

City Council Work Session Transcript – 04/09/2019

Title: City of Austin

Description: 24/7

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 4/9/2019 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 4/9/2019

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:15:16 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Good morning. I think we have a quorum so we can begin. This is our work session. Today is April 9th, 2019. We're in the boards and commissions room. It is 9:14. Today we have just T pulled items and then we have the land develment code discussion I think we should go through the pulled items here quickly and get those done. That frees us up the to discuss the land development code. We have four items that have been pulled, one probably related to more scheduling. But let's see. Let's go ahead and start, Jimmy. I think you pulled item 29.

>> Flannigan: Yeah. I was really just curious what the need is to do the dedication on this land wn we already own it. It doesn't seem like the dedication is necessary on land that we already own. It makes more sense if we're acquiring it as a dedication or dead da indicating it O owe dedicating it as a par of acquiring it. But I don't know if we need to go to the voters in the future. I don't know if anybody has an opinion on that.

>> Garza: First of all,it's a floodplain so we probably cld never build anything on there anyway. And then I'll let legal and real estate answer, but I'm assuming part of the eminent domain -- I know there's many in the community that want it parkland because of the buyouts that happened and a lot people not trusting government. Are you just going to build here again after you buy these families out and they're very supportive of it becoming parkland. I'll let real estate answer.

>> So originally this request just came fromard.

[9:17:17 AM]

There are adjacentarkl pd, the greenbelt that's adjacent to it. Parksnd a rec had requested this dedicatn to happen as part of the -- once all the properties were owned. But -- I'm sorry, Alex gale, interim officer for the office of real estate. But I'll let Pam maybe answer to the question of the requirements with our agten with the U.S. Army corps of engineers.

>> Good morning, Pam Kerfit, watershed protection. You are correct there is no agreement with the arm do S we dedicate this as parkland. We have a partnership with the Army Corps within the larger onjoin buyout area, a little more than half of the buyout area to convert about 99 acres of it into a precreation area, something such as football its location in the floodplain. Hopefully a community amenity at the surrounding area can enjoy. The balance of the area is ecosystem restoration, so is floodplain restoration, allowing the floodplain to return to its natural function. We're not required to, but in conversations over the last decade or so with the parks department will long-term maintenance and stewardship of the recreation area it was a request from the parks department that we formally dedicate it as the public expression that this is recognized by the city now as a park.

>> Flannigan: So it's fair to say the dedication is symbolic. I'm not going to make you answer that question. I'm sorry, I shouldn't have done that. I feel like this is symbolic and mayor pro tem, if this is folks not trusting in government, I would have to double down on their belief by proving them right that we don't even trust ourselves as a city when the land is obviously not going to be anything else. The rules are the rules. Floodplains and et cetera. But I don't have to belabor this point and I'll just vote no on Thursday.

>> Mayor Adler: In my mind it is more than just symbolic. It is a policy decision that is before us and what I'm going to support. I think that it's kind of a statement of value for us as a council to make such a significant investment in one part of our town, not only to protect people from flooding, but to spend tens of millions of dollars to put a park in the southeast part of the city.

[9:19:50 AM]

I think that's an important statement to make. And as a council we will spend tens of thousands of dollars putting parks in different parts of our city and -- parts of our city and I think this is an important statement for us to make. I think this is the appropriate use of it and I think that it gives a measure of guarantee that this will always be a park not something. I understand the issue, but to me it goes a little bit further on for that to me on doing that. And I think it's important for the city collectively to join to put -- just to make that kind of investment for a park in a specific part of town. Anything else on this?

>>>> Garza: Yeah. I was going to let it go, but I said that about the community to provide some context. I didn't say whether I agreed with that or not. And I do think it's important and I think a lot of what we do in government is symbolic and I think that that's important. And this part of Austin is really excited about having a very large parkland and one of the local developments is contributing significantly to another part of this park, and yeah, if anyone has ever been there it's a beautiful area, despite the history. Very unfortunate history of homes being built in a floodplain. So of course I will be supporting this on Thursday.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this mayor pro tem -- Kathie?

>> Tovo: The moment has passed. I guess I will say, I'm going to support the rezoning to parkland. I think it's a statement of intention. I don't think it's symbolic and I think it's good practice and it is our practice as a

city to have the zoning reflect the intended use. So I think it's very appropriate too so. I think it also may aid in fund-raising and other support for the park. To have it codified in that way.

[9:21:53 AM]

>> Lese.

>> Pool: If we designate it as parkland doesn't it bring chapter 26 into play so it even further solidifies the fact that that parkland?

>> So it would but even if we don't necessarily put it as parkland, but putting parkland dollars into it, it would still -- we would still have to go through that chapter 26 process. And I know Leanna has come up and one of the things they can take into consideration is parks and rec does take the acres of parkland into consideration when they're calculating their parkland improvement fees and so that's another item that having dedicated parkland does affect calculations that the parks and rec department does as part of their overall goals.

>> Pool: Great. I think it also sends a message into the future that so difficulties happen, that the floods happened on this area before and it was an intentional act of the council to set aside all that land so that nobody could be put in the path of flood waters again. And 50 years from now when none of us are around that may be message that we'll be providing to a future Austin.

>> Yes. And I just want to add -- this is Leanna, assistant director with the parks department. That one of the metrics that we have as a department is to calculate the acreage of parkland that we have for the population. So -- and maintain that metric at the current value. So adding this as dedicated parkland allows us to prove on this because we have all the influx of the new population in town and maintain at a value that the department feels comfortable. And this is one of the metrics that it's used for -- by the trust for public land to evaluate and

[indiscernible], and that's one of the key performance indicators that we are using.

[9:24:01 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody

else?>> Flannigan: So I just think it's important to clarify. This is not a zoning case. This is about dedication. So it's not zoned for development. It's owned by the city right now. And the fact that land is dedicated or not dedicated, I don't believe is a key metric. The amount of parkland is a key metric. So I also want to be very clear that the dedication does not get you bonus points. The fact that it is parkland is what gets you bonus points. Nobody is disagreeing that it should be parkland. I also don't think dedication is a flood control tool. It's a parkland tool. And floodplain regulations are the floodplain tools and it is also a floodplain, which is why you wouldn't build anything there. I just want to be very clear that the

toolsuldho solve the thing the ioo built to solve for and we shou N't be layering on a bunch of extra complicated things just because we're afraid of the future.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Let's go to the next item. Item number 19, councilmember alter, you pulled this one, boards and commissions appointments.

>> Alter: Yes. I just want to say from the get-go that I did not pull this to raise any issues about anyone's nominee. I am chair of audit and finance and it was brought to my attention that the bond oversight commission is having trouble meeting quorum. This is a particularly important commission given the amount of bond money that we have out there, and they need to be able to do their job. They canceled five of their 12 meetings in 2018, three of which were the result of Orum issues. They switched their monthly meeting -- bimonthly meetings for 2019 and have yet to be able to make a quorum at a meeting. There are currently three absences, one of which I'm filling on this week's agenda, so that's good, but I'm bringing this up now rather than talking individually because there are four other councilmembers who potentially need to take action with their commission members or appointing.

[9:26:06 AM]

So please make sure that you have a commission member or that your commission member will be there for the May 15th meeting. There are a lot of things that they're trying to accomplish in terms of oversight and data and other things that will be really important and critical in our oversight role for the amount of money that we have out in bonds. I passed some information out that I got from the clerk's office, and there are -- you know, there have been absences of folks who are appointed. There are vacancies but this is a particular commission of all the commissions that is experiencing some severe Orum issues and I would venture that it's one that needs to be rectified quickly, so I would ask my colleagues if you could check in with your commissioner that would be great and/or appoint somebody. And some people may need to reappoint somebody as well if they're in violation of the absences. Or appoint someone new.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Item number 26. Jimmy, you pulled this one?

>> Flannigan: Yeah. So mostly this is just a process question around the budgets. I understand this is just asking the manager to go figure it out and bring back for confirmation, but my understanding is that this was a privately fundraised project from the Salvation Army, and now their priorities have kind of struggled, so they're coming to the city to kind of help close the gap at the end. I'm hesitant to signal that that's the role of the city and I'm also hesitant to move forward when we haven't gotten a full reading back from our homelessness officer on how this might fit in to the suite of solutions we're going to provide.

[9:28:07 AM]

I find myself often bringing up this debate point describing this particular shelter and soln. Sounds great. It's not about that. And saying this is a great one is not why I'm bringing it up. It's more so how this fits into the larger homelessness approach and if this is the right signal we want to send to privately fundraised programs.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Kathie?

>> Tovo: Yeah, thank you. I don't know that -- I wouldn't characterize the Salvation Army's capital campaign as -- I've forgotten the word you used, but I wouldn't crack tries the way you did. They have already raised \$19 million to fund several centers, including this one. It's going to be extremely helpful and is extremely in line with the goals that we've set when we passed the actn plan to end home it's providing emergency shelter for families T ve children and so one of the things that's going to enable is the moving out of the families with children who are currently in their downtown location. And as you look at that area of downtown it is not ideal for kids, it's not the kind of environment I would want my children getting off a bus. I think the families who are down there really need and are going to benefit from being moved into -- having that shelter and that new facility out at Tannehill and it will free up space for additional individuals. And one of the things that both T actn plan notes, councilmemberitch K's resolution notes, the previous resolution that I br GHT asking for temperature shelter is that have a real lack of emergency shelter and need an immteia solution. And so as we looked at -- as we looked at different options from providing emergency shelter in rec centers that had a lot of challenges and then councilmember kitchen brought forward a resolution which I know staff are working to respond to to identify opportunities for maybe temporary structures or other kinds of partnerships, I think this is one that Reay bears very serious considerati because we do.

[9:30:21 AM]

The salvation arm is a partner of ours. We partner wit them on the women and children's shelter that is adjacent to this one. And so see them as a partner. We partner with them in a lot of ways. And in the same way we were able to provide a little bit of support the matter of fevers for community first village. I see our potential partnership with others in the same way. And again, it allows us -- instead -- it may mean that we're not taking steps to build additional costly shelter. We're instead investing in a shelter that is going to have lots of community amenities, it's brand new. It's on a campus that is really undergone a lot of chges and is now lovely in terms of outdoor spaces as well. And it's just a better 11ing of our funds and -- leveraging of our funds and our dollars. And again I think it will provide us with some additional capacity downtown as well.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm usually the person that's speaking out against budget decisions that are made mid budget. This particular resolution, though, is not asking money to be spent anywhere. It'ssking the manager T identify sources of funding. It that together with the fact that it addresses what we've identified as our number one one authority T me I'm real comfortable with this resolut moving forward. I'd like to know where W that money comes from. But I also think to Jimmy's points, whenever we make these decisions it's always a question of choosing among priorities. And we can't -- heeason that I don't really like budget decisions made at budget is they become oneoff, there's a comparison thing toha so in

coming back in June I would appreciate manager, I don't think needs to be part of the resolution, that there needs to be some context that's given to us.

[9:32:35 AM]

I don't know if we have the homelessness czar on at that point. I know the questions will be asked if we're going to put money towards homelessness is this the one we would make. And as you identify funding sources I'm sure there would be choices associated with that. All of that to bring back to the council at that time so that we have a context within which to have this conversation.

>> Renteria: Thank you, mayor. I basically agree with everything you said there. The only reason I'm not a sponsor is because there were already five. But someone that has experienced the fear of being homeless and the potential being on the street without shelter is just one of the scariest feelings that you can -- a person have. I really support these type of projects and programs that we're doing. I will be supporting it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And

N?>> Kitchen: I would just say that you know, I really agree that we need to be thinking about things in the context of an overarching strategy for homelessness. The problem is we don't have that yet. So the needs are so immediate and urgent that we can't wait. My thought is that one of the first things that the homeless strategy officer will do, I hope, when that person is hired is put it all together for us. Because we have a lot of different things that we're doing that are strategies, and all which of I think are necessary, but it's not in the form of a plan that is easy -- it's not in the form of a plan that's very easy for the public to see. I know that we've got the pieces there and longer documents and things like that. When I go and to the community, one of the first things they ask me is where is our one pager that says here's -- this is our number one priority.

[9:34:39 AM]

Here's our strategies. Boom, boom, boom. And how we're proceeding. So that's going to be important, I think. And we don't have that yet and we have someone who is an interim homeless strategy officer and thank you for appointing someone. So perhaps they could help us with that. I know we've adopted various things. We do have a plan of sorts, but I think we need to put it together in a way that's better to communicate. And again, at the bottom line I would say is that we have just urgent needs with regards to homelessness and we just need to move forward, understanding that we've got our pieces in place to get us to where we can point to a strategy that's more concrete for us to understand.

>> Mayor Adler: Jimmy?

>> Flannigan: Just again as I started, I appreciate hearing the more detail on the center. I've researched it. I'm very aware of what they do. And I'm sure you and Councilmember Renteria laying out your concerns

for homelessness is not trying to say that we don't care about our issues or don't want to see these problems solved. Obviously we're trying to get them solved together. I'm comfortable, and I am, making decisions one program at a time. But I acknowledge that we're not making the decision, we're asking the manager. I get that. But I think it's where we lay out a strategic plan and we set up priorities this is where the rubber meets the road for me on how hard that is to stick with it and not allow ourselves to hear one good program and then want to rush to do that program without understanding the breadth. It's just going to be a hard thing for us to do as a city.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie.

>> Tovo: I appreciate the on-site and the additional comments. I would just say as I see it our community worked for a very long time and by our community I'll say it was really the housing providers and the social service providers along with our city staff, and they incorporated a good deal of feedback from our city staff in developing the action plan to end homelessness.

[9:36:43 AM]

So we actually, absent a director of homelessness, our community has really laid out a strategy for ending homelessness and I think there are a lot of very good recommendations and one of the important things about it is that it talks about investing in multiple areas, not just in one. So emergency shelter is certainly one, but you notice that there's also some case management we're asking you to look for funding for case management as well. So I think it's a great suggestion to ask our interim director or whoever the appropriate staff would be to synthesize that action plan into a couple of pages, but, you know, again, I would say we are very much in line with -- and we have got to move forward. We can't -- that one person is going to be significant and will advance this effort, but there's a tremendous amount of effort and forward movement that we need to keep allowing to move forward in the interim. One of the things that we have already initiated that I just want to remind people of is the redesign to the arch. And one of the significant factors of that is the reduction of beds. And so we have announced its need for additional emergency shelter beds. And what we're doing, the reason that this resolution is in two parts, it's not just looking for funding to help support the emergency shelter piece, it's also looking for funding for a case management piece so that we can have -- we can then have all of the individuals who are receiving shelter downtown being case managed, which makes for shorter, yes more permanent exits out of homelessness, and would just bring our practices in line -- again, not just with kind of best practices nationally, but also in line with the action plan that we've endorsed and have said we want to guide our efforts in this way. So...

>> Mayor Adler: Ann?

>> Kitchen: Yes. I misspoke. Thank you for referencing the action plan.

[9:38:43 AM]

We do have an action plan. I guess more what I meant is that I'm hoping that we'll work towards an actual implementation plan because the action plan gives us the strategies that we need to take. I'd like to see at some point an actual work plan that is -- these are the strategies. This is when we're going to do them and that sort of thing. But this is -- I agree with what's been said. This needs to happen now and so I fully support this resolution.

>> Maydler: All right.

>> Tovo: I'm sorry, I thought of one more thing. You know, my other hope is -- I mean, Thi as we've all said when we're asked about it, ending homelessness is going to have to be a partnership between the community, government, social service, but my hope is that too this helps bring attention to this issue of the salvation Army and their attempts -- and their son going efforts to close that gap. And will hopefully result in some other donations that come forward as well. An so that's -- I think we all -- I think our deliberate being this issue will also raise the disability of this opportunity for people to -- you know, to do something prctive to help in this effort.

>> Mayordler a okay. So let's move on. I think some calendaring items. Item number 33, aliso you pulled that one? This is the strategic mobilitylan. I'm sorry, I didn't -- go ahead.

>> Alter: Great. I pulled this so that I could share my amendments at I'm proposing. Overall I think this is a great plan and I appreciate all of the work inhe public engagement and the time and the carend the professionalism with which this was approached. I have not fully had these completely vetted by staff, but in the interest of making sure that I broht forward for my colleagues what I'm thinking about, and we'll massage the language over the course of the next couple of days, I did want to raise the issue.

[9:40:58 AM]

So the first thing THA it wanted to try to find a way to incorporate into the document is a recognition that we need to pay attention to east-west connectivity and not just north-south connectivity. There are several action items that in vious ways have been used toevel D this such as the park and rides and there's some language in transitnd a specific roadways that are enhanced in particular ways. T there did not seem to be kind of overarching statements that made it clear that as we were making some of these decisions that we need to pay attention to the east-west connectivity. So my staff and I pulled out a couple of different places where we thought we could incorporate language, but still respect the flow and the shape of out this document had been organized. So in my mind this is not just about roadways, it's also about transit, it's about everything. But these were the places that W found ways to incorporatehe language. So I think you guys can, you know, read through them and if you have concerns, please let me know. But it's essentially just a bunch of different ways to incorporate that in a way that respect the flow of the document and the overarching commitment to that. And then aitioddly in the discussion for action item 234 that was changed in B 64, that's number 6 in my document, the red in thatcase is what b-64 is changing from item 234, and my addition is in yellow on the third page where I'm asking them if they're going to use transportation demand nagement that we also need to develop tools to monitor D enforce the implementation of tdm strategies where applied.

[9:43:02 AM]

It's pretty easy to see whether a street is built a light is built or a crossing. It's harder to see that for tdm. So that if we are going to incorporate more and more tdm to our traffic impact approach, then we also need to make sure that we have a monitoring and enforcement ability for that. And then item 7 adds the word, an appropriate mixture of land uses to the discussion of updating the land development code. Because I think there are some things that particularly when you're talking about in the residential areas that are appropriate uses and others that are not. So for instance, I would be comfortable with day cares being in the residential areas, but I couldn't be comfortable with a car dealership. So I think that it shouldn't be all uses that are allowed, but that we should be paying attention to an appropriate mixture or that. And again, my change is the one that's in yellow and the red is what has been included from b-24, which is the staff's if arrangement.

>> Mayor Adler: thank you. Did you want --

>> Alter: If you can give me comments now or we can work it out later. However --

>> Mayor Adler: You're just --

>> Mayor, we don't have any objections to these. These are -- seem pretty minor. We will be bringing appendix B, as it's already been alluded to, which are staff-proposed amendments to our February 22 draft. Of course at the last meeting mayor you opened a public hearing and passed on first reading the February 22 draft, so staff is bringing appendix B as our recommended changes. And that includes everything from grammatical changes that we found errors, changes in policy, maps, indicators, action items, street network table, glossary, and executive summary.

[9:45:11 AM]

Based on comments that we received from a variety of resources, both citizen comment, ongoing citizen comment, as well as boards and commissions so we've tried to be pretty comprehensive in that, and council member Alter referred to that, and I just want to make sure you knew --

>> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, with respect to this I did something on the message board yesterday in terms of how I would suggest that we proceed. I've asked Ann to make the base of the plan with the schedule B amendments from staff. So I would recommend that we start work on that. There are a lot of different amendments that were made by boards -- or suggested by boards and commissions that are in that section C. Some have been incorporated in part, but because they were incorporated in part they still remain on this section C. Some are not being moved forward. And I would imagine that there may be some that originate from us that aren't on there. I'm concerned about getting a lot of amendments that people have not had a chance to vet or discuss on Thursday, so my hope is that people will daylight those as Alison did, one she's making, hopefully by the end of business tomorrow so that people at least have Wednesday night to take a look at them. Just for me, I'll say that if there are other kinds of

amendments we haven't had a chance to vet I'm going to be really uncomfortable parsing language or adding that on the dais on Thursday. We do have the option just approving second reading on Thursday if there's an influx of new issues over amendments, but the degree to which we could get through a third reading that would be great but I think it's going to require some measure of disclosure to be able to get there. From an overall scheduling standpoint we have two big things that are going to be potentially on the agenda on Thursday.

[9:47:13 AM]

We have the asmp and we also have the pub opportunity to be able to talk us on the L code. All things being equal what I'd suggest is we try to deal with asmp before dinner and, you know, as soon as we can after the lunch break, we take care of zoning that we've got into that and see if we can get that done. Then with respect to the land development code we can talk about this more at the end of conversation, to let people know it may come up before three say so people aren't waiting in the morning for that but we allow ourselves the opportunity to at least raise that question before we go to dinner. It's probably that we let the community know that regardless we will come back after dinner Thursday give people the opportunity to come talk to us about the land development code on Thursday. I think it's a big enough thing given everything that we've been through as a community and the issues presented. So I would recommend that, the asmp come up early in the afternoon, we'll be back from lunch as soon as we can, at the land development code we say won't be brought up earlier than 3:00 but also under any scenario there will be an opportunity for people to be able to talk to us after dinner. Then I also note, Leslie, there was item 27, you wanted to have a time certain on that in the afternoon. Inkthou said like 4:00 or something, for some kids to --

>> Pool: Right, both and I have requested that.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't think there's a problem with that. So we'll note we won't handle that until 4:00, not a lot of time but to help encourage that kind of participation, I think, would be great.

>> Mr. Mayor, if I may also on item 33, I would just remind you that the public hearing I believe is still open and so you need to decide what to do with that, if you want to continue to leave it open.

[9:49:23 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: You're talking about asmp?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: I would vote at called when we call it up in the afternoon.

>> Absolutely. What I was referring to was the body needs to decide if they want to close it or continue to open it. I don't know the legal parameters of that.

>> Mayor Adler: I think if we can vote on I on third reading then it will be closed because we will have decided the item and moved on. If we only vote on second reading or the like then we'll make the decision then about whether or not to open it -- my hope is we'll call the item, get the testimony, consider amendments and if we can dispose of that so that we can turn to the land development code.

>> Absolutely.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further discussion? Kathie and then Leslie.

>> Tovo: Yeah I have some questions for staff about a few different items.

>> Casar: Sorry, councilmember Casar, my questions were still on the scheduling issue if you don't mind.

Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Casar: Just to make really clear, so is the idea that folks want to -- asmp public hearing is still open. Is that right?

>> Mayor Adler: Correct. >> Asar: So people that would want to testify on the asmp should come after the lunch break and executive session or is it after zone

>> Mayor Adler: We don't have executive session tomorrow so we should be able to --

>> Casar: Thursday.

>> Mayor Adler: I mean on Thursday, rather, we don't have executive session. So we can have a relatively short h.nc so we'll have citizen communication at noon. We should be done at 12:30. My hope is we'll be able to reconvene at 1:30, then kind of lay out and see where we are with respect to the asmp in that half an hour. At 2:00 we can call the zoning and get that taken care of so that people can leave on zoning and then come back to the asmp and see if we can finish it. So I would say that probably likely to come up also sometime after 2:30.

>> Casar: So people should -- if people want to speak their peace on the asmp and they have to get off work they should be trying to get here around 2:30.

[9:51:27 AM]

>> M Adler: I would suggest that. I think there will be a lot of people showing up and I'm not sure we can do two big things in the evening for people. Yes, Alison.

>> Alter: I'm not sure why we wouldn't be able to take asmp before noon, given what's on the agenda. We have to begin hearing people. People are there.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't have any problem about doing that. I'm just trying to think of --

>> Alter: I'm confused. So I think the public -- so I'd like to get some --

>> Mayor Adler: Misspoke. I would say we should bring up asmp as soon as we can, do the consent agenda and handle the consent agenda and if the time we can lay out amendments and figure out

where we are in the morning. It's hard for know believe that we're gonna bible a to dispense with asmp in the morning. I could be wrong about that. But I would probably suggest that we call it as soon as we can, if we can in the morning we could. We can talk through amendments and have discussion, that we not take the vote, then we reconvene at 1:30 and then get as far as we can,:00 we do zoning, come back to asmp if we have to come back, try to T thge done, and then go to land development code. Greg.

>> Casar: I guess my question was, S I think -- since some people knew and we did make clear that we were only doing first spread there would be testimony again available on Thursday, some number of people that haves and jobs I understandhose not to participate last time in order to participate this time 37 since it lines up with the same hearing we're doing land development code stuff I totally understand, none of us want to drag this so late so as to P them both time certain late so I'm trying to figure out if someoneeds to take three hours off work or get something to ke care of their child, if there is a -- if there is a three-hour window we can give instead of a six-hour window.

>> Mayor Adler: I would say that at 1:30 we will call the asmp.

[9:53:32 AM]

>> Casar: Great. If people can get here 1:30 you would hope they'd be able to testify in that time period, they wouldn't show up at 1:30 and hingav us already have taken all testimony and voted and not listened to them.

>> M Adler: That's correct. We'll take as much as we can in the morning to advance it but we will leave it on. At0 we will call it back again and if there's testimony we'llle it then. Leslie.

>> Pool: I Thi you were having Kathie go before.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody else on scheduling stuff? Okay, Kathie.

>> Tovo: Thank you. I'll add my thanks to that of my colleagues for all this really just thorough and collaborative and very thoughtful work on really how we can move into a different space with regard to transportation and ring vehicle trips. So thank your really all the -- both for the product but also for your process. I have some pretty particular questions that I just want to air while we've got a few minut here at the work session. B25, action item -- and it refers to page 271, there was an addition, it's not clear to me where it came from because many of the commission's recommendations got folded into this one, review existing parking incentives and exemptions for structured parking. Can you help me understand what existing parking exemptions refers to?

>> Cole, Austin transportation, division manager. Parking exemptions, one in particular that we're looking at, that we would look at during land development code rewrite, is how structured parking is considered towards calculations.

>> Tovo:ow doe H that relate to -- >>towards the far.

[9:55:35 AM]

>> Tovo: So that does not collide residential permit parking, for example? That would not within that category.

>> No.

>> Tovo: Okay. I just couldn't figure out the exemption, the use the word "Exemption" with regard to structured parking.

Mayor Adler: Before you move past that one, that's like whether it counts against the far deal, it's above-ground parking and the potential is to incent below-ground parking structures if they're gonna be built, something like that? Okay. I'm sorry. Mayor pro tem -- Kathie.

Ovo: Let's see. Then b53, toward the end of that additional language that came from the planning commission, there is -- the last sentence talks about people living downtown and near the university of Texas campus already have the lowest R of drive-alone trips and I wanted to clarify are you referring there to west campus?

>> Yes.

>> Tovo: Okay. Are there -- is there existing information that would help us understand what the current density per acre is in various -- I understand it varies, obviously, but have you mapped that? Do we have any sense of whether we currently are with regard to those metrics of density per acre in different parts of town?

>> I would say the quickest resource to look at is capital metro tool priority tool. They've done an analysis that looks at the fta criteria and to see where those station areas line up as far as the densities go.

>> Tovo: Great.

>> But otherwise it would be an exercise of taking resources that we have a calculating those numbers based on the way we would want to look at it, whether it's half mile, quarter mile, et cetera.

>> Tovo: Okay. Thank you. And what is the capital metro tool priority tool, what did they map?

[9:57:38 AM]

Did the map a quarter mile or half mile?

>> It's based on fta criteria, so it would be a half mile.

>> Tovo: Thanks for that resource. We've heard some very good queries from individuals in the Rainey street area, and they had, as you know, the question of why -- let me think how to frame it, why only one of their roads is included in the street network table. And it wasn't clear if because those fell into the category of a level one street.

>> I think when we look at Rainey, we have to understand what the T asmp is -in- particular the street network, let's see what it's being used for. The asmp identifies new roadways and where we can expand roadways, whereas when we look at Rainey, there are very few opportunities to add roadways, so there is one proposed connection to extend Rainey to Cesar Chavez. However, the rest of the streets would primarily stay the same configuration, so it's kind of a category that's not mapped, which would be reconstruction and you would be reconstructing roadways to facilitate better operations. However, you would be basically putting down exactly the same number of lanes that exist today.

>> Tovo: Well, I think -- so one of -- I'll just signal that one of the amendments I likely will bring will be dealing with mobility with regard to Rainey as -- and I know Anne and others on your staff were actually at our walking town hall on Rainey and got an opportunity to Reay visit with the Rainey neighbors and some of the business owners about the mobility challenges in that area so I think we need to have some language in this plan that speaks to some of those challenges and our intent and potentially some direction about how we're anticipating addressing them.

[9:59:49 AM]

So I don't know if you have any suggestions, I so I'd love to work with you on that.

>> Tnk you for that. We'd be happy to work with you in the next couple of days to think through that, but you're exactly right, asco pointed out, you know, we have Teed up extensions as necessary so that when the few -- those few areas that are still, you know, G looked at for redevelopment so when they do come we do have the proper extension there's in place to acquire the right-of-way that would be needed for the urban form that will help distribute the traffic and improving the grid system. To the extent we can. But we're largely working with the Roa the network designs that there, and we did tee up, to the extent we could, over the last two years what multimodal improvements, and those are included in the street network table. So bike facilities were Ed, of course thinking about scooters as well as in that same space. So that is Teed to the extent that we can. But we'd be happy to work with you on what further we could do about looking at a lowerrality tied of an operations plan for Rainey, which is not the altitude of this plan but to set up an action item or something like that is something we could certainly discuss.

Tovo: That would be great, thank you. I had a question about sidewalks. So at c127 the staff said they supported the inclusion of that recommendation and that it would be incorporated into b64 but if it's b64 I'm missing how. So it started in 127, and it was a recommendation from planning commission to clarify the use of fee-in-lieu in neighborhoods to effectively require sidewalks and to redirect new funds quickly to appropriate locations, clarify citizen participation and then the staff response was that this change was supported and it would be incorporated into b64.

[10:01:51 AM]

And unless I'm missing it I don't think b64 has that. So it may just be an oversight and I'd be happy bring forward that amendment.

>> Correction. It's b63. B63.

>> Tovo: Ah, okay, I see. Thank you. actually, then you've answered another question I had, which was what -- how neighborhoods participate in this context, that makes sense given its origin. Thank you. I may have a couple other -- I may have a couple amendments for thuday, and I'll try to get those U on the message board in a timelyish fashion. One is nothing tremendously substantial. I mentioned Rainey street. There may be a few others here and there. One of the things I wanted to do is just look back at some of the recommendations that had come to us from the nor commission and be sure -- it wasn't clear to me that allse had been incorporated or responded to in the staff comments. We've gotten aple other recommendations here and there and I likely will suggest a footnote in the section that talks about transportation as often the number 2 cost for families point I think when we excess express it this way, as we've talked about in this context before, we aren't acknowledging for manyfa lies in our city child care is very often their number 2 cost. So I understand that's different depending on the family situation, but I think it's one of the I know we tend not to focus as much attention on child care resources as we do on some others. So I'll likely bring that change as well. Again, big thanks for all of your works on this. %-Úp>> Mayor Adler: Great. Leslie.

>> Pool: Thanks, and I just want to join my colleagues in that I canning aneet and he team for a job well done.

[10:03:51 AM]

I appreciate the community outrea Thach you all performed and how you responded to therds and comms.onand just to say it's a tremendous project, and I know that you all have worked really hard to bring us T forward-looking document. So thank you. And I have two questions, and then I will explore two amendments that I may bring on thursdayo kind of get them out there. So the first- first question refers to them ap introduction. There's a chart on XVII page 17, ran nomeral 17, there's a chart in there we're talking about primary motivation for the asmp is a plan to reduce the drive-alone to work mode she from 74% to 50% by 2039, and I support that. I think that's a laudable goal so I just want to get a little bit additional information about that, more detail. I want to understand if this is a goal for our city of Austin residents or are we extending this goal to includthe region?

>> The last part, it's primarily just focused on the city.

>> Pool: Okay.

>> As in residents of Austin. How do we commute to work. That's clearly something that if we do well, that should expand to the region, to be able to lead in the region how we get around. So hopefully we could have those conversations at the campo levelalk T about mode share goals in the 2045 plan update.

>> Councilmember, I would add to that I think this gives us standing to start having that discussion as advocates the region to reach 50/50. As we know large percentage of people coming to work in Austin are coming from outside our area, and I know many of our partners would also say many people that come to work in their places come from Austin so in both ways, the benefits can carry on once we have a policy like this.

[10:06:03 AM]

We can certainly advocate that obviously this is a plan of the city of Austin so we have to focus on Austin residents.

>> Pool: Great, that's excellent, the answer I was expecting because we don't have control outside of our own jurisdiction so 1941 the partnering as you're talking about with campo and other entities. I'm glad we're actively partnering with the surrounding jurisdictions to help meet this goal and I imagine those conversations are ongoing and have been. Okay.

>> Yes.

>> Pool: The second question I have --

>> Mayor Adler: As you move off that one, just to point out that Alison is on the small work group, as is Jimmy, in the 2045 campo plan.

>> Pool: Great.

>> Mayor Adler: They're two of the seven members so we have a direct tie-in to the work going on at the time.

>> Pool: Great, really helpful and necessary. Thank you. The second question I have is about the growth concept map and the transit priority network. They're layered together on page 37. I'm seeing some gaps, where I think we ought to be planning for transit. These gaps are primarily around the eastern crescent. They include many imagine Austin activity corridors and centers. This doesn't seem to align with our strategic plan and strategic housing blueprint plan which call for providing greater transportation alternatives in high density and high opportunity areas. I'm also looking at the GIS maps that show current transit routes the same gaps exist there. So not only are we not servicing these areas with with -- current local transit but we don't have any plans in this strategic mobility plan to do that, to serve them in the next 20 years. Can you help me understand the rationale for not colliding these activity routes and centers the transit priority map?

[10:08:05 AM]

And I have a picture here that shows with these overlays. I can pass along to you guys but then let me have it back. You can see that the eastern crescent is largely not contemplated.

>> Do you mind if I --

>> Pool: I think that's a great idea.

>> Why don't we put that up. We also have revised exhibit B, page 19, ite b14, revise growth concept and thereto priority network map. We did include additional corridors that were not in the original map. These include Parmer lane, south pleasant valley, tension south of slaughter - O south of William cannon. And but as far as just what went into the development of the transit priority network, the basis of the network was looking at connections 2025 and project connect, and this is looking at the criteria of bus frequency. So these are all corri rsthat would support 15 minutes or better transit

--service and that's what's either currently in operation or planned to operate. In regard to how do we make that transit priority network bigger, more expansive to the eastern crescent, we would have to work with capital metro to talk about how do W provide service that operate at 15 minutes or better in those areas. So what the asmp does is as a starting point it looks at what's known, what's currently planned, and then let's -- work on how to prioritize and improve those services, and then moving forward working with capital metro we would talk about service changes and that's where tt can start occurring.

[10:10:27 AM]

>> Pool: Sometime after 2039?

>> The other thing to take into consideration is the asmp is intended to be updated every five years with incremental amendments in between, and should there be changes, especially around service changes, we should be able to pivot and make amendments to the asmp to reflect the latest and most up to date information.

>> Pool: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Excuse.

>> Just an upde we're unable to pull the map up.

>> Pool: I can tell. That's great.

[Laughter] At least we don't have a black screen anymore so that's good. So that answers my question about whether the asmp is a living document that will be amended, at least four times in the next 20 years. But I just have to say that the vision doesn't look like it even responds to our current conditions, and I think that that is -- so that's something that I want to have a look at. I want us to focus on opportunities for transit to serve all our current and planned regional townnd neighborhood job centers or regional, town, neighborhood and job centers. The advancement of these areas will go a long way to relieving our congestion, shortening our trips to work in home and that reduces transption costs and let's folks get used to ING various different transit modes. I see that capital metro has come up and -- so they may want to respond and then I just will talk about the amendments I may bring on Thursday

>> Sure. I think that's a good point, and as we develop both project connect and other future service plans we absolutely look to imagine Austin as one of our guideposts. One of the things on the anti--- eastern crescent IST service area boundary, so we need to be a partner, and in many cases it's in unincorporated Travis county that needs to be Travis county.

[10:12:37 AM]

One example we'll be implementing in few months is in the horns by bend area, which is in the eastern crescent, and that is made possible by a partnership with Travis county because, again, it's within the service area. So as we look to the future, as Cole said, you know, it is a living document, as new developments come as we know they are coming out in that area, we certainly are open to modifying, updating our plans to account for that. And Dave may have a few other things to say with regard to project connect.

>> As we run forward with project connect we focused really starting at the region level to go ahead and make sure that we've got the park and rides and express service coming in, and then into the lighter corridors it started out as light rail with the aspirational goal to go ahead and improve those so they would be full high capacity, whether that is light rail, whether it's bus, whatever it is, but it's that feeder system. As we go forward there have been many suggestions that we've added. We're still taking suggestions and comments. We had our first public meeting last night on the Orange line, had very good attendance, and look forward to having those meetings there and also on the blue line coming up in the next month.

>> Pool: Okay. We thank you all for that. So if possible I'd like to see our transit priority network map amended, some language added in the plan to better reflect and to acknowledge future planning for future service to imagine Austin activity centers and corridors. And I'd like to see an e-book would work with my staff on that to bring something for Thursday.

>> Sure.

>> Pool: , Okay, great. On other topic I'd like to amend language in chapter 3 around mobility hubs to make sure we are incorporating the concept of civic space for active public gathering spots. And so I'll be posting these two amendments to the message board this afternoon or tomorrow, after we get a chance to work with staff and thank you all for the work that you've put into this.

[10:14:44 AM]

And to all my colleagues for their very good amendments and I look forward to Thursday. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Ann.

>> Kitchen: I have a question related to the transit enhancement program but also let me say, thank you, councilmember Pool, for bringing that up. I do think it would be helpful to have the language you're

suggesting, which acknowledges that in the future we're king towards planning, particularly -- I mean, we know we're planning in the future for thereto, but I think the connection with the activity centers that are in -- that are on our map, that we need to specifically acknowledge that. So thank you for bringing that up. I think that's a good amendment to make. So my question has to do with the thereto enhancement program. So -- transit enhancement program. The original question was where and how do we see -- do we see that in the asmp? So thank you for providing the crosswalk to the -- I know there's -- there are policies throughout the asmp that relate to our transit enhancement program. So my question is just more basic than that. So, for example, action item number 83 speaks to develop a transit enhancement program guidelines and strategies for transit enhancement treatments and when to apply them. So that's an action item. So my question really is, what is the document that we see the criteria, those guidelines in? Because I had originally thought that the -- that that would be in the asmp itself, that the actual transit enhancement program with the guidelines and strategies would be a place in the asmp. But if that's not the appropriate place to put it, that's okay. I just want to -- I just want to understand where the document is, and then I would want to just reflect that in the asmp.

[10:16:55 AM]

So where it says -- where it says -- Action item 83 develop transit enhancement program guidelines and strategies, I would want to then add "And document those in xyz document," or whatever it is.

>> Councilmember, Robert Spillar again. I would recommend we collate those in either one of two places, administrative guidelines that we plan to promulgate after this.

>> Kitchen: Or.

>> Or the transportation criteria manual might be another location just to computer that. But because the authority right now is administrative to design lanes and do other enhancements in coordination with capital metro for a variety of reasons those would be the places we'd recommend to do that.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry. You said administrative guidelines

-- >> Transportation criteria manual, which is obviously also administrative in nature but it is a place where we could capture those ideas.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Criteria manual, we are going on now to begin that process in July, correct?

>> Yes, July.

>> Kitchen: My thought would be -- tell me if I'm understanding correctly. It sounds to me like transit enhancement program is a specific -- transportation criteria manual is a specific document which seems to me like that might be the best place for us to just say that's where it's gonna be documented because it's easier for folks to understand where to go to.

>> Mm-hmm.

>> Kitchen: So if that's appropriate, I would like to amend that item number 83 to just make that statement, develop transit enhancement program guidelines strategies documented in the transportation criteria manual and then go on from there. Would that be -- would that make sense to y'all I think that's acceptable, yes.

>> Kitchen: All right, thank you.

>> So will you be bringing that amendment --

>> Kitchen: I don't know what the process is. I can bring it or I don't know if you guys are making changes from this point forward or what?

>> Bring it forward.

[10:18:56 AM]

>> Kitchen: Bring it forward? We'll do that.

>> I think it will be the staff recommendation just for clarity instead of trying to amend it now.

>> Kitchen: That makes sense.

>> Mayor Adler: I think bringing it would be good. It was an area resolution from council that I think Councilmember Kitchen brought that had asked for that to be documented somewhere a year or so ago and thank you for staying with that and making sure that we actually have a place to put that and that happens.

>> It was our intent to document it but I think this makes it transparent.

>> Can I ask a quick clarification on that topic? Will there be public input process for that criteria manual or how long we adjust that document moving forward?

>> Good question. We are at 60% on amending our criteria manual, the transportation criteria manual at this point. As soon as we're at about 90% it goes through what's called a rules posting process, which is an administrative process for our criteria manuals. However because of the nature and because it's a thorough update to manual, as well as the importance of the manual, we've committed to have public meetings about it as well with folks in the community, as well as with the development community, as well, who really has an interest in understanding what the modernized criteria will be so we are committing to enhance that process with public meetings. Which will probably be in the fall of this year.

>> Ellis: Great.

>> I'd like to clarify one thing. Throughout the process during the public outreach we've been taking comments and indicating that would be appropriate to include in the TCM. So the public has been engaged along this process even to get to where we're at. So that we can come out with them with a draft so they can reenact to that.

>> Ellis: Fantastic to hear. I don't know if it's something appropriate for the mobility committee to just have a brief discussion to kind of wrap it all in together before it's finalized.

>> That's a great idea if it's not already in our plan once we get to the 90%, we certainly will work with cmo to go ahead and get a briefing on the mobility committee.

[10:21:01 AM]

>> Ellis: Okay, that's great. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Kathie, is your light on?

>> Tovo:m-hmm. Yes. So there is -- the planning commission added some language with regard to annexations to updating administrative -- the administrative process to provide comments on potential annexations to collide information on multimodality, connectivity, et cetera, et cetera. And it seems to met would make sense to do that on other major redevelopments as well, like planned unit developments and there may be some others. Would you have any concerns about an amendment along those lines?

>> That makes sense as far as our comments towards P.U.D.S and mids as well.

>> Tovo: So I'll include -- bring forward an amendment with regard to P.U.D.S and mids and if there are any other land use designations that we should highlight that would be helpful to know from colleagues or staff. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? Greg.

>> Casar: And I just want to let folks know because me and my staff are working pretty lengthy hours to get the documents together for our next discussion we are putting together sort of our asphoughts or any amendments for -- very quickly. We'll get those posted if not today first thing tomorrow. We're finishing going over what staff has put together and looking at stuff in our district as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Thank you. All right. Ready to move on?

>> I'm sorry --

>> Garza: I have the same amendments that I think we have one different one. But I forgot what you said what the process was. Do you want us to have all those on the dais on Thursday? Or --

>> Mayor Adler: You can. Or give people them ahead of time.

[10:23:01 AM]

We are looking for to daylight the amendments early as you've done so that what we're considering on Thursday people have already seen. But I would go ahead and bring your amendments with you on Thursday.

>> Garza: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We ready?

>> Tnkha you, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Good work. Thank you. That gets us to the last thing we he, which is the conversation on the land development code. I would propose Thate start today by just going around the dais and at a high level have people express how they -- where they are presently with respect to the five questions that the manager has asked, just by way of being able to daylight to people on the dais what people are thinking. So at a really high level with not Reay a lot of detail or gloss with respect to that. And then once W gonve around the dais and kind of heard from everybody on that, then we then go through each of the five questions thatave hen presented, each one just in turn. I want to thank Greg and your staff for having done a lot of work. I think that what I had originally asked you to do was to take first stab at adngsidr those five things, thinking that would give us perhaps some kind of form that we could workff of. I really areciate, as I'm sure we all, do everybody then joining in to express thoughts or concepts.

[10:25:05 AM]

It's beeneall R helpful to read what everybody posted. And then, Greg, I appreciate your office's attempt, again, laboring oar trying to pull into one place at least the issues that were addressed by people. And thathes document I guess that you've handed out now. Probably is not a document that anybody would support in its present form. But I think the goal is to try to get in one place the different ideas and concepts that we need to be able to talk through so we make sure we you don't miss any. What I'd propose to do by way of orienting people if you could describe what it was that is this document that you pulled together just so that we can hear that, and then if people are okay then I would suggest we go around the dais at a really high level people kind of respond to the five questions that the manager asked and then, again, go into pull up each question and let's talk about it. Greg, you want to talk about this, high level.

>> Casar: Thanks, mayor. So the important work is to get us through April, taking a vote giving clear direction to the manager as the manager asked, and that's hard to do because we have so many thoughts and all those thoughts sometimes fit in thousands of pages of code. So trying to get our thoughts in one place was hard. Mayor pro tem and I put together a first stab at the five questions, and then I think lots other -- everybody -- virtually everybody else on the dais then posted their thoughts. So in attempt T get those thoughts into one document and to getseho thoughts underneath the five questions so that they are -- because I think everybody's answers generally were, you know, fit pretty well under one of the five questions, sometimes under multiple questions but pretty much fit under the five questions, the goal was to bring everyone's additions together into one place.

[10:27:13 AM]

Since some people's posts were as recent as yesterday afternoon and we got -- we E trying to get this out before seven last night, I may have missed somebody's additions it may not be perfect. Bu I really just wanted to try to get thing in one place. And then in lots of places folks had really simil suggestions to one another's, and so we tried to put those in the same place. And sometimes edihed wording, any edits are in yellow highlight to try to make it not too separate, but similar thoughts, but to make it one thought. In someces there may have been more of a conflt than that but we tried to put together a version that would work, a version that could be before us and a version that could be amended. Some people posted direct edits to this document. Soe W took the words stht fig that. Others posted more of their general broad thoughts, so we tried to pull some of those thoughts into the document. Again, if the wording here doesn't really reflect whatsomedy meant for their thoughts to be, that's noon purpose. It's just trying to create ondirection that the council can work on, knowing that probably all of us, including my, would have wording that I would change if it was just my document or preference but doing my best to try to get us a document so that we can take concrete votes and if somebody wants a new sentence or doesn't want a new sentence we can just vote on that but I just wanted to get us as close T a proposed starting place as possible rather than having multiple documents. Another change is that sometimes we changed a word -- anywhere there was changed wording it's highlighted. Changed wording to make sure it's always staff direction sometimes folks said council should consider a or council should consider B, and in some of those places we changed it to the manager should do a or B or the manager should prove options to us in the code to ado and B.

[10:29:14 AM]

But generally that is the intent. We have it color-coded based on sort of where the material wasedrc from, whether it be the mayor pro tem's and I's original document, the mayor's, the stuff that is labeled 1356 is the label for the post from councilmembers harper-madison, Renteria, kitchen and Flannigan, given their district members and any other councilmembers. Some folks' edits included the lesions of content. I didn't put deletions into this. I tried to keep all of the content in. But then the intent was to -- because in looking at everyone's additions it didn't look like people's -- you know, it seemed like the additions all added towards more clear direction so we tried to take T additions and reconcile them best we can. So thanks for y'all's grace and just understng this was our first attempt at a starting place but then we can go from here wherever you guys think is best but it's just an attempt to get

it'll in one place.>> M or Adler: Ann.

>> Kitchen: Well, let me just say thank you very much, councilmember Casar. This is difficult. And I underst TD because when I posted mine, I tried to D that, too, by building on the previous ones, and I'm sure that I missed things and probably did things unintentionally the wrong W so I think you what -- I don't want to use -- okay, let boning. I think I want -- back up. I want to have our initial conversation first, which I think is how we work this out. Then it might be appropriate to go back and revise Thi kind

of document or a different document. Because I think what inadvertently happened here is when you change -- you did change wording and you did move things around and you lost meaning.

[10:31:19 AM]

So and I know you didn't intend to do that. It's almost impossible not to if you haven't had the conversations with folks, but I don't want to start from a document that has -- changes my meaning and then have to vote to have it come back to my meaning. And I really don't want to do that. So what I'd rather do is let's talk through the issues and then we can decide as a group how we want to have one document, and it may be taking this one and going back in and just fixing things. But I don't want to use this and I don't want to vote off of it at this point in time. Again, I just I really appreciate it. I know how hard it is to -- particularly when you don't know if somebody used one word and really meant something in it or if you could change out another word. It's impose to know that without having the conversation. So ieall R would like to -- we just set this document aside for now andust talk through the issues in each area?

>> Mayor Adler: I think so. I agree with you. I don't think we should be parsing language at thispoint. I think the first thing we should do is go around the dais and have people like a minute or two kind of say what they were thinking abint terms of the questions they were asked by the manager.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Then to pull up each one, 1-5, and then people can talk about -- I don't min people making reference to the document, but we're not parsing language or trying to edit a document, but if there are concepts that are missing from this that people have, I would really like people to daylight that to say, hey, when you read this that's not what I meant by the way there's an issue with it I raised that did not work its way through or don't make a referen to the document but to talk about that area but not to parse language or to decide language. I think mostly what we're trying to do is just to communicate to one another what are theissue I that we think are important with respect to that item.

>> Kitchen: And I think that's great. The other thing I woulday is, this is not theormat that I would want to vote on in the first place anyway.

[10:33:21 AM]

So I think that we're gonna have to work on some -- work towards some other document anyway because necessarily, as we express what we're thinking, we' got language in here that's not direction. It's more opinion. Which is fine as we'retalking about things, but it's not something that we would want to vote on. So I don't knowwhat this is a document that we'renaon parse language in anyway. So --

>> Mayor Adler: Correct. We're not anywhere near that place to be able to start gonna vote on or not vote on.

>> Kiten: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Does that sound okay as a way to proceed? Leslie.

>> Pool: Yeah. I'm kind of reluctant to kind of set a marker anywhere. We haven't heard from the public yet. And I think that that's significant and I understand the city manager is looking for a process and kind of some -- which track are we on, and I think, you know, I can offer some let Rick to that point, but -- rhetoric to that point, but, yeah. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Greg.

>> Casar: And then one last thing I didn't mention my explaining of document, is that when somebody's name is listed next to something, unless it isn't in highlight, it's not necessarily attributed to that person. It's not -- nowhere here am I saying that is the words that -- and exactly the way is person endorses it or means it. It is meant to be talking about where it is that we pulled that information from. So if anybody feels that -- that there's misattribution of what somebody meant because it got moved somewhere else and lost meaning, I think in the end what I'm trying to say is, for example, on the very first page, very first thing highlighted councilmember kitchen and the mayor's comments noted. The point is that the mayor and councilmember kitchen and the mayor pro tem Garza and I's document all addressed that issue somewhat slightly differently so the highlighted section is the attempt of pulling all that language together into something that makes meaning and doesn't conflict with itself.

[10:35:23 AM]

So I just, again, we can move forward however people want to. I just don't want someone picking up this document and having the misinterpretation that we're trying to change the meaning of someone's words.

>> Mayor Adler: I think mostly people are just trying to use different vehicles to facilitate a conversation where we can learn from each other where we are. We're not at a place to vote on a document. We're not at a place to parse language. We're not at a place to do any of that. But I think we do need to see if -- how close we are or how far apart are or how we're each approaching these kinds of issues. And I think over the course of this conversation that we'll have, we'll have a feel for whether or not we're ready to actually start giving direction by the end of April. I notice several people on the stage board post have indicated a desire to do that. We haven't decided to do that yet but it looks there may be a critical mass to do that so the question is how do we get from here to there to be able to highlight those issues. And that would be one of the things we could talk about because, you know, it could be that some people don't want to do that and they want to wait until we're not ready to do this yet. We'll pick that conversation, too. So let's go ahead and start and see if we can start addressing issues. So if we could, let's have people weigh in on where they are with respect to answering their questions. Does anybody want to go first?

>> Renteria: Mayor. My whole goal is -- the way I see it is, you know, I'm advocating for doing away with single family one, single family two and just zone everything out there single family three. You know, we should have -- let people have the option to build a secondary unit if they want also, that we should concentrate our major corridors where we're investing all our taxpayers' money improving all

these roads and we're going to with 2025 capital metro plan so we really need to -- and that's what I want to be focusing on.

[10:37:36 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. That's helpful.

Jimmy. >> Flannigan: I want to thank councilmember kitchen and Renteria and harper-madison for joining me on the document that we prepared, and thank you, depreciation for colliding almost all those, couple little things, it's not cessary to get into that. As far as the manager's questions are concerned, I posted on the message board, you know, under the scope, you know, we've got to do the whole thing. I don't think we can do this piecemeal and I think we have to do the map and code at the same time on the capacity. You know, I posted -- or T four of ushat T put on our document that it's -- we had a lot of issues discussing capacity and forecasts the last time around. And I think it will be helpful in the conversn about those numbers to understand all of the barriers that are present to a landowner maximizing their attempt.

-- Entitlement. The first is the maximized entitlements but as we know few properties actually build out to their maximized entitlements so there's forecast that's take into account site conditions and there' third level I calli D in our document to say there are propeyrt owners who even with site conditions, even with market forces still just want a single-family home and they'll still be able to build a single-family home. And you've got other propertin I the city, I can think about just in mydi rict huge pieces of property that have pretty siificant entitlements that still remain undeveloped because the properties are locked up incustody battle or families are arguing with each other, whatever the interpersonal reasons that landowners decide to leave their land green, we want to make sure we're not assuming all of the stuff will get blt in the next ten years. Of course there's the question of ten year in the blueprint but the code lasts for 30 years and how do we understand what we're zoning today versus when we thinkwe 're going to be getting that output.

[10:39:41 AM]

So that's -- for me that's question number 2. Question three, you know, in our document we talkedbout form based code because I think really the question here for me is not should we be getting into a conversaon of one, two, three its, and as councilmember Renteria said, there's a lot of opportunity fomultr LE unit, but really I think the question is what is the size of the thing that's getting built. And that seems to be a more critical question for neighborhoods and parts O the city as they incrementally and naturally evolve over time. So I would like to see us focus more on the form of building ass L much on what's inside of it but for maybe performance requirements that come along with zoning to say, you know, we want to magic sure that we are getting certain levels of output based on certain indicators like location to a thereto or proximity to transit. Compatibility, I think, is one we ted a lot about over the last couple years. I think there's an interesting conversation to talk about compatibility both in the ways that

it might reduce what you can build but also in the way that it might increase what you can build. You can build. Mayor, you laid that out in your document about these weird lot sizes and are we applying compatibility to a whole lot even if it's a long and skinny lot or thin and wide lot, how might we think about that differently. So if you've got a pie-shaped property on the one side is more clearly internal to a neighborhood but the back side is just feet away from a transit corridor, maybe the back side of that lot should allow a bigger density even if the base zoning itself might not have allowed that because of its proximity and thinking more about access to community assets shared community assets. I put in my document too say transit I think is the one we talk about the most as I think we should but I think there's also argument that says anywhere we're spending public dollars like parks, swimming pools, community centers might be another place where allowing more people to live within walking distance may be appropriate.

[10:41:45 AM]

So just something to consider. The parking requirements, you know, I'm comfortable eliminating minimum parking requirements, as you've seen in lot -- a lot of areas in the city, more specifically proposed Google building, even when you have no minimum parking requirement you might still get 16 floors of parking in a downtown building that is near blocks away from our busiest and will always be the busiest transit center. I think we've got to think about what outcomes we're trying to seek. Would we want to do parking matrices far away from community assets? I don't know that we would need to do those type of things but we're getting -- we have areas without parking minimums over parking their buildings now so to think through how are we crafting a code that allows us to get the outcomes we seek in ten, 20 years and is not what's on the ground now. And then -- is that the last one?

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah.

>> Flannigan: The fifth one? Great. Just to wrap up, I think one of the things that we saw in the last go-around was a lot of F25 zoning, which, you know, I hope we don't have to see or at least we have a process to undo it in a short time frame. We wouldn't have a city of two codes. We already have one code that's bad and complicated and I would hate to see us add a second code but still have a bad and complicated code. We mentioned criteria manuals. I know there was a lot of concern that policy was making its way into criteria manuals so if there was a think through what that process looks like so that the criteria manuals are really about implementation of policy but the policy discussions are happening at the council level, so I think that's what we want to be doing, that's what the community wants us to be doing but overall I'm really very excited. I hope you all are excited about this process.

>> Yeah!

>> Flannigan: I mean, really. I drive around Austin now. I'm living in district 6, you have to drive around when you live in district 6.

[10:43:50 AM]

Although it is no ozone action day, let anybody forget I did take the bus today but we've got to do something different that isn't just the type of developments we get now and how are we getting the smaller scale development. And that's my -- my focus is not how do we get more ten-story buildings, we already get ten-story buildings. How are we getting that house scale residential that actually will get us affordable housing both market rate and subsidized.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I'll go and then I hope other people are getting ready to go.

[Laughter] I think it is important to point out today is our first ozone action day of the year. Also the earliest in the year Austin has ever had an ozone action day. So thank you for mentioning that. My hope, personal hope, is that we'll be able to get to a place where we can answer the manager's questions by the end of April. My hope is that there's sufficient group willingness to do that. My hope is that we go beyond just answering the question that the mayor asked, that we can actually give more direction. I'm concerned about having a process just with those five questions because it leaves so many things undecided. Some of which are ethical, and if we don't give the staff direction on those kinds of things that are perhaps hard things to give direction on I think we repeat one of the chief challenges that we had last time we had the process where we just didn't step up to the bar and give direction if we're able to do that. So I really hope that we do and I appreciate the effort of the people who have gone on to the message board to post. With respect to the questions that the manager asked at a really high level my guiding principles, similar I think to what Pio said, was I think the two most significant challenges are affordability and mobility.

[10:45:56 AM]

So as I look at rewriting the land development code I'm going to prioritize those two things over everything else. There are lots of other things that I want in the city that I think are really important values for the city, but when there's going to be a conflict, because there will be conflicts, I'm gonna err on the side of those questions of priorities when there are difficult choices. I also believe that in a perfect world we don't do any of this until we have planning processes for each part of the town. We come up with something that is all site-specific in the individual area. But I think that would be a perfect world, and I think that the community expects us to act more quickly than that. So I see us acting but also leaving a door on the back side to really do planning and do planning in a more aggressive way than we've done it in the past, area planning maybe putting a lot more resources to it so we can do planning areas that are larger and can move through the entire city more quickly. That then has then what do we do for the land development code right now. And I think, again, affordability and mobility at a really high level. I think that we should be unlocking the ability to have greater density and residential affordability on corridors and centers. I think that we have a base zoning right now that would let us do a lot of that but we're not able to realize the zoning allowances that we have because of compatibility or competing priorities that we ask so much of every piece of property that something has to give, and my concern is that I don't want things that go to housing supply and to affordability to be the thing that gets compromised. So at a really high level I think we should be unlocking the existing entitlements that exist along corridors to be

able to have, but add residential use in those areas and then to adjust compatibility or the non-zoning site specifications in a way that allow that to actually happen on those properties.

[10:48:17 AM]

To that end then, as I've put in my comments that I made, I think we have to do something about compatibility and I don't know whether it's changing the compatibility zone or whether it is just zoning for missing middle housing components, and by that I mean duplexes, triplexes, quads, to be able to create a non-triggering land use that, again, unlocks the opportunity on the corridors. And in the centers. And then I would give additional ability to have additional supply or additional height or additional whatever on those corridors and centers in order to induce and incentive greater affordability. And I think we need to actually calibrate them in a way that is not aspirational but is actually market indicated so we know that it's actually being used. I think we should do that all through the city, but other than that, I would be focusing on the corridor and then that triggering mechanism is behind that. So my answers to these questions then correspond with that. I'm comfortable with A1 because I don't think we can achieve what I just described without doing both mapping and the plan. On question number 2, I support C because I think that we should allow for greater -- we have to be able to realize greater housing than was previously provided. With respect to missing middle housing, I think that's really important. And I think that we should do more in the areas that I was talking about in terms of mapping as transition but without triggering compatibility areas. With respect to compatibility standards, you know, the one for me that could be somewhere between B and C because I don't know if the right mechanism is to compress compatibility or change the triggering element.

[10:50:23 AM]

Either one of which I think could achieve the same result which is unlocking the potential on the corridors and in centers. And on parking requirements, I also on the for option C. I recognize parking is going to be hard because it is also one of those issues which can incite great emotional responses, and I understand that. I think we're gonna be in an awkward place in our city as we move to a city that is less auto-dependent and more transit oriented and it's not always going to be comfortable as we make that transition, but if we're going to be able to achieve a 50/50 split in our city and not stay at 74% commute alone in our cars we're gonna have to start doing that there are people that are leaving our city because of affordability and mobility issues. I don't know anybody that's leaving our city because of a parking concern. People are really annoyed by it and they're frustrated by it and it raises concerns but I don't think it's existential so I would also pick C for the parking area. Ann.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I'm just gonna hit the highlights like everyone is doing and not get into too much detail. If I off, I would say that I do that I we need to get this done this year. And do agree that we should, if at all possible, and I'm planning to vote by the end of April on direction. So that puts me I think in the A1 category on the first one. Let me make a comment about the categories. I don't want us to get

caught up in whether we're talking about B or C. I want us to go below that with some of these when I responded on questions 2, 3, 4, I put B with targeted options or enhanced B, and what I meant by that was that I wanted to know what we were giving direction on.

[10:52:35 AM]

I felt like if I was just gonna say C in response to the city manager's memo, that memo is pretty high level, necessarily, in regards to those three very, you know -- very important topics. And so I was -- what I meant when I said B or C, I meant I want to know what we're voting on. So that's why I don't care so much whether we call it B or C, I just want to know what it is that we're giving direction on. So that's what I meant by that. Let's see. So to -- I also think it's really important to go beyond the five questions because there's a lot of interrelationship, and affordability in particular is not in these five questions -- or not -- what I mean is we don't talk about our direction on the density bonus program, we don't talk about a whole list of things that we could do. What I would like to see in addition to this kind of -- these areas that we have highlighted is a specific set of direction that is -- that is from the council that's directed towards affordability in the sense of affordability for our 60,000 goal in the strategic plan. , In other words, you know, we want to get to -- that's in addition to what we have. We want to get to 60,000. Here's the four or five key directions from council to make that happen. One of them I think you mentioned, mayor, ask that S with regard to increased height along corridors in exchange for some affordable housing. There's some other things too. Related to that, the other thing that I'd like to see in that bucket is, how can we incentivize keeping more affordable units in our neighborhoods so that WRE not -- so that -- right now I'm -- I feel like TRE's more of an incentive to replace single-family homes with larger single-family homes.

[10:54:43 AM]

And I'm wondering if we can do something that at least makes it easier for folks to have a real choice, to either keep the size of their home and add on or to replace their home with a duplex or triplex or something like that. I think we need to talk about that. be use when we're talking about affordability, what's happening in some of our center neighborhoods is we're replacing single family with single family that's larger and is, you know, very expensive. But we're not gonna address that question we're not gonna get results on that question if we don't actually drill down to what's happening and what specific kinds of policies we might put in place that might help with that. Let's see. Few other things. The parking, I generally agree with C so that's why I went ahead and put C on that one. I do think that we need to have some context sensitivity around parking, and that would just be in areas where -- in areas further in the neighborhoods where we might have wide streets and no sidewalks. We just need a -- we need -- I think we need to establish some kind of context-sensitive criteria for areas like that and a process for addressing that. So that in reimagining parking -- in changing our parking minimums and removing that we're not -- we have a process to account for areas where that wouldn't be appropriate. And then let's see. On compatibility, I think that, mayor, you mentioned some of this. So I won't repeat what you said. I

think I'm in agreement that we need to think about how compatibility works so that we can get the density we're talking about or the increased options, particularly affordable housing along corridors.

[10:56:47 AM]

So we need to think about what that means more specifically for, like, the back side of lots that border on corridors. But I think that this too, even more so than parking, we have to -- I would suggest that we allow for some context-sensitive criteria, and I think that because of the complexity of that, I think that what we may have to do is we may have to say, here's where we're going in general with compatibility, compatibility and building along corridors, and we recognize that we need -- there needs to be some context sensitivity and that may have to come later. Because it's -- in deciding how context-sensitive criteria are applied, we may need to engage in a planning process. And the reason I think that that might be necessary is because -- I don't think there -- I may be wrong about this. I don't think there's that many areas of the city where we would be impacted by that kind of context-sensitive situation so I would want to allow for some process for applying it that really looks at what's going on. I'm not sure if I'm being clear. I'm thinking about in general I think we need to address compatibility and then we need a process for ensuring context sensitivity and that process needs to allow for some time to consider planning perhaps along those areas. And, again, I'm saying all that because I don't think that that -- I don't think that that -- I definitely don't mean that we need to plan the entire city. I don't think that's necessary. That takes too long, but I do think there would be some areas that might be appropriate in. And then, and finally, let's say there's a lot of other things I've mentioned in here. I don't want to take all the time to do that. Let me just say that -- I'll just highlight one thing that I think is important to think through and give direction on, and that is our -- I think we're calling it district level.

[10:59:00 AM]

We may be calling it small area, but the planning process. And I know councilmember pool has put some more parameters around that. I won't speak to that now, but I do think to as part of our direction establish how we're going to address that. And then finally, I'm sure I've forgotten a few things I'm trying to hit on the high points -- finally I would say my overarching concern or direction here is that we get specific enough in our direction that it's clear what we are asking staff to do, that we are targeted in our direction so that we're clear that the best we can we're giving directions going to get us what we want, which is affordability. I mean, there are other things too, but that's like a top priority for all of us. I would like to make sure that we're hitting the target as opposed to a scatter shot in the general direction of a target. I want to hit the bull's eye as much as possible and to do that I want to be specific. So that's why I added the 60,000-dollar goal, 60,000 home goal for affordability. I think that WHA people have said with regard to the 135 and capacity and all that, I agree that's important. But if we hit that target and we don't pay attention to the 60,000 affordable units I don't think we will have accomplished what we want to accomplish. So I've talked too long. I will stop right there.

>> Mayor Adler: Greg.

>> Casar: Thanks, mayor. So for question -- overall I think getting something done this year, passing clear direction to the manager this month makes sense to me and I think highlighting our blueprint goals, strategic mobility goals and as councilmember S mentioned in her message board post also our climate and missions goals seems to me a really important starting place for what it is we want to start out in 2019.

[11:01:19 AM]

Lee that a-1 is the place to start so -- and it seems like there's some good consensus on that, which is we need a new code and map while recognizing councilmember pool and councilmember Kitchen's posts yesterday that even once we get something done this year there will need to be -- of course it will need to be continued planning and continued refinement and continued work and precept the parameters and expectations we can set for some of that future work. For question number 2 I also, and the mayor and I both chose option C recognizing that 135,000 units to be achieved will require significantly more zone capacity and significantly more economic feasible capacity than that in order to not cut ourselves off at the knees to achieving that goal. I think it's good that councilmember Alter and Kitchen also noted the affordability numbers and more direction on how to really get every unit out of the density bonus program that we can I think would be warranted and good. I also as part of the housing capacity question have a question about where that capacity goes. If we put all of the capacity in one place that doesn't make great sense. Something that I found lacking in Codenext draft 3 is that the overwhelming majority of the housing capacity was outside the urban core and the big majority of the housing was in lower opportunity areas. So that's why we have a line to say I would hope that we could come back with something that is more equitable and more transit supported than that kind of distribution of the housing capacity model. Then for question number 3 on missing middle housing types, I really concur with what councilmember Ellis wrote up, which is that transition zones should offer the housing capacity that we have in our -- we want for our goals.

[11:03:24 AM]

Our goals also include 30% of the new housing production being missing middle housing. That is a council passed goal in our comprehensive plan and Codenext draft 3 fell far short of that. So the closer we could get to achieving that I think is really critical. We are seven years out from imagine Austin. If we spend more years picking where we will put missing middle housing, we will go a 10 year cycle without building hardly any. So I think it's important for us to take some strides this year to get missing middle housing on the ground and we can always map more in future planning processes. But I think it's close to get to the 30%. I really want to highlight what councilmember Kitchen along with councilmember Harper-Madison, Renteria and Flannigan said about disincentivizing over-forness prevalent for single-family homes as well as single-family homes. I wanted to reemphasize that point so I add an

extra line about that in the longer document, but I also want to recognize point 9 that y'all collectively wrote speaks to that. I emphasize four or more and try to get more units in, but I think we could go further beyond that saying want to disincentize a smaller house becoming a bigger house and creating options for people today in place and make a duplex or triplex makes a lot of sense. I think there's a lot of energy in that direction. On compatibility, I'm still enhanced B or oppose C. To me it's more getting to the outcome as opposed to exactly which letter we pick, but it seemed to me reading everybody's posts that we're headed in the same direction. We want to unlock the density bonuses on the corridors and then have a transition zone coming off of them and sort of the size and depth and height of that transition zone I know is important to get worked out.

[11:05:28 AM]

The mayor's language is that council should come up with general criteria for how we can work that, and I'm very open to trying to pre-load as much of that criteria in April knowing that then of course we'll have Toake modifications when something comes back. And also want to state that I am fine with, as councilmember Kitchen said, and actually as the four councilmembers joint document said, having some joint sensitive exceptions or particular place where's it doesn't make as much sense because your streets are really close, whatever those exceptions might be, I'm very open to doing that. I want to make sure that we treat exceptions as exceptions and don't hold back from doing stuff everywhere else where it makes sense because we haven't sorted out the exceptions. I think it's on us to do the hard work to figure out where our general rules about compatibility and missing middle, where do those generally maybe need more discussion? If the priority of getting it done everywhere else is to hold on a couple of things, I'm open to that, but I don't want the price to be we don't map our affordable housing bounces and don't map our missing middle housing this year because a small example of cases. And then on parking there was a number of things thrown on to the message board so my best attempt at trying to bring it all together given that one of the documents suggested eliminating parking minimum citywide or parking maximums or having it near transit stops. What I have written down is the following option C and that generally subject to details and subject to context sensitive exceptions we should eliminate looking at parking minimums that are within a quarter mile of corridors T stations with high frequency services. And also with some mention and looking at how it is we handle A.D.A. Parking in that context.

[11:07:30 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

Paige.>> Ellis: I appreciate all of us having the opportunity to answer these questions. I think you have to start at high level to get into the nitty-gritty which we will be coming as we roll through this process. I want to make sure we're all remembering that we're just starting with the beginning and this is the moment we need to be providing you with the staff direction on exactly how we want to see that played out. It's important to be doing coding and zoning at the same time. As I said in my post I think

changing one part or another or creating a map would work, but if we're trying to achieve goals and holding ourselves accountable to getting this done, I think it's important that we look at it really comprehensively. That's why I went with a 1. As far as housing capacity, I just think it's really important to know that even if we zone to 135,000 we can't force the market to build exactly that number. We'll have to figure out that magic number of trying to go past it. Talked about whether it's two times or more than two times on the planned expected housing that we're going to need. We definitely need an affordability crisis and housing cost is the biggest indicator of how people get priced out of our community and then create sprawl and traffic and pollute our air and water. So that's why we need to be looking at dense corridors and the transition Zones N opinion first and foremost to be able to get these things done. Missing middle housing, it's just something I really actually liked the graphic that the city manager included in this I think it's 39 memorandum that shows all the diversity of housing that we're missing. It's not just duplexes. It's duplexes, triplexes, quad plexes, mixed use developments all these other new zoned areas that I am excited to see that y'all turned back to us to start doing because I think there will be an opportunity to be creative and to start to really understand what a big city we've become and that if we're going to be a global leader on all these issues that we champion, like environmental protection, that we're going to have to do it smarter with our housing as well.

[11:09:54 AM]

As far as parking requirements, it's another thing that I really know that people who are willing businesses and know that everybody is going to be able to take the bus or that they're going to be able to walk to work, I think that's fantastic. And other businesses that have the space to build parking will do it because they know that that's what their patrons want to see or they live in an area where there's appropriate. So I don't know that it is appropriate to say that one one-size-fits-all when it comes to parking requirements. That's going to be context sensitive. So I'm excited to see us kicking it off. I'm excited to have been able to answer your questions. I think we're in a good position to move forward by the end of this month and I just think everyone is doing a great job on keeping us in line with the direction that we're headed. And my other colleagues that are providing amazing input on exactly where we need to look and exactly how we need to be doing it this time around. So thank you so much.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Alison.

>> Alter: Thank you. I may not follow your format exactly. So with respect to a 1 I'm more focused on getting it right than the speed. My experience with the maps in codenext was that there were a lot of problematic elements if we are focused on how we're going to achieve our goals, and particularly how we're going to achieve the creation of the affordable housing, the income restricted housing or the housing that's targeted for 60% or below. I had one street in my district that took hours and hours and hours to have conversations that was in a high opportunity where it had no residential, it was mapped by right for all sort of residential and we were missing opportunities to put in density bonuses into achieve affordable housing. And I don't think it was the only spot that that was where we place it.

[11:11:56 AM]

Previous ultimately our ability to do the text and the map within the year is going to depend on the quality of the map that comes back and whether it's actually allowing us to achieve the goals that we have set for us. I'm very focused on with respect to housing capacity on how do we get that 60,000 of housing units for that 60% and below with the various categories. I think that as we do this we need to have direction that allows us to achieve those numbers and it has to be direction that recognizes the reality of the market and it's shortcomings. I do not share the belief that the market will provide this type of housing on its own and I do not share the belief that if we give a lot of buy right entitlements across the board that the market is going to end up trying to cater to the areas that we most need the housing. I do agree with comments that the housing capacity doesn't have to all be there at once that we have to have tools over time that allow us to increase capacity through planning. We're not going to map everything to get the full capacity or the yield or whatever at once. We have to have the tools that allow us to get that over time. I think also it can make sure that as we provide direction in terms of what we're going to create as we come out of the maps, that we not only look at how what we give by right impacts our ability to leverage a density bonus, but tool means that we're looking at how we're mapping things in the entitlements we're giving and how it impacts the tools that we do have, the few tools that we do have to create affordable housing with our own funds, whether it's through land banking or subsidies or other mechanisms in conjunction with the affordability unlocked.

[11:14:04 AM]

So I think that's an important thing that we have to consider as we look at these things. In terms of the other answers, I'll just say that I am much more in line with the B approach. I recognize that codenext was not perfect. I'm not saying that I want that. And I think there are certainly things when done contact sensitive that we can incorporate and improve on to get outcomes that we want. I will be looking to see if that kind of direction that Ann Kitchen has put in there is in there in her individual post and looking to see if those nuances are covered because I think they get us towards a broader quality of life for everyone. The other thing that I want to mention is we'll be looking at this also through environmental lens and while I appreciate the arguments of not wanting sprawl and densification, helping the environment, it is also true that as we densify that we need parkland because people won't have yards that they can go and need the open spaces, the public places. Today is an ozone action day. What we need is trees. The trees matter. They play a very important function and we have a lot of things that we're balancing and a lot of trade-offs, but some of these things once we give them up we cannot get them back. So I will also be looking at

this through those lenses. >> Mayor Adler: Leslie.

>> Pool: Thanks. I am looking forward to hearing from the public on these items and I understand that the city manager needs a little more direction on this in order to move forward and bring back a set of things we're looking for.

[11:16:05 AM]

I understand why we've engaged in this activity at this point. I do think that the comments that those of us around the table have talked about nuance and context sensitivity and environmental lens also track with other concerns that I have. And I think the mayor used the word existential threat and that is for sure. So I'm generally supportive of the enhanced B options, but I'm super supportive of any planning that we can do in advance and that was generally the message of the posting that I put up on the message board yesterday that I worked on with Ann and I appreciate her help. That planning was asked for -- I think the resolution that Ann led on back in 2017, it was September 28th, 2017, it was item number 101 and it passed unanimously, the 10 of us who were on dais. So that's to establish and begin a system-wide planning process focused on our imagine Austin activity centers and transit corridors. And this underpins the work that we're doing with our land development code rewrite. So the process needs to have some element a procedures as codified and they need to be codified into the LDC such as identified geographical areas and areas for determining when an area is ready for planning. So we need to work on our direction for future planning efforts. And maybe when I'm done going through my comments, Rodney or Brent could comment about the small area planning and a response to that resolution from 2017. So my emphasis is on planning, small area plans, and so on a 1 I do agree that to the extent that we can -- I'm sorry, on question option a 1 to the extent that we can get there by the end of the year as much as we can get done I think is a good idea.

[11:18:11 AM]

I think the public would like to see some additional definition on us on how we're moving forward and a recognition that we won't get everything done this year, but we will be able to move this effort far forward by December that we can then turn attention to the other considerable issues that are in front of us. The rest of my preferences with nuance are B with either targeted C options or enhancements on B. I would say on question number 2, housing capacity, I remember really well we were in this room. Maybe it was two -- a year and a half ago. I can't remember when we were going through, maybe it was St. June. We were going through some voting on our preferences on choices and we were talking about adding housing along corridors that don't currently have it. That was the VMU concept. And I was entirely supportive of that. And if we only added housing possibilities along corridors we would go a huge long way to getting to the number that we have identified, the 135,000 new units, which I also would like to know when we're going to start counting those 135,000 because we have been putting a large number of units into play through all of our zoning decisions for the past four years. So I'd like to know when we start that ticker just as an aside. For them to be affordable is really the challenge. So I think we have general agreement about housing and density on corridors, how to make them reachable by middle income workers like government workers and our teachers is for me the challenge. And if we can get that inclusionary zoning bill passed some time up at the legislature, that also would go a long way for us to mandate that we can include lower cost units.

[11:20:21 AM]

So that's B. I'm sorry, that's number 2. Three, the missing middle housing types. Great, I mean, I would think the market should go for it. And depending upon what people love to see, do they want to build an accessory dwelling unit. I looked into it myself and it was pretty darn expensive. It actually would require a second mortgage for me to put on my lot and I'm sure I'm not too much different from other folks. So to the extent that it's reachable financially, I agree the city shouldn't stand in people's way. I also want us to be really mindful of our new flood -- our new flooding maps will impact buildability and be really careful that we're not inadvertently urging people to build in areas that then end up like our Onion Creek and Williamson Creek neighborhoods where we have buyouts. And it may not happen within our purview, but we're changing WHA on the ground throughout our community and that will have some long-standing future consequences that we might not be here to address. Four, question number four was compatibility, enhanced B along the lines of how my colleagues have mentioned specifically. And I like -- I'll mention this specifically. I was at a neighborhood group meeting last night. Folks were concerned about the quarter mile, half mile metric. And they were conflating that with the land development code the way it used in ASP. And I pointed out that our federal grants require that measurement. So that's a federal requirement that we talk about things as quarter mile or half mile from transit nodes and so forth. But mayor, I like what you had said, maybe it was the last time that we met in a work session or at some point you were talking about the street behind the corridor.

[11:22:26 AM]

So the properties that were -- that backed up to maybe a commercial strip on a corridor. And to look there to try to get to compatibility. And then that's a good way to kind of ease into the conversation and it's a little bit more organic, most people who live back up on Burnet Road, but there's a lot of commercial that's been there for a long time, but there are homes that have converted into really interesting little eateries. And the people there have been on there for some time. And the tolerance for seeing changes to compatibility may be different than if you were to go further into the heart of the neighborhood. So I'd like, Steve, what you were saying about the street behind. And then I think question number 5, the parking requirements, again enhanced B, we really need to update the strategic mobility plan so the mobility of transit in the future is acknowledged. I'm very concerned about our seniors and people with disabilities that we are not in fact actively talking about what the needs are and so that has to be -- that is absolutely top of mine or me. Whether it's a transportation plan or in the strategic mobility plan. And then we promote our partnering with associated entities like CMAP and Cap Metro again as Steve had pointed out, both Alison and Jimmy are involved with that, which I think is really good. And then just a last shout-out in support for what Paige was saying about context sensitivity and that kind of fits throughout all of this. So that as we plan for a future that will go beyond us sitting here one day, we can have a robust approach that people can rely on and sort of see themselves as part of it. I think that would be my parting hope for this process that we really do embrace the public who will -- this will be a real -- this will affect where -- literally where they live and where they work.

[11:24:41 AM]

And so thank you. That's pretty much where I stand on all of this.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Other people on the dais? I guess we haven't heard from -- Delia.

>> Garza: Don't want to take up too much time especially because I answered the questions as asked.

[Laughter]. I think that's been public the longest. And I understand the concern with working off what councilmember Casar has put together, but I think it's -- I think we have to start somewhere and you know, the resolution asked the city manager to provide us a process and he did that. And I know it's going to be extremely hard for everybody to feel that their concerns are addressed, but I'm just really hoping that the process doesn't become incredibly frustrating to me, but it probably will because it's already headed in that direction.

[Laughter]. So I'm not going to go through the questions because they're there. The answer to my questions, I hope we can -- C you know, the -- I do appreciate the not wanting it to be speedy, wanting it get it right, but if you asked if the question was what do you think is right you would get 11 different responses. I'm ready -- we're going to have to take incredibly hard votes and, you know I have been on the winning side of the and the losing side of those, and that's part of the process. So I am ready -- I know we're not working off a document. But I think what has been provided here -- and then the additional comment that was added has just made it better.

[11:26:46 AM]

It feels like we're all kind of doing the same direction and I think that's a good thing. I don't know what the next step is, but I'm ready -- if we are really going to get to a vote on this in three weeks, I'm ready to start handing stuff off to staff and asking you to bring something back to get this done. Granted, we have not had the public hearing, which will happen Thursday. I hesitate to say this, but I seriously -- I will be very surprised if anybody says anything Thursday that helicopter been said in the past when did the next start? 2000 --

>> 2012 or 13.

>> 2012. In seven years we've had public comment. I will listen, but I don't know if there will be anything different than what has been said in the past seven years. And I'm ready to make the necessary changes. It's a huge, if a gigantic leap. It's going to be incredibly difficult, but we have to do it. And I'm ready.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Ellis: Just wanted to make a quick point. I have a lot of appreciation of people the last few years who have given public comment. I'm amazed by the city's ability to reach out to people and try to incorporate as much public comment as possible even when people are in disagreement. So there may be some

beneficial information that's been provided throughout the years and I'm excited that we have that to use and can move forward with a council that is excited to work together to make this change and that we already have some comments and input that can be useful. So I just want to extend appreciation for all of that process that's already taken place.

[11:28:57 AM]

Know it's a lot of work.

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor, after council member Tovo, I want to make a comment on the public process.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Kathie.

>> Tovo: And I'll start there with the public process. We haven't really had a conversation specifically about how we would have gone back and what we would have changed about code next, both the process and the product. But it was really clear to me from all of the conversations and all of the public feedback that we heard that the public didn't feel incorporated and they didn't feel that they were collaborating in this process. And so it's very important for me to approach this differently. I think we have an opportunity -- you know, our work sessions indicated and my conversations out in the community indicated that there's actually a fair amount of agreement on some key points, density on the corridors. I think that that's where we'll get most of our housing capacity. And there was a lot of agreement at that point. And there were a lot of other specific points where I think reductions in parking within a gain with some kind of context specificity. And sensitivity to context. I think there's support for that. So I hope we can approach the conversation differently and spend less time arguing over the places where number one there is -- there are pretty strong feelings and the results of those are pretty minor in terms of housing capacity gains. So I am going to make some comments, but underscore the fact that we haven't heard from the public on this particular framework of questions and I will say yeah, we've heard a lot from the public and we've heard so much that I was at meetings where people were shouting at the mayor and we had people who put together a petition that 30,000 people signed, and it came within four votes of passing.

[11:31:01 AM]

So there were a lot of people who had concerns. So yes, we heard from the public and I think we should as best we can really try to with a process that is inclusive and where people listened to and a product that is reflective of both the need for change, but so context specificity in places where it's appropriate. And as I -- my kind of general thought about that is had there been more shifts between, say, draft one and draft two in response to the public comment we probably wouldn't have ended up with a draft 3 that was of such concern that the council halted the process altogether. So my urging would be that we kind of learn from that and I think it's great to adopt an aggressive timetable, but I think we also need to not keep marching on if, say, that draft is not in our hands from the planning commission in October. That

was also, I think, one of the lessons that I learned from last time, though we talked about it throughout if we had a realistic timetable. So I mentioned density on the corridors. I think that increases should be tied to income restricted affordable housing or other substantial community benefits. I would like to learn from the Riverside example of being careful about increasing entitlements in addition to a density bonus program where we then have people just using the existing entitlements and not creating those affordable units. So to the extent that we can calibrate that really well, I think those increases should be tied to those -- to getting those community benefits we need. And then at the same time proceeding carefully. I am supportive of what I mentioned and I'll get to at when I get to number five or whatever number parking is. I'm supportive of reductions in parking, but we need to think through how we deal with that with density bonus programs such as the one we considered a few weeks ago with councilmember Casar's resolution where parking is part of the entitlement -- parking reductions are built into the entitlements that you would get as part of the participation in the density bonus program.

[11:33:16 AM]

Vnu is another one. So if that becomes a by-right entitlement, how do we incentivize the creation and production of affordable housing? We've talked a lot about demolitions and those are occurring in our current code. And during the next we sort of asked what would be rules for slowing those down because for all the reasons that we've talked about, that tends to result in more expensive housing and very seldom more units. And lots of very good materials ending up in our landfill. So it's not supportive of several of our goals. So I would like to see -- I would like to see us look at -- make sure that we're moving forward with a code that doesn't incentivize demolitions in particular? I know many others have mentioned this. We shouldn't be incentivizing the redevelopment of affordable housing? At the end when we have a draft I hope we'll do what we did last time, which is to analyze those code changes for estimated displacement using the envision tomorrow tool. And then going through the questions... With regard to a -- with regard to number 1, supportive of a, I'm undecided about with or without the map. I can probably play that round or flat, but I'm interested in the public's comments on that. Two, I'm supportive of B with the comment I made earlier that I think we should really rely on our density bonus programs and really build those to make sure that we're using the right tool for the right to get the community to want. With regard to three, I'm supportive of B. I would say a, think doesn't on -- I've already mentioned this to you, I think, city manager.

[11:35:18 AM]

The way in which I take issue with the way in which it's phrased to suggest that we can't currently have duplexes and ads and other things. Those are within the range of housing that is allowable within our code, though not allowable in every zoning category. But I'm in B on that with C, and I think councilmember Kitchen, you said C in targeted ways or something along those lines. I thought that a language LE was something I could support. Four, compatibility score M complicate R. Complicated -- it's too complicated for me to answer in any of the ways that have been requested. To me it really makes a difference whether

we're talking about just corridors or whether we're talking about other areas as well. In -- I appreciate that you've identified challenges with that. So there may be other tools that can help us achieve the same aims. I don't know what those look like. But they are -- we talked so much about placemaking with regard to the convention center and I see compatibility standards within that context as well. And maybe because almost every day of the week I'm getting calls from constituents that relate in some way to the compatibility of uses that are in close proximity to residential uses, whether it's in south Austin where we have a real challenge enforcing zoning regulations and there's an auto mechanic shop going on right next door to a house. Or the challenges with short-term rentals or music downtown or in various other -- there are -- we need something that proximates compatibility standards to make sure that residential areas remain great places to live. And that we are balancing those -- the property rights of those who reside within these areas alongside the rights of businesses to operate and helping them in some ways really create good neighbors when we have those kinds of provisions that are balancing those needs against one another.

[11:37:22 AM]

So five I've mentioned parking, support reductions. Needs to be considered. I think that we -- because transition Zones has come up a couple of times today and it is causing some discussion within the discussion as much as one of my colleagues referred to, I think how we define them is critical to whether or not -- whether or not we'll have support from members of the union and where they rest on that. As one of the last amendments that came forward define transition Zones in such a way it covered entire neighborhoods. So again I think the what happens in those transition Zones is pretty different. And if we're talking about a transition zone that is one street that's a different animal. And again, I think that as I've mentioned, the community expects us to act in collaboration with them. We have a tradition of grassroots, ground up planning and I think that is something we can leverage. I would -- I like the approach that I think, Ann, you laid out about item 1 to look for that small area planning. And so I see the transition Zones falling into that category as an area where we can set expectations for different areas and then ask for a small area planning to respond. And that's about it. I've seen lots of both on the council and off, I've seen a lot of contentious land development questions and issues. I think far and away the redevelopment -- the revision of the land development code has just exceeded that in all kinds of ways and I hope that -- I'm really committed to approaching this conversation in a positive and collaborative way and I think it's very possible to achieve the aims that our community expect of us and that many of us have mentioned here on the dais in ways that are not divisive and vicious -- divisive and vicious.

[11:39:24 AM]

And by that I'm not talking about on the dais, but as a community I think we can have this conversation in a more positive way and I look forward to doing everything I can to support that.

>> Renteria: Councilmember, I hope that you didn't mean four votes, you mean four percent. You set it almost passed by four votes.

>> Tovo: Oh, yeah, yeah. Yes, I meant to say -- yes, I was talking about points -- thank you. I didn't even remember what you were referring to.

>> Mayor Adler: Ann.

>> Kitchen: I just want to say whenever we wrap this conversation up today, I'm not suggesting it's right now, but whenever we do, I would like to leave it by providing some clarity for the public. I think we've kind of said that, but I think it's important to keep reiterating that, because part of the issues we dealt with before was communication issues so I just want to be as real clear. I think and I hope that everybody understands that Thursday is the opportunity for them to come and speak to us. So I think it's important to make that clear. And then I think they will also need to understand whenever we're ready, but they'll need to understand what exactly are we voting on and when exactly are we doing it with regard to this direction. And it's that kind of clarity that I think is a big part of what causes -- contributes to lack of trust and concern in the community is because they don't know. We're living and breathing it, but they don't know when and how to comment and on what. So maybe that's today, maybe it's Thursday. Whenever we reach that conclusion I think we need to clearly tell them that we're voting on and when. We and I think that should give them enough notice. I don't think any of that is consistent with us being able to vote at the end of April if we're ready. We just need to back up from that, hopefully a few weeks so that people understand what the document is, what the actual language of the document is that we're voting on.

[11:41:34 AM]

So anyway, that's my hope is that we can get that much clarity for folks.

>> Mayor Adler: My hope is -- I'll come back to Leslie here in a second. My hope is in terms of the conversation that I heard that there's a desire to see if we can make some action by the end of April, get it off our plate and put it back on to your plate. So that you and staff are dealing with that. I think Thursday is going to be the first and perhaps best opportunity for the public to be able to weigh in. So I would suggest collectively as colleagues that we break for lunch and come back after lunch and actually go through each of these five questions to hit the issue because I think if we don't do that we're not leaving ourselves enough time to actually get this done. And quite frankly, I think if we have that conversation we can give a lot more information to the public when they come in to talk to us because perhaps the areas that -- wherever there is controversy might be something that we better identify. So if -- and maybe right after lunch as we start that, you and staff can talk to us about if we gave you -- if we answered these five questions and gave the kinds of decision that we have in here, is it in fact viable to consider you being able to surface something that goes through a community process and a planning process that gets back to us in October so that we might be able to take final action before -- first reading action before the end of the year. Maybe you could speak to and address that. But my hope would be -- as I look at this, what would be helpful for me, I have two drafts in front of me. I have the

one that Ann had. I had the one that Greg handed out. When I leave here this is what I'm going to be at least starting with, these two things to surface and thoughts for me.

[11:43:38 AM]

So if when we come back we could go through each one of these, perhaps looking at these two documents and trying to identify where there are significant -- I'm again not parsing language, but where there's a concept that indicates that there might actually be a difference on the council so that we can talk through the differences that so that we can pull up. As you were saying, Delia, let's pull up where you think -- let's see if we can identify where there may be a difference. Let's talk about it and see how many of those, if any exist, and what they are and give people a chance to speak through that. So what I would recommend is we finish this conversation, I'm going to recognize Leslie first and I'll come back to Ann. And then maybe we break for lunch for an hour so people can eat and talk, and then maybe we come back and you open it up, talk to you about your concept of process going forward and then we actually spend half an hour on each one of these questions or whatever time sufficient to identify -- because my belief as we went through this is there is so much common ground here. I really think that we have the capacity to be able to do this and help deliver the community through this process. Leslie?

>> Pool: Thanks. I was going to ask the city manager if he would give us a summary of how he sees the public engagement going forward. That was a big I think failure of codenext as a number of folks here have talked about, the engagement wasn't community and listening to what they had to say and then them knowing and trusting that we were hearing what they were saying and seeing it play out in front of them. And we did try to have a communication strategy last go-round and I think we have to have one. So I think that was one of the postmortems that you came back with, Spencer was you're thinking that that was -- that was an oversight on our part. So I wanted to see if you could summarize that so we would know.

[11:45:41 AM]

And then I wanted to ask Rodney and Brent if they could just walk us through the small area planning documents that Ann and I have talked about, the necessity of moving that forward. It was a resolution that she let the council back in September of '17. We have some memos from Greg Guernsey, but we have never had the presentation here for us to know what your intentions are. And I think we've got two pilot areas targeted, north Lamar north of 183 and Pleasant Valley in the south part of town. So because it's important for us to align our strategic management plan and our land development code work and then how we are targeting and spending our bond dollars with project connect, I wanted to make sure that all of those important initiatives that we have approved and are moving forward are on all aligned, including timelines.

>> Thank you, councilmember, and I'll speak to this more after lunch as we discussed. But certainly that idea of how do we ensure that there is more and broader communication with the public, especially as we

move through this process. On Thursday it's just a chance for the public to comment on T memo itself. To give feedback to the councilmembers as they consider answering the memo. That was the goal of the -- putting it on the agenda for Thursday. But depending on the answers to that, that will help engage how we think through what the next steps in the process will be. But I'll be able to talk to you a little bit more on that after lunch.

>> Mayor Adler: Jimmy and then Ann. I'm sorry, what?

>> Pl:oo I had a second question for Rodney, but I'm sorry, Jimmy is going to respond to that. But I did ask for Rodney to talk about the small area planning memos that we got briefly.

>> We were prepared to talk about that after lunch, but we can certainly talk about that now if it's the Will of the council.

>> Pool: After lunch is great.

[11:47:42 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: We'll open back up with you if you could hit thought you had from today, thoughts from the two memos, small area planning, but trying to leave us as much time -- a good complete answer, but let us the time to work through the five things today because I think that's really important for us to do for the public as they come in on Thursday. Jimmy.

>> Flannigan: Two things. One, just on the engagement side. I'm not sure that engagement was the problem the last time around. I think there were a lot of conditions there. And so some level it was the most public engagement maybe the city has done in 30 years on a topic and to the mayor pro tem's point, I think it's the same thing they were saying last year. We want to check in with the community, but I don't think we need to broaden even -- six years. So I don't know that that was necessarily the issue. And I want to thank councilmember Tovo. I am with you that the rhetoric last time around was not productive for anybody. And I can remember going to -- hosting neighborhood meetings on code next in my district and folks coming in and screaming and yelling based on information that was actually not true because when we pulled up the map it was actually just one property in the very corner of the neighborhood and they were saying, oh, hole W neighborhood is going to turn into this thing. And I go, but it's actually just this one that's like on the highway access road. And they go oh, but the whole neighborhood. And I went to the same -- several of the meetings that the mayor was at and I can remember people getting up and screaming. And every neighborhood is going to have their own read on what we're doing here, but I want to stand with you and say that we're not going to repeat that type of negative rhetoric.

[11:49:43 AM]

We're going to be very clear with community, we're going to listen and think we can get this done in a way that we can all be proud of the result at the end.

Kit>>en: I would ask the city manager to think about -- we can talk about this more when we come back. I'm wanting to think about how we get from this point to the document that we're actually going to vote on and if it's something that the staff can turn into a document. I don't know if there's agreement on that or not. But basically the thing that I'm thinking is that that I really want to make sure that what we write into direction is something that the staff can understand as direction and that we understand what we're saying. So to my mind that means that we've got to get a crisp, clear document and I don't know if that might be best done by staff after hearing our compilation of ideas or not. But I think we should have that conversation.

>> Mayor Adler: Definitely have that conversation. Let's go through the five items and maybe that will help us understand it. And to Ann's point, if there are questions that we haven't identified that relate to these, then when we turn it back over to you, you all will be sitting around the table saying this is a thorny one. I wish they had given us direction on this one. Make sure that you surface those questions if they're associated to these things. All right, it's 10 till --

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, one more thought. I just want to keep on the table that there are things that I'd like us to address beyond these five. Now, semantic maybe we can fit them under these, but I don't want to lose that. And I don't want to be stuck with these five.

>> Mayor Adler: No. In fact, we talked about first going around the table as we have done with votes and then going through each one of the five things individually.

[11:51:47 AM]

Once we've gone through these five questions then I think it's open for other people by way of direction, further direction, to raise an entirely different subject area if they want to and see if people want to engage. All right. It's 10 till --

>> Garza: Sorry, question. When you said going around, is that different from what we did?

>> Mayor Adler: No, we've already done that. When we come back we're going to have the manager and staff talk to us relative to questions we have and then I want to call up each one of these. I'm going to say number one, let's look at the two documents in front of us and see if there are things that we think we disagree on or things that are in controversy. Let's air those, let's talk about the things where we perceive are differences and see if we can all agree or if there's a majority of us we're going to do what. We're going to do two, do all five.

Garza: I was just curious if staff had taken like a tally on listening and if there was between now and then you could provide like a spreadsheet and show the answers and then maybe that would give us a visual to guide the conversation.

>> [Inaudible].

>> Garza: Yeah, by councilmember how they responded.

>> We can certainly try ING that. I know that councilmember gaa's document also tried -- councilmember Casar's document also tried doing that. I think where it gets fuzzy is the enhanced B and C piece of it. So it doesn't necessarily fit in any one box, if you will. But we can certainly try doing that.

>> Mayor Adler: My hope is this afternoon we're going to parse the fuzziness and figure out whether you call it B or whether you call it C, what are the elements that we're focused on. Ann?

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, a question. So I'm wanting to understand how long we're going today? I had been -- this is just me, but I had been thinking in terms of going until about 3:30. So I don't know if people are planning to go -- I just want to know what our end time is. We could talk about this for days.

[Lighthouse. So it would help me to understand if we have an end time in mind?

[11:53:49 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: I suggest we come back at 10 till 1:00 and that the manager and staff speak to us and then we spend half an hour -- up to half an hour on each one of these five questions. That would be two and a half hours.

>> Kitchen: Is that 3:30? All right. That's fine. I have to leave at 3:30.

>> Mayor Adler: But let's work fast and let's not get lost in process when we come back. Let's really try to hit the substantive issues as much as we can and try to hold back process concerns as best we can so that we don't spend our time doing that and not hitting the substance areas. I'm going to try to be hyper vigilant on that issue. All right.

We'll be back here at 10 till 1:00.

[1:08:48 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We about ready to tee this up? Managers how about if I give it to you. Is April 7, we're back from our recess. It is 1:08.

>> Sure. Mayor, council, I'll kind of step back to where we were about a month ago when I first teed this conversation up for you and the community on how to move forward with the land development code revision process and, you know, the memo that then subsequently went out a couple weeks later made sure that the next step that we had to take before any other decisions were made about what those additional things were on these policy questions. So I really want to keep us focused on answering

those policy questions. I'd allly appreciate the conversation that we had this morning and thast' been going on the message board. There will be steps along the way that result from how these questions are answered. I will have more to say on that after the questions are answered. Buts you know, there are both legal requirement ons how it goes through T planning commission process, that it would come back to council, the amount of time it would need for staff to take the answers to the policy questions a craft a new version of that code. That's a lot of work on is staff's part and I want to acknowledge and recognize, to the degree that that will ke state time, depending on how quickly these questions are answered. I wasntentional in not putting any time frames within the documenhat T I put forward because, to councilmember alter's point, we want to get this rightande want to make sure that we're doing it in a way that makes sense for this council and the cmunity. And so I know that the conversation has been going to potentially taking some votes later this month, but I really feel strongly about needing some specific direct from this cou,ilto the degree that you want to put additional direction or clarification, that's helpful.

[1:10:52 PM]

Because it does help guide the staff process in crafting the code from that direction.bu I really want to keep our focus there for the time being. So if there's any otherti Ng questions from staff that they can clarify or answer, but I'd appreciate the opportunity today to dive into each of those specific questions to see if there are points of agreement that we all can work from.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Leslie.

>> Pool: Thanks, Spencer. Then did you want to touch on the communication strategy?

>> Appreciate you rsingai that. Because it was very clear, know, as I talked to community members and from stakeholder groups that we need -- we do need to do a better job Howe W communicate what the decisions are and how people understand what is -- what is being votedn an O what that means for the common we've asked our staff to think differently about how to get that information to the pubc.li I really want to thank Jessica king 234 in the communications department in shepherding a new way of looking at that. As we get further direction from council we'll continue to ensure ttha if there are -- if there's misinformation out there that we'll try T address that in realtime if there's other ways that we can make that pol question clearer for the community, we'll do that as well. But we also will take your feedback and if there are ways that we want to communicatefereifly with the community we'll certainly be open to those suggestions as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I don't know if you guys want to say anything before we start in. What I would have us do is we would start with number 1. We'd have a conversation about it. We would, you know, try toelaborate, see if there's additional direction that people wanted to give with each of them spending no more than 30 minutes on any one of them.

[1:13:04 PM]

With an eye to seeing if there's additional direction. And what I would ask from y'all's perspective is, if we're not addressing something that you see as an inherent question, then that has not been resolved in each one of these areas that you identified, so that we're not inadvertently passing over something. It's not to say we're gonna be able to resolve it, but if you tee it up we ought to see if we can. So don't let us pass by something that might be available for us to decide. And in that regard I'm going to be working off these two lists myself in terms of just -- the one Ann handed out and one Greg handed out. But I would suggest that we keep our conversation restricted to things that would be direction to the staff, to the manager and the staff, as opposed to us discussing or parsing value statements. It's entirely possible that each of us might have different value statements that would lead us to a similar conclusion, and if that's the case we want to be able to get there since the value statement isn't the direction, let's try not to get lost in that. And let's try our best we can to keep to the substantive kind of stuff and not get lost in process conversation. Leslie.

>> Pool: I think the one the question that I had asked to be addressed when we came back had to do with small area plans, if we could address that before we get into --

>> Mayor Adler: Sure.

>> Pool: Thanks.

>> Brett Lloyd, development services, sure, we'll dive right into that question. Small area planning, director Guernsey has provided, I believe, a couple memoranda to council related to kind of the forward-moving planning process that the city is considering and updates on status in response to your prior resolution, and I believe he will be present.

[1:15:21 PM]

I think it's on the 25th of this month as well to answer any questions. We're not prepared to really go through the update that he's provided, but what we can address is how does small area planning potentially relate to the land development code. And what we sort of gleaned from councilmember Kitchen's comments is that there's a desire on council's part to see the topic of small area planning addressed in the land development code at least at the level of providing some criteria that would kind of help to frame the circumstances in which small area planning is desirable ahead of rezones. And to really help kind of enable that process. And that would be definitely new territory for the city. The city is generally not -- in our current code doesn't have a lot of guidance on those sorts of planning processes. But there are other cities that do that. There are other cities that have a little bit more guidance in the code about how subarea or small area planning processes work and when they're appropriate and the kinds of criteria that should be considered in initiating those procedures. And that's another something that we can consider, if asked by council, if council gives us that direction. And I think that councilmember Kitchen's -- and I forget who the other sponsor of that language was, but I think there's some really instructive language in the message that will help us get there. So that's what I'm prepared to say on small area planning.

>> Mayor Adler: Delia.

>> Garza: Since we're talking about that, I just want to -- I guess express concerns with small area planning.

[1:17:25 PM]

In that, you know, it goes along with the conversation of I understand needing to be context sensitive to different parts of town, but context changes over time. And I'm concerned how we reconcile with what I would agree with having to be context sensitive to certain parts of town to putting a plan that is frozen in time and would require extensive process to even put in place an extensive process to change. An extreme case of being context sensitive would be the 1928 plan that segregated our city, and that was context -- that was the context at that time. And so I know that's the extra, extreme example of that. On who goes to decide and who is voicing what an entire neighborhood -- how it should be planned because the reality is it's a minority of people that are able to show up to these neighborhood meetings and participate in these kinds of processes. I'm not saying I'm against them, but I'm looking for a process that emphasizes equity and reconciles how they really remain a living document.

>> Mayor Adler: My recommendation is not to the degree we can we don't get lost in conversation right now about the next level of planning because I think there was a general consensus in our introductory comments that people wanted to do planning, but what planning we do or don't do I think will come up in the context of answering the five questions. And since we're gonna spend a half hour on each of these, I would just urge us to get to it as quickly as we can.

[1:19:26 PM]

>> Kitchen: Just real quickly, I'm sorry, we should have been more specific. I'm not talking about neighborhood planning when I use -- and one of the things that we want to clear up in the land development code is when we're talking about small area planning in this context, it's not neighborhood planning. The resolution that we all passed over a year ago was not about neighborhood plans. So I hear what you're saying about neighborhood plans. This is about you may think of it, like, the O statesman property. There was, you know -- there was planning around that area. There's been other planning in different parts of the city and the idea behind that planning is to consider -- is to align our investments from a transportation/housing/economic development standpoint with where in the city like activity corridors and things like that that we may want to encourage growth. I hear what you're saying about neighborhood plans. I just wanted to -- and maybe we would want to speak to that but I think those are separate issues, and I'm sorry we weren't clear about that. The use of the terms is not clearly defined. But I'm not speaking -- I think the neighborhood plans we need to talk about, but I think that's a separate issue.

>> Mayor Adler: We're gonna get to neighborhood planning as the topic after we get to the five. So keep that thought.

>> Kitchen: This isn't neighborhood planning so let's be clear about that.

>> Mayor Adler: Area planning, small area planning, the planning component associated with the land development code we're dealing with, whatever it's called, we're gonna get to it. but after we address these

five questions. >> Pool: Just to cap what Ann is saying is this was a 10-0 vote of us back in September of '17 to put these criteria into play and we sent staff off to go and get that started, and they never had a chance to come back and explain to us what they had or had not yet been able to do. so his was an attempt to kind of summarize that because it does have a role to play in how we go forward but it wasn't intended to be a full discussion of that topic.

[1:21:35 PM]

So to kind of close the communication loop with council, there was a resolution that Ann had led on, and we were looking for some answers, and we hadn't yet gotten them. With the two memos that we got from Greg Guernsey, one in the middle of March and one last Friday, I think it was or maybe this week, this was an attempt to surface those so if anybody had any questions they could ask them. But that's all. And this isn't neighborhood -- it's not neighborhood plans. It's not neighborhood Ni

>> I do want to offer a couple clarifications I think in response to mayor pro tem Garza's comments. Having -- I think we'll talk a little more in the coming questions about mapping and about kind of how -- what council wants the zoning map to look like. And there may be differences in thinking among you all about whether -- the more sort of intensive zoning should be deferred to a small area planning process. That may be something about which there are some different perspectives. But what I was suggesting is in response so councilmember Casar's comments is simply having a generalized enabling provision in the code that calls out small area planning as a thing and says here's the kind of circumstances where it's warranted considering. And that would not foreclose -- that would not dictate decisions on mapping. It would just sort of enable the process of small area planning and provide a little guidance. Just to flush out the concept a little bit, especially for those of you that are newer to the dais, some examples of small area planning would include, like, the east Riverside corridor, the north burnet gateway, TODs, stationeries, those are all examples of small area planning. Most of the time in our process, I think the small area planning process ultimately results in some sort of a regulating plan that is specific to an area that sort of is distinct from the land development code, that provides some very tailored, regulatory provisions, but cities will also use small area planning just to sort of guide area-wide rezones that use more conventional-based districts that are in the code but just apply them in a more thoughtful manner.

[1:23:51 PM]

So there's different approaches to small area planning. Having a little bit of meat in the code about what that looks like doesn't dictate what your decisions are gonna be on the map. So I guess that's all I would say

on that. And, mayor, if you're okay with that, I would like to offer just a few Gener comments before we dive into the specific questions.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> We all talked over lunch and just want to say that we're really appreciative of everybody's engagement. There's a lot of great material in all the differmessage board posts. We're impressed that you ready generated enough to warrant color-coding.

[Laughter] And we think that the raw material is here for clear direction. Does it need fine-tuning? Does it need edit absolutely. I think everybody recognizes that. But the raw material is here, and we look forward in the coming couple weeks to crystalize this.

[1:25:45 PM]

We're happy to help with wordsmithing, with helping to kind of crystallize and make the direction more precise if asked.

This is you your process, so we'll sort of look for your lead in terms of how you would like our help.

I do want to emphasize that substance is more important than form, that if you all want your ultimate deliverable to be a report, that's just sort of a document, more in the form of a memo, that is fine.

If you want it to be in the form of a resolution, that is fine too.

And so we're available to help in either way.

I also just want to say, before we dive into the specific questions, that a little bit of opinion, a little bit of philosophy in your direction is fine.

You have some of that.

You have, you know, some paragraphs, some essay writing, and that's fine.

But it's helpful if, once you've sort of established that sort of philosophical foundation, it's essential for this document to be useful, that you follow up with specific, concrete numbered direction.

And I think that you're moving in that direction with this document.

So we're hopeful that we're gonna get to a place where you will make a strong impact on what the code product is going forward.

And you'll provide direction that is gonna be very helpful to staff in doing that.

So those are just my general comments.

If we can with the mayor's if everyone is all right, should we just move into the first question?

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah.

I'll take us through that.

My hope is we don't give you any high level guidance or philosophy or that kind of stuff because I don't want to spend time doing that unless it's something you tell us you need for that.

Otherwise, I think we really want to get into discuss the specifics.

For me on this question number 1, I would hope that you get us back from a planning commission in October a new a code and a map that we can adopt on first reading at least before the end of the year.

So I would want to get you whatever it is that you need in order to be able to get that done.

And my sense is, is that as much of that as we can get done in April to provide direction for when you go away and do that, for me that's what I would want to do.

And my sense from people talking this morning is where most of the dais is.

As we go through these five things, if we're not addressing, we're glossing over or finessing, we're not giving you things that would be helpful direction to you with respect to these, I'd appreciate if you'd just raise your hand and say just to note, you guys didn't decide this tough question so we don't miss any.

And if we want to we can discuss those tough questions.

Okay?

Yes.

[1:27:15 PM]

>> And we talked that over at lunchtime, too, so you'll see us prepared.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good.

With respect to number 1, Greg no?

I was gonna say with respect to number 1, the question was what are we gonna do?

Is it a map and a text?

Or just text?

Or amendments to the existing one?

My sense was, is that most people were ready this morning, I think, to go to A1, which gives us the opportunity to actually put some stuff in place.

For me, the extent of that work, I think, we need to recognize that we're not gonna be able to deal with everything and get everything done, and that there's perhaps some I believe there will be some planning in some form or another that comes to after we would approve this.

Not trying to decide that form now.

I would hope that we would be able to do at least what was necessary for us to have the tools, thus the text, and at least the mapping of those tools.

In a way that enables us to achieve the things that we need to achieve to address affordability and mobility in the city.

Greg.

>> Casar: I think I'm at the same place on question number 1.

For me, it is within that time line as described by the mayor to achieve the to address those two primary key issues as described by the mayor and that the mapping should address the other four questions in the document.

Where we actually map missing middle housing to achieve our goals, actually map to our housing capacity in the blueprint and try to get as close to that income restricted goal as we can have&have capacity to reach our actual goal and where we redo and readjust compatibility and parking, again, to meet those same goals.

To me the scope is to actually do the five questions within our for our ten year planning horizon to get as much of it done this year and then if there's something we can't get done this year there can be small area planning to do more.

>> Mayor Adler: Jimmy.

[1:29:45 PM]

>> Flannigan: I would like a little more, not now, but explanation on difference between planning and what we're doing with this code.

Because I certainly have constituents and I have found myself in a place difficult to explain the difference between between mapping the whole city and writing a code and planning.

Because it sounds like planning.

So so a little clearer explanation for us in the community I think would be helpful.

What I heard Greg just say, which is kind of interesting thought, is that what we're doing in this round is the 10 year.

If we have a housing goal for 10 years then the housing activity is between what's between 11 and 20 and 20 and 30 for a 30 year life for a code.

7 that is an interesting thing.

As far as the scope, which I think this question is about on our document that that that kitchen, Renteria and Mathis put together, there's a question about the criteria, I want to make sure we are doing policy at the council level and not finding ourselves or staff finding itself applying policy at the criteria manual level.

That we are really thinking about that at the code level.

And I we brought up the form based or the use based, but I think there's a kind of a scope question in terms of of how how substantive is this change.

So there's a there's not just do we write it and do a map and do it at the same time, but I think there's a scope question.

>> So I can address that and there's just I think a couple of concrete specific questions related to scope that that we want to talk about a little bit and get some direction on.

I will address form based code first.

I want to say for potentially this question, but definitely all of the others. We have staff present. We have a great team of people from planning and zoning.

We also have transportation present and neighborhood housing as well. I think that you will be hearing from all of those departments this afternoon.

With respect to form based coding, for those of you that may have different levels of understanding of what form based coding is, it basically is a philosophy of coding that seeks to get away from separating uses, having districts that are sort of defined rigidly by different use classifications and focus more on the form of the building and how it relates to the public realm.

>> Does anybody need the description of form based just want to make sure that we're spending the time well because

>> That was all that I was going to say on it.

>> Mayor Adler: All right.

>> So that I just wanted to be clear that we all knew what we were talking about.

Draft 1 of CodeNEXT had a very robust form based coding that made that a central part of the code.

Staff does not recommend that.

Staff in the interest of sort of finalizing a code product for council to consider is if council would like to see more of the less emphasis on separation of uses along the corridors, less prescription with regard to what land uses are allowed or prohibited within certain areas, that is perfectly fine.

But sort of going back to the more more full on form based code approach, which can be can be introduces some complexity.

[1:31:45 PM]

As part of form based code is also form controls.

Controls of what buildings look like, a lot more detailed regulation, with regard to building form than we generally have under more conventional zoning.

The bottom line is we do not recommend going more full on with form based coding, but to incorporate the overall philosophy along corridors or within centers with respect to kind of loosening the separation of uses, that is the kind of direction that I think staff could consider and implement within, you know, the time and vision for for a code development process.

>> If I might just I'm not certainly going to advocate for anything I saw in CodeNEXT as what I imagine form based code to be.

So part of this is I think, what I said earlier about the scale of the things that get built is the is my primary thing that I would like to see.

Even if we're not getting into how big the balconies are.

Then what I have routinely in nearly every council meeting brought up about how we do use policy based use restrictions that are based on not just what property happened to be rezoned at that moment and being more thoughtful about that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> The other question with regard to scope that I just this is an issue that I think will come up and sort of animate discussion of the other questions as well, but is just with regard to mapping.

And the question is just how robust are a new zoning map do you want to see in terms of the more intensive zones being applied on a city wide basis.

And I think part of that question, it's not the only aspect of it, that is the F 25 zoning category.

That is the former title 25 zoning category.

And that is a category that is used basically, a placeholder category, that is meant to sort of preserve existing zoning, but also, you know, we don't it would be untenable for the City to have a zoning map that uses different zonings under different codes.

So for those areas that council does want to preserve, under a current zoning regime, F 25 is the placeholder.

And one, I think, direction that would be very helpful to staff is just do you want to see a level of F 25 zoning comparable to what draft 3 provided or do you want to see less of that and more robust application of the newer zoning categories?

So that is, I think

>> Mayor Adler: I'm trying to distill what you said into specific questions.

One of the questions that you want us to answer do we want to preserve the existing draft 3 F 25 or decrease or increase that.

That's one question.

What's the other question that you wanted to have answered?

>> I think that's with regard to mapping.

>> Mayor Adler: Just that one question.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

Conversation about mapping and code.

>> Yes.

Anne?

>> Kitchen: Okay.

So I also want to ask that question and I'll give you my thinking about it.

Because when we say that we want mapping, I think we need to drill down a little bit more in order for you guys to have direction.

So so I would be thinking, this is what I want to check and see if we're on the same page or not, I would be thinking that when we're talking about bringing us a map at the same time that we're bringing us code changes, that we would be starting with draft 3 map, and that would be the base that you would make changes to, you would then make changes to it based on the direction that we're giving you, not just these four questions, but any direction that we give you as part of this process.

However, I think it's important for us to to allow for to allow for the fact that some of that mapping may not be able to happen right now.

[1:33:45 PM]

I'm thinking specifically to the extent that we that we give direction on context sensitive criteria for compatibility, for example, then I would think that there may be places where we're not ready to map that.

With the map that comes back to us.

Depending on the extent to which people are we'll have to see what we decide in terms of that particular issue.

But what I don't want to say here as part of this one is we're going to map every single thing that we give direction on, because we don't know yet.

So I just want to allow for the fact that we would try to do most of the mapping, but that we would acknowledge that we may have to kick some of the mapping to a little bit later in the process.

Is everybody are we on the same page with that caveat?

>> Renteria: I feel like that should be the way that we go.

Last time when we tried do all of the mapping it got so confusing everybody was looking at just their piece of property and not knowing whether what that meant.

So I think we should do I'm more in support of A 2, but that's just me.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: So Kathie?

>> Tovo: Yeah.

As I said earlier, I can see advantages and disadvantages of decoupling it from the map.

One of them is that there were they were there were lots of properties that people wanted to talk about and there were some errors on the it just I'm not sure I'm not sure about the feasibility and the time table.

And I do think for some of those context specific conversations that they are going to take some time.

Back to the F 25 though.

It's my understanding those are applied there weren't terribly many instances of them and they were applied in the neighborhood combining district, right?

>> Hi, yes. That was one of the components. The other one was whether we had PUDs or TODs today. NBG and [indiscernible] zoning and then a slew of COs and [indiscernible].

Those were the criteria for F 25 in draft 3.

>> Tovo: Okay.

So those are all a little bit different, right?

The PUD is going to be complex enough that it's going to be hard to map that in any other way.

The COs I suppose the idea was to build them into a new zoning category.

That seemed to provide some challenges.

Yes?

>> And we don't have to get like a definitive direction on this question right now.

I think your direction on missing middle, on other issues, may inform the mapping question.

But I just want to tee it up as something that is going to be important for council or staff to have a little bit more clarity on going forward.

But but I want to just sort of add on to what lacy Patterson from planning and zoning, who is a mapping expert and will be very central to the process going forward, to some of the comments that she made.

So so there are some categories that were labeled F 25 on the zoning map that we actually don't think need to be F 25.

Like PUDs. So we so some of the old PUDs, well all of the PUDs now are written in a manner where they reference current title 25.

[1:35:45 PM]

But we're still going to have PUD zoning going forward, so we're no longer, I think, going to be recommending that those be labeled F 25.

We will simply have some text that accompanies the PUD classification that says if it's a PUD that's built on today's code, today's code applies to the extent necessary.

So we've already identified some ways in which F 25 isn't necessary.

But where we will need your direction on is are there areas where council wants to preserve current SF 2, for example?

Are there areas where council wants to preserve zoning categories that are not going to be carried going forward.

The residential categories going forward, as you all know, are like the residential house scale, the R zones.

So F 25 to the extent council wants to see it would be appropriate for those areas where you really want to kind of temporarily preserve status quo zoning.

We can talk about going forward in relation to other questions. >> One question going back to the question that you asked.

I would like to see us map and and do the code [indiscernible] and map along the corridors and in the centers.

And then to figure out what we're going to do with respect to the transition areas.

I recognize that there's a level of detail that goes beyond when we could decide how constrained or not constrained to make the transition areas or how we deal with compatibility.

[1:37:15 PM

But I would like to see us do it.

I would like to see it on the ground so things can actually start developing that way in our community.

I'm not adverse and think it would be good for us to come back with part of a planning process.

To determine whether or not there are changes made on a site specific basis on those things.

But my hope is, for me, that we actually adopt something that that are in those areas, even recognizing that we want to go back into those same areas as part of a larger planning process, that's where I would be on that question.

The F 25 question, where I would be on that, I think that that there are some places where where it's important for us to carry forward what we already have.

So where we have a regulating plan where we have a station area plan.

I think those things carry forward as part of the new code which I think is what I heard you say.

Beyond that I think that where we already have unique zoning districts, that could be PUDs or unique zoning districts, I think we would carry that forward.

What I'm uncertain about in the whole category that you had or just the CO areas, I don't know if it's a way for us to incorporate the CO standards into some of the tools that we have.

But that's where I would be at those questions.

Greg and then

[1:39:15 PM]

>> Kitchen: You can go first.

>> I had asked the staff a question but I never got to provide my feedback.

>> Mayor Adler: We will come back over here for Greg.

>> Tovo: I can speak to the neighborhood conservation combining districts and my interest in seeing those continue.

These are in areas such as Hyde Park, I know Hyde Park was often coming up in discussions of CodeNEXT.

I think as we look at moving forward in a kind of informed way, I would point out that though Hyde Park was became a place that there were lots of comments about changing the zoning and F 25 became the poster child of F 25, it is an area that has has the mapping is imperfect.

But have in the neighborhood in the high 70s percentage of units are rental units.

So I think that those neighborhood conservation combining districts fall primarily in my area, although there is also one in District 1.

I would say the complex they are not terribly complex, but the body of the zoning that are part of those historic neighborhoods are an important have been an important part of the place making in those areas and they have before, you know, accessory dwelling units were permitted on other single family lots, they were permitted in Hyde Park.

And so I would say that those are the COs and the others I know we're going to talk about separately.

But as a person who represents areas with four of those NCDDs, I think that I have a strong interest in seeing those continue forward as part of continuing our

[1:41:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I'm trying to distill the questions that I've heard.

One is we would preserve F 25 and do we want to go beyond mapping the corridor centers and transitions?

And what does it mean to map those? I think those are the two questions that I distilled from what you had. Greg?

>> Casar: So on the F 25 question, I'm trying to bring y'all some discretion on how it is that you have some of those individual cases.

But what I don't want to do is get caught up as we're trying to fix this for the whole city on an efficient way, on like any one building or any one CO that did this or that.

I don't want us to get so caught up, slowed down by any individual parcel too much.

So if anything, if there are places whereas the mayor mentioned that you can't there's a slew of COs that are trying to block storage in areas that we want to be walkable, yeah, if you could just write the zoning category as to generally discourage or not have storage, that clears up a bunch of CO that's fine.

But I don't want to lose the whole forest because we're dealing with a few trees in this process.

Also if you give us the tools and the ability to go in and say, well, on these plays we are actually going to use this new zoning category and get rid of the F 25 because it makes sense to us, fine.

But I don't want you all belaboring or us belaboring it because I think ultimately those cases are pretty few and far between.

On the mapping question, I do think when we're talking about mapping and adding housing capacity, that the corridors and mapping this [indiscernible] off of those corridors makes really good sense.

Right now this document has two pretty clear pieces of direction.

One we want to try to get closer to our goal of 30% of housing being produced being missing middle and two we need to create some sort of thoughtful criteria that with potential exceptions for where that goes.

And if what's in this document is sufficient for you guys to move forward, great.

[1:43:20 PM]

It seems to me there is a potential that you might need to say to us we need you to give better direction how deep those transitions go and how we get you that more missing middle housing.

I'm happy for us to take that on here in the month of April if you need that additional direction.

To me, like I said, almost seven years into the into this process CodeNEXT draft 3 produced minimal amounts of missing middle housing, so we need to be able to do some that is more.

At the same time I do agree with Councilmember Kitchen's points or questions, if there are particular areas or particular places where it is harder to do and that there needs to be more thoughtful planning in order to do it, I'm just marking here that I'm willing for us to get get the majority of it done, a strong majority of it done, if in the end it means that we're going to have to do some more next year or the year after that to fine tune some particular areas.

I just don't want to hold up everything else.

I don't want to hold up most of the missing middle housing because I'm worried about a part, some of it.

>> A lot of questions that [indiscernible].

Trying to make some some sense here. First, I'm not sure how we're using the documents.

But it's very important for me to point out that the document that Mr. Casar did not include any of the shared goals that both the mayor and I and Anne had in there and that were cited as direction and those are worded as things that would be informing the mapping.

>> Mayor Adler: Do you want to list some of the things that you think are

>> You had key goals on Page 2, bullet points [indiscernible], Page 5 bullet point 6 which are all in your comments or Anne's comments.

Every time that it was stated as part of your direction being those key goals, that was that was perhaps inadvertently, but it's not in the document and it's important for me that that direction be there because it informed how we go about about each of these things and provide some of the context that that I think should be there.

And so it's I just want to point out that it's missing

>> I think what would be most helpful for me a lot of those I think were high level kind of theory and intent kind of stuff that I think collectively we're trying to stay away from.

But if there are really specific things that tell the staff what it is that we want them to do, then please pull it out so that we can actually write it into the the document.

I thought most of the things as I read the key goals, they were the basis for, the understanding, the intent behind the kinds of things that I saw written in the document.

So it was more of kind of kind of that was supporting information for the specific things that were mentioned as opposed to being independent things themselves.

But if something is missing from that, and you would pull it forward, that would be helpful, then we could have a conversation about whether that belonged in our final thing or not.

[1:45:15 PM]

>> I will try to do that, I don't have that done given when we got the document and whatnot.

I just wanted to note that was missing.

I think the conversation about the form based is interesting.

I'm not sure that I fully understand what you are proposing in terms of a form, you know, to the extent that it's talking about the scale and not regulating some of those other pieces.

That's an interesting direction, but I don't fully understand what that means to say that.

I would be in favor of that.

So I would like more information on that.

Appreciate Councilmember Flannigan and Councilmember Casar bringing up the questions of uses.

One of the things that I think that we have to think about as we are mapping corridors and activity centers, what are some of the uses we don't want.

We have a huge number of storage units on Burnet on our corridor that could easily have been residential that ended up storage because they were allowed to.

I just think we should not allow storage in good chunks of our corridors.

Others, too, so how do we put the uses to we get the residential or kinds of businesses that we think are going to support what we're going for.

I am, you know generally okay with the direction on this one.

I am I am still uncertain about the feasibility of doing this within the timeframe. That folks are laying out.

My agreement with it is ultimately going to depend on the answers to the other four, because I think it kind of feeds back into this one.

I think it's a really interesting direction that we can just kind of roll our PUDs over as PUDs.

I would be curious to have a little bit more data on the numbers of of other zoning categories that would be falling into F 25 and and any sense that we had of where those were.

As well.

>> Just very briefly, zoning categories that some zoning categories were labeled F 25 for no other reason than the document sort of creating that special category was written with reference to current title 25.

And I think that that if it's a zoning category that we want to be active going forward, it represents something that the City would want to enable in its current code.

It doesn't need to be F 25.

So I think there's some things like PUDs, like north Burnet gateway, like East Riverside, that cannot don't have to be labeled F 25.

I think the mayor's formulation of the question, those two component parts, is helpful to just keep in mind

>> Mayor Adler: Let's ask about that.

Does anybody disagree with the general proposition that we should be carrying forward unique zoning districts, such as NCCDs or PDAs, that we should carry forward with areas regulating plans like the ones that you mentioned?

Does anybody generally disagree with that?

Jimmy.

[1:47:45 PM]

>> Flannigan: I think the devil is in the details on this.

I would the things that are highly customized like PUDs seem very straightforward to carry on into the future.

's of but I would be really curious to see if something in an NCCD might be baked into whatever the toolbox is so that it becomes a tool we might use elsewhere in parts of town that really are not going to get the [indiscernible] plan.

Like every part of my district which is not afforded the type of process that leads to an NCCD, but maybe these are great tools that we might want to apply elsewhere.

It's hard for me to answer the question until I know I think it would be great to see if we could bake those types of things that we like into a code.

And not require it be a separate process.

I think that's my point.

>> Mayor Adler: So we don't get lost just on that for right now, let's bookmark NCCDs and they with take a look at whether or not they would be called out, but I think that the general premise is as stated let's bookmark and come back to the conversation about the NCCDs.

Yes, Greg? >> Casar: One detailed question.

I think I feel comfortable with this detailed question.

Let's say in a TOD, in in my district, or a CO case in my district, I wanted to apply one of the new zones in this round.

If you got this direction as we just described, leave the TODs, leave the PUDs the way that they are.

Do you envision my understanding is let's say that part of the TOD of Guadalupe and St. John's wort in my district, if I wanted to remove some of that from F 25 and put a new zone there, that this wouldn't preclude me from doing that if on a case by case basis I wanted to do that.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that's the sums that we're work assumption that we're working with here, with respect to everything that we do.

>> Casar: I wanted to make sure we aren't locking ourselves out, that if the baseline was out, we couldn't change that this year.

>> Mayor Adler: Honestly, seriously, because if we don't adopt that rule generally, we're not going to be able to do anything because everyone will always have a site specific thing that they're going to want to incorporate into the general rule.

So we're going to say this is the general rule, do this.

But as part of the process, people can say that doesn't apply here, should be done in a different way.

Anne? >> Kitchen: I'm going to need to I want to comment go first. Much.

[1:49:45 PM]

>> I had a really quick question about talking about PUDs and transportation.

Transit Oriented Development.

Mostly they already have ordinances written on them and stuff is underway.

Those were agreements that were hard fought.

We're not suggesting that we would open those back up and change them.

>> The comment that I made, getting into a level of minutiae that I don't want to distract people.

Those TODs that everybody wants to be carried forward doesn't need to be called F 25.

They were only called F 25 because the documents are written with

>> There wasn't room for them in the existing document.

>> I think what we're talking about going forward is those zoning categories that really were adopted fairly recently, kind of reflective of sort of more forward thinking sort of values.

Those would just be called TODs.

Just be called north Burnet gateway.

Yes, when you actually open the documents up, they're going to still require us to refer to the current code because we don't have time to rewrite them with current citations.

But they don't have to be called out as F 25.

I think the mayor has correctly identified the circumstances in which F 25 would be appropriate and that can be certainly a discussion that we have going forward.

I think we've hopefully helped kind of frame the issue.

[1:51:15 PM]

>> Okay.

>> I'm going to go to the second question that you posed.

That gets back to the mapping.

I'm not sure that I have I'm not sure that I'm understanding so what I'm trying to say is that I don't I don't want to give direction at this point that we will map I'm trying to figure out how we map transition zones which I think there's some general agreement to context sensitive criteria.

So unless we are able to to come up with the specific context, specific criteria, even then, I first of off, let me back up.

I don't want to slow down the process of mapping the areas that we can.

Because I think that's important and I think I'm hearing from everyone that we want we want to move forward and do some concrete things.

So my supposition, when we get to context sensitive discussion that we're going to find that's the exception as, you know, as Councilmember Casar said, it's the exception not the rule.

Which means that it's going to be less areas.

But my concern is that I don't want to map areas and then come back later and have to remap them.

Then come back later and deal with the context sensitive part of them.

Once you map them, you can't go back.

So it is a placeholder at the moment.

All that I'm trying to do under number one, because we have to we have to move to this conversation under number 4.

All that I'm trying to do under No. 1 is say we will map the corridors, we will map the neighborhoods, we will make the transition zones, except to the extent that there are context sensitive requirements that we want to apply that we may decide to do a some sort of process that might take a bit longer.

That's all that I'm that's the only thing that I'm trying to say right now. >> Mayor Adler: And I guess I think that makes sense to me.

What I don't want to have is the exception swallow the rule.

>> Kitchen: I just said that.

>> Mayor Adler: To the degree we can say we're going to try to map the tools so that we can realize on the corridors the density and supply that we want, and there's some kind of minimum something that has to happen for that to happen, like for instance the lots being of a category that doesn't trigger compatibility, I can see us doing that.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Before we would expand that into the neighborhoods, I would think that we need to either deal with the general rule that people like or we hold that for a contact sensitive kind of discussion.

But I would want us to at least get the minimum necessary for us to be able to unlock the corridors and the centers and to give us some amount of that of that fronting missing middle housing.

>> Kitchen: That makes sense to me.

I have to ask one further question.

What does that mean, our goals and unlocking affordability?

The reason I ask that is because in our documents, we were we are pulling out different goals and we have a set of goals.

We have a set of goals for affordability, which is the 60,000 we've got a set of goals, 135, we've got a set of goals of 30% and we have some other goals, too.

[1:53:15 PM]

So I just want to be specific.

I would be thinking that's our set of goals.

And that when we're trying to accomplish something we're looking at that set of goals.

So I just want to make sure that we're clear on that because to my mind sometimes when we're balancing these goals, you know, if we just focus on one of them, we may not get the other one.

That's why I want to be real specific if we say we're going to map the corridors, so we meet our goals, to my mind that means all of our goals.

I want to make sure we're all on the same page with that.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that for me we will get into the detail of that as we talk about missing middle housing, talk about compatibility.

I think that will true up.

My only concern with trying to meet all of our goals all of the time is that if we don't set any priorities, we are not setting any priorities, we might not be able to realize any of our goals or we're effectively not realizing some goals because we have done that.

I would want us to have a conversation about priority so as to be able to deliver on certain things, but I think that would be a conversation to have.

But I think you're right we need to have it in the context of what our goals are.

[1:55:45 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay.

So I'm hoping that we are moving towards agreement at least for This No. 1 at this point in time we are allowing that we may not map everything in the transition zones right now that we have to have this other conversation before we can say exactly what we're going to map.

>> I bookmark that now and let see how the conversation is going points 2, 3, 4, 5, see if that answer then helps us answer the question From No. 1 Renteria mayor, that's what I was trying to say.

When I was saying about the mapping is that if we try to map everything, it's going to bog down everything.

So we really need to start focusing on what the major corridors, what I feel like.

And that's that's where I stand at.

But, you know, I I'm afraid if we start trying to map the whole city, it's just going to bog down the whole thing again, you know. It did last time.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> I think it's why it's important to be looking at this map at the same time, if we are really going to provide all types of housing in all places for all kinds of people, we're going to have to be looking at this, you know, in ways where maybe there are some missing spots.

Like my district doesn't have a lot of high density corridors but we still need that housing.

I think in order to incentivize the transit plans that we are working on, we are going to have to have some sort of idea where we are building the density, corridor, transition zones, understanding there's sensitivity with overlapping plans.

But to not do the map because we want to talk about that at a separate time would be detrimental to this process.

[1:57:15 PM]

>> Allison?

>> Alter: I generally agree with Councilmember Kitchen and how she's laid out the mapping with the context sensitivity.

I just wanted to ask for clarification.

I think we're all on the same page, but since it's easy to refer to corridors, I know the documents mentioned, activity centers which are really appreciated.

One of the critiques of CodeNEXT is that the active centers were not addressed that and because we talk about corridors, then the assumption is that everything has to go downtown.

I don't think that's what we are trying to accomplish.

That affects the mapping and to the extent that we are not looking at the activity centers for that density and we are only looking at the corridors, it sends I think the wrong message to the community.

I know that's easy to use as shorthand.

I just wanted to throw it out to see if there was some agreement that we were really talking about corridors and activity centers, not just corridors.

There's some room for improvement I think in the activity centers to be achieving our goals whether or not actually something that we have addressed.

I think there's confusion out there in the community as we speak.

So am I am I sensing >> Mayor Adler: For me, if I ever use the word corridor and not corridors and activity centers, then I misspoke.

Because every time so far I mentioned corridors that would also apply to active centers as well.

I think that's general consensus on that.

>> I think that that part of the anxiety comes from a sense by saying these things that we are saying, all of the density has to go, you know, in a certain area.

But there are these activity centers and we want to distribute that out and helps us achieve our mobility and our affordability goals.

>> Mayor Adler: I think there's agreement.

I look around and people are nodding.

Leslie?

[1:59:45 PM]

>> Pool: That underscores a conversation that I've been having with staff and that is to look at the organic growth of our city since imagine Austin was passed.

We have new nodes of activity we haven't memorialized on our growth map.

Our growth concept map and I think that's also an area that we should address because we have more of them out there than we than we put on seven years ago.

>> Mayor Adler: Maybe the thing we do out of this, if you could develop a list of what you understand to be the directions from the dais, as best you can, and then in each section list these are additional questions that we're unclear of, unclear whether there was a consensus on.

Or just as an additional question that is that staff left alone told to develop something would be wondering what the council direction would be on that.

With respect to each one of these five areas where you think and you can pull language out of these things if you want to, but tell us what the direction is.

Not so much value statements except insofar as value statements are helpful to you, but then list the questions that you want as to make sure that we answer for you in those or just open.

And maybe that the council can't answer them.

But just to identify them for us.

Kathie?

[2:01:15 PM]

>> Tovo: I like that plan.

I know we're not talking about process.

But I do want to just throw out for contemplation the value instead of trying to agree on which value statements to include and which not to and whatnot, the document that you, Councilmember Kitchen and Councilmember Alter did, I think had a lot of support and I know we have new colleagues who will want to review it and talk about it as well.

But that may be the if we need a value document to go along with this, I would suggest that might be easier than trying to agree on new language.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

Thank you.

So anything else anybody wants to add?

Any top line questions On No. 1 that you want us to speak to that you can think of right offhand, that you have insufficient

>> Mayor, with regard to the last comment about if staff could take this document and then add the direction, I think the concern that we would have is of course this is only the first question.

We haven't gotten to the other four.

At this point what we want to do is listen to the feedback and see where we're at.

It may be what we do is we put, with regard to each of those questions, more clarification of what our position is.

And then council then opine on that maybe through the message board or something like that.

[2:03:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: However you want to make a statement and ask us to react to that.

If you think there's insufficient direction from council from something that's left open, either ask a question and say do you agree or disagree with this statement.

What I want to make sure is if we act in April, you are not looking at each other in May and saying I wish we had some direction on this.

I want to give all of the direction we can give to you.

At least a shot at that.

If there's nothing else On No. 1, we will go To No. 2.

All right.

On To No. 2.

No. 2 is housing supply questions.

>> Flannigan: We addressed this in the document the four of us put together.

There seems to be agreement the [indiscernible] how do we scale that number out sufficiently to look at the result of this process.

There I still think there's a lot of confusion in the community when we were doing that forecast capacity balance.

But as opposed to just picking a number out of the air, and saying 135 double that, triple that, quadruple that, whatever that is, I'm hoping for a little staff direction on how to answer this question.

Because it's we already voted on the outcome.

The 135.

What do we have to see in this to reliably believe we're going to get that outcome in 10 years?

[2:05:15 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I think ape's gloss on it, we did not only approve 135, we also approved 160 within a certain range.

I think those are both goals.

Not one or the other but both, individually directed.

I would like to know how much opportunities we have to provide in the community to be able to achieve both of those.

Do you need more direction from us other than do what you need to do to achieve both of those?

>> No.

I think council can give very general direction along the lines of what you just suggested.

This is also, you know, a question that informs potentially the map and relates to other questions as well.

So it's a technical question.

A lot of different questions about capacity yields forecast.

In regard to lacy we have Laura Keating here who is a specialist in this area, also involved in mapping and GIS.

If council has any questions to help you better understand capacity and what direction you may want to give, I think now would be a great time to pose those questions.

[2:07:45 PM]

>> The question that I would have is what direction would you need other than we want to have enough opportunities around the City so that we have that a legitimate expectation that we will actually get 135 total and at least and 60,000 at least, which incorporates having enough supply in this city, enough supply in the areas where people want to build, where the market wants to build so that we actually realize that.

I think there's consensus on those numbers.

So I'm not sure what other additional information or questions you would need for us to answer to say go forth and do great work.

Greg and then page on this question.

>> Casar: I agree with that.

I think that there is other direction that would be useful because I think in some ways draft 3 fell short of each of those, right.

I agree with Councilmember Flannigan that the ultimate yield is is you know, is the goal and we have to get there.

And draft 3 at 287 of capacity, I think a lot of the experts were saying that's probably cutting it too too close.

But I think on top of the outcomes that you have laid out, mayor, CodeNEXT draft 3 produced, yeah, four times as many income restricted density bonus units as our current code, which is good.

But four times as many was still very short of eating into that 60,000 more.

So for me it really is the most income restricted units as we can get the better.

I think that the consultants had some levers that they were already preparing for us that would have increased that number by many times more.

For me it as close to that 60,000 as you can get.

[2:09:15 PM]

Also where that housing capacity is distributed I think is an important part of the conversation because in draft 3 you had 200,000 units of capacity outside of the urban core and 86,000 inside of it.

To me that seems not the growth pattern that we're talking about in imagine Austin.

I know that it's never going to be all inside of the urban core.

But 200,000 versus 86,000 seems to me to be too far skewed outside of the urban core as in too far skewed into low income opportunity as opposed to evening distributed.

What kind of capacity I think is important.

We can talk about it when we get to the missing middle question.

Of the something like 140,000 new units and capacity in draft 3, about 2% of that 140,000 was in missing middle housing.

So if our goal is to have more missing middle housing increasing by 2% seems like close to nothing.

While there are bigger goals, how those numbers look on the ground to me is more income restricted, more equitably distributed, more urban distributed and more affordable for low income people on the

[2:11:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Do you know what kind of levers were being considered in order to improve those numbers.

>> Casar: Like the dash A which was adding residential into commercial zones as long as they participated in the affordable housing bonus.

>> Mayor Adler: Which I think there is unanimous sentiment for around the dais.

>> Casar: I think in some places it was better calculating and utilizing city bonuses in more places.

At this point it was probably almost a year ago we got that presentation.

Maybe you guys have had a whole nother year to think of more good ways.

To me how they are distributed and what the housing type is because just relying on large single family house or large apartment building for our housing capacity we are trying to get away from some of that.

>> Mayor Adler: Page, Allison and then Leslie.

>> I think that's why I would call for validated housing capacity modeling.

I know with a decision this large on how to get over 287,000 new units it would be helpful to see even just to kind of a breakdown of information that you already have regarding, you know, economic growth, housing units being built, similar economies to ours like other cities we might be able to compare against for the next foreseeable future.

So I think just seeing it spelled out that way would be helpful for me.

It may be data that you already have access to.

It may help to kind of see it in one or two page kind of break down of what that number should really be.

[2:13:15 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

Thank you.

Allison?

>> Alter: So page's idea there of a validated housing model.

I think it should also be informed by our demographer and our demographic data on the number of units and permits that we're already producing.

We've produced quite a few even since we started the CodeNEXT process.

And to better understand where we're on track.

We had a discussion during the housing blueprint.

I just want to raise for discussion purposes, the 60,000 is actually a number that represents something that we need in the City that we have demonstrated a lack of within the City.

135,000 number is a need for the whole MSA that we decided to adopt as our city goal and those make them very different numbers as we're thinking about our capacity.

Moving forward.

Just so we have that background recalled.

On this point I wanted to clarify just because the translation from the message board into the compiled document missed a very important part of my direction.

[2:15:45 PM]

So my direction was not simply that the citizens community bonuses should be properly calibrated to produce as many affordable units as possible and as efficiently as possible.

That should happen when we are considering mapping additional entitlements, you know, in conjunction with the map that we have to get that right to get the affordable units because you can make a lot of entitlements and make it so you don't want to take advantage of the density bonus.

You can also make it so that it makes the land incredibly expensive for everyone but also particularly for those you are trying to purchase it to build affordable housing.

So I want to make sure that it reflects that kind of nuance.

In the same section, also not translated from the other document, was the inclusion of Parkland as something that we would be prioritizing.

Again, as I said before, we have an interest in if we densify, we need to have that Parkland space that we have as one of our strategic goals, access to Parkland, I think that's important to keep in there.

Some other thoughts on Page 7, but I'll let other folks go.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

Anne and then Leslie.

[2:17:45 PM]

>> Kitchen: I would say, I would also say so mayor you had posed the question about what direction is needed to reach the 135 and the 60,000 goals.

I think we were probably shorthanding that for a couple of other goals in there.

But I think when we say that we're also talking about the 10,000 preserving affordable housing units and producing the permanent supportive housing units.

Those are all goals wrapped together.

I think that's intent.

So Councilmember Ellis, if I heard you correctly, that you were suggesting that I agree as part of that, that we have some kind of I forget the exact word that you used, but the modeling or the housing model.

So I think that's important.

I would add one other thing, because this all goes together to me.

If we're asking what do we need to do to reach those goals, and we are saying that we need to do some kind of modeling to make sure that we're going to do it, going to reach it, I would also want to know what are the policies to accomplish this?

And in other words I'm I'm okay with giving direction to get there, but I want to know what the policies are that you all would put in place to get us there.

So to the extent that you can tell us that, during this process that we're giving you direction, that would be very helpful.

Because then we're giving you direction at a deeper level, understanding and telling you our priorities for the tradeoff.

If we don't have that conversation now we're going to have it when it comes back to us and it would be giving you some better direction now if we had it now.

So, for example, we have been talking about the importance of the Parkland and tree preservation and things like that.

And personally I don't think see those as in conflict with our housing goals.

But I would want but I wouldn't want to give you a direction for a housing goal not understanding that in your mind that meant that we were going to not preserve as many trees.

If this is for clarity and understanding on the direction we're giving you.

Does that make sense?

Okay.

[2:19:15 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Leslie?

>> Pool: So kind of in the order of people offering these up, same things are in my mind.

Page talked about the validated housing capacity model.

We absolutely have to have that.

That goes to what Ryan Robinson the demographer told us about.

One half of the equation was numbers for the MSMA and the other half for the City of Austin and we went ahead and continue to approach that.

I think we need to have the demographer tell us how many units have we already gotten on the ground.

Let's just say in the last three years.

Or two years.

Whatever so that we have a solid number from which to work.

We have been doing an a massive job approving zoning changes throughout the City for the four and a half years I've been on the council, that's got to have translated into significant numbers on the ground.

So when we talk about 145,000 or 60,000 or 135,000 or 287,000, I want to know how we have validated the capacity numbers and how we have moved the dial to achieve them.

[2:21:45 PM]

So then we know what we have left to work on.

And I think that if we can get to via news on every corridor, I talked about this morning, there's general agreement VMUs on every corridor, that will additionally pump up those numbers in ways that we can then work with.

Then we don't have to give away entitlements when we really need to ensure we are getting community benefits back from the developers who are bringing us this housing so we are not giving things away without getting something in return.

So I want to confirm and emphasize what page said about the validated housing capacity model.

What Allison said about the demographer, the numbers that he's already provided, the differs between the MSMA numbers versus the City of Austin numbers and then specifically Anne's comments about Parkland.

We absolutely have to maintain our tree canopy, it keeps our air clean, it's the cheapest way to clean our air.

Way cheaper than any kind of an air cleaner that we would put in institutionally.

So Parkland and open space have to remain an integrated part of our documents and it's not an either/or.

>> Mayor Adler: Greg?

[2:23:15 PM]

>> Casar: I think that folks, I hope that folks mean what it is we are saying here is the 135 in our [indiscernible] blueprint is not the metropolitan housing need.

The 135 in the metropolitan housing is much greater than 135,000.

We adopted 135,000 into our comprehensive plan and our housing blueprint as us wanting to capture, to build more housing inside of the city than usual.

And capture some of the regional housing that is sprawl and displacement into the City to reduce the rate of sprawl and displacement that was occurring.

By no means is 135 the metro need.

The metro need is much, much greater than that.

When the demographer came and explained to us that 135 was ambitious, that's why we set an ambitious goal because we want to get from where we were going to have 80 to 90,000 up to 135.

Which would mean we were capturing some of the regional demand inside of the city.

He did explain really clearly that we would need to not only make land use and planning changes if we wanted to accomplish 135 but also make transportation investments like mass transit investments for people to feel like there was a place for them in the City and that they could get around.

[2:25:45 PM]

I wanted to make it really clear.

Because I have heard people misunderstand and think that we are capturing all of the metropolitan area's housing needs inside of the city and that's not the case.

>> Flannigan: The building of housing inside the City of Austin is almost always going to be more environmentally friendly than any other housing that we will get in the MSA because of the density, saves water and it would be under our regulations, et cetera, et cetera, as opposed to a lot of the housing that I see bordering my district out in Williamson County.

Very fine housing, but not necessarily going to be environmentally sensitive as what we get in Austin.

Thank you Councilmember Kitchen for bringing up the point about tradeoffs.

Question No. 6 that the four of us put together kind of addresses that.

The number of units that we get is the lowest priority and we enforce the set backs, heights, frontage, lot widths, all of that stuff first and whatever we get from the unit yield is the last metric.

I think there's a way to rethink that, is there a space for administrative variance that helps maintain the unit goal and preserves a tree or that we are able to more clearly define when you can use a drainage field as open space because the engineering has made it so it's a safe place and has a trail around it or something and finding more ways to think through what the ranking of priorities are to the extent that it is not just a matrix and very complicated but that we are actually getting housing, which getting housing itself is a community benefit.

It's why it's number one and number two on our strategic plan.

[2:27:15 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I WOULD HAVE THREE THINGS REAL FAST.

THE FIRST IS THE CITY VERSUS THE AREA OUTSIDE.

I THINK THIS IS A POINT THAT HAS BEEN DEBATED IN THE COMMUNITY.

IT IS REALLY CLEAR THAT MOST OF OUR GROWTH IS HAPPENING NOW OUTSIDE OF THE CITY AND I THINK THE DEMOGRAPHER POINTED THAT OUT.

I THINK ONE OF OUR GOALS IS TO STOP THAT TREND, AND TO DO SOMETHING AFFIRMATIVE THAT WILL REVERSE THAT, BECAUSE WE WANT TO WE DON'T WANT IT TO HAPPEN FURTHER AND FURTHER AWAY FOR ALL THE REASONS THAT PEOPLE HAVE GIVEN AND I THINK IT'S GOING TO REQUIRE US TO ADOPT DIFFERENT POLICIES IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO TO STOP THAT PATTERN.

I THINK THE DEMOGRAPHER HAD GIVEN US NUMBERS ON WHAT TO EXPECT WITH HOUSING IF THAT TREND WERE TO CONTINUE AND THAT WAS GOOD INFORMATION TO GET.

IT WAS ALSO VERY SCARY TO SEE.MY HOPE IS THAT WE WE DON'T THAT THAT IS NOT OUR FUTURE, AND I THINK THAT ONE OF THE WAYS THAT WE DO THAT IS WITH RESPECT TO THIS CODE.

WITH RESPECT TO THE PRIORITY ISSUE, YOU KNOW, I AGREE WITH JIMMY.

I WOULD LIKE FOR US TO BE ABLE TO PROTECT EVERYTHING, TREES, PARKLAND, IN ADDITION TO RIGHT OF WAY AND DRAINAGE AND WATER QUALITY AND TRAFFIC MITIGATION, TDM.

BUT I THINK THAT IT MAY VERY WELL BE THAT AS A COUNCIL WE MIGHT BE ASKED TO GIVE YOU PRIORITIES, AND I AM PREPARED TO DO THAT IN APRIL SO THAT IN THE PLACE WHERE SOMETHING HAS TO GIVE, WE'VE GIVEN YOU SOME MEASURE OF RANK ORDER ON THAT SO THAT YOU KNOW HOW TO DO THAT, RECOGNIZING THAT WE WANT YOU TO DO IT ALL.

[2:29:45 PM]

BUT FOR ME, THE HOUSING SUPPLY AND UNLOCKING THE THE ABILITY FOR THOSE QUARTERS WOULD BE HOW I WOULD PRIORITIZE THAT, AND I THINK IN MY NOTES I ALSO PUT RIGHT OF WAY BECAUSE YOU CAN'T GET THAT BACK AND WATER QUALITY AND DRAINAGE BECAUSE WE DON'T WANT TO FLOOD AND LOSE PEOPLE.

THE LAST QUESTION I'LL GO TO IS THE BY RIGHT ISSUE, THAT I THINK ALISON RAISED, AND OTHERS.

I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD BE AS A GENERAL RULE, I DON'T THINK THAT THIS EXERCISE WE'RE GOING THROUGH RIGHT NOW, AS OPPOSED TO A SUBSEQUENT PLANNING EXERCISE, IS BY RIGHT AS MUCH AS IT IS UNLOCKING THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT ALREADY EXIST ALONG CORRIDORS.

I THINK THERE MIGHT BE SOME ADDITIONAL BY RIGHT WORK WE'RE DOING WITH RESPECT TO MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING BECAUSE THAT'S SOMETHING WE WANT TO HAVE HAPPEN, IN AND OF ITSELF.

OTHER THAN THOSE TWO THINGS, IT SEEMS TO ME, GENERALLY SPEAKING, WE'RE TRYING TO ATTACH IT TO OUR DESIRE TO DRIVE AFFORDABILITY AND TO GIVE US THE GREATEST AMOUNT OF LEVERAGE TO DO THAT.

BUT THE QUESTION I WOULD ASK OF YOU AND STAFF IS, ARE WE OVERLOOKING SOMETHING?

IS THERE SOMEWHERE THAT WE WOULD WANT TO GIVE BY RIGHT ADDITIONAL DENSITY OR CAPACITY OTHER THAN WHAT I JUST DESCRIBED, AND I DON'T KNOW IF IF WE WANT TO DO THAT IN AREAS LIKE ROBINSON RANCH, WHERE WE'RE TRYING TO GET AN ADDITIONAL DOWNTOWN CENTER OR IF WE'RE GOING TO DO THAT IN A TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT BECAUSE WE WANT TO CREATE ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC AND CRITICAL MASS IN ORDER FOR SOMETHING TO HAPPEN.

IF THERE WAS, AND I WOULD WANT THOSE TO BE IDENTIFIED, SO THAT WE'RE REALLY TARGETED ON WHERE WE'RE DOING THAT FOR A GOAL WE'RE TRYING TO ACHIEVE.

KATHIE AND THEN ALISON.

[2:31:50 PM]

>> Tovo: I'LL JUST NOTE THAT AS WE WERE TALKING ABOUT CAPACITY, I WAS JUST TRYING TO LOOK BACK TO SEE WHETHER WE EVER GOT AN ANSWER THAT RECONCILED THE TWO SETS OF CAPACITY NUMBERS, AND I'M NOT SURE THAT WE DID, AND SO AS WE AS WE CONTINUE THIS WORK AGAIN, I THINK THAT WOULD BE INTERESTING TO KNOW, AND JUST AS A REMINDER, THERE'S A QUESTION IN OUR CodeNEXT Q&A ABOUT IT.

IN 2011 THERE WAS A ZONING CAPACITY STUDY THAT INDICATED WITH EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS AT THAT TIME WE HAD THE CAPACITY FOR 224,530 ADDITIONAL UNITS, AND THAT WAS AND THAT WAS MAPPED BY NEIGHBORHOOD AND NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING AREA.

SO AGAIN WE HAD GOTTEN A VERY DIFFERENT ESTIMATE BACK FROM CodeNEXT ABOUT WHAT THE NEW CODE COULD PRODUCE IN TERMS OF ADDITIONAL UNITS, AND IT WAS NEVER CLEAR HOW TO RECONCILE THAT LOWER NUMBER WITH WHAT BACK IN 2011 WE HAD BEEN TOLD WAS THE CAPACITY OF THE EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS.

SO I'LL JUST I DON'T I THINK THAT'S IN THE WEEDS FOR TODAY, BUT I'LL JUST NOTE THAT AS AN ONGOING IRRECONCILABLE QUESTION AS OF YET UNRECONCILABLE QUESTION.

NOT IRRECONCILABLE.

>> ALISON?

>> ALTER: I'M NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND THE DISTINCTION YOU'RE MAKING BY GRANTING BY RIGHT AND UNLOCKING THE POTENTIAL BECAUSE UNDER OUR CURRENT RULES THEY DON'T HAVE THE RIGHT TO DO IT, THEN THEY DON'T HAVE THE RIGHT TO DO IT, BUT I'M NOT SURE THAT I TOTALLY UNDERSTAND THE MAGNITUDE OF WHAT'S BEING UNLOCKED.

SO IN RESPONSE TO YOUR COMMENTS, MAYOR, I WANT TO SAY THERE ABSOLUTELY HAVE TO BE PLACES IN OUR CITY WHERE IF WE DID PLANNING WE COULD HAVE GREATER DENSITY AND GREATER EMPLOYMENT AREAS IN THE PLACES THAT YOU CITED AND THE PLACES YOU CITED ARE SOME OF THOSE.

AS WE THINK ABOUT THE CAPACITY WE HAVE TO REALLY REMEMBER THAT OVER TIME WE'LL BE DOING THAT KIND OF PLANNING, WE SHOULD BE DOING THAT KIND OF PLANNING.

WE HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN THAT SAYS THERE ARE ACTIVITY CENTERS WHERE WE SHOULD BE DEVELOPING THEM OUT, BEEN VERY SUCCESSFUL IN THE AREA OF THE DOMAIN OF CREATING THAT, AND WE SHOULD BE BUILDING ON THAT AND CREATING MORE OF THOSE, BECAUSE THAT WILL ADDRESS THINGS.

WHAT I'M NOT SURE, AND I'D ALSO LIKE TO UNDERSTAND, IS IF THERE ARE WAYS IN WHICH WE'RE UNLOCKING THIS POTENTIAL AND THAT THAT IS THEN CREATING INCENTIVES NOT TO NOT TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF DENSITY BONUSES EITHER, SO KIND OF THE FLIP PART OF THAT IF WE'RE UNLOCKING THIS POTENTIAL AND GIVING IT BY RIGHT, DOES THAT MEAN THAT WE'RE NOT GETTING THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THOSE SPACES, AND I DON'T TOTALLY UNDERSTAND THE NUANCES, BUT I DON'T THINK OF THAT AS I THINK OF THAT AS GIVING THEM BY RIGHT UNDER NEW RULES, AND SO I WOULD LIKE TO UNDERSTAND THAT BETTER AS WE MOVE FORWARD.

>> SO ON OUR CodeNEXT DROP FREE, MOST OF THE HOUSING CAPACITY WAS DOUBLE WITH THE CURRENT CODE, UNDER THE METHODOLOGY THAT THE CONSULTANTS USED, WHICH WAS DIFFERENT THAN THE CAPACITY STUDY IN 2011, AND MOST OF THAT CHANGE WAS THROUGH THE APPLICATION OF THE DASH A, SO MOST OF THE ADDITIONAL HOUSING CAPACITY WAS THROUGH ASSUMING THAT THE DEVELOPERS WOULD PARTICIPATE IN THE BONUS PROGRAM.

>> CAN YOU TELL US WHY DID WE HAVE

[2:33:15 PM]

>> WHY ARE [INDISCERNIBLE] PLANNING AND ZONING.

>> AND WHY WERE THERE SO FEW DENSITY BONUS UNITS THAT WERE AVAILABLE?

I MEAN, IT JUST DIDN'T SEEM LIKE WE HAD THE NUMBER GIVEN THE MAGNITUDE.

>> WELL, IN MANY CASES WE WERE ALLOWING RESIDENTIAL IN AREAS THAT RESIDENTIAL WASN'T ALLOWED, SO YOU WOULD ALLOW A FULL BUILDING OF RESIDENTIAL AND THEN A PERCENTAGE OF THOSE WAS AFFORDABLE, AND THAT WAS DUE TO THE CALIBRATING THAT THE NORTHWEST DID.

>> OKAY.

>> STILL NOT VERY MUCH I MEAN, THE YIELD ON THE AFFORDABLE UNDER DRAFT 3 WAS IF I REMEMBER, WAS ON THE ORDER OF LIKE 5,000 UNITS OR SOMETHING.

I MAY HAVE THAT WRONG, BECAUSE WE HAD A LOT OF DIFFERENT DRAFTS, BUT

>> IT WAS 6,000 UNITS.

>> YEAH.

SO AND WE DID MISS AREAS WHERE WE PUT, YOU KNOW WE PUT RESIDENTIAL BY RIGHT, AND WE DIDN'T DO ANY AFFORDABILITY, AND THAT WAS IN THE MAPPING, PERHAPS, NOT IN THE CODING, AND SO WE NEED TO BE CAREFUL ABOUT

>> Mayor Adler: SO I THINK THAT ALISON RAISES AN IMPORTANT ISSUE, AND I THINK IT'S SOMETHING THAT AS A COUNCIL WE NEED TO CONFRONT AND THEN GIVE YOU DIRECTION ON, BECAUSE I THINK YOU'RE RIGHT, IT DEPENDS ON HOW YOU LOOK AT THAT, AND I THINK YOU IDENTIFIED THE QUESTION RIGHT.

IF I HAVE A PIECE OF PROPERTY THAT CAN GO TWO STORIES ON THE CORRIDOR AND GIVE A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF ACTIVITY AND DENSITY, BUT BECAUSE OF CAPABILITY STANDARDS I'M NOT ABLE TO GET BUT ONE STORY ON IT, I USE UNLOCKING AS ALLOWING THAT TWO STORY ZONED PROPERTY TO BE TWO STORIES.

BUT ALISON RAISES THE QUESTION TO SAY IT WAS NEVER A TWO STORY TRACT BECAUSE IT WAS COVERED BY COMPATIBILITY, EVEN THOUGH IT WAS ZONED FOR TWO STORIES, IT WAS NEVER MORE THAN ONE STORY.

AND I THINK THAT'S THE DIFFERENCE, AND I THINK AS A COUNCIL THAT'S SOMETHING WE NEED TO TALK THROUGH AND GIVE YOU DIRECTION ON.

MY FIRST IMPULSE IS TO GIVE PEOPLE WHAT THE ZONED ABILITY WAS AND THEN TO DO A BONUS OR A DENSITY BONUS TO GO BEYOND THE TWO STORIES, JUST BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW HOW ELSE YOU I MEAN, FOR ME THAT MAKES MORE SENSE THAN TREATING THAT AS A ONE STORY AND THEN GIVING A DENSITY BONUS FOR NOT TRIGGERING THE COMPATIBILITY.

BUT I RECOGNIZE THERE MAY BE DIFFERENCES ON THE DAIS ON THAT ISSUE, BUT NOT TO GLOSS OVER THAT ISSUE, WE SHOULD CONFRONT THAT AND MAKE A DECISION ON THAT ISSUE.

THAT'S THE KIND OF THING I APPRECIATE YOU POINTING THAT OUT.

ANN?

[2:35:50 PM]

>> Kitchen: OH, I JUST WANTED TO MOVE ON.

I THINK IT'S SOMEONE SAID I THINK I WANT TO CIRCLE BACK TO WHAT COUNCIL MEMBER FLANNIGAN SAID, IF I WAS UNDERSTANDING CORRECTLY, YOU WERE BASICALLY JUST RAISING THE QUESTION ABOUT POTENTIALLY IF I UNDERSTOOD CORRECTLY, HAVING THE ABILITY TO THINK THROUGH IN SOME CIRCUMSTANCES HOW WE MIGHT PERHAPS GET MORE UNITS IF YOU HAD SOME MORE FLEXIBILITY AROUND IF I HEARD YOU CORRECTLY.

>> YEAH, AND IT WAS ESSENTIALLY THINKING OF AN EXAMPLE SCENARIO.

IF THERE'S A PROPERTY AND IT'S GOT A 10 FOOT SETBACK AND IF IT ONLY HAD A 5 FOOT SETBACK IT COULD BOTH PRESERVE THE TREE AND GET THE SECOND UNIT.

RIGHT, THAT SHOULD BE WHAT WE PREFER AS OPPOSED TO WHAT I THINK THE WAY IT WORKS NOW IS WHERE WE PRY OR SIZE THE SETBACK AND THEY DON'T GET THE SECOND UNIT.

>> Kitchen: WHEREAS THERE MIGHT BE A CIRCUMSTANCE WHERE YOU CAN GET THE TREE AND THE ADDITIONAL YEAH.

SO TO SPEAK TO THAT I WANT TO SPEAK TO THAT, THAT NO. 14 ABOUT IMPERVIOUS COVER, BECAUSE MY THOUGHT WITH REGARD TO THAT IS THAT IT'S IMPORTANT TO LOOK AT KEY WHEN I WHEN WE TALKED ABOUT THIS I ALWAYS THINK OF IT IN TERMS OF FOCUSING ON BETTER TOOLS TO ADDRESS FLOODING.

I WANT TO SAY RIGHT NOW, BECAUSE I THINK SOME MAY HAVE MISINTERPRETED WHAT I WAS SAYING WITH THIS ONE, THAT THAT I STRONGLY SUPPORT THE SAVE OUR SPRINGS AND IMPERVIOUS COVER.

I CONSIDER IMPERVIOUS COVER TO BE AN IMPORTANT TOOL FOR THE ENVIRONMENT.

YOU KNOW, IN TERMS OF, YOU KNOW, PRESERVING TREES AND FOR LOTS AND LOTS OF REASONS.

SO THAT'S JUST WHAT HAPPENS WITH US PUTTING WORDS OUT HERE THAT WE DON'T HAVE TIME TO REALLY HAVE THE CONVERSATION ABOUT.

I JUST WANT TO REASSURE PEOPLE THAT I AM NOT BACKING AWAY FROM IMPERVIOUS COVER REQUIREMENTS BECAUSE THERE'S A REASON FOR THEM, BUT I DO THINK THAT WITH REGARD TO FLOODING WE REALLY NEED TO BE THINKING ABOUT HOW WE AS WE MOVE FORWARD WITH OUR FLOOD MITIGATION PLAN, REALLY BE THINKING ABOUT HOW WE CAN BE MORE INNOVATIVE AND CREATIVE IN TERMS OF PROTECTING AGAINST FLOODING.

[2:37:15 PM]

>> FLANIGAN: OKAY.

IF I CAN ADD TO THAT.

I DON'T THINK ANYBODY IS SAYING WE WANT TO MAKE CHANGES TO SAVE OUR SPRINGS.

SO PEOPLE ARE GOING TO SAY THINGS IN NEIGHBORHOOD NEWSLETTERS IN ORDER TO INCITE FEAR AND CONCERN.

OBTAININGLY THAT'S NOT HAPPENING.

WHAT I'M THINKING ABOUT IS NOT SO MUCH TRYING TO PACK IN, RIGHT, THIS IS NOT THESE ARE PROPOSALS NOT INTENDED TO BE BLACK AND WHITE.

THIS IS ABOUT THE SITE SPECIFIC SCENARIOS THAT MAY EXIST.

YOU KNOW, A LOT OF THIS FOR ME IS I THINK ABOUT ALL THE SUBURBAN STYLE SPRAWL DEVELOPMENT THAT EXISTS IN MY DISTRICT, YOU KNOW, I'VE GOT A AN OLD STYLE SUBURBAN SHOPPING MALL.

THE PARKING LOT IS NEVER FULL, BLACK FOR BLACK FRIDAY IN THE '90S.

DOES IT MAKE SENSE THAT WE CAN'T GET MORE HOUSING ON THAT SITE, GIVEN MY DISTRICT FALLS UNDER AN URBAN REGULATION OF 65% COVER.

I THINK A LOT OF TIMES PART OF THE CHALLENGE AND THE BENEFIT OF DISTRICTS BOTH IS I THINK ABOUT THESE THINGS OFTEN IN TERMS OF MY DISTRICT, WELL, HERE'S SOME EXAMPLES, WE MAY WANT TO HAVE ANOTHER PROCESS OR WAY TO THINK ABOUT IT BUT PEOPLE DON'T THINK ABOUT IT IN THE WAY I THOUGHT ABOUT IT BECAUSE FRANKLY THEY'VE PROBABLY NEVER BEEN TO MY DISTRICT TO UNDERSTAND THE SITE CONDITIONS.

[2:39:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: WITH RESPECT TO THIS SECTION, IF YOU COULD DISTILL IT DOWN, THINGS ARE OPEN, YOU NEED US TO DECIDE.

LET'S TALK MISSING HOUSING WHICH IS THE THIRD SECTION.

DOES ANYONE WANT TO THROW THIS OPEN?

>> [INAUDIBLE]

>> Mayor Adler: LET'S HAVE SOMEBODY GO FIRST OTHER THAN JIMMY.

GREG, DO YOU WANT TO START US OFF?

>> Casar: I DON'T KNOW IF I HAVE MUCH TO ADD.

YOU KNOW, OUR WE WANT 30% OF OUR NEW HOUSING UNITS TO BE MISSING MIDDLE.

THAT'S WHAT WE HAVE IN OUR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AND THEN THE PARKING REQUIREMENTS OR SITE DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS, I THINK YOU JUST HAVE HAVE TO FOLLOW FROM THAT.

I'M INTERESTED IN WHETHER HOW MUCH ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE THE STAFF NEEDS FROM THE COUNCIL IN THE MAPPING PROCESS HERE TO KNOW BEST HOW TO MAP IT AND WHERE TO DO SO.

BUT LIKE I SAID, I AM FLEXIBLE ON WHETHER WE GIVE SOME OF THAT DIRECTION NOW. IF YOU NEED IT LATER, AND IF THERE ARE KEY EXCEPTIONS TO THAT THAT WE NEED TO MAKE, I'M HAPPY LIKE I SAID, I'M HAPPY TO TAKE SOME EXCEPTIONS IN ORDER TO GET MORE SIGNIFICANT AMOUNTS OF THIS ON THE GROUND.

BUT THERE IS JUST SO LITTLE IN DRAFT 3 AND IT SUPPOSEDLY WAS ONE OF THE KEY REASONS FOR DOING THIS IN THE FIRST PLACE.

[2:41:15 PM]

>> Flannigan: JUST AS AN EXAMPLE, IN DRAFT 3, THE PLACE WHERE I LIVE, WHICH IS A DUPLEX THAT LOOKS LIKE A HOUSE, WAS ZONED FOR A SINGLE FAMILY.

EVEN IN DRAFT 3.

SO THERE'S A LOT OF LIKE WHAT WAS WRONG IN DRAFT 3 THAT WE DON'T WANT TO CARRY FORWARD THAT WAS MISSING IN THE ANALYSIS THAT, YOU KNOW THAT'S WHY I LIKE TO THINK ABOUT THINGS AS MORE OF A FORM QUESTION, BECAUSE IF WE CAN BE VERY CLEAR ABOUT THE SCALE OF BUILDINGS, THEN DOES IT MATTER IF IT'S TWO UNITS, EACH WITH TWO BEDROOMS OR IS IT THREE UNITS, EACH WITH ONE BEDROOM.

I MEAN, I'M I DON'T KNOW THAT I CARE NECESSARILY AS MUCH ABOUT THAT DIFFERENCE, BUT ACKNOWLEDGING WE'RE NOT DOING FIVE STORY BUILDINGS FAR AWAY FROM CORRIDORS, RIGHT?

NONE OF US WOULD EVER WANT TO DO THAT.

>> Mayor Adler: SO I WOULD NARROW THE CONTINUUM DOWN, AND I WOULD HOPE THAT WE CAN ACTUALLY GIVE YOU DIRECTION WHERE WE ARE ON THAT CONTINUUM SO THAT YOU'RE NOT TRYING TO FIGURE THIS OUT, BECAUSE I THINK IT'S KIND OF A THRESHOLD KIND OF QUESTION.

AGAIN, I WOULD I WOULD HAVE THE CORRIDORS AND THE CENTERS BE ABLE TO DEVELOP OUT AND UNLOCK THAT.

I'D DO THAT BY PERHAPS EITHER CHANGING THE COMPATIBILITY AREA OR BY PUTTING IN A ZONING CLASSIFICATION THAT DOESN'T TRIGGER COMPATIBILITY, THAT COULD BE LOW SLUNG APARTMENT ON THE BACK END.

IT COULD ALSO BE MISSING MIDDLE.

[2:43:45 PM]

I RECOGNIZE THAT ALL THE MISSING MIDDLE DESIGNATION IN THE NEW CODE MIGHT NOT SERVE TO REMOVE A TRIGGER FOR COMPATIBILITY, BUT THAT'S CERTAINLY SOMETHING THAT COULD BE CONSIDERED, AND IT MIGHT BE A CONTEXT SENSITIVE KIND OF THING.

IT MIGHT BE THAT A DUPLEX TRIPLEX QUAD IN THAT AREA DOESN'T SERVE TO TRIGGER COMPATIBILITY ON THE ADJOINING CORRIDOR OR CENTER TRACT.

AND THEN I THINK THAT THE ISSUE THAT IS OPEN THAT WE NEED TO RESOLVE IS, IS IT MORE THAN JUST THE FRONTING TRACT THAT IS ADJACENT TO THE COMMERCIAL OR CORRIDOR ISSUE, AND I THINK WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO HOPEFULLY WE WILL KNOCK OUR HEADS AROUND THAT AND GIVE SOME DIRECTION ON THAT SO THAT IT'S HOPING PEOPLE HAVE THAT KIND OF DIRECTION.

YOU KNOW, WHERE I PUT IT IN THE DOCUMENT THAT I DRAFTED, I EXPRESSED MY THRESHOLD PLACE WHICH IS IT'S THE ADJOINING TRACT, FOR NOW AND IN THE FUTURE, AND WE CAN PLAN THAT OUT, BUT I DID ALLOW IN THIS PROCESS OVER THE MONTH TO SEE IF WE COULD COME UP WITH A MORE GENERALIZED RULE THAT WE MIGHT HAVE BE TO IMPLEMENT THAT HAD IN CONTEXT SENSITIVITY WITHIN IT TO BE ABLE TO GIVE A MORE REFINED STATEMENT THAN THE ONE THAT I WAS ON, BUT I AGREE WITH GREG, YOU KNOW, I WANT US TO GET SOMETHING DONE, AND I DON'T KNOW, TO KATHIE'S POINT, HOW IMPORTANT ANY ONE OF THESE ARE GOING TO BE TO THE OVERALL NUMBERS.

I WANT US TO GET OVERALL PRODUCT DONE, RECOGNIZING WE CAN FINE TUNE THAT OVER TIME.

LESLIE?

>> Pool: SO I WAS SUPPORTIVE OF B WITH SOME WITH SPECIFICALLY OPTION C2, FURTHER REDUCING THE BARRIERS TO MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING, BUT I WANTED TO KNOW, WHAT ARE THOSE BARRIERS?

I DON'T KNOW IF YOU GUYS CAN ANSWER THOSE RIGHT NOW.

>> SURE, GREG [INAUDIBLE], PLANNING AND ZONING.

>> SURE, I HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS.>> SURE.

BARRIERS WE HAVE, MISSING MIDDLE, IS THAT THE QUESTION?

>> Pool: YEAH, WHAT ARE THE EXISTING BARRIERS TO MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING THAT WE NEED TO REDUCE?

>> WELL, SO THE BARRIERS THAT WE HAVE TODAY ARE LARGELY IN THE CODE THAT HAVE TO DO WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW THAT'S REQUIRED FOR MISSING MIDDLE.

>> Pool: OKAY.

IN OPTION B WE TALK ABOUT SIMPLIFYING THE REVIEW PROCESS.

>> YEAH, SO OPTION B, IF YOU TAKE OPTION B TO BE DRAFT 3, THAT IS A PART OF DRAFT 3, STREAMLINING THAT PROCESS.

[2:45:15 PM]

>> ALL RIGHT.

THE MAPPING OF TRANSITION AREAS THAT'S IN B IS DIFFERENT FROM C, WHICH WAS MAPPING LIKE NEW TRANSITION AREAS, AND I THINK, STEVE, BASED ON WHAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT, EXISTING TRANSITION AREAS AND THE BLOCK IN, I THINK THAT IS MORE ALIGNED WITH MY UNDERSTANDING OF WHERE YOU WERE ON THE MAPPING.

SO THAT IS ALSO OPTION B.

THE LAST AND THEN I HAVE TWO MORE QUESTIONS.

IT SAYS UNDER C, PROVIDE FOR A GREATER RANGE OF HOUSING TYPES BEYOND THOSE IN DRAFT 3.

WHAT WOULD THOSE BE THAT WEREN'T IN DRAFT 3?

>> SURE.

I THINK THAT THAT'S A LITTLE BIT TBD.

I MEAN, THAT WOULD TAKE SOME BRAINSTORMING AND CREATIVITY, BUT FOR INSTANCE IN DRAFT 3 WE HAD SOME NEW HOUSING TYPES LIKE THE DUPLEX, PLUS THE ADU, THAT'S SOMETHING NEW, OR COTTAGE COURT, SO WE COULD IF YOU GAVE US DIRECTION WE COULD TRY TO COME UP WITH SOME NEW PRODUCTS LIKE THAT.

>> BECAUSE I FELT LIKE WE HAD PRETTY MUCH BEEN AS COMPREHENSIVE AS WE POSSIBLY COULD ON THE TYPES OF ON THE HOUSING TYPES IN DRAFT 3.

I DON'T KNOW IF I WANT TO ASSIGN STAFF THE ADDITIONAL WORK TO COME UP WITH NEW ONES THAT WE HAVEN'T ALREADY CHECKED THE LANDSCAPE TO INCLUDE.

IF SOMETHING POPS UP MAYBE YOU ALL COULD BRING IT TO US BUT I THINK MAY HAVE WE HAVE GOTTEN WHAT THE FULL RANGE IS AND ARE WORKING TO MAKE THAT FULL RANGE AVAILABLE THROUGHOUT THE CITY.

I DID HAVE ANOTHER QUESTION ON HOW DOES THE AFFORDABILITY UNLOCKED POLICY INTERSECT WITH C2, WHICH IS THE FURTHER REDUCING BARRIERS FROM THE MISSING MIDDLE.

AND I'M LOOKING OVER AT GREG BECAUSE IT WAS HIS BABY, BUT IF STAFF WANTS TO ANSWER THAT'S FINE TOO.

>> Casar: MY UNDERSTANDING IF WE CODIFY AN ORDINANCE, THE RESOLUTION WE RECENTLY PASSED THAT WOULD OCCUR CITYWIDE IN RESIDENTIAL AND NONINDUSTRIAL AREAS, AND SO THESE MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING TYPES WOULD STILL HAVE TO BE MAPPED TO PARTICULAR AREAS, WHEREAS THE AFFORDABILITY UNLOCKED PROPOSAL IS AUTOMATICALLY BAKED IN ACROSS THE CITY, IF THAT MAKES SENSE.

>> Pool: OKAY. WELL, I'M COMFORTABLE ON THIS MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING TYPE WITH B AND C2, ASSUMING THAT THERE ARE ANY ADDITIONAL BARRIERS THAT WE NEED TO REDUCE, CERTAINLY WE SHOULD REDUCE THE BARRIERS.

IF IT'S MORE THAN JUST THE SIMPLIFYING THE REVIEW PROCESS, BRING BRING US WHAT THOSE ARE, BUT WE DO HAVE THAT IN 3.

SO FOR ME MISSING MIDDLE, IT'S OPTION B WITH C2, ASSUMING THAT THERE IS SOMETHING THAT WE HAVEN'T ALREADY DISCOVERED IN DRAFT 3.

[2:47:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: GREG?

>> Casar: SOMETHING ELSE I FORGOT TO MENTION IN MY INTRO COMMENTS THAT IS IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT FROM MINE AND MAYOR PRO TEM IS REALLY ABOUT WORKING ON MAKING EXTERNALLY TO USE AND INTERNAL ADUs EASIER TO DO, AND THAT IS SOMETHING THAT WAS BEING WORKED ON IN CodeNEXT, BUT I THINK IT ACTUALLY PERFECTLY DOVETAILS WITH SOME OF THE EMPHASIS FROM A VARIETY OF MY COLLEAGUES ON DISINCENTIVIZING ONE FOR ONE REPLACEMENT OF HOUSING, SMALL HOUSE WITH A BIGGER HOUSE AND INSTEAD INCENTIVIZING PRESERVATION OF AN EXISTING BIGGER HOUSE AND GIVING PEOPLE MORE OPTIONS.

BUT THAT WAS LATER.

WE DIDN'T QUITE COVER THAT.

THAT'S LESS OF A MAPPING ISSUE AND MORE OF HOW OUR ACCESS ZONES WORK.

TO HOW IT IS THAT WE MAP THIS QUESTION, I KNOW THE PLANNING COMMISSION WAS WORKING ON BREAKING DOWN DIFFERENT KINDS OF CORRIDORS, SAYING, YOU KNOW, A MAJOR CORRIDOR WITH FREQUENT TRANSIT SERVICE, A REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTER VERSUS MORE OF A NEIGHBORHOOD CORRIDOR, VERSUS A CORRIDOR IN A GENTRIFYING CENSUS TRACT, ACCORDING TO THE UPROOTED STUDY, SO IF IF IT'S USEFUL FOR US TO GET INTO THAT LEVEL OF DETAIL IN APRIL TO GIVE YOU ALL DIRECTION ABOUT HOW TO LOOK AT DIFFERENT KINDS OF CORRIDORS FOR MAPPING COMPATIBILITY AND TRANSITION ZONES, I'M READY AND HAPPY TO ENGAGE ON THAT IN APRIL.

I'M JUST TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW MUCH DETAIL YOU NEED IN APRIL VERSUS HOW MUCH WE NEED TO LET YOU GUYS WORK IT OUT IN CONSULTATION WITH COUNCIL MEMBERS AND THEN WE WORK IT OUT IN THE FALL.

SO ONCE WE HAVE SOME SENSE OF WHAT IT IS WE NEED TO DO IN APRIL TO GET YOU GUYS GOING ON MAPPING, YOU LET US KNOW, BUT FOR ME THE OUTCOME IS GETTING US CLOSE TO THAT 30% OF THE MISSING HOUSING THAT WE CAN GET TO.

>> Mayor Adler: ANN, IS YOUR LIGHT ON? >> Kitchen: WELL, WITH REGARD TO THE COMPATIBILITY AND MAPPING, WHICH I MENTIONED EARLIER, YOU MENTIONED AN APPROACH THAT COULD BE HELPFUL IS IF YOU KNOW, IF WE END UP JUST GIVING DIRECTION THAT, YOU KNOW, OUR BASIC GENERAL RULE ABOUT COMPATIBILITY, BUT ALLOWING FOR CONTEXT SENSITIVITY ISSUES THAT THE COUNCIL MEMBERS CAN WORK WITH THE STAFF ON, THAT WOULD BE AN APPROACH THAT COULD BE WORKABLE, BECAUSE THE AS WE SAID AS WE DISCUSSED EARLIER, THE DIFFICULTY THAT WE HAVE IS THE TIMING OF THE MAPPING, YOU KNOW, AND THE DESIRE TO DO MOST OF THE MAPPING BUT STILL ALLOWING FOR THE CONTEXT SENSITIVITY.

SO I THINK IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT THAT WE ALLOW FOR CONTEXT SENSITIVITY AROUND COMPATIBILITY AND THAT WE ALSO DON'T WANT TO SLOW DOWN OUR PROCESS, SO I THINK THAT THE MOST EXPEDITIOUS WAY TO DO THAT WOULD BE TO GIVE DIRECTION THAT ALLOWS FOR CONTEXT SENSITIVITY AND THEN PERHAPS WORK IT OUT WITH SOME DISTRICT LEVEL CONVERSATIONS.

SO I WOULD ALSO SAY THAT WELL, LET'S SEE.

THERE'S SO MUCH HERE, I'M NOT QUITE SURE WHERE I WAS GOING TO GO TO NEXT.

WELL, I JUST WANT TO REITERATE SOMETHING THAT YOU SAID.

THE MISSING MIDDLE GOAL IS IMPORTANT TO ALLOW FOR MORE TYPES AND THE GOAL FOR MISSING MORE MIDDLE IS IMPORTANT TOO, BUT IT BUT TO MY MIND WHAT'S IMPORTANT ABOUT IT IS ALLOWING FOR MORE AFFORDABILITY.

IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT I SEE IT AS IS ALLOWING MORE OPTIONS FOR PEOPLE TO EITHER LIVE IN SMALLER SPACES, BUT I THINK THAT THE REASON WE THINK THAT'S IMPORTANT IS BECAUSE IT'S MORE AFFORDABLE FOR PEOPLE.

SO I THINK WE JUST NEED TO RECOGNIZE THAT MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING IN CERTAIN PARTS OF TOWN AREN'T GOING TO BE AREN'T GOING TO BE MORE AFFORDABLE.

SO SO IF WE JUST DO THAT ALONE, I DON'T THINK WE'RE GOING TO GET TO WHERE WE NEED TO BE.

[2:49:45 PM]

I THINK IT'S I'M NOT SAYING DON'T DO IT.

I'M JUST SAYING WE NEED TO COUPLE IT WITH THE OTHER KINDS OF OTHER KINDS OF POLICIES.

SO I WOULD ASK FOR STAFF TO ALSO GIVE US SOME GIVE US SOME AND THIS MAY BE SIMILAR TO WHAT I ASKED FOR EARLIER, BUT TO ALSO GIVE US WHAT POLICIES CAN WE PUT IN PLACE TO HELP MAKE SURE THAT OUR MISSING MIDDLE ACTUALLY ARE MORE AFFORDABLE.

I ASKED IN OUR LAST CONVERSATION TO GIVE US POLICIES THAT WE'D NEED TO ACCOMPLISH OUR GOALS FOR THE 60,000 HOUSING, WHICH IS THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING, SO THIS IS SIMILAR BUT NOT QUITE THE SAME.

IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT POLICIES COULD WE PUT IN PLACE TO HELP US MAKE SURE THAT WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING, WE'RE NOT JUST TALKING ABOUT VERY, VERY EXPENSIVE CONDOS AND DUPLEXES AND THINGS LIKE THAT, BECAUSE I DON'T THINK THAT'S GOING TO GET US TO WHERE WE'RE TRYING TO GO.

AND RELATED TO THAT IS SOMETHING THAT COUNCIL MEMBER CASAR MENTIONED AND THAT IS THE POLICIES AROUND THE ONE TO ONE REPLACEMENT ON SINGLE FAMILY HOMES IN A WAY THAT INCENTS PEOPLE TO TO NOT JUST REPLACE A DEMOLITION OR A TEAR DOWN WITH A MUCH MORE EXPENSIVE LARGER HOME, NOT THAT WE'RE SAYING THAT PEOPLE, YOU KNOW, CAN'T DO THAT.

IT'S JUST THAT IT SHOULDN'T I WOULD I WOULD HOPE THAT IT'S NOT EASIER FOR THEM TO DO THAT THAN TO TO MAINTAIN A SMALLER SIZE HOME WITH AN ADU OR TO ALLOW FOR DUPLEX OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, BECAUSE AGAIN, BECAUSE WHAT I'M TRYING TO GET AT IS THE ABILITY TO HAVE MORE OPTIONS FOR PEOPLE TO LIVE CLOSER IN TO TOWN SO THAT OUR NEIGHBORHOODS ARE NOT ALL JUST BECOMING ONES THAT YOU HAVE TO BE, YOU KNOW, HIGHER INCOME, AND ACTUALLY A PRETTY HIGH INCOME TO LIVE IN.

[2:51:15 PM]

SO....>> Mayor Adler: SO WITH RESPECT TO THOSE ISSUES FOR ME, THE I ALSO BELIEVE, AND I THINK THERE'S CONSENSUS ON THE DAIS OF TRYING TO FIGURE OUT INCENTIVES TO GIVE PEOPLE OPPORTUNITIES TO DO SOMETHING THEY COULDN'T OTHERWISE DO TO AVOID DEMOLISHING A HOME.

SO I THINK THAT THERE IS GOING TO BE CONSENSUS FOR RELAXING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OR OTHER KINDS OF THINGS THAT MIGHT OTHERWISE EXIST IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO INCENT THAT IN THE CITY.

I THINK THAT WE WANT TO GET AS MUCH AFFORDABLE, AND BY AFFORDABLE I MEAN 80% AND BELOW, DEPENDING ON THE STRUCTURE AND THE LOCATION, I LIKE THE DASH A AND I LIKE THE BONUS

DENSITIES AND BEING ABLE TO DO THAT AND RESTRICT BEING THE BY RIGHT SO THAT THEY HAVE THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITY TO REALLY REALLY TAKE PLACE.

BUT I ALSO BELIEVE IN THE CONCEPT OF MORE AFFORDABLE, AS DIFFERENTIATED FROM AFFORDABLE WITH A CAPITAL A.

SO IF I HAD A LOT THAT HAD A HOME ON IT THAT WAS NEXT TO A CORRIDOR OR NEAR A CORRIDOR, I'D RATHER HAVE TWO HOMES REBUILT ON THAT LOT THAN ONE BIG HOME BUILT ON THAT LOT, EVEN IF IT'S STILL AN EXPENSIVE HOME BUT IT'S MORE AFFORDABLE THAN WHAT THAT BIG HOME WOULD BE AND GIVES ME GREATER DENSITY THAT'S GOING TO HELP ME WITH MY MOBILITY ISSUES, SO I WOULD ALSO BE TAKING A LOOK AT THAT.

AND I'M OKAY TRYING TO CONSIDER LEAVING THINGS OPEN FOR STAFF WITH RESPECT TO HOW YOU DO SOME OF THESE THINGS IN A CONTEXT SENSITIVE WAY, BUT IT MAKES ME NERVOUS, SO I THINK IT'S SOMETHING WE NEED TO TALK ABOUT.

SOMEHOW OR ANOTHER WE HAVE TO EMPOWER YOU AS STAFF TO BE ABLE TO TELL A COUNCIL MEMBER NO WHEN THEY'RE COMING IN AND ARGUING FOR SOMETHING IN THEIR DISTRICT THAT MIGHT RUN COUNTER TO A TO A CITYWIDE GOAL.

THAT SAID, I THINK THAT WE ALL AGREE THAT THERE'S A CONTEXT SENSITIVITY COMPONENT IN THIS.

THAT'S SOMETHING THAT SHOULD GENERALLY BE APPLYING CITYWIDE, AND I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY HOW TO DO THAT, AND THEN ULTIMATELY I GO TO WHEREVER I WAS BEFORE, I WANT US TO FINISH THIS PRODUCT, AND I DON'T WANT US TO END UP GETTING LOST OVER A TRACT.

[2:53:45 PM]

I WANT US TO ACTUALLY BE ABLE TO MOVE THIS FORWARD AND A LOT OF THIS STUFF WE CAN DEAL WITH IN THE FUTURE IN THE NEXT ITERATIONS AS PART OF PLANNING ISSUES.

SO I WOULD REALLY LIKE US TO COME BACK.

I THINK THAT'S A BOOKMARKED ISSUE.

I THINK WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO CONFRONT THAT ISSUE OF HOW MUCH DIRECTION WE GIVE OR DON'T GIVE AS YOU GO OFF TO TO DRAFT.

AND PART OF IT IS GOING TO DEPEND ON ON HOW REALISTIC IT IS THAT YOU CAN ACTUALLY DO THE WORK BY YOURSELF WITH LIMITED DIRECTION.

I KEEP GOING BACK TO ONE OF THE CHALLENGES WE HAD UNDER THE OLD PROCESS THAT COUNCIL DID NOT DO THAT.

THEN FOR THAT REASON YOU HAD TOO MANY CHOICES TO DECIDE BETWEEN AND NO GUIDANCE ON WHICH CHOICE TO MAKE, AND WE NEED TO AVOID THAT AS BEST WE CAN.

>> Kitchen: COULD I SPEAK TO THAT?

>> Mayor Adler: LET ME GIVE OTHER PEOPLE A CHANCE TO SPEAK.

>> Kitchen: I WANT TO RESPOND TO WHAT YOU WANT YOU SAID.

>> Mayor Adler: I'LL LET YOU DO THAT.

WE'LL GET BACK TO YOU. >> KIND OF ALONG THE SAME LINES, I DO THINK THAT MISSING MIDDLE ADDRESSES AFFORDABILITY, BUT AFFORDABILITY IS SUCH A SUBJECTIVE THING.

SO TO THE EXAMPLE THAT THE MAYOR GAVE, YOU KNOW, IF THERE'S A LOT YOU COULD PUT A \$1.2 MILLION HOME OR YOU COULD PUT TWO \$600,000 HOMES AND \$600,000 NOT AFFORDABLE TO PEOPLE IN MY DISTRICT, BUT TWO PEOPLE WHO CAN AFFORD THAT 600 AND COULDN'T AFFORD THE 1.2, THAT'S PROVIDED MORE SUPPLY AT THAT LOWER LEVEL.

SO IT'S I DO THINK MISSING MIDDLE DOES PROVIDE AFFORDABILITY.

[2:55:15 PM]

IT'S JUST IT'S A SUBJECTIVE THING, WHAT IS AFFORDABLE TO DIFFERENT FAMILIES.

AND THEN GOING BACK TO LESLIE'S QUESTION ABOUT HOW DO WE ENCOURAGE OR WHAT ARE THE BARRIERS FOR THAT MISSING MIDDLE, I MEAN, IT'S LOT SIZES, IT'S SETBACKS, IT'S THE BARRIERS TO LIKE CONTAINER HOMES AND TINY HOMES AND THE RESTRICTIONS OUR CURRENT CODE HAS ON THOSE KINDS OF OPTIONS.

ON MINIMUM, YOU KNOW MINIMUM SQUARE FOOTAGE KIND OF THINGS, YOU KNOW, WHERE A FAMILY COULD MAYBE BE ABLE TO BUILD AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT BUT NOT A CERTAIN SIZE ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT.

AND SO IN ANSWERING THIS QUESTION WE'RE TALKING A LOT ABOUT WHERE WHERE THE MISSING MIDDLE GOES, BUT I GUESS MY ADDITIONAL DIRECTION TO STAFF WOULD BE ALL THOSE OTHER LITTLE THINGS THAT CREATE THOSE BARRIERS, INCLUDING THINGS WHEN YOU'RE REFERRING TO THE TRANSPORTATION CRITERIA MANUAL, WHICH WILL REQUIRE YOU IF YOU BUILD AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT TO PAY FOR THE SIDEWALK, AND THAT CAN ADD AN ADDITIONAL \$5,000 TO A PROJECT, WHERE WHICH WOULD END UP POSSIBLY REDUCING THE SQUARE FOOTAGE THAT YOU WERE GOING TO EITHER BUILD AN INTERIOR ADU OR EXTERIOR ADU.

AND SO THERE'S ALL THESE LITTLE THINGS THAT COME INTO PLAY WHEN YOU'RE DOING THAT PROCESS WHEN YOU'RE ATTACKING THE WHOLE TRYING TO DECIDE IF THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO DO.

SO THOSE ARE THE THINGS THAT I WOULD ASK THAT WE IN NO. 3, I OBVIOUSLY SEE, BUT MAYBE TO LESLIE'S POINT, PROVIDE EVERY SINGLE ADDITIONAL THING THAT COMES INTO PLAY WHEN YOU'RE BUILDING THAT MISSING MIDDLE AND HOW IT ADDS TO THE COST OF IT, AND WE CAN PUT THAT IN THE PARKING LOT AND, YOU KNOW THE EXAMPLE JIMMY JUST GAVE, IF IT'S A 10 FOOT SETBACK BUT WE CAN SAVE A TREE AND PROVIDE SOMETHING ELSE AND MAKE IT A 9½ FOOT SETBACK, THERE SHOULD BE THAT FLEXIBILITY IN OUR CODE INSTEAD OF, NO, YOU DIDN'T MEET THE 10 FOOT SETBACK SO YOU CAN'T BUILD WHAT YOU WERE THINKING YOU COULD BUILD.

>> Mayor Adler: PAIGE AND KATHIE.

>> Ellis: I'LL ECHO THOSE SENTIMENTS.

I REALLY WOULD LIKE TO SEE OUR CODE BE ABLE TO ACCOMMODATE FOR INNOVATIVE TYPES OF HOUSING.

I LIKE THE IDEA OF GARDEN HOMES OR I SEE LIKE COURTYARD APARTMENTS IN HERE AND I THINK THAT'S A GOOD WAY TO BOTH PROVIDE HOUSING AND ALSO PRESERVE SOME GREEN SPACE SO THAT WE CAN KEEP OUR TREES AND KEEP OUR, YOU KNOW, WATER QUALITY ISSUES AT BAY.

AND I ALSO LIKE THE IDEA OF INNOVATIVE ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS WHERE YOU COULD HAVE TINY HOMES OR THEY'RE DOING 3D PRINTED HOUSES, SO I THINK IT WOULD BE AN INTERESTING CONVERSATION TO BRING THOSE IN BUT KEEP IN MIND DURING MAPPING THAT JUST BECAUSE WE THINK OF PEOPLE WHO WANT TO LIVE IN DENSE ENVIRONMENTS AS TYPICALLY YOUNGER, THAT IT CAN PROVIDE PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO AGE IN HOME IN OTHER PARTS OF OUR COMMUNITY.

SO I WOULD REALLY LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ALL MORE AND SHOW YOU WHAT I THINK FOR MY DISTRICT IN SOME OF THOSE LEVELS.

[2:57:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: ANN?

>> Kitchen: OH, COUNCIL MEMBER GARZA, WHAT YOU SAID, REMINDED ME YOU HAD DONE A RESOLUTION A WHILE BACK, SO I'D LIKE TO UNDERSTAND IF WE IF WE FOLLOWED THROUGH ON THAT, BECAUSE YOU HAD BROUGHT A RESOLUTION TO TRY TO ADDRESS BARRIERS RELATED TO I THINK IT WAS ADUS BUT IT WAS ALSO SMALLER HOMES.

SO I THINK THAT'S ALL OF WHAT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT.

AND COUNCIL MEMBER ELLIS, THANK YOU FOR BRINGING UP THE INNOVATIVE TYPES OF HOUSING.

WE PARTICULARLY NEED TO THINK ABOUT THAT FOR SENIORS, FOR EXAMPLE.

SO AND I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY MY MY I I'M HAPPY TO WEIGH IN TO FIGURING OUT CONTEXT SENSITIVITY NOW AND TO PROVIDING DIRECTION TO THE STAFF.

I SIMPLY MENTIONED THAT THAT MIGHT BE SOMETHING THAT COULD BE WORKED OUT AT DISTRICT LEVEL BECAUSE I WAS THINKING THAT IT'S FAIRLY BECAUSE I WAS THINKING THAT THAT'S GOING TO TAKE US SOME TIME, POTENTIALLY, BUT, YOU KNOW, IF IF THE COUNCIL WANTS TO WEIGH IN TO OUTLINING CONTEXT SENSITIVE CRITERIA I'M HAPPY TO DO THAT.

TO MY MIND IT'S NOT SO MUCH ABOUT A COUNCIL MEMBER TRYING TO GET SOMETHING DONE FOR THEIR DISTRICT, IT'S ABOUT US UNDERSTANDING WHAT'S ON THE GROUND IN OUR DISTRICT, JUST LIKE THE KIND OF EXAMPLES THAT COUNCIL MEMBER FLANNIGAN GAVE.

YOU KNOW, WE CAN PROVIDE A LEVEL OF INFORMATION THAT THAT THE STAFF MAY NOT HAVE AND THAT WE MAY NOT WANT TO DIG INTO, YOU KNOW, NEIGHBORHOOD BY NEIGHBORHOOD, STREET BY STREET IN THIS SETTING.

SO SO, YOU KNOW, IT'S NOT ABOUT TELLING A COUNCIL MEMBER NO.

IT'S ABOUT SETTING UP A PROCESS SO THAT WE SO THAT WE EITHER HAVE TO DIG INTO THOSE DETAILS AS A GROUP AND TAKE THE TIME TO DO THAT, OR WE HAVE TO SET UP A PROCESS THAT WE'RE ALL COMFORTABLE WITH TO FIGURE OUT HOW THAT'S GOING TO BE APPLIED, BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, FRANKLY, WE WE'RE TALKING ABOUT SOME REALLY CRITICAL STUFF HERE FOR PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY.

WE'RE TALKING ABOUT WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN TO THEIR HOUSE ON THEIR LOT.

AND THAT IMPACTS THEIR PLANS FOR THEIR LIVES, AND WHAT YOU KNOW, WHAT THEY MAY BE THINKING ABOUT DOING IN THE NEXT FIVE TO TEN YEARS.

AND SO I KNOW THAT ALL OF THIS IS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT, AND I AGREE WITH THE VAST MAJORITY OF THIS, TO GET US WHERE WE WANT TO GO AS A CITY, BUT WE NEED TO THINK IN TERMS OF TIMING AND WHEN THAT HAPPENS AND HOW PEOPLE UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN AND HOW THEY HAVE SOMETHING TO SAY ABOUT IT.

SO I JUST WANT TO REMIND US ABOUT THAT.

[2:59:15 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: KATHIE, THEN PIO.

>> Tovo: I AGREE, AND I JUST WANT TO GO BACK AND ANSWERING THIS I THINK I DID ANSWER THIS QUESTION EARLIER AND SAID I'M SUPPORTIVE OF ENCOURAGING MORE ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS AND DUPLEXES AND OTHERS THAT FALL INTO THIS GENERAL CATEGORY WHICH WE VERY RARELY DEFINE, SO I APPRECIATED THE DESCRIPTION THAT YOU ALL INCLUDED IN THE MEMO.

I THINK IT'S I JUST WANT TO UNDERSCORE THE POINT I MADE EARLIER, THOUGH.

ONE OF THE THINGS THAT CAUSED WELL, IN ANY CASE, I THINK IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT THAT WE NOT HAVE HAVE TOOLS BUILT INTO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE REWRITE THAT ARE GOING TO INCENTIVIZE INCREASED DEMOLITIONS, AND SO AT THE POINT WHERE WE'RE LOOKING LET ME GIVE AS AN EXAMPLE, LOTS OF SINGLE FAMILY, THREE LOTS CAME BACK IN THE FIRST DRAFT AS T4, WHICH WOULD ALLOW UP TO EIGHT IF IT'S ON A CORNER LOT.

I MEAN, THAT WILL ABSOLUTELY INCENTIVIZE THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES ON RESIDENTIAL LOTS.

SO I WOULD I WOULD CHALLENGE OUR OUR STAFF TO LOOK TOWARD WAYS TO INCREASE AND TO MAKE POSSIBLE INCREASED OPPORTUNITIES FOR USING THOSE OPTIONS WITHOUT WITHOUT INCREASING THE LIKELIHOOD THAT WE'RE GOING TO SEE EXISTING STRUCTURES DEMOLISHED AND THE

CREATION OF SO THAT WE GET AN ADDITIONAL UNIT OR AN ADDITIONAL TWO UNITS ON A TRACT, AND I CAN TELL YOU IN PROBABLY EVERY ONE OF THE NEIGHBORHOODS I REPRESENT, THAT IS ABSOLUTELY NOT LEADING TO I MEAN, WE ARE REPLACING MUCH MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING, NOT CAPITAL A AFFORDABLE HOUSING, PROBABLY NOT EVEN MARKET AFFORDABLE HOUSING, BUT WE ARE REPLACING THE EXISTING HOUSING WITH MUCH MORE COSTLY HOUSING.

I MEAN, THE TOWNHOMES ARE THREE QUARTERS OF A MILLION DOLLARS, SO THEY'RE YOU KNOW, WE ARE I REPRESENT A MAJORITY RENTER DISTRICT.

I CITED THE NUMBERS IN MOST OF HYDE PARK.

I MEAN, THAT IS TRUE FOR A LOT OF MY NEIGHBORHOODS, AND I SEE IT AGAIN AND AGAIN IN MY OWN NEIGHBORHOOD, THAT WE ARE DISPLACING LONG TIME RENTERS IN MANY CASES FOR VERY HIGH COST HOUSING.

SO THAT'S THE CHALLENGE BEFORE US, AND I HOPE CodeNEXT CAN HELP US, CODENEXT AS MY DAUGHTER WOULD SAY, CAN YOU HELP US FIND WAYS NOT TO AGAIN, TO PROVIDE FOR THOSE INCREASED OPPORTUNITIES WITHOUT DRASTICALLY INCREASING THE REDEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING STRUCTURES.

AND WHEN WE GET BEYOND AS WE CONTEMPLATE SITUATIONS WHERE WE'RE INCREASING THE NUMBER OF UNITS THAT CAN BE ON THE TRACT FROM BEYOND WHAT WE HAVE NOW, I WOULD WANT TO SEE AN AFFORDABILITY AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMPONENT ON THOSE TRACTS.

>> Mayor Adler: PIO?

[3:01:45 PM]

>> Renteria: YOU KNOW WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT AFFORDABLE AND SAVING THESE HOMES, ESPECIALLY IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD, OUR HOUSING STRUCTURES ARE VERY OLD THERE.

I MEAN, YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT HAVING TO SPEND ANYWHERE BETWEEN 50 TO \$150,000 JUST TO REHAB ONE HOME.

AND LOW INCOME PEOPLE CANNOT AFFORD TO DO THAT.

I MEAN, THAT'S JUST NOT POSSIBLE FOR THEM.

YOU KNOW, THAT'S THEY CAN'T GET A LOAN.

THE FUNDING IS NOT OUT THERE FOR THEM.

AND I HOPE THAT WHEN WE ADDRESS THE NEW CODE ALSO THAT WE ADDRESS ISSUES LIKE AT MY LOCATION THERE.

I'M ON A CORNER LOT.

WE HAVE A 25 FOOT SETBACK, 15 FOOT SETBACK FROM THE BACK FENCE, YOU KNOW, SO WE HAVE A LOT OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE AND SO WE HAVE TO BUILD YOU KNOW, EVEN THOUGH WE WANT TO BUILD A SECONDARY UNIT, IT RESTRICTS US ON WHAT WE CAN, AND THEN PLUS, THE OLD WAY OF I DON'T KNOW IF THEY HAVE BEEN CHANGED, BUT THE BOTTOM FLOOR CANNOT BE USED FOR A LIVING SPACE.

IT HAS TO BE A CAR GARAGE.

YOU KNOW, I HAVE TO BUILD A TWO CAR GARAGE WHEN I BUILT MY BOTTOM.

I DON'T USE IT.

BUT IT'S THERE.

I USE IT MORE FOR STORAGE THAN ANYTHING ELSE.

[3:03:15 PM]

BUT I HAVE THREE A TWO CAR GARAGE AND A CARPORT ON THE OTHER HOUSE.

I DON'T HAVE THREE CARS.

I DON'T HAVE THREE VEHICLES.

SO BUT THAT'S WHAT WHERE WE'RE WHAT WE'RE FACING THERE, AND WE NEED TO MAKE IT FLEXIBLE ENOUGH.

YOU KNOW, RIGHT NOW IF YOU WANT TO BUILD A SECONDARY UNIT YOU HAVE TO BUILD YOU HAVE TO GO OUT THERE AND GET TWO METERS, A WATER METER, ELECTRIC METER, GAS METER, AT LEAST A GAS METER, THEY'LL PUT THAT OUT AND INSTALL IT FOR FREE.

THEY DON'T CHARGE YOU FOR INSTALLING IT.

THEY'RE HAPPY ENOUGH TO HAVE YOU AS A CUSTOMER.

BUT WHEN YOU HAVE TO PAY LIKE \$32,000 JUST TO PUT TWO METERS IN YOUR HOUSE, YOU ALREADY RAISED THE COST OF THOSE HOUSES, AND I WAS REALLY INTERESTED TO SEE WHERE COUNCIL MEMBER GARZA'S RESOLUTION IS AT, BECAUSE I DON'T THINK WE EVER HAD FEEDBACK ON HOW TO HOW CAN WE REDUCE THE COST SO THAT PEOPLE CAN AFFORD TO PUT ADUs OUT THERE.

IF NOT, IT'S GOING TO COST YOU ANYWHERE BETWEEN 200, \$250,000 JUST TO BUILD IT OUT THERE ON THE BACK, SO MOST PEOPLE AREN'T GOING TO BE ABLE TO AFFORD TO DO THAT.

>> MAYOR ADLER: JIMMY?

[3:05:45 PM]

>> FLANIGAN: THANK YOU.

YEAH, I REALLY WOULD LOVE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT WHAT IT IS THAT'S CAUSING WHAT ARE THE OTHER FACTORS AT PLAY THAT DRIVE UP THE COST OF HOUSING, SO HOW MUCH OF THIS IS JUST WHAT THE MARKET WILL PROVIDE, HOW MUCH OF THIS IS THE COST OF THE TAP FEES, HOW MUCH OF THIS IS THE TIME IT TAKES TO WORK THROUGH THE PROCESS, AND SO THEREFORE UNLESS YOU'RE SELLING THE UNIT AT A CERTAIN PRICE, IT'S NOT EVEN WORTH BUILDING IT.

NOT ALL OF THAT IS GOING TO BE IN THE CODE.

SOME OF THAT IS DECISIONS MADE OUTSIDE THE CODE, BUT, YOU KNOW, I THINK I THINK THERE'S A LOT OF AGREEMENT, COUNCIL MEMBER TOVO, ON NOBODY LIKES THE DEMOLITIONS.

AND REALLY WHERE I STRUGGLE AND I THINK A LOT OF US STRUGGLE IS, YOU KNOW, WE CAN'T PREVENT ALL OF THEM, SO WHEN WE HAVE THEM HOW ARE WE ENSURING WE'RE GETTING SOMETHING GOOD FOR THEM AS A COMMUNITY AND AS A NEIGHBORHOOD AND AS A CITY.

AND IT'S A REALLY GOOD AREA.

YOU PASSED A BUNCH OF RESOLUTIONS RELATED TO DEMOLITIONS.

THERE'S A LOT OF STAFF RESEARCH AND WORK THAT'S BEEN DONE ON THAT AND I THINK THAT MIGHT BE GOOD TO HAVE THAT SYNTHESIZED AS WE THINK ABOUT WHICH PART OF THAT SPECTRUM OF CHALLENGE CAN BE ADDRESSED OR EXACERBATED, WHICH WE DON'T WANT TO DO, THROUGH THE CODE REWRITE, AND WHICH PARTS OF THAT CAN BE ADDRESSED IN SOME OTHER WAY.

[3:07:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: KATHIE?

>> Tovo: YEAH, THANK YOU, AND YES, AT THIS POINT WE HAVEN'T ADOPTED ANY CODE CHANGES, WHICH I THINK IS THE NEXT STEP AND I'M REAL EAGER TO DO THAT AND HAVE GIVEN THAT SOME THOUGHT AND WILL THINK MORE ABOUT THAT A LITTLE LATER THIS SPRING.

I DID BUT YOU REMINDED ME OF SOMETHING I WANTED TO MENTION AND THIS IS OUTSIDE THE CODE AS WELL, BUT, YOU KNOW, SEVERAL OF THE STUDIES THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT HAVE HAVE TALKED ABOUT THE ACCESS TO CAPITAL AS BEING A BIG OBSTACLE FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO WANT TO BUILD ADUs, AND SO I THINK THAT THAT'S I'M NOT SURE THAT WE'VE I KNOW THAT THAT'S COME UP A COUPLE TIMES BUT I DON'T KNOW THAT WE'VE ACTUALLY TAKEN ACTION TO CREATE ANY KIND OF LOAN PROGRAM, AND I THINK THAT WOULD REALLY BE SOMETHING WE SHOULD SERIOUSLY CONSIDER.

THAT SEEMS TO BE A KIND OF INCREASE THAT ALLOWS FOR THE INCREASE OF DENSITY BUT IT ALSO, AS WE'VE TALKED ABOUT, IS OF HELP TO A PROPERTY OWNER, SO IF WE CAN FIGURE OUT HOW TO MAKE THAT A LITTLE EASIER FOR PEOPLE OF CERTAIN INCOME LEVELS, I THINK THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL.

I DON'T THINK WE ANY LONGER REQUIRE TWO WATER METERS.

I THINK AS PART OF THE FEEDBACK THEY'VE RECEIVED, I THINK THEY HAVE MADE SOME CHANGES AND THAT'S ONE OF THEM, JUST FOR THE RECORD.

>> Mayor Adler: OKAY.

THANK YOU.

>> I FORGOT I WAS GOING TO MENTION IN MY COMMENTS ABOUT POSSIBLY PROGRAMS LIKE THE ALLEY FLAT INITIATIVE, IF THE CITY COULD MAYBE, I DON'T KNOW, MAYBE CODIFY SOME OF THOSE WHERE, YOU KNOW, IF THEY BASICALLY WAIVE A BUNCH OF THEIR OWN FEES AND IF THERE WAS WAIVE SOME OF OUR FEES, AND PART OF THAT IS THAT THEY HAVE TO, I BELIEVE, KEEP THAT UNIT 80% AFFORDABLE AT THE 80% RATE FOR LIKE FIVE YEARS OR SOMETHING.

AND SO MAYBE THERE'S SOME CITY PROGRAM WE CAN THAT WOULD ENSURE THAT AFFORDABILITY FACTOR FOR PEOPLE BUILDING AND TAKE OFF SOME OF THE I'M ASSUMING IN THE PRO FORMA THEY WOULD BE ABLE TO DO THAT AND TAKING OFF SOME OF THE COST AND MAYBE THERE'S A WAY TO WAIVE PERMITTING FEES OR SOMETHING IF THEY DO SOMETHING LIKE.

>> Mayor Adler: YOU SPOKE TO COMPATIBILITY.

WE'VE ALREADY HAD A LOT OF THE CONVERSATION I THINK THAT RELATES TO THAT.

AGAIN, I HOPE YOU'RE GETTING ENOUGH THINGS TO BE ABLE TO PLAY BACK TO US THINGS YOU HEARD THAT WE'VE DECIDED AND THE QUESTIONS THAT ARE STILL OPEN ON COMPATIBILITY.

WHAT APPEARED ON GREG'S THING THAT WAS IN RED WAS WHAT I HAD WRITTEN DOWN.

AGAIN, I'D JUST LOOK AT COMPATIBILITY, THE CHANGES WE NEED TO MAKE IN TERMS OF UNLOCKING THE ABILITY TO BE ABLE TO GET THE SUPPLY IN DENSITY AND AFFORDABILITY, MAINLY IN THE CORRIDORS AND IN THE CENTER, I'D LIKE TO FIGURE OUT WHETHER WE MINIMIZE THAT AREA OR BUILD IN SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T TRIGGER THE COMPATIBILITY TO APPLY.

LESLIE?

[3:09:20 PM]

>> Pool: IF WE GET INTO DENSITY BONUSES IN THIS AREA I WANT US TO BE REALLY MINDFUL THAT WE'RE NOT WAIVING ANY STANDARDS, BECAUSE WE HAVE TO KEEP THE AFFORDABILITY PIECE IN THERE.

SO THE ONLY WAY TO WAIVE IT IS IF YOU ARE INCLUDING AFFORDABILITY.

WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT HOW DIFFICULT IT IS TO ENSURE THAT THERE ARE BELOW MARKET UNITS FOR PEOPLE TO LIVE IN, SO SO JUST TO REITERATE WHAT I THINK STEVE HAS SAID ALREADY TODAY, AND I THINK ANN AND ALISON AND KATHIE AND MAYBE SOME OF THE OTHERS HERE, WE HAVE TO MAKE SURE THAT WE DON'T LEAVE OUR AFFORDABILITY REQUIREMENTS ON THE GROUND IN OUR

HASTE TO OPEN UP PROCESSES WITHOUT ENSURING THAT THAT WE HAVE SOME KIND OF TRIGGER, SO IF THERE IS A WAIVER, YOU'RE GETTING THE WAIVER BECAUSE WE ARE GETTING A COMMUNITY BENEFIT BACK FROM IT.

>> Mayor Adler: OKAY.

ANN?

>> Kitchen: I WANTED TO MENTION ANOTHER ASPECT OF COMPATIBILITY.

WE HAD SUGGESTED BRINGING IN SOME OF THE PROVISIONS IN THE EAST RIVERSIDE CORRIDOR THAT RELATE TO LIKE THE DUMPSTER REQUIREMENTS AND THINGS LIKE THAT.

IT GOES BACK TO SOMETHING COUNCIL MEMBER TOVO MENTIONED EARLIER, AND THAT'S JUST THINGS THAT CAN CAUSE, YOU KNOW THAT COMPATIBILITY IN A DIFFERENT SENSE THAN JUST THE HEIGHT IN BUILDING, BUT JUST THE NOISE AND DUMPSTERS ARE A BIG PROBLEM WITH NOISE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT AND THINGS LIKE THAT.

SO MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THE EAST RIVERSIDE CORRIDOR REGULATING PLAN HAD SOME HAD SOME PROVISIONS FOR THINGS LIKE DUMPSTER REQUIREMENTS AND OTHER EQUIPMENT AND UTILITY SCREENING AND THAT KIND OF THING, SO I JUST WANTED TO NOT THAT NOT TO GET LOST IN HERE, AND IN TALKING ABOUT IN TALKING ABOUT PROVISIONS RELATED TO COMPATIBILITY.

>> Mayor Adler: JIMMY?

>> Flannigan: I OFTEN THINK ABOUT COMPATIBILITY IN TERMS OF HEIGHT ONLY, BUT IT'S A REALLY GOOD POINT, BUT THERE'S A LOT OF THINGS THAT COULD EASILY FALL UNDER THIS UMBRELLA.

I THINK ABOUT THIS AS AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, ABOUT USES AND HOW WE REGULATE WHERE USES ARE APPROPRIATE.

I THINK THERE'S A COMPATIBILITY VERSION OF THAT ARGUMENT THAT WORKS BETTER THAN JUST SITE BY SITE USE RESTRICTIONS WHICH IS WHERE INCLUDING ZONING ALWAYS TENDS TO BE, AND TO THINK THROUGH BETTER, YOU KNOW, WHAT USES ARE COMPATIBLE AND HOW THOSE ARE TREATED, AS OPPOSED TO JUST WHERE DID YOU ZONE IT, IS A GOOD EXAMPLE.

AND THEN THE VEGETATIVE BUFFERS AND STUFF, WE SEE A LOT OF THOSE POPPING UP IN COs, AND THAT MIGHT BE A PLACE WHERE CodeNEXT TRIED TO DO THAT, AND I THINK IT WENT FARTHER IN PLACES THAN IT NEEDED TO GO, BUT THAT TAPS INTO THE TRADE OFF PIECE TO WHERE IF WE CAN HAVE BOTH THE SETBACK IN THE DRAINAGE AND THE TREE PROTECTED, AND IT'S LITERALLY THE SAME, YOU KNOW, STRIP OF LAND, WE'VE ACCOMPLISHED ALL THREE THINGS AND NOT CREATING A SCENARIO WHERE THE STAFF FORCES THE BUFFER AND THE SETBACK AND THE TREE PROTECTION AND THE DRAINING FIELD DRAINAGE FIELD AND YOU'VE ELIMINATED DEVELOPABLE LAND ENTIRELY, HOW WE'RE ENSURING THAT STAFF ISN'T ABLE TO DO THAT AND GET INTO THE CONFLICTS I'VE HEARD BEFORE WHERE THINGS ARE LAYERED AND IT HURTS OUR ABILITY TO GET UNITS.

[3:11:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: ANYTHING FURTHER ON COMPATIBILITY?

>> I THINK THAT ONE, IF I MAY, JUST ONE ISSUE, A LITTLE BIT OF CLARIFICATION IN THE DIRECTION, IN THE DRAFT MESSAGE BOARD POST, AND I THINK THIS MAY HAVE BEEN FROM THE MAYOR.

YOU HAD SUGGESTED SOME, YOU KNOW, TYING OF COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS TO SITUATIONS WHERE THERE'S DEEP LOTS LOCATED ON A TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR.

YOU HAD ALSO SUGGESTED CONSIDERING SHALLOW LOTS AS WELL IN CONNECTION WITH TRIGGERING COMPATIBILITY, AND I THINK THERE ARE SOME CONCERNS WITH THAT KIND OF APPROACH, AND I THINK THAT IT'S AN EXAMPLE OF WHERE THE THEME WE'VE HEARD TODAY ABOUT CONTEXT SENSITIVITY, THERE ARE DEFINITELY WAYS TO DO IT, BUT THERE ARE ALSO WAYS THAT IT GETS IT CREATES SOME PROBLEMS.

AND SO, LACY, WOULD YOU WANT TO SPEAK TO THE ISSUES WITH RESPECT TO THE DEEP LOT SCENARIO THAT WE DISCUSSED?

>> SURE.

LACY PATTERSON AGAIN WITH PLANNING AND ZONING.

I GUESS THE FIRST PART OF THAT CONVERSATION IS IF YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT CONTEXT SENSITIVITY THIS IS ONE WAY TO ADDRESS IT, RIGHT, BASING ON LOT SIZES AND THE DEPTH ON CORRIDORS.

TO HAVE THAT CONVERSATION, THOUGH, IS ABOUT WHAT ARE YOU TRYING TO ACHIEVE WITH COMPATIBILITY.

IS IT HEIGHT ONLY OR IS IT KIND OF THAT U STRUCTURE?

IS IT THAT DUMPSTER AREA?

[3:13:20 PM]

BUT WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT IN DRAFT 3 WE DID TRY TO REFRAIN FROM SPLIT ZONING AS WE LIKE TO CALL IT, DIVIDING PROPERTIES INTO MULTIPLE ZONING CATEGORIES AND TRYING TO MAKE OUR ZONING REGULATIONS WORK IN A WAY THAT WAS UNNECESSARY.

SO I GUESS WE WOULD REALLY WANT CLARIFICATION IF THAT IS SOMETHING, DIVIDING UP LOTS, IF COMPATIBILITY IS ALREADY WORKING IN A WAY THAT WE DON'T HAVE TO USE MULTIPLE ZONINGS ON A PROPERTY.

IS THAT SOMETHING THAT WE WANT TO WORK WITH MOVING FORWARD OR NOT?

AND KIND OF JUST FURTHER CLARIFICATION IF THAT IS SOMETHING, BECAUSE I THINK THAT'S WHERE WE CAN REALLY START TO GET INTO THE WEEDS OURSELVES ON STAFF SIDE WHEN WE'RE STARTING TO LOOK INTO HOW WE'RE IMPLEMENTING SOME OF THESE POLICY CHOICES.

IF YOU HAVE A PREFERENCE ON CONTEXT SENSITIVITY, LOOKING AT SHALLOW LOTS IS CERTAINLY, AND ZONING WEATHER A PROPERTY ADJACENT OR WITHIN A CERTAIN DISTANCE OF IS A VERY SIMPLE WAY TO START TO LOOK AT THOSE COMPONENTS.

BUT WHEN YOU START TO LOOK AT HOW DEEP IS A LOT, HOW FAR INTO IT DO WE WANT TO START MAKING ADJUSTMENTS, WE GET INTO REALLY COMPLICATED CONVERSATIONS THAT MAY NOT BE AS VALID FOR THIS POINT.

>> Mayor Adler: MY INTENT IN THAT LANGUAGE WAS NOT TO PRESCRIBE THE WAY TO DEAL WITH IT BUT TO ENABLE THE CORRIDOR FRONTING PROPERTIES TO BE ABLE TO DEVELOP WITH GREATER DENSITY AND GREATER ENTITLEMENTS THAN THEY CAN UNDER EXISTING CODE, SO AS TO BE ABLE TO GET US THE HOUSING SUPPLY, THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE DASH A, AND OTHER THINGS.

SO COMPATIBILITY IS ONE OF THE LIMITING FACTORS ON THAT AND I THOUGHT THERE WERE TWO WAYS TO ADDRESS THAT.

ONE IS YOU COMPRESS THAT SOMEHOW, AND THE OTHER WAY TO DO IT IS TO DO SOMETHING THAT ABUTS IT THAT WOULDN'T BE THE TRIGGER.

[3:15:45 PM]

AND THAT'S AND THAT'S MY GOAL.

REASON WE TALKED ABOUT THAT USE ON THE BACK WAS BECAUSE I THOUGHT THAT ALSO PROVIDED, THEN, AN OPPORTUNITY TO PLACE IN OUR CITY LOW SLUNG APARTMENTS OR MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING.

MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING RIGHT NOW STILL TRIGGERS COMPATIBILITY, SO IT WOULD REQUIRE SOME KIND OF ZONE CHANGE TO ALLOW MISSING MIDDLE TO NOT TRIGGER COMPATIBILITY, IF THAT WAS GOING TO BE THE CASE.

BUT THAT WAS THE GOAL THAT I WAS TRYING TO ACHIEVE, AND I WAS TRYING TO PLACE THINGS THAT I WOULD BE WILLING TO ACCEPT, BECAUSE I THINK SO MUCH OF SETTING THIS IS ALL ABOUT PRIORITIES AND TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHAT'S MOST IMPORTANT FOR US TO BE ABLE TO DELIVER WHEN YOU HAVE COMPETING FOLKS.

SO IT WAS REALLY AN ATTEMPT TO SAY I'M OKAY WITH COMPROMISING SOMETHING THAT I OTHERWISE LIKE, BUT I'M NOT TIED TO THAT PARTICULAR SOLUTION SO LONG AS, FOR ME, WE GET THAT DENSITY AND THE SUPPLY ON THE CORRIDORS, THOSE ENTITLEMENTS ON THE CORRIDORS, AND WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR MORE DENSE HOUSING AS A TRANSITION TO A NEIGHBORHOOD AND MORE MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING, WHATEVER IT IS THAT MAKES THAT HAPPEN.

JIMMY? >> Flannigan: I THINK THIS IS ALWAYS A TOUGH CONVERSATION, BECAUSE I FEEL LIKE IT'S ONE OF THOSE SCENARIOS WHERE EACH INDIVIDUALLY THINKING OF AN EXAMPLE, BUT THEY'RE VERY DIFFERENT, AND SO AS WE TALK THROUGH COMPATIBILITY I'M THINKING ABOUT AN EXAMPLE IN MY

DISTRICT AND PAIGE MAY BE THINKING ABOUT AN EXAMPLE IN 8 AND KATHIE IS THINKING ABOUT AN EXAMPLE THAT'S CLOSER TO DOWNTOWN THAT'S FACING A WHOLE DIFFERENT SET OF PRESSURES THAN MY EXAMPLE IS THINKING OF.

SO I THINK THAT'S WHY THIS ONE TENDS TO BE VERY DIFFICULT, BECAUSE I COULD SAY A THING THAT I THINK ABOUT COMPATIBILITY, AND IT WOULD BE INTERPRETED VERY DIFFERENTLY BOTH IN THE PUBLIC AND ACROSS THE DAIS.

SO, YOU KNOW, MY VERSION OF THAT WAS MORE THINKING SPECIFICALLY JUST IN THE CORRIDORS AND CENTERS AND THINKING ABOUT COMPATIBILITY NOT ONLY AS A THING THAT RESTRICTS BUT A THING THAT DEFINES, IS TO SAY THAT CORRIDORS MAYBE SHOULD BE ALLOWED A CERTAIN, YOU KNOW, WITHIN DENSITY BONUS RULES AND WHATEVER, AND THAT WE'RE NOT GOING TO ALLOW THE TAIL END OF A LOT TO INHIBIT THE ABILITY FOR CORRIDORS AND CENTERS TO DO A THING, BUT THEN ELSEWHERE IN MOST CASES THE ZONING TAKES CARE OF IT, AND BUT FOR EXAMPLES TO DEBATE IT'S HARD TO KNOW WHAT CONTEXT SENSITIVITY LOOKS LIKE WITHOUT EXAMPLES THAT WE'RE ALL LOOKING AT THE SAME PLACE ON THE SAME LOT.

>> Mayor Adler: KATHIE AND THEN ANN.

>> Tovo: YEAH, I AGREE, AND, YOU KNOW, I JUST WANT TO RESERVE I CAN'T I CAN'T WEIGH IN ON YOUR SUGGESTIONS AT THIS POINT BECAUSE I'VE GOT A COUPLE QUIRKY EXAMPLES I'VE GOT TO THINK THROUGH.

ON THE OTHER HAND, I THINK YOU MADE THE POINT EARLIER, IT'S EASIER TO MAKE ROOM TO DEAL WITH QUIRKY EXAMPLES THAN IT IS TO COME UP WITH A POLICY THAT WOULD BE STANDARD ACROSS I MEAN, THE ONE ANYWAY, I WON'T TALK ABOUT THE QUIRKY EXAMPLES, BUT I THINK THEY GET BACK TO WHAT I'M SAYING ABOUT, YOU KNOW, WE WOULD BE TAKING OUT A WHOLE BUNCH OF NEWLY RENOVATED NATURALLY OCCURRING AFFORDABLE HOUSING I MEAN, JUST EXAMPLES LIKE THAT WHERE WE JUST NEED TO MAKE SPACE.

WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TO I NEED TO THINK THROUGH THIS ISSUE A LITTLE BIT FURTHER BEFORE WEIGHING IN ON WHAT IT, LOOK LIKE, BUT IT IS IT LOOKS LIKE, BUT IT'S MUCH BROADER THAN I APPRECIATE THE CONVERSATION.

I THINK THIS IS ALREADY A BROADER CONVERSATION THAN WE'VE HAD IN PREVIOUS CONVERSATIONS ABOUT COMPATIBILITY.

>> Mayor Adler: ANN?

[3:17:15 PM]

>> Kitchen: OH, I JUST WANTED TO COMMENT, I THINK IT'S ON PAGE 11 OF, COUNCIL MEMBER CASAR, THE COMPILATIONS THAT HE DID, AND THAT'S SOME LANGUAGE ABOUT MAPPING OF ADDITIONAL PARCELS.

SO I'M THINKING THAT THAT MAY BE LANGUAGE THAT WELL, I'D RATHER SEE THAT LANGUAGE TAKEN OUT, I THINK, BECAUSE I THINK WHAT WE'RE THE CONVERSATION SEEMS TO BE GOING IN THE DIRECTION OF PROVIDING MORE MORE SPECIFIC DIRECTION, AND THIS SAYS MAPPING OF ADDITIONAL PARCELS.

I'M NOT SURE WHAT'S MEANT BY "ADDITIONAL PARCELS."

I WAS THINKING THAT THIS WAS GOING IN THE DIRECTION OF ESTABLISHING THE CORRIDOR AND PERHAPS THE NOT PERHAPS, BUT THE CORRIDOR AND THE AND THE BACK LOTS BEHIND THE CORRIDOR.

>> THE MAYOR'S LANGUAGE.

>> Kitchen: RIGHT, THE MAYOR'S LANGUAGE.

>> Casar: [INAUDIBLE]

>> Kitchen: ALL RIGHT.

SO MAYBE I HAVE A QUESTION THEN.

I'M NOT SURE WHAT IS MEANT BY MAPPING OF ADDITIONAL PARCELS.

WAS THAT MEANT TO MEAN BEYOND THE BEYOND THE BACK LOT OR WAS THAT MEANT TO MEAN THAT IF WE PUT CONTEXT SENSITIVITY IN PLACE, THAT WE THEN MIGHT NEED TO MAP IT LATER?

I GUESS I'M NOT UNDERSTANDING WHAT THAT LANGUAGE MEANS.

>> Mayor Adler: MY INTENT OF THAT WAS TO ALLOW FOR THE I KNOW THERE WERE SOME PEOPLE ON THE DAIS THAT WANTED MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING TO REACH FURTHER INTO NEIGHBORHOODS.

>> Kitchen: OKAY.

[3:19:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: WHAT I HAD DESCRIBED WAS SOMETHING THAT HAD THE MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING AND THE ADDITIONAL DENSER HOUSING, SERVING AS THE TRANSITION BETWEEN AN UNLOCKED CORRIDOR WITH A RESIDENCE.

BUT I ALSO KNEW THAT THAT WAS NOT NECESSARILY THE SENTIMENT OF EVERYONE ON THE DAIS.

SO THIS WAS A SECTION WHERE I SAID, AND TO THE DEGREE THAT WE MAPPED ADDITIONAL PARCELS, BEYOND WHAT IT WAS THAT I JUST DESCRIBED, THAT I WOULD WANT TO SEE IF COUNCIL CAN CRAFT A CONTEXT SENSITIVE CRITERIA THAT WOULD ALLOW FOR THAT.

OTHERWISE I WAS PROBABLY GOING TO HOLD TO WHAT IT WAS THAT I HAD STATED, BUT I WANTED TO LEAVE THE DOOR OPEN TO THE CRAFTING OF GENERAL CONTEXT SENSITIVE CRITERIA.

>> Kitchen: OKAY.

WELL OKAY.

SO ALL RIGHT.

I THINK I'M UNDERSTANDING.

SO THEN WHAT I WAS SAYING THAT WAS AN ADDITIONAL NUANCE THAT I WASN'T SURE IF YOU MEANT OR NOT, WAS THAT THE CONTEXT SENSITIVE CRITERIA SHOULD ALSO APPLY TO THAT THAT BACK LOT.

IN OTHER WORDS, THAT TO THE EXTENT WE COME UP WITH CONTEXT SENSITIVE, IT'S NOT JUST APPLYING TO ADDITIONAL PARCELS.

IT WOULD APPLY ALSO TO THE LOT BEHIND THE CORRIDOR.

[3:21:15 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: AND FOR ME, I WOULD BE WILLING TO CONSIDER THAT.

>> Kitchen: OKAY.

>> Mayor Adler: AND COULD SUPPORT THAT SO LONG AS WHATEVER WE DID DIDN'T STOP THE DIDN'T STOP UNLOCKING THE CORRIDOR FOR THE HOUSING SUPPLY AND THE DENSITY.

>> Kitchen: WE JUST NEED TO DIG INTO THE DETAILS ON THAT.

>> Mayor Adler: OKAY.

ANYTHING ELSE ON COMPATIBILITY?

YES, ALISON.

>> Alter: I JUST WANTED TO GET A CLARIFICATION BECAUSE I'VE HEARD DIFFERENT, PURCHASE TO COMPATIBILITY, AND I THINK IT WILL CREATE CONFUSION SO I THINK THERE'S ONE INTERPRETATION OF THIS WHERE WE'RE TALKING ABOUT CHANGING COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS ONLY IN CORRIDORS AND CENTERS, AND THERE'S ANOTHER WHERE IT'S EVERYWHERE, AND I OBVIOUSLY WOULD PREFER THE FORMER.

I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY BECAUSE IT SEEMS LIKE WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE FORMER, BUT I THINK THAT WOULD GO A LONG WAY FOR A LOT OF PEOPLE FROM THE UNCERTAINTY.

>> Mayor Adler: FOR ME AT THIS POINT WITHOUT KNOWING, I WOULD LEAVE OPEN THE CONVERSATION FOR SOMEONE TO SUGGEST SOMETHING DIFFERENT, BUT FOR ME I'M FOCUSED ON THE CORRIDORS AND THE CENTERS AND UNLOCKING THAT, WITH THE EXCEPTION BEING THE ADUs, WHICH I DON'T THINK TRIGGER COMPATIBILITY, MORE WIDELY PLACED.

THAT'S WHAT I'M THINKING.

>> Flannigan: I'M I WOULD I STRUGGLE BASED ON MY FRAME OF REFERENCE TO SEE WHERE COMPATIBILITY IS FAILING OUTSIDE OF THOSE AREAS NOW, RIGHT?

BECAUSE I ONLY I MEAN, HOW RESIDENTIAL, BE IT THREE UNITS, TWO UNITS, ONE UNIT IS COMPATIBILITY SO >> Mayor Adler: SO I THINK TO THE DEGREE

>> Flannigan: THAT'S WHY I STRUGGLE TO ANSWER THE QUESTION THERE MAY BE A SCENARIO WHERE I WANT IT TO BE OFF I WANT TO CHANGE OFF THOSE AREAS, BUT I CAN'T THINK OF ONE WHERE THE WAY IT WORKS NOW IS THE WAY I DON'T LIKE BECAUSE IT'S ALREADY KIND OF AT A CERTAIN LEVEL.

[3:23:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: SO WITH AVOIDING THE RISK OF PEOPLE COMMITTING TO SOMETHING THAT THEY CAN'T UNDO LATER, WHICH I THINK IS INHERENT IN EVERYTHING THAT WE'RE SAYING AND DOING, I THINK GENERALLY SPEAKING WHAT YOU SAID WAS ABSOLUTELY CORRECT, AND IF PEOPLE CAN THINK OF PLACES WHERE THAT WOULDN'T APPLY, THEN THEY SHOULD DAYLIGHT THAT.

>> Alter: BECAUSE I JUST THINK THAT'S THE KIND OF THING THAT AS WE'RE TALKING THROUGH THIS, IF WE CAN NAIL DOWN SOME SPECIFICITY AND BE CLEAR IN HOW WE'RE TALKING, WE CAN AVOID SOME OF THE UNCERTAINTY AND ANXIETY THAT WE HAVE EXPERIENCED IN THE PAST, BECAUSE I KNOW THAT COMPATIBILITY AT LARGE WAS A GIANT SOURCE, AND OBVIOUSLY THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO LIVE OFF THE CORRIDORS WHO WILL BE CONCERNED.

I'M NOT SAYING TAKING THIS STEP WOULD BE WITHOUT ANY CONSEQUENCE, BUT IT IS STILL A MUCH BIGGER STEP TO SAY WE'RE GOING TO GET RID OF IT EVERYWHERE ON EVERY PARCEL.

>> Mayor Adler: THANKS FOR BRINGING THAT UP.>> Mayor Adler: THANKS FOR BRINGING THAT UP.I WANT TO TALK ABOUT NEXT STEPS. PEOPLE ARE NEEDING TO LEAVE. MANAGER YOU SUGGESTED THAT THE COUNCIL TAKE ANOTHER STAB AT

THE NEXT ITERATION OF THIS DOCUMENT. YOU SAID THAT YOU WOULD STILL HAVE STAFF COME BACK WITH THE QUESTIONS THAT THEY

THINK HAVEN'T BEEN ANSWERED AND POST THOSE SO THAT WE MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE GIVING THE DIRECTION. BUT MAYBE GREG AND ANN, YOU

GUYS CAN SIT DOWN AND BETWEEN THE TWO OF YOU COME UP WITH -- >> WITH A QUORUM?

[3:25:15 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: CAN'T WITH THE QUORUM ISSUE. I'M TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW WE GET TO THE NEXT DOCUMENT. >> YOU CAN CERTAINLY USE THE

MESSAGE BOARD TO COMMUNICATE DRAFTS.>> [INAUDIBLE] >> Tovo: MAYOR? >> Mayor Adler: YES.
>> Kitchen: I'M HAPPY TO TAKE A STAB AND PUT IT ON THE MESSAGE BOARD. >> Mayor Adler: CAN YOU
DESCRIBE WHAT THE RESERVATION IS YOU HAVE WITH THE STAFF TRYING TO TAKE OUT

THE VALUE STATEMENTS IN THIS AND JUST LIST WHAT THE AGREEMENTS WERE THAT COUNCIL -- THAT
THE STAFF HEARD? >> MAYOR, I THINK THIS IS A REALLY PRODUCTIVE DISCUSSION

TODAY AND I FELT LIKE THE WORK THAT BOTH COUNCILMEMBER CASAR DID AND THEN THE ADDITIONS
THAT COUNCILMEMBER KITCHEN AND THE GROUP THAT SHE WORKED WITH, I THINK

THERE'S ENOUGH OF THE SUBSTANCE THERE AND IT'S JUST A MATTER OF PUTTING THAT TOGETHER. I
WOULD MUCH RATHER HAVE THAT COME FROM COUNCIL THAN COME FROM STAFF BECAUSE

THERE ARE THINGS THAT STAFF WILL MISS AND WE DON'T WANT TO GET IN THE WAY OF THOSE
CONVERSATIONS THAT ARE HAPPENING AMONG YOU. >> Mayor Adler: I'M TRYING TO AVOID DOING
THE MESSAGE

BOARD BECAUSE IT'S WAY TOO CUMBERSOME AND WE REALLY NEED TO GET A DOCUMENT OUT THAT
THEN PEOPLE CAN START REACTING TO.

[3:27:15 PM]

>> Tovo: AND MAYOR? >> Mayor Adler: YES. >> Tovo: I'M SORRY THAT I'M GOING TO NEED TO LEAVE,
THOUGH I COMMENTED ON PARKING EARLIER. I WANT TO AGAIN SAY I THINK

THAT WE COULD SPEND A LOT OF TIME UNPRODUCTIVELY TALKING ABOUT THE VALUE STATEMENTS
AND WE WOULD ALL FRAME THEM DIFFERENTLY. SO I WOULD JUST URGE WHEREVER THIS
CONVERSATION

GOES AND WHOEVER IS DRAFTING IT, JUST THE KIND OF STRAIGHTFORWARD QUESTION AND THE
RESPONSES AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PEOPLE HAVE PROVIDED, I THINK THERE'S A

FAIR AMOUNT OF CONSENSUS AROUND AND WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO IDENTIFY SOME AREAS WHERE WE
NEED ADDITIONAL CONVERSATION OR MAYBE THERE ARE POINTS OF DISAGREEMENT.

I THINK WHEN WE START GETTING INTO THE NARRATIVE VERSIONS, WE'RE GOING TO BOG DOWN AND
WE'RE GOING TO ALSO BE PROVIDING STATEMENTS THAT CAUSE CONCERN AND FEEDBACK

AND, AGAIN, A LOT OF LESS PRODUCTIVE DIALOGUE IN THE COMMUNITY. SO THAT'S MY TWO CENTS
ON THAT. >> Mayor Adler: I THINK THERE WAS GENERAL AGREEMENT ON THAT.

GREG, YES. >> Casar: MY SUGGESTION MIGHT BE IF YOU WANT TO TAKE THIS, YOU, MAYOR, AND TAKE
OUT VALUE STATEMENTS AND JUST MAKE IT BULLETS FOR DIRECTION BASED ON

EVERYTHING YOU'VE HEARD TODAY SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN TRACKING IT.

[3:29:45 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: THEN WE'LL DO THAT AND POST -- >> Casar: THEN WHAT I WOULD DO IF I OR ANYBODY

ELSE HAD ANY SUGGESTIONS OR DISAGREEMENTS THAT WE COULD POST OUR AMENDMENTS TO A CLEANER DIRECTION DOCUMENT. >> Mayor Adler: OKAY. WE'LL TAKE FIRST STAB AT DOING THAT. WHILE WE'RE HERE AS A GROUP,

LET'S DISCUSS PARKING. AND I UNDERSTAND THAT ONE OR TWO OF YOU MAY NEED TO LEAVE, BUT LET'S SEE IF WE CAN SURFACE DEALS. I THINK WITH RESPECT TO PARKING, MY SENSE IS THAT THERE'S ALWAYS A CONTACT

SPECIFICITY ISSUE WITH RESPECT TO THIS, BUT I THINK THAT GENERALLY SPEAKING THE CONSENSUS ON THE COUNCIL WAS TO BE MUCH MORE LIBERAL WITH RESPECT TO PARKING. AGAIN, ALONG CORRIDORS AND

CENTERS IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO SUPPORT TRANSIT, AS WELL AS TO LOWER THE COST OF MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING AND THE ABILITY TO REALIZE DENSITY AND SUPPLY ALONG THE

CORRIDORS. ADDITIONAL GLOSSES ON THAT? >> Renteria: AND I AGREE WITH YOU AND THAT'S WHY I'M SUPPORTING C ON THE PARKING. YOU KNOW, SO THAT --ESPECIALLY AROUND THE MAJOR CORRIDORS.

I MEAN IF WE'RE GOING TO MAKE TRANSIT WORK, WE NEED TO MAKE SURE THAT WE DON'T PROVIDE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR PEOPLE TO HAVE TO BUY A CAR AND DRIVE AROUND AND THAT WILL ALSO REDUCE THE COST OF

BUILDING. PARKING IS VERY EXPENSIVE. SO -- ESPECIALLY ALONG THE MAJOR CORRIDORS, AND I THINK IT'S JUST A BIG WASTE OF MONEY. AND IF WE COULD JUST REDUCE THE PARKING REQUIREMENT, ESPECIALLY ALONG ALL THE

MAJOR CORRIDORS THAT WE'RE INVESTING A HUGE AMOUNT OF MONEY, THAT WE'RE REALLY SERIOUS TO ADDRESS THE TRANSIT PROBLEM OFTEN THE CONGESTIONS WE HAVE IN AUSTIN, WE'RE REALLY GOING

TO HAVE TO START LOOKING AT REDUCING THE PARKING REQUIREMENTS. >> Mayor Adler: OKAY. JIMMY. >> Flannigan: I'M IN FAVOR OF OPTION C, AT LEAST I THINK, YOU KNOW, IT'S IMPORTANT FOR THE COMMUNITY

TO REMEMBER THAT NO PARKING MINIMUMS DOES NOT MEAN NO PARKING. EVEN PARKING MAXIMUMS WOULD NOT MEAN NO PARKING BECAUSE THE MAXIMUM WOULD NOT BE ZERO. IT WOULD BE SOME OTHER

[3:31:15 PM]

NUMBER. SO IF WE WERE -- SO AS AN EXAMPLE, YOU KNOW, I HAVE A TRAIN STATION IN MY DISTRICT THAT DOES NOT HAVE A T.O.D. FOR SOME REASON WE ONLY DID THE FORMAL T.O.D.s IN THE

AREAS THE TRAIN WAS ALREADY FULL, IN THE CENTRAL AREAS, WE DIDN'T T.O.D. THE STATIONS OUT IN FRONT OR WEST. I'M STILL BUILDING A TON OF PARKING WITH EVERY UNIT THAT

IS NEAR THAT TRAIN STATION. AND THE CHALLENGE, THOUGH, IS, AGAIN, AS TO THE CONSIDERING THE MAXIMUMS QUESTION, THE DEVELOPER THAT -- THE LAST ONE I TALKED TO WHO IS CONSIDERING SOME MULTI-FAMILY RIGHT

ADJACENT TO THE TRAIN STATION, IT'S NOT EVEN ACROSS THE STREET, IT'S LITERALLY AT THE TRAIN STATION, BELIEVES THAT THE BANK WHO IS FUNDING HIS PROJECT REQUIRES MORE PARKING THAN WE MAY EVEN

REQUIRE ON THAT SITE. SO, YOU KNOW, JUST HAVING NO MINIMUMS ALONE DOESN'T NECESSARILY GET US TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE BUILDINGS BECAUSE THERE'S A DISCONNECT BETWEEN WHAT THE FINANCE INDUSTRY IS

REQUIRING IN LOAN PRODUCTS. SO HOW WE -- HOW WE ADDRESS THAT MARKET FORCE IS SOMETHING I THINK WE NEED TO CONSIDER. >> Mayor Adler: OKAY. GREG? >> Casar: MAYOR, I TRIED TO SQUARE ALL THE DIFFERENT

POSTS ON THIS. MY FIRST STAB AT SOMETHING WAS TO SAY TAKE THE GENERAL REDUCTION THAT ALREADY EXISTED IN DRAFT 3, THAT WOULD BE OPTION B, BUT TO GO TO OPTION C WITHIN A QUARTER

MILE OF OUR CORRIDORS AND ACTIVITY CENTERS TO DO -- TO NOT HAVE PARKING MINIMUMS NEAR THOSE PLACES WHERE IT IS THAT WE WANT TRANSIT, BUT TO OTHERWISE LEAVE IT THE WAY THAT IT WAS IN CodeNEXT.

AGAIN, I WOULD BE MOVED OR CHANGED OR CONVINCED BY ANYONE, BUT IN TRYING TO FIGURE OUT, YOU KNOW, RATHER THAN ELIMINATE THEM EVERYWHERE, REALLY FOCUS ON THOSE AREAS NEAR TRANSIT.

IF THEY NEEDS TO BE CONCEPT EXCEPTIONS, ADA ISSUES, ISSUES RAISED BY THE MAYOR WHERE WE COULD DO OPTION A OR B IN PARTICULAR PLACES, THAT'S FINE IF WHERE WE REALLY WANT TO HAVE MORE

AFFORDABILITY AND TRANSIT FRIENDLINESS WOULD BE WITHIN A QUARTER MILE OF THOSE PLACES. SO THAT'S WHAT I PUT UP. >> Mayor Adler: ALISON. EXCUSE ME. ALISON.

[3:33:45 PM]

>> Alter: SO THERE'S A LOT OF THIS THAT I LIKE. I THINK THAT SOME OF THE TRANSLATION ACROSS THE DOCUMENTS LOST SOME OF THE NUANCE THAT THE MAYOR HAD AND I'D LIKE TO SEE THOSE REINTRODUCED.

I APPRECIATE THE COST SENSITIVITY BEING IN THERE AND FOR ANY REDUCTIONS, I WOULD BE PERFECTLY FINE IF IT WAS NEXT TO A T.O.D. OR TRAIN STATION TO SAY THERE WOULD BE NO PARKING.

BUT THERE ARE OTHER PLACES THAT ARE IN THE MIDDLE OF A CORRIDOR THAT HAVE A BUS, RAPID TRANSIT, THAT I WOULDN'T -- I WOULDN'T BE COMFORTABLE COMPLETELY ELIMINATING IT.

AND SO THERE'S STILL A LITTLE BIT OF VAGUENESS IN THERE THAT RAISES SOME CONCERNS FOR ME IN THAT I WOULD ALSO REMIND FOLKS THAT I'M PRETTY SURE THAT IN THE CONTEXT OF ASMP, AND WE'VE

GOTTEN SO MANY PIECES WE'VE BEEN READING WITH THAT, I'M NOT KEEPING IT STREET. PRETTY SURE STAFF SAID THEY WERE NOT IN FAVOR OF ELIMINATING MINIMUM PARKING

REQUIREMENTS ACROSS THE BOARD. AND THAT THERE WAS ALSO GENERALLY NOT FAVORING OF A MAXIMUM PARKING. SO I JUST THINK THAT WE PROBABLY DON'T HAVE TIME -- I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE TIME

RIGHT NOW BECAUSE FOLKS HAVE TO GO, BUT I THINK IT WILL BE USEFUL TO GET THAT INPUT AND MAYBE WE'RE CALLING IT IMPROPERLY, BUT --

[3:35:15 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I DON'T RECALL THAT, BUT LET'S CHECK ON THE ASMP. YOU AND I ARE ON THE SAME FORUM, SO IF YOU WOULD GET TO ME THE NUANCE THAT YOU THINK WE'RE MISSING, THAT

WOULD BE HELPFUL. GENERALLY SPEAKING I'M DRAFTING THIS THE WAY THE WAY GREG DESCRIBED IT, BUT A GENERAL SITE SPECIFIC FOR THINGS NOT WITHIN A QUARTER

MILE OF THE STATION OR MID-CORRIDOR AND SEE THAT MAKES SENSE AND SHOULD THERE BE AN STANDARD FROM A ACCESSIBILITY STANDPOINT.

>> BRENT LLOYD, DEVELOPMENT SERVICES. I THINK THERE'S DEFINITELY SOME ABILITY TO FACTOR IN CONTEXT SENSITIVITY IN HOW MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS ARE STRUCTURED, BUT I THINK

STAFF IN SORT OF REVIEWING THE COMMENTS, ONE OF THE AREAS OF CONCERN WAS THAT HAVING CONTENT -- CONTEXT SENSITIVITY THAT IS SO SPECIFIC AS TO VARY PARKING

REQUIREMENTS BASED ON THE WIDTH OF ADJACENT STREETS, THAT SORT OF THOSE SORT OF VERY GRANULAR TYPES OF DISTINCTIONS I THINK ARE CONCERNING TO STAFF IN TERMS OF THE COMPLEXITY OF

APPLYING THE REQUIREMENTS AND I THINK THERE'S SOME CONCERNS THERE, BUT I THINK GENERALLY IN TERMS OF TYING REQUIREMENTS TO DISTANCES FROM CORRIDORS AND THINGS

LIKE THAT, I THINK THERE'S A LOT OF THE IDEAS THAT ARE FLOATED IN THE MESSAGE BOARD POSTS THAT ARE THINGS THAT IF YOU ALL INCORPORATE THEM IN THE COUNCIL DIRECTION ARE

THINGS THAT STAFF CAN WORK WITH. >> Mayor Adler: OKAY. >> AND LINDY GARWOOD, WHO IS AN EXPERT ON PARKING REGULATION, IS DEFINITELY HERE IF PEOPLE HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ON THOSE ISSUES.

[3:37:50 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I THINK WE'RE LOOKING FOR YOUR QUESTIONS ON THOSE ISSUES. WITH RESPECT TO EACH ONE OF THESE. SO IT'S GOING TO -- WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN NOW IS MY

OFFICE, JOHN, MICHAEL TAKING THE LEAD, WILL TRY TO REDUCE THE CONVERSATION THAT WE HAD INTO A DOCUMENT WE CAN SEND OUT. IT'S GOING TO TAKE OUT THE VALUE STATEMENTS, TRY TO

JUST BULLET POINT DIRECTION AND THE ANSWERS TO THE FIVE QUESTIONS. OF COURSE, THE FIVE ANSWERS WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE DIRECTIONS THAT IS BELOW THAT. CONTEMPORANEOUS WITH THAT,

IF YOU COULD START DRAFTING A LIST OF QUESTIONS IN EACH OF THOSE FIVE THINGS THAT IF COUNCIL WERE ABLE TO GIVE DIRECTION, WE CAN GIVE YOU DIRECTION ON, HOPEFULLY WE CAN GET THOSE DOCUMENTS OUT

TO EVERYBODY BY THE END OF THIS WEEK SO THAT PEOPLE HAVE THE WEEKEND TO ACTUALLY LOOK AT THEM, PEOPLE ON THE MESSAGE BOARD CAN MAKE CHANGES AND EDITS. I MIGHT APOLOGIZE IN ADVANCE

FOR ALL THE THINGS WE WILL GET WRONG BECAUSE I'M SURE WE WILL, BUT IT WILL BE A DOCUMENT PEOPLE CAN WORK OFF. IF YOU CAN GET OUT YOUR LIST OF QUESTIONS THAT YOU DIDN'T HEAR ANSWERS TO AND COULD

GET THAT, THAT WOULD BE REALLY HELPFUL SO PEOPLE COULD BE THINKING ABOUT THAT TOO. BY WAY OF REMINDER AS WE END THE THING HERE TODAY, WE'RE GOING TO CALL UP THE ASMP AS SOON AS WE CAN, EITHER LATE

[3:39:15 PM]

MORNING OR EARLY AFTERNOON. THE INTENT IS GIVE PEOPLE A CHANCE TO SPEAK PUBLICLY ON THAT TO US. BUT THE HOPE IS FOR US TO BE ABLE TO TAKE ACTION ON THE ASMP BY MID-TO-LATE AFTERNOON.

WE'RE ASKING EVERYBODY ON COUNCIL TO POST AMENDMENTS SO PEOPLE CAN SEE THEM AHEAD OF TIME. THE EXPECTATION WILL BE WE'RE NOT GOING TO CONSIDER EXCEPT ON SECOND READING ANY NEW AMENDMENTS THAT HAVEN'T

BEEN IN FRONT OF US FOR US TO DISCUSS. THEN WE ARE INVITING THE PUBLIC TO COME AND WE ALSO SAID THAT WE WOULD KEEP ASMP OPEN SO THAT AT 1:30 PEOPLE WOULD KNOW WE WILL BE

CALLING PEOPLE TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE ABLE TO SPEAK ON THAT. WITH RESPECT TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, THIS IS THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO BE ABLE TO GIVE INPUT TO US AND TO STAFF

WITH RESPECT TO THE FIVE QUESTIONS. AND WE'LL GIVE PEOPLE OPPORTUNITY TO DO THAT HOPEFULLY IN THE LATE AFTERNOON WHEN WE'RE DONE WITH ASMP. BUT WE WILL BE MEETING AFTER

DINNER FOR THE PURPOSE OF TAKING TESTIMONY ON THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE. THERE WON'T BE ANY ACTION BY COUNCIL ON THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE RESOLUTION.

[3:41:45 PM]

JIMMY? >> Flannigan: JUST SO THE PUBLIC DOESN'T MISUNDERSTAND, THERE WILL BE TONS OF PUBLIC OPPORTUNITY, PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY AT THE END OF THE PROCESS AS MORE DETAIL AND FINAL PROPOSALS AND THINGS COME OUT. WE'RE REALLY, AS YOU SAID, MAYOR, JUST THINKING ABOUT THIS INITIAL BEGINNING. >> Mayor Adler: THE ONLY GLOSS I WOULD PUT ON IT, I

WOULDN'T DESCRIBE IT AS THE END OF THE PROCESS. AT SOME POINT THE MANAGER IS GOING TO BE BRINGING BACK, WHICH WILL HAVE ALL THE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ANY ORDINANCE PROPOSITION HAS INCLUDED BUT NOT LIMITED TO LEADING UP TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAKING A RECOMMENDATION AND COMING BACK TO US. SO IT'S THE NEW BEGINNING.

WITH THAT SAID, IT IS 3:45. THANK YOU ALL FOR THE TIME SPENT. WE'RE ADJOURNED.

[3:43:50 PM]