doesn't include capacity rf 3, but not R 1 and R 2. >> If they were not in the vacant land inventory. So vacant land is always included. But if it's not a vacant parcel in R 1 and rt it's less than 10,000 square feet. So it's R 1 and rt, less than 10,000 square feet and has a unit in it, then it was not included in the redevelopment analysis. >> Alter: So all the houses -- the numbers that we have for redevelop are underestimated because they don't include any redevelopment that might happen under existing or under draft 2 for the future? >> I think there's a clarification here for -- because the way the analysis was done here, how many net new units are you getting. If one looks at -- if you can only replace it with one unit it doesn't help us with the calculations of capacity because you're not actually gaining any new units. So for this purposes of the capacity analysis,

[11:51:57 AM]

they weren't included. I believe in the next steps there is that desire to study, okay, what's happening in R 1, R 2, R 3 for how many houses might redevelop, which I think is the question you're asking. So for the capacity standpoint we didn't include it because you don't actually gain any units. >> Alter: But from a policy perspective part of our concern is how many people will be displaced by the incentives that were created? >> In the R 1 and R 2? >> Anywhere. >> Alter: Railroad 1 and R -- R 1 and R 2 don't mean anything to me yet. >> R 1 and R 2 -- I think the key is that we do recognize one of our next steps is to do the redevelopment analysis which is different than the capacity analysis because they're not the same. >> Alter: But then under our pre[unintelligible] Count that were less than 10,000 with respect to the redevelopment. Only if you can increase units if there was no increase in unit, but it might be redevelop that wasn't captured in this analysis. >> We were looking at the feasibility of buying the property and redeveloping it by adding units, yes, by replacing the existing -- whatever the value was of that, whatever is there now, the value is low enough to purchase it and replace it. Almost always you're getting a multiple of extra units out of that in the analysis. So we know that from the last analysis you had 2600 demolitions from 2010 and about 2100 of those were one to one replacements. That's hard -- that's not really a zoning -- in current case it's not a zoning issue, it's a market issue where you've got probably properties that are in

[11:53:58 AM]

the marketplace a new house would bring you a million dollars and the homes are selling for two or three hundred thousand. People buy the house as if they were buying a vacant lot, tear the house down and build another house. That's a really strong market issue rather than zoning capabilities. To what they can do in those cases you increase the likelihood that someone is going to do that. And you change the market feasibility not for the developers to buy it and redevelop, but for people to make the calculations about whether they can stay in their homes. >> So we're going to do that. In the R 1 and R 2 what's the tipping point that you could buy it for to tear it down and replace it with a building with an Adu, getting rent from the Adu. And we're going to -- we thought it was better given our early efforts to analyze it were not successful in railroad 1 and R 2. R 3 seemed to make more sense. >> Alter: So for today we're seeing the capacity analysis that is capturing when the number of units would change. You will in the future provide us with a redevelopment analysis that will help us understand where it's like lick that we see redevelop possibly replacing one for one. >> Yes. Where you have a capacity -- where the potential is for redevelop in the city. As best we can we'll make our best efforts to estimate that. It's much more difficult to do than estimating capacity on vacant land which is fairly straightforward. We'll take a crack at that and give you our analysis next time. >> Alter: Then as we move forward and we think about this process and people have questions, will they be able to comment in the way they were in the first round?

[11:55:58 AM]

And when the map come out along with the text? >> The map and text will both be released at the same time. And the common tools that have been in place will continue to be in place. So being able to comment throughout the text and being able to use the map tool to comment on the map as well. >> Alter: Will that hold for both draft 2 and draft 3? >> The intent is both of those tools will be used through the entirety of this process. So it will continue to be offered. >> Alter: Great, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Thank you again for all that information. It's been a lot. We're talking about capacity in the estimates of Austin. We're not talking about capacity to the region. I just want to be clear. >> It's in your 180,000 acres or so that are within the city limits? >> Houston: Because sometimes we talk about regional capacity and I want to be clear that this is inside the city limits. And then my other statement is about we've talked about where developers want to live, where people want to live, but we've never talked about where people want to work. And that's a piece that's missing. They work downtown. We have not been very successful in getting people to be -- have jobs where they live and where developers want to build. So what we're creating is a part of Austin where we have a lot of residential and nothing else. And that's what I think we need to be careful about, how we plan our city is that you need to have all components. You have to have where developers want to build, where people want to live, where there are jobs for the people. As councilmember Garza said, where there are other amenities like hospitals and health care and food. So we've missed that part about where people work. There's none that is happening. So it's going to be a

[11:57:59 AM]

disconnect. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar? And then we'll move on to the process question. >> I want to address a little bit what Ora said. I think looking at the corridors is where we've made a decision to where we want to grow and live in the future. So those jobs, housing, having those areas -- R areas for the future are now that are being developed that could have those components. >> Houston: And since I was part of imagine Austin I know where those are, but they're not developing at the rate that the housing is developing. So what we will have is a lot of residential folks and people still coming into downtown to work and that's going to increase the congestion. >> And that's the 2039 plan so it is a long range plan. As time passes and population increases you will see some of those other centers develop. Maybe not as quick as some that are closer in, but they'll develop. >> Houston: And Mr. Guernsey, our elderly population is also growing and I won't live to 2043. So I'm saying this now because you hear it now and whoever is on this council in the future hears it, we're doing a disservice by just placing residential now and not focusing on the other. >> Mayor Adler: Did you have something? Mr. Casar? >> Casar: I think having the housing where it's going to be by district and mapped out is very useful and in relation to transit and the numbers is really helpful and understanding how much of that in particular is a moderate high opportunity areas is also in line with the -- how much of that is a moderate

to high opportunity areas I think is also in line with the fair housing analysis that we wanted for the maps. And in particular one concern I had with the last draft, the housing

[11:59:59 AM]

drafts that we had an income restricted unit it seemed like a lot of that was mapped outside of some of the higher opportunity areas because of where we mapped the missing middle housing types that were allowed to have that income-restricted unit in them. So I think for us to really hit our goal of having an economically integrated city, I think it's critical for us to look at -- giving people a chance to live in high opportunity areas and having those income restricted units there. So I just want to mark that alongside the list of requests that I'm equally interested in that my colleagues brought up. As far as the market feasibility question, I haven't -- some folks have articulated an opinion on that issue, but mine is kind of different so I just wanted to float it, which is that I'm not interested in and I think the majority of us aren't interested in just mapping things exactly to where the market is going to go. That would really just eliminate a lot of our job here as far as planning goes, but I don't sense that that is what is happening right now because you and I just had a conversation, for example, about not increasing the zoning capacity of some low income apartment complexes because we know that the market really wants to redevelop that. So I think what I'm interested in and what I'm hearing that we're having a debate about is being market informed, I don't want to be -- I don't want to not think that anything that I zone is just going to happen. I need to know generally what real estate capital wants to do so that I know whether to resist that by regulating it or allow it to act in a particular way. So I appreciate that you have a team of trained economists and people can help tell me what's going on out there so that it can be shaped. So I would just say that I really appreciate having some knowledge about it, knowing that I'm not going to map exactly to it, but map knowing that it exists. We all can feel how much

[12:02:00 PM]

it exists. So I appreciate that. And I want to reiterate councilmember Garza's point we're figuring out how it is that we reduce that one to one replacements and create opportunities for that to be smaller sf and missing middle as opposed to large single-family, whether it falls -- whichever category that means. I think it's something that consistently basically unanimously I've heard around the dais is something that we're interested in continuing to work on, to not get that one to one replacement of small single-family house being replaced by huge one, but instead if it's going to be replaced because the market is out there doing this work how do we get something different. Can you tell me again what the number was of one to one replacements over what time period? You mentioned it to councilmember alter, but I missed it. >> I'm going by memory, but there were 2600 lost units through demolition and 2100 were

one to one replacements of single-family. >> I think it was 2010 to 2016, but I'll have to double-check. It was in a presentation we gave to you last time we were before you. >> Casar: Thank you. That's really helpful. >> It's probably in the file somewhere. That was one of the slides. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's go on to process sessions now. It's after noon. Do you want to talk to us about those issues? >> I believe that mayor pro tem was wanting us to talk about how we're handling the map provisions, is that correct? >> Mayor Adler: Two different process questions, I think. One of them was -- >> The process for map revision and process and timeline for community and commission outreach for the second draft. So with regard to the map revisions, since we released the draft map in April, we've of course had numerous work sessions with board and commissions such as the environmental board, the CDC, the planning commission, the zap. We've had numerous work

[12:04:00 PM]

sessions with the city council. We've had meetings with neighborhood associations and groups such as ANC, reca. Tonight we're going to preservation Austin. We've received position papers from many groups outlining their concerns about both the text and the map. We've held an open house in every city council district to focus on the maps as well as the previous meeting on the text. And we've received about 2500 comments through our online mapping tool where people can comment on specific tracts of land and what the proposed zoning for that was. So since then of course we have gone through a major change in the -- >> Jerry? We also had the code -- the cag, so when we worked with the cag they did individual outreach. They had meetings that invited other boards and commissions to meet and they hosted and took input in but they had several meetings throughout all that same time period and going back several years actually. >> Since then we've of course gone through the major change of the zoning structure which John spoke of earlier. What we've had is we've been going through and considering all the input that I just named previously and remapping. We have a team of people from the codenext team on our office focusing on the text and a portion focusing on the map. The folks that are working on the map have been doing some simple changes where it was pretty obvious that you took a category that was proposed in draft 1 and it's translating into something in draft 2. Other ones because the actual zoning categories are changing required more thought. When the staff is going through those whenever they have a question we've been having meetings at least twice a week, sometimes three times a week, where the mapping staff had been working with Mr. Guernsey and myself or the two of us plus the consulting team to look at specific instances where they feel that they need

[12:06:00 PM]

further guidance on what too do. Sometimes that's a specific area, for example, what do we do in this particular neighborhood with this particular situation. Other times we discuss it more in terms of generalities like in this type of situation what should we do? So there has been work from a dedicated section of our team as well as guidance from the team. >> Mayor Adler: Any questions or comments on this? Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: Just a couple of quick ones. One I submitted through the Q and a, but I'll ask it here. From information that community members have gotten, that in cases where the existing zoning is quite different from the proposed zoning that the staff are actually recording those comments and the rationale somewhere. And I had asked you kind of where that is and if we can get access to it. >> Let me speak to the staff some more to see what kind of thought processes they've been doing. We don't have an explanation for every parcel obviously, but I think we could address broader issues about types of situations. >> Tovo: In this case it was a community member through a public information request actually got some very specific information back about why certain properties had been mapped to in this case from a T 4 to an sf 3. So there was documentation in your presentation about why that shift happened. >> Right. The staff, as we go through these meetings, have been taking notes and putting together kind after spreadsheet that said in this type of situation this is what we're going to do. >> That was actually the information I was requesting. That's helpful. And can you give us some sense of -- I know you got tons of feedback and I guess how are you balancing it? I know you got lots of feedback because I got

[12:08:01 PM]

copied on, I don't know, 150 emails, maybe more, saying, you know, our adopted neighborhood plan looks like this. The staff mapped it this way. To what extent has there been an attempt to get your neighborhood planning, the staff that have worked on neighborhood plans back in to get input or historic preservation officers back in to the conversation or into the conversation for the first time to analyze some of those mapping changes and could you address the neighborhood plan question? >> Sure. We've been using almost the entirety of the staff to varying degrees in this exercise. For example, the past couple of days we were talking about the north creek shore neighborhood. It's got a plan in process, but not. [Indiscernible]. We consult with the neighborhood planning staff when we had questions about past neighborhood plans. Sometimes we talk to the staff who work on that specific plan. We've been doing that recently in the south congress combined plan. And you know, tonight we're going with the historic planning staff to the preservation Austin group. So it's been everybody at the office to varying degrees. >> Tovo: Okay. And this is my very last question. Was there an effort in those areas where you were getting lots of feedback that the mapping diverged from the neighborhood plan? Was there an effort to bring it more closely into alignment? >> Yes. I think that as you said we've heard from a variety of different people. We've had a great volume of information from a variety of people. I think when you see the map come out late next week and early the week after when we present it to you, you will see that we have listened to what people had to say and there were some changes. Some

people will not like all the changes. Some people will feel that we went too far one way or the other. Some people felt that --

[12:10:11 PM]

we put out a map that we felt was appropriate at first and then we had a lot of feedback over the past, whatever it's been, six, seven months, so it's been our job to consider that input and make whatever changes we feel are appropriate. I'm not anticipating everyone will be happy, but we're trying to get there. >> Tovo: Thank you. >> And I think a lot of the concerns were about residential properties. I think the commercial properties were mapped very carefully and matched the plans that had been adopted neighborhood plans or others. So I think we heard more from individual property owners than on the single-family homes more than we did other groups that have come out. >> I'll touch briefly on the second point, which is what the process and timeline is moving forward with the second draft. So we anticipate releasing that draft on the 15th, which is not this Friday, but next. We'll be before a combined meeting of the planning commission, the zap, on September 19th. We'll be here the next day, September 20th, before the city council, to give you your presentation on draft 2. And from there we plan on having a series of open houses. We plan on having five open houses at various places throughout the city and then one additional meeting in Spanish. I do have tentative dates for those meetings, however we are still working on securing facilities for those meetings. Quite a few of them are probably going to be in schools again and with school in session it's a little bit more different to land those, but we're looking at -- if you don't hold me to the dates, starting the first one at about September 30th and having a couple more the first week of October and then moving onward through October. And having the last of them on it's looking like Halloween will probably be the last date. So the whole month of the end of September and the whole month of October will be having community open houses. We'll be having work

[12:12:11 PM]

sessions with the planning commission, zap. We will be of course coming before you one more time in September, and we'll also be meeting with the environmental board and the historic landmark commission as per the direction in the resolution that the council passed earlier. We do anticipate coming out with draft 3, which would be the revision to draft 2 based upon all the input that I just mentioned' November 28th was our anticipated release date for draft 3. We will take draft 3 to the various commissions in about the middle of December, looking like December 12th and December 19th. We are hoping to have the final action from both commissions by January 11th, which was the date that was mentioned in the council resolution from earlier. And we plan on having an annotated version of

draft 3, which would include all the comments from the planning commission and the zap out on January 26th. And as per the council resolution we plan to meet before the city council with the first reading of draft 3 on February 8th. So that is the schedule moving forward. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: Just quickly, I'm not sure if I heard you. On the south Austin combined neighborhood plan, will that be reflected in this map that's coming out? >> Yes. We did hear when we had the meeting in district we heard from some folks in that area that felt that the draft map was deficient in some areas with regard to the plan. So we're working on that. >> Kitchen: Then I will reach out to you. I would like to meet with you and go over that before the 15th, just a quick meeting. I know you have a lot on -- >> We were still working on it yesterday. >> Kitchen: I'd like to see it before it goes out there on the 15th. And then the last point is just I think you got to this, but just some feedback. I think that one of the pieces of feedback that we got was how difficult

[12:14:11 PM]

it was for folks to understand the zoning codes. Now, these are obviously much more simplified and we appreciate that. But I'm wondering if there is some kind of very easy tool that will be available on the website at the same time you put this out on the 15th. I think some of the frustration people had is they had to go back and try to figure out what each zone meant. So if there's something that is a pretty easy tool that can be put out there at the same time that you release the second draft, like a one pager or something like that. >> Councilmember, we are preparing new I guess promotional materials for lack of a better word, information packets similar to what we did last time. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> And I also feel we've been focusing a lot on the mapping and housing today, but I also feel that when you see the text you will find that we have a better -- we've had a lot of input into the way it's laid out and I think it will be more intuitive to people on how to find the information that they need than the first draft was. >> Kitchen: The other thing they might consider and we can talk about this later and think about whether it makes sense is the other suggestion that we received was some kind of workshop specifically focused in detail on the zoning. So not the -- not the neighborhood or district open houses, but really a workshop for those people that want to really dig into the details so that they can go and they can have the questions and you just go -- go through the zone specifically. I think that that -- most people are not going to be diving in in that level of depth, but our most involved people are, and they have a level of expertise and experience that they need that kind of -- they need that kind of

[12:16:13 PM]

workshop because they'll be doing that on their own. And it's much better for them and for everyone if they're doing it together and in a setting where they can ask those kind of questions. So you might

consider that as a prelude to going around to all the open houses. >> And I forgot to mention we're going to have an open house when we conclude the council meeting on the 20th of September, we're going to set up out here in the lobby with some posters and stuff like that for anyone hospitals to come down. I know it will be during the workday, but -- >> Kitchen: I'm thinking of an actual meeting where people have the chance to ask questions, have a group discussion, that kind of thing. Thank you. >> And we will continue to have office hours where they can come in, individuals can sign up to meet with staff directly on their property. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, Mr. Renteria? >> Renteria: I'd also request when you're sending out this notice that basically in my district if you also send it in Spanish. I know a lot of these zoning changes, especially through the planning commission, that doesn't come to us. A lot of the people that have been getting notice over there, they didn't realize what was going on in their neighborhood either for lack of not being able -- not being in communication with the contact or planning team. And they will see these departments coming up and say what's going on here? And I say you should have gotten notice of what was happening. And they said well, someone sent it in English. I don't know what it said. >> Councilmember, we will be sending out prior to the public hearings at the land use commissions and of course before the hearing for the city council we'll be mailing coast guard -- a post guard -- shows you what I'm thinking of. To every resident in Austin, both the property owner and renter, informing them of the public hearings and letting them know about codenext and there will be a Spanish element for that rather large size postcard as well. >> Renteria: Thank you. >> And there is an ask that staff would have of

[12:18:13 PM]

council to confirm when the council date would be because we would like to send the dates out in a single notice. The cost of sending out the notices are rather expensive, 175 to \$200,000 to do this. So the sooner we can get a date, it wouldn't have to be the date when council makes a decision, but it would be the date for the council public hearing and then we can include that with the mailout when we send out for the commissions as well. >> Mayor Adler: That sounds good. Why don't you send out what your recommendation is after looking at the calendar? >> Mayor, we'll bring forward a recommendation for council meeting dates working with your office. We'll try to get it in by the September 28th meeting. >> Mayor Adler: That would be good. All right. Anything else? >> Mayor, if I could to follow up from last meeting. I commented to councilmember Garza that we would have R 2 and D 2, we will have that on the map next week and I'm disappointed to say that we did have some commercial districts that were changed this week, but for awhile we had C 3 in Pio's district. So we had c3po in the district. [Laughter]. >> Mayor Adler: I want to thank you again. This is a difficult process that we're going through. There's a lot in play. People all over the community are concerned and it's their homes and it's their neighborhoods. It's also an opportunity to advance the code in the city. You guys are working really hard. I think this will reflect, from what you described, a pretty substantial change to what we had before. And with that we know that there's still going to be challenges and things that still need to be changed further, but you guys have worked really hard and we really appreciate that.

[12:20:14 PM]

We look forward to the additional work. Thank you.

[Adjourned]