

City Council Regular Meeting Session Transcript – 04/25/2019

Title: City of Austin

Description: 24/7

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 4/25/2019 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 4/25/2019

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[10:20:23 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead and try to kick this off. Let's see what we N do. Recognize we may take recess foople to be able to talk to each other about amendments or a lot of land developmentode C amendments being handde out. I think that Paige and have been asked the same question by a couple people this morning. The amendment that just got passed out on the yellow sheet is just a restatement of what was on the bulletin board mid-day yesterday put in yellow page form. No changes. Just carry it over. Before we begin our meeting, let's begin with the invocation. We have reverend Nathan Loudin from milwood Baptist church. Would everyone please rise.

>> Thank you mayor Adler for your work and we are paying for you. I'm reminded of a passage from first kings, verse 9 that my wife wrote on a sticky note andced on my desk years ago when I was going through aifficult time in leadership and making decisions which is what you do ery day. It was a prayer from Solomon. He said give your servant an understanding mind to govern your people. You are great people that I may discern for good an elvi for who is able to govern people. I'm thankful to know we don't have to eat too many fortune cookies to get wisdom. I would like to pray for you and just ask god give you wisdom. Father, we give you thanks anpraise for our city councilmembers, for mayor Adler and their T staff for the work that they do day innd day out both when this room a their offices and on the phones for making this place a city that is good for all people from wherever they come.

[10:22:27 AM]

We're thankful for them and we pray for ery councilmember that you would give wisdom, that you would grant unity among the council and in our city. We're thankful that you have been so kind to us to give us such a wonderful city, a wonderful place to live, and we pray for your glory our joy you might take care of it. We pray you would be known and joyed in ts city. We pray this in Christ's name, amen. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. All right. It is Thursday, April 25th , 2019. Anticipate happy anniversary, Diane, if you are watching. We are in city council chambers, 301 wessecond street in Austin. It is 10:22. Colleagues, the changes and corrections today on item number 2, it should be noted on April 16, 2019,

Thi I recommended by the resource management commission on the 7-0 vote with commissioner Smith off the dais and two commissioners absent. One vacancy. Item 35, this event, our festival, will be held on Friday, may 24th, with street closures from Thursday, may 23rd, 5:00 P.M. To Saturday, may 25, 8:00 A.M. Item number 36 iseing withdrawn. From the agenda. I think it's beingplaced with item number 73. Item number 42, please add councilmember Ellis, number 44 add councilmember harper-madison, 48 add councilmember harper-madison as sponsors.

[10:24:27 AM]

Item number 51, there's a suggested date. It should be may 9th in 51. On 52, the suggested date, again, is may 9th. And itust J relates to site development and not site plan requirements. On item number 61,t I should be Ned that the first reading of this was approved on January 31, 10- with councilmember Flannigan absent. We have some items that he been pulled on our agenda today by councilmembers. Fo items pulled by councilmember alteill all be pulled and discussed at the same time. That's 13, 14, 29 and 30. Councilmember tovo has pulled item number 18. We have late backup in items 12, 35, 36, 40, 41, 47, 55, 59, 61, 63, 66, 71, 72 and 74. We have someolks that have signed up to speak on various issues. The consent agenda is items 1 throughand also 73 and 74. Item number 11, land development code, pulled by speakers. So pulled items are 11, 13, 14, 18, 29 and 30. Councilmember tovo, for the working group on item 32, are we approving that a recommended? Are we approving the item as posted?

[10:26:29 AM]

>> Tovo: Mayor, I have a motion in that Rd aar so it will be short but do need to pull that quickly.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's pull item number 32. So let's hear from the - sorry, yes, councilmember alter.

>> Alter: Thank you. As I mentioned in work session, item 48, which is a fee waiver for the

[inaudible] Sponsored by organization, we need tiondi fee waivers for 435 and I believe councilmemberis,Il councilmember harper-madison and councilmember kitchen wanted to contribute. There is a 435 left so now I think would be the appropriate time to mention any additional fees anyone would like to contribute.

>> I would love to help with that.I can put in 235 towards that.

Alter: Thank you. So that would leave 200. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I can put in 200.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: Yes, mayor, want to also -- I don't want to pull 41, but I just want to postpone east Austin CDC election.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Terien till may 23rd meeting.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Are you moving to postpone consideration of all of the CDC commission members shown on that?

>> Renteria: No, just the east Austin one.

>> Mayor Adler: Just the St Austin one. Without objection, the east Austin one will not be included on today's item number 41. Anything else before we go to speakers? Councilmember Tovo.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I found that amendment I wanted to make.

[10:28:31 AM]

The work group would like to move 32, but with the condition that Austin Energy bring the utilities contracted janitor labor in-house with all the accompanying city benefits prior to conclusion of this contract. And so this would be a one-year contract and prior to the conclusion of that, Austin Energy would work to bring those jobs in-house and we would expect that those costs will be made known to us during the budget so we'll have an opportunity to review those, but based on our analysis, we believe it's the city benefits that are the difference -- differential between -- that would amount to the increase. But these are permanent jobs, ongoing jobs that Austin Energy needs. This is -- and so we think it's appropriate that those be city employees rather than contract laborers.

>> Mayor Adler: I have a couple questions, so let's pull 32 and we'll come back to that. Yes, councilmember.

>> For item number 74 for the sunshine camps, I wanted to add \$150 of fee waivers for that item.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's go then --

>> The balance of the sunshine?

>> [Inaudible]

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry?

>> Alter: I was curious what the balance was for the sunshine account.

>> I think there's still close to 3,000 of fees that they are needing for that one.

>> I don't think so actually, but I will get an updated balance for that. Within the next couple of minutes. I think we are down closer to 300. H, O okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Casar: Mayor, if it's 300, put the last 300 on mine.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. Is Gus Peña here? Mr. Peña, do you want to come on down? Jennifer Schwartz is on deck.

[10:30:35 AM]

>> Good morning, councilmembers, Gus Peña, president and co-founder of veterans for progress. Numbers 1 item 8, execution of contract with equity for rosewood neighborhood park bath house. A long awaited issue and I'm glad it's coming to fruition. Item 10, funding for competitivproposal agreement with rs Ellis doing business as southeast corporation for the Austin fire department locker room. This also has been -- and I thank god it's already into fruition to have the bath house or facility for women firefighters also. We shouldn't just have for or just certain people. So I'm glad that it's coming to fruition. Mayor and councilmembers, I'm going to -- I'm going to say this and I don't care whether you like it or not, I'm going to say this. This homeless count, according to paper, according to Ann Howard of echo, veterans, only 37 veterans heless in Austin, Texas. It's in the newspaper. This is a slap in the face to us veterans. I can count 64 veterans right near the V.A. Clinic. We did our own count. This is a slapn the face to us Marine Corps, army, air force, Navy and special forces units. We're trying to help the veterans get their due diligenc how in the heck can we get that and do that when somebody is lying about the count of the homeless veterans. It's in the paper. And I can go sw Yoho right now where 67 of those veterans are, they are right here at the V.A. Clinic. N take you right now wherever you want to, I'll pay the gas. It's not appropriate to be lying about the veterans who served our country. I served during vietn and I will tell you this much, it makes my blood boil to hear, to read such a lie.

[10:32:43 AM]

I just want a better count than this. And also I want to say this and I want to thank senator Eddie Lucio III, senator Lucio, and state representative -- I'm sorry, Eddie Lucio II and the third forgiving veterans for progress a proclamation from the senate and also proclamation from the house for veterans for progress. We are nationally known. A lot of us are still homeless veterans, mayor, and I brought that issue to you when you were running first for mayor. We helped you get over against Martinez to become -- or elected mayor. Don't forget that. I think you've forgotten already and those quotes you in the newspaper. Let me tell you something, I don't like anyone lying about my veterans.

[Buzzer sounding] Not these lies that Ann Howard brought up.

>> Mayor Adler: THA you. Next speaker is Jennifer Schwartz. Is she her how about Victor king? Why don't you come on down. Pete Rivera is on deck. You'll go next. . King, you have three minutes. Yes, sir.

>> Well, mayor, I'm back. Number 12 is talkingut parks and talking about -- what is it? 56,000 acres that y'all are going to give or whatever, but we don't have enough parks. My people done have enough of parks. We just had a mder just happened two weeks ago on a friend of mine, and the reason why he was

murred is because my people done ran out of things to do. And I'm going to give each one of you all one of these.

[10:34:46 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. King --

>> I'm going to hand them out. I'm going on the hand them out. That's my right. You'll see. I'm ayer,pa I'm a citizen and I'mng Toi hand them out.mi' going against the norms. We're going to doomething for my people. I want to you read it. I want you to figure out how these murders going totop in my city. Y'all think'm playing, you think [inaudible]. You are going to see. You are going to see. A man was murdered the other day because my people are being eliminated and don't have a future in this city. I don't nee ydr microphone. Ok at all these people. They rich. And they get welfare, but my pele don't get nothing. You can call it grants, you can call it whatever you want to call it. You won't ignore my people what going onn this city. But all of all going to be questioned with these people. Y'all going to help my people. That's the ultimate thing that's going wrong in this city.

[No microphone on] Billions of dollars to stop them bats from being eliminated. Y'all [indiscernible] These people don't Gett.

[No microphone on] This ain't right, man. Y'all get in here and get all this money, then you can look at me.

[10:36:53 AM]

You ignore me like other people try to ignore what's going on on the east side of this city. My people are being trapped at a damn park. You try toontain my people. And eliminating themselves. This city going to STO man.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Mayor Adler: Next speaker is Pete Rivera. Why don't you come on down.

>> [Inaudible]

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Good morning, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Good morning.

>> I have some supporters with me today. I got my brother Raymond Gilbert, my sister-in-law Jane and a couple other -- a few other neighborhood association members, Michael, April and ahren. I'm here to speak on behalf of the red bluff issue. I understand that you all have put it in consent. I believe that it's

in approval of everybody to dedicate the land, the 56.9 acres land a-- to have it dicated as parkland. So basically before my time runs out, I would like to thank you, mayor, and Pio renteriaor F sponsoring and co-sponsoring the resolution during y'all's last terms from last yea before this council was here, duringhe last council. And I aols would like to ank Marisa Perales and P Thompson for passing the resolution in the environmental issimm.

[10:38:54 AM]

And I also would like to at this time thank all the folks in my nghborhood association, which is the springdaleghborhood association, and the hog pen neighborhood association a- who have been working with atx environmental justice and a bunch of other environmental clubs that are inre Austin that we have gotten together to bring light to this issue to see if we could make happen what is happening here tayod which has been a long journey and I'm real happy and excited to know that it's finally going to happen. So thank you for everything that you all D and I'm excited to see this 56 acres, 56.9 acres dedicate- to be dedicated as parkland today. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[Applause] Mr. Renteria.

>> I also want to say THA you for all your hard work and your patience and understanding. You know as you found out, it's a long process to get through here, but I really appreciate your patience and understanding that there's -- we have to take a look at that for affordable housing and when it came back identifying we said let's gohead and just turn it into park. I really want to thank you and your group and your contact team and your family. I know they did a lot of work on this issue and I really want to thank you for all that that you've done.

>> Thank you, Pio. I would like to wish --

[buzzer sounding]

-- All the luck in the world with the housing issue. I ho wepe find some land somewhere. Okay? Thank you.

>> May Adler: Thank you. Council, those are all the people that we have speaking on the consent agenda.

[10:40:56 AM]

Again, the consent agenda is items 1 through 54, 73, 74. The pulled items 11, 13, 14, 18, 29, 30 and 32. Is there a motion to approve the nsencoagenda? Councilmember Casar, yes.

>> I was going to me a clarification.

>> Mayor Adler: Let me get a second real fast. Is there a second to this? Councilmember Renteria. Yes, councilmember harper-madison

>> Harper-madison: We were only short -- thank you, councilmember Casar, we don't need you.

>> Mayor Adler: No, no, it only needed 150. It's been moved and seconded. Disionus

>> Flannigan: I don't want to be shown voting no on 12. It also doesn't fund the park, but would unnecessarily tie our hands land that is already owned by the city and allocated to the parks. No on 12.

>> Mayor Adler: Those in favor? Those opposed? Unanimous on the dais. It passes. The pulled items then, councilmember alter, you pulled those four, 13, 14, 29 and 30.

>> Alter: I pulled these items that deal with how we process our DNA so we can provide greater clarity in term processing these kits to help U to understand a little better about looking backwards and looking forwards th twis. I would like to refer my colleagues and the community to the Q and a where we've covered some of the technical aspects and some of the statistics rated to how we process DNA. T I do have some big picture questions and I've asked Dr. Cadavi, the DNA B executive director and for assistant chief gay to be here.

[10:43:07 AM]

If I could start with asking Dr. Cadavi . The rcas pertain to D cases, both sexual assault and nonsexual assault cases that are new and incoming. My undstanerng is the assault kits from the backlog have all been through their initial processing and are awaiting technical review and Leib entry into codus. In addition to creating a plan for the fute. I would like you to help me and the community understand how we're handling sexual assault kits in both cases and how these processes are related.

>> Yeah, well thanks for having me. Good morning, council, mayor, city manager. What we have working here is APD's sort of overall ssion or goal with regard to this type of analysis. That's to provide high quality, technically defensible DNA services that span the laboratory analysis portion, the reporting portion, and the codus review and up load portion. And to do this for all DNA cases that are projected incoming for the city of Austin from today moving forward so weever N end up in a backlog like we've seen with the sexual assault kits and we're trying to do tt in a very reasonable time frame. For me what a reasonable time frame for that dnaanal is laboratory portion is about 6 days. With the codus review being about 30 days. Wiof course, contingency put in place in case we have a public safety emergency in which we need to expedite services. So our overall vision is to be able to set ourselves up to be able to provide all of these DNA allegations, not just for -- but also evidence of other violent lmes, human trafficking, murders, homicides, burglaries and robberies.

[10:45:16 AM]

We want to put the resources in place to be able to serve our community with all of those analyses, and to do that in that reasonable time frame. And so the way we've set this up is kind of two parallel paths. One being let's finish what we started. Let's finish what we started with that sexual assault kit backlog. The other part being let's set ourselves up for success moving forward. The four council action items you see today are really designed to address the what do we want to do going forward. Those are set up to say all of the DNA cases that I can predict today over the course of the next two, three, four years, what resources do we need to put in place to ensure that we can provide those analysis, high quality, technically defensible within a reasonable time frame. So there's two sections of that. Two of the contract extensions you are going to see, 29 and 30, are in regard to expanding, augmenting our current capacity for the laboratory analysis piece. Two interlocal agreements are put forth to you to augment the codus review and upload process. Second to that is the finish at we started. In a parallel path, we've been working very hard the past six months or so putting together the parts and pieces to truly expedite the codus review and upload of those sexual assault kit cases that have not been processed and recorded. Of those we have about 1,300 left that need to be codus reviewed and uploaded. We need to expedite that process. So what we've done, we've captured all the requirements, written up statements of work, we have identified the very limited niche providers of these services throughout the nation and working with department of justice who is going to fund this effort and we're going to be able to truly significantly impact how quickly we can do that part of the process in coordination with the cap lab, the existing codus laboratory.

[10:47:23 AM]

That's the second piece of the puzzle. You don't see an action today for you to vote on that. I expect to finish the plan and coordinating with our grants coordinator. We should have those details completely compiled in the next week or two so I expect we're going to be requesting your help to put that on a council agenda item to see if you agree with that approach.

>> Alter: Thank you. I appreciate you walking us through that and helping us understand we have to look backwards at the kits not processed before and making sure we don't get ourselves into this situation moving forward. I look forward to seeing the full plan and the steps and I'm glad to hear that there is some funding from the justice department that will help us move forward on this. I want to note for the public that several of our legislators at the state capitol are also putting forward legislation that will help on the state capacity level for these issues because this is an issue that not just Austin is experiencing and it's my hope those will move forward to further assist us in addressing these issues. So thank you, doctor, I have a couple questions for chief gay. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Alter: Thank you for being here. We've been hearing some concern in the community vis-a-vis the tests that have been completed and the notification process to victims about whether their DNA sample has been processed or not. I wanted to ask if you could walk us through the notification process, if there is a DNA match or if a case is being reviewed for reopening.

>> Thank you, mayor and council. One, I want to thank you for your continued support in this area. And we do appreciate and could not do that without your support. Our team has been working on a survivor's notification plan.

[10:49:26 AM]

As you know, we do have a plan. It will be coming through in reference to addressing the backlog that we are prepared to make those notifications. In reference to what that will look like is that we have a victim services counselor as well as a detective that will be reaching out to our survivors. Once we do receive the lab results, which hopefully will be coming soon in reference to the complete. Whether the case is to be reopened or not or whether there's a CODUS hit or not, most of our survivors will be notified in reference to the lab results. The reason I said most is that there are some survivors that at the beginning of these cases have made it very clear that their intention is not to know what the results are. So we will be honoring those wishes of our survivors. Also when notification -- because some of these cases are years old when we'll be reaching out, is that we will be asking the survivors from our counselors if they want to have that information. And are prepared because we have already received feedback from our survivors that they may not want to know. So in some cases we will provide that information and in some cases in honoring their wishes we will not.

>> Alt: Thank you. As we move through this process and we begin to get more of this data back, I think it would be helpful if we could have someplace where we published listed at that protocol is just to make it a little easier for folks to understand. They may not come back and watch this council video and I just think to the extent that we can be clear about what those processes are and communicate to the community of survivors, that would be much appreciated.

[10:51:27 AM]

>> Absolutely. And we do have a tip line and information on our website now. But what I'll do is we'll make sure we put some additional information with that so our survivors will know exactly what the press will be moving forward.

>> Alter: Thank you, and look forward to the report from Dr. Cadavi soon and the action item so we can continue to move forward. I wanted to, before I motion on these items, I wanted to also invite my colleagues to a proclamation that was added to the addenda, but you may have missed it. That will be accepted by the Austin-Travis County Sexual Assault and Resource Team this evening so I hope you can join us for that. So unless my colleagues have other questions, I'd like to move passage of those four items, 13, 14, 29, 30.

>> Mayor Adler: Does anyone have any other questions or comments for the witnesses or otherwise? Okay. It's been moved, seconded by council member Pool. Any discussion? In favor of those four items, please raise your hand. Those opposed? It's unanimous on these. Those pass.

[No microphone on]

>> Mayor Adler: Why don't U come on down, Mr. Peña. I apologize.

>> Mayor and councilmembers, Gus Peña, president veterans for progress. Nti to thank both staff, city and APD and also the counselors on this ISS. It is one the issues that, as president of veterans for progress, we have women veterans also and we hadne victim already that -- in sanntonio that they are going through this process also. But I want to thank you very much for, you know, the notification process T victims is very important. Also survivor, any kind of pslogihol treatment, the psychiatrist is very important, so we strongly support this item on the agenda.

[10:53:41 AM]

We have two female veterans that -- well, they were assaulted, but we don't want this to happen to anybody, but we're strong supporters of womens rights and children's right. I want to thank both city and APD and counselors and the doctor for taking care of the women. And, you know, I miget off on the edge, but nobody can say that I'm disrespectful to woman. I am respectful to women. I might get disrespectful to men, but, you know, my wife and I have been married for 32 years. You met her when we were mpaingning for you so she is one of the orpp ters also for the immigrant womens rights also. So anyway, thank you very much for the help you give the community and APD and counselo .>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. I'm going to take that vote again. It's been med and seconded. L inal favor? Thoppoe D? They pass unanimously on the dais. I think that councilmember Renteria was here forhe first vote voting aye. He's off the dais right now. That gets us then to those four pulled items, that gets us then to item number 18. Councilmember tovo, you pulled that one.

>> Tovo: We H asked this question of staff, B I apologize it didn'ttake it into the Q and a. And my question for staff, what I would like to -- we've had an opportunity to talk about this a couple times. This is, as I understand it, chemicals that are going to be used to help treat the high levels of ammonia coming from several of our industrial -- our industrial partners.

[10:55:42 AM]

And we had adopted a surcharge to cover the cost of these chemicals. And I want to be sure that the price -- that the surcharge that we are assessing those companies will fully cover the cost of these chemicals.

>> Greg mayor masarus. You are correct, we put surcharge and that's been in place may to June. We had three dischargers that have been paying the surcharge. The surcharge process involves several calculations of cost. One, it involves the strength of waste or strength of ammonia from a discharger, D wan routinely update those. As a matter of fact, we just went through a round of updating to update the surcharge based on this year's strength of waste. And then there's a unit cost that go into that. A cost of chemicals, cost of poweand some labor costs. And we would typically update those during the budget

process as we get updated costs, update the surcharge. Surcharge updates occur in a you can of ways, strength of waste as well as changes in you want tosses.

>> Tovo: In terms of the cost of chemicals we're purchasing, those fully covered by the surcharge at this point?

>> Well, this this new contract, provided council approves it, we'll have to add this new contract and its unit costs into the new surcharge calculation. We're going off of old contractual ratings so this new rate will be faced in with updated surcharges, along with any other changes with power and manual labor that we have. Although chemicals is the bulk of the costs.

>> Tovo: Is this higher, is this a higher cost than we've been paying in the past for such chemicals?

>> Yes, I believe this is a higher cost per unit than the previous calculation amount that we used.

>> Tovo: Does the -- so that means then act the surcharge that we're currently assessing is not fully covering the cost of these chemicals.

[10:57:47 AM]

This is a look-back when we -- when we update the surcharge during the budget process, will it capture -- will it capture these additional costs or are these chemicals going to be in place after the budget period?

>> Cou state the question again.

Ovo: I guess what I'm trying to -- the bottom line I'm trying to make sure that we are -- that we fully assess the costs of treating this discharge. And so if these chemicals are more expensive than the ones we were previously using, how will we capture those costs. Is there an ability to factor those into the new surcharge? Will there be any gap?

>> Well, we would typically look at all of our charges during the budget process and provide a comprehensive update to those. So that would be our business approach to this. So if you are asking would we do this surcharge for ammonia updates sooner, is that what you are asking?

>> Tovo: No, sorry I'm not being very clear today either. If we looked backwards, we were covering the cost of treating the waste wastewater discharge, and that was being passed on to ratepayers. We all agreed last year we didn't want to do that anymore. We were assessing a surcharge to those companies so they would be covering the cost of treating that discharge. In fact, the council implemented it I think six months earlier than the water utility recommended because we wanted that to stop immediately. And as this contract is coming forward today, what I'm trying to determine is since it's an increased amount, how will we capture those costs. How and when will we capture those costs? If the surcharge doesn't adequately cover the costs of these new chemicals, how and when do we capture those costs?

>> When the council adopts the budget, our typical approach would be to recalculate all those charges and add updated numbers for the budget process.

[10:59:57 AM]

That's when we would update our charges.

>> Tovo: So when will those -- when will the chemicals we're contracting for on today's agenda start to be used?

>> If council approves this transaction today, this new contract would go into place roughly the first of May.

>> Tovo: Does that mean from May to September when we adopt our new budget, we'll have a gap in what we're assessing and what we pay for those chemicals? It sounds to me like there may be a gap.

>> Yes.

>> Tovo: So do we have the ability to go back to those companies and fold in that gap into next year's surcharge.

>> No, we typically wouldn't apply it retroactively. The only thing we could do is accelerate the ammonia surge had we bring it to council sooner.

>> Tovo: I think that would be appropriate. I don't want to put words in the mouths, but I think that's -- let me just say I think that's appropriate. We need for these costs to be borne appropriately and not on the generate payers. I will motion to approve this contract Austin Energy return with a surcharge that adequately captures the costs of treating the wastewater discharge.

>> For ammonia.

>> Tovo: Correct. Yeah thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Could I ask a question? I notice it was not that you were recommending coming to council. Is that something that is an appropriate direction to council to give? Is there a reason why it hasn't happened? Are there additional conversations you need to have? I'm trying to figure out if we're ready to take the vote to make that decision.

>> Well, again, you know, our typical approach is to update all of the charges at the budget time or to review all of those.

[11:01:58 AM]

We typically don't update individual charges throughout the year as we take commodity bids and work through those processes. That would produce a lot of ordinance to update individual charges on individual transactions. So it is -- it is not typical for us to do that. We certainly can with this charge if that's the council's direction to us. It would have a financial impact to any ammonia surcharge payers. We would have to notice them and let them know that we were doing this. I don't believe updating the surcharge would have a public hearing requirement, but we would have to check with law on that. I don't know, but

-- and we would have to prepare the ordinance just for this ammonia surcharge. In terms of internally, we can calculate the surcharge and update it. It's not a significant amount of effort to do that.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm going to ask for direction or suggestion on this in a second. yes, councilmember alter.

>> Alter: Thank you councilmember tovo, thank you for raising this concern. You just mentioned we don't typically raise the prices on commodities. How many other commodities that we're purchasing are regulated to just a few companies in the way that this commodity is where it's very clear that we have to pay for this in order to address discharges or whatever would be the appropriate thing commodity is used for.

>> There are other strength of waste discharges besides ammonia. We have other forms of strength of wastewater waste that involve calculations of labor, and/or chemicals. Our ammonia discharges are probably our largest discharges other than fast oils and greases. I don't know off the top of my head all the companies that pay those and all the commodities and transactions that go into that.

[11:04:04 AM]

Typically we would not update charges based on every transaction, we do that all during the budget process.

>> Alter: I understand that, what I'm trying to understand because this is -- from what I'm understanding, it's a differentiation of surcharge in that we identified this clearly as something that needed to happen because of extra discharges that these particular companies were engaging in. And so I'm trying to understand if there are other situations where we have, like, that.

>> Yes, we do. There are other strength of waste parameters other than ammonia that have special surcharges that involve calculations to update organics, suspended solids, fats, oils or greases. I don't have staff here to go into all that but this is not unique for us to have a surcharged constituent. So --

>> Alter: Okay. Let me think about that.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm going to support this amendment, this executive order. So the -- direction. Councilmember tovo makes a motion to approve it, but to ask that the charge be implemented sooner than next fiscal year. Is there a second to that? Councilmember alter seconds that. Is there any discussion? Let's take a vote. Those in favor raise your hand. Those opposed? Passes unanimously on the dais. Thank you very much. Next actually petroleum, councilmember tovo, item 32. Let me tell you why I pulled it and then maybe you can answer that question. There was a question that was being asked of the group, how do we handle these contracts generally, should they be coming in-house or not in-house.

[11:06:12 AM]

We were all concerned and I think we all are concerned about making sure we pay people who work for us a living wage and we're not kind of getting around that. I really appreciate the work that was done by the group. I just haven't seen the work that was done by the group so I don't know the basis for this. So I'm uncomfortable giving a direction now as to what happens at the end of this contract or the next budget process just because I haven't had a chance to see it yet. And I wonder if it would be possible to -- if we want to approve this contract for whatever period of time would have been part of your motion, if we could hold off on the direction until you or the group could report back or tell us what the more holistic -- what the holistic answer was just because I wasn't part of those conversations, action I don't know Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: Kevin H participated in the working group and this would be approving a year contract, I think it does either way, which is to say we're approving the contract today regardless of comfort level with the future, and whatever the future looks like will happen during the budget cycle. And so we will give H that opportunity to deliberate, and so I'm -- given that I'm being part of it and going through it, I would at the very least like to have staff provide that analysis for us. We've been taking in a lot of staff and bringing staff in and talking to them and going through where the analysis that we received had gaps and there was a lot made that as we dug deeper kind of realized that there were costs being eye sighted to this decision that weren't costs. One example being the analysis showed we were going to have to hire supervisors in order to bring these folks in-house. When we dug deeper, we realized we were already supervising them because anybody you bring in is going to need supervision by staff.

[11:08:20 AM]

Once we really got into the difference, it became about are we having full-time employees at the city who aren't receiving city benefits. That's ultimately what it came down to. I think the direction is really for staff to come back with that for us during the budget process, and so my hope is we can approve this contract today and have the decision be made during the budget process base it would be anyway.

>> Mayor Adler: So I'm really comfortable with that. I'm comfortable taking your recommendation just on the basis you guys have reviewed it and just on this contract. If there was a way to give direction to staff that says that we want to tee up as part of this next budget conversation this issue holistically, not this contract but more generally, as opposed to anticipating what the answer is in terms of the direction. I don't know how to accomplish both those.

>> Tovo: They are not really differ. Councilman Flannigan, did you want to add --

>> Flannigan: As we dug this in addition to other examples like security, the security was much more complicated as a question. So I don't think we would have been prepared to make this determination on a security contract. But on the janitorial one, it was fairly straightforward. I'm with you on the holistic question. We're not saying all of these things have to come in-house. What the working group came to, it's pretty clear on the janitorial one that's what we need to be, and the larger holistic conversation on other contracts similar to this still needs to be fleshed out.

>> Tovo: I -- we're all in agreement on the working group about that. This is a pretty straight -- let me say this is a pretty straightforward contract because, as T Q and a reveals, they are -- there is a permanent need, ae does not employ custodial staff at all. They rely on cusdi Staal through contracts.

[11:10:21 AM]

And so there will be an increase in costs Austin energy, but right now those costs are really being borne by the employees themselves because they are not getting -- they are not getting the benefits that a city of Austin employee enjoys. And so to me this is much more straightforward. As councilmember Flannigan said, the security contract, some of the other ones are more complicated because they are specialized training and the needs flux F what is that right word, flux or -- change, throughout the year. Those are going to be more complicated. We are working on a decision-making tree or something like that and most of those contracts will have to be a portion permanent and a portion contract. So those are -- those are all going to be more complicated. This is one is pretty straightforward. How about we approve it for one year and ask staff to come back to us with some information about exactly how much that would cost and any other unexpected information at the Austin energy -- at one of our upcoming Austin energy oversight meetings so we can review it in advance of the budget.

>> Mayor Adler: That would be perfect. >>

Ovo: As councilmember Flannigan said, we'll have the ability to approve bringing those employees on board in the budget process, but we don't want to wait until then to have that conversation because by then it's complicated to figure out whether we are hiring existing employees which is a value our working group has identified. We want people who have been -- really working for the city of Austin even if they are employed by somebody else to have a shot at those jobs and whatnot.

>> Mayor Adler: I appreciate that. And so the motion is to approve the contract and to ask staff -- for one year ask staff to come back at a Austin energy meeting.

>> Tovo: The earliest opportunity.

>> Mayor Adler: To walk us through this issue. So we can decide it as a council well in advance of going into the budget session.

[11:12:23 AM]

Is there a second to that motion? Councilmember Flannigan seconded. Is there any objection to that? All in favor raise your hand? Those opposed? Unanimous on the dais. Thank you very much. Thank you, councilmember Tovo. Okay just real fast so we can get RIFD this one too, item number 55 is appointing Julie Zuniga to the central health board of directors. Someone want to make that motion to approve that appointment? Councilmember Harper-Madison makes that motion, seconded by the mayor pro tem. Any discussion? Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed? It is approved. I'm looking at

amendments right now for the land development code. And I want to make sure that I have them all. I have -- and as I go through this, I'm also going to urge everybody, if Y haven't given a copy of these to the clerk, if you would give a copy to the clerk so the clerk C post them on to the Messa board -- the backup so that people can see them. What I have is the amendment a from councilmember Ellis and myself. Frouncilmember tovo, I have questions 1, and 2 3. From councilmember --

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, you are going to have to go slower for us.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. Again, I have thenerom councilmember Ellis and myself.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Multi pages. I have three from councilmember tovo, question 1, question 2, question 3.

>> Tovo: And a fourth.

>> Mayor Adler: And 4.

[11:14:29 AM]

Okay.is everybody caught T up? All right. And then I have councilmember Flannigan. Then from councilmember kitchen I have 1 and 2. And 3.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I -- I have another one coming. 3 and the next one will just be in case. In case. So I wenthead and passed them out.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And then I have councilmember pool has 1 and then 2 through 4 combined. And then I have councilmember harper-madison has 1 and councilmember Ellis has 1. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Councilmember kitchen, I don't think I

have any of yours. >> Kitchen: You don't? We sent them out at the very beginning.

>> Tovo: I'll keep looking.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, we have not printed out the amendments that were posted by the mayor pro tem and I, in part because after seeing your and councilmember Ellis' post, it seems like you covered pretty much everything in ours.

[11:16:45 AM]

Ours went a LE bit further in the transition Zones, but given that it seems like we have T G two six or seven votes to get something done, I think that it seems like the majority lands where your documents is on those transitions so I won't be printing or passing that one out. The only thing that's in the mayor pro tem's and mine are --'T D have to do with transition zone are a couple of pretty S, I think, unobjectional amendments as they rate to maximizing downtown, and W get that printed at some point through this process, Bute W just wanted to not give you too much paper.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So let's do this.

>> Alter mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. >>Alter: I have two simple amendments that I don't have ready distribute. They are related to cauring affordable housing units as we map by entitlements, but they are relevant depending on which proposal moves forward.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And this isn't locking down the number of amendments at this point. It's just trying to figure out what it is that we have on thes to make sure that everybody a copy of everything that's on the dais. I was just handed from councilmemberitchen numbers 5 and 6. So I hav 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6. We don't have 4 yet; is that right?

>> Kitchen yes.

>> Mayor Adler: I just wanted to confirm that.

>> Kitchen: Sorry about that.

>> Mayor Adler: What I want to do right here, what I thought we would I D we could D it was what question did with the strategic mobility stuff. Maybe there's some things in people's amendments that no one objects to.

[11:18:47 AM]

I'm going to take, like, a five, ten-minute recess for people to take look at this to go through to see if they are able to mark ctions that they Arey going in. If you haven't had a chance to read it yet or you don't understand it, then just circle it and we just won't let it go in right now. But let's see if there are things people can agree to that we can sort of move off the plate. So the first thing we'll do is go through without scussing anything, we'll Ju say does anybody have any objections and if there are we're going to circle it an come back T it.

>> Renteria: I think I understand. For --

>> Kitchen: I think I understand. We're putting them in two buckets which is what we did with asmp.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Same thing.

>> Tovo: I need you to clarify. I'm sorry, we're going to -- would you mind saying that again.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm going to begin by saying Adler-Ellis amendment A. I'll start with that. And I'll say there are three changes on page 1. Does anybody have any objection to those? And if no one has an objection, then they will be incorporated. Otherwise we're just going to circle it and come back to it. We're just going to do that for all five pages. Then we'll go to the next amendment, ask the same question. Just like we did on the transportation deal.

>> Tovo: One thing I would ask is we recess more than five or ten minutes. I would say it's going to take us at least 10 to read through the amendments. And 2, in some places the amendments play off each other so to the extent they've been separated by question, I would suggest we look at all the amendments for question 1, for question 2. There are some as I mentioned in my post last night, by the time I finished mine, you all had done yours and there may not even be a reason in some cases for me to bring forth mine if one of the others -- if we can lay out all the amendments for one, that might make moot some of the other ones or make unnecessary.

[11:21:04 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: I hear that. Let me see how the first part goes. That's not how we do it on the mobility and I recognize that. It causes -- it tangles up the issue and people could amend that issue at that point by bringing in any amendments that they had elsewhere. But my hope is, honestly, to try to get through the

>> Pool: Maybe we take the citizens communication and possibly lunch to be prepared so that we are sufficiently prepared.

>> Mayor Adler: My thought was if people did that we could touch base with each other, we might learn something in that 20 minutes about procedure so people might better spend the time over lunch and executive session. So I would us to come back at 20 till. People might say now that we've looked at them 15 minutes, need two hours. Or people will say we've gone through them and I think we're okay. I would like us to touch base before 2:00 so we get more direction before we find out what we're doing. Okay?

Itchen: Mayor, just one last thought. My thought is if we have a bit more time, we might end up with less sections that we have to mark.

[11:23:08 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Might be. Let's come back at 20 till. If that's the sense of the council at that point after people have looked at it, we can certainly do that. We'll be back here at 20 till noon. We're in recess.

[Brief recess]

[11:30:05 AM]

[City council is in a brief recess]

[11:48:28 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: L right. We are back. It is 11:48. I will concede that there's not enough time for us to go through and identify, but I think the process is still right. When we come back from lunch, we'll go through, as we said, just running through them, not discussing them but to see what stays in and what need to -- either we object to or we want to discuss. We'll identify those, and then we will startnd a go through the adler-amendment a. We'll vote to these up and down.

>> Kitchen: Can I make a suggestion to make sure I'm understanding? We're going to go through the adler-ellis amendment a.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct.

>> Kitchen: An decide what we need to put in the bucket of talking about more. I would suggest we go --

>> Mayor Adler: When we talk aboutket more, we're going to go through all of them.

>> Kitchen: Well, I know, I'm just talking about what order to go through.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: We can through amendment a first, then I would suggest you go through Flannigan, harm, renteari next, then mine, then go through the individual ones if that makes sense to you.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll take a look at that after lunch. We're back up. We do have some people. Let's see if there are some people who might want to talk to us who are here, give them a chance to do that if they want to. Let's see here. Is Stewart Hirsch here? If I C your name and you're not here, you are not giving up the opportunity to speak.

[11:50:29 AM]

Is Mr. Peña here? What about Mr. Montgomery? Mr. Montgomery, you want to come on down? You wine T prize. You geto speak -- before lunch. I have some time donate by Becky Montgomery. Is she here? You have five minutes.

>> [Off mic] I'm the president of the judges hill neighborhood association. As a reminder of where that is, it's bordered by Lamar on the west mlk on the north, 15th street on the south, and Rio grande on the east side, which will tell Yo why the talk about automatic upzoning around transportation corridors pues our interest. We're an interesting neighborhood. Only four by five blocks in size, but in that small area, we have 23 historically dested homes. Nine of those are Texas landmarks, and two of those are

national registered historic homes. The downtown Austin plan recognized judgesill an historic tree-canopy gem tt brings character to down Austin and should be protected. But in an effort to tell you something different from what you've already heard, maybe sometimes over and over, I'm going to talk today about something that surprises. Amidst all O those historic homes, we have a sprising amount of what you've termed as missing middle housing.

[11:52:39 AM]

Surprised us when we did a walk-throu the neighborhood. We have two duplexes, 1 gage apartments, five basement apartments, 112 condos, both small and lge apartment buildings that add upo 2 T units, and a vegetarian student co-op with eight bedrooms and eight very nice residents. I think -- I think you heav to eat meat to be alled bad neighbor. And that, by the way, may be the most affordable housing in downtown Austin, that student co-op. There is not a chance that theopen market would replicate that much missing middle housing if U turn developers loose on us. 348 total units. To the council women who have shown that they recognize the value and itance of downtown ighborhoy of Austin, judges hill would like to say thank you. We appreciate your support very much. On the other side of the ledger, to those who are on the other side of the debate, I'd like you to please consider not only what we gain in a new code, and we recognize that we will gain a lot, what we might lose that could be, would be, irreplaceable.

[11:54:52 AM]

Historic homes and a huge amount of missing middle housing. I'd ask that you work with neighborhoods. We have demonstrated in the past an ability to work effective with the city. Weorked long and hard on the downtown Austin plan. We've mad significant concession uoning in that process. That was not an easy discussion within our neighborhood. The easiest things for neighborhoods to do is just say no and dig their feet in, but W have not demonstrated that that's what we do. The downtown Austin plan has re ted in significant increases in housing, especially to the north side of us in the west campus area, and to the east of us.

[Buzzer sounding] Thanks for your attention.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is Scott turner here?

>> Hello, mayor and council. As you deliberate today about how to solve our housing crisis, please keep in mind who needs that housing. We do nee 60,000 affordable units as quickly as possible, but we need even more housing for average austinites. Our community heroes, teachers, firemen, policemen, can't afford to live here. They have good jobs, but they can't afford a single-family home when median price is \$375,000. If we're going to solve our housing is, is we need more housing that average austinites can afford. Missing middle housing is more affordable, missing middle housing is workforce housing, and missing middle housing is compact and connected.

[11:56:55 AM]

So missing middle housing should be a priority. Please consider that in your deliberations so that average Austinites can afford to live here again. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you, sir. Is Hank Smith here? What about Adam Greenfield? Why don't you come on David King is on deck.

>> Good morning, Mayor and Council. My name is Adam Greenfield. I'm on the board of Work Austin and I want to thank you for restarting this conversation. We think -- the Work Austin board thinks that the city manager's memo was a great direction for us to head in, and a lot of what you've been saying, we strongly support that, so keep going. I don't want to repeat things that you've already heard before, so the board wanted me to communicate a couple of points that maybe we think could be elevated in this conversation. And the first one is perhaps on the subject we've heard before, about mandatory parking minimums. The Work Austin board recommends ending these across Austin. One of the common fears that people have about development is it's going to lead to more traffic. And they're right, because of mandatory parking minimums. But on top of that, there's another element we think should be raised which are gated subdivisions. We think that the new land development code should ban such developments. Other cities have actually banned these subdivisions. They discourage walking and they channel traffic onto a small number of arterial roads.

-- Arterial roads. It's definitely a direction we should be ending quickly. Another element that should be raised in the conversation is the quality of the buildings we create. I think one of the reasons why many of the people in Austin are so development-phobic, they're scared when there is development, it's not good stuff.

[11:59:08 AM]

It's soulless and it doesn't last very long. It gets turned down in 30 years. Quality development is not just an aesthetic, though aesthetics are important for preserving a neighborhood's sense of pride and preserving property values. Quality development is also an affordability issue. If we keep building buildings that only last for 30 years, the residents, the occupants of those buildings are constantly paying for the costs of the building that just got built. We need buildings that last for a hundred years. We need buildings that have a character that fits in with the -- Austin's historic character. I don't hang out much on East 6th Street, but it is clearly the finest here. I think if the people of Austin knew that we could build buildings like that and streets like that again, they would get excited about development. And we want to see that brought back. We want to see Austin reach the heights it has previously reached. So lastly, I want to just encourage you to vote for a land development de --

[buzzer sounding]

--

[buzzer sounding]

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. The last speaker we'll take before we do citizens communication is David King.

>> Thank you, Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem and Councilmembers, and thank you for your service to our community. I want to start off by saying what you're doing, this process of establishing these policies is the right process to be doing. And I appreciate you stepping up to the plate to address these difficult policy issues head on. I feel that was one of the failures of our previous attempt at a land development code rewrite, so I think this is the right process. I may not agree with all the policies, [chuckling] But I will tell you about a few of the policies I think you should take a look at and incorporate.

[12:01:09 PM]

I don't think this is an either/or. We can do all of the above, we can have affordability, equity, diversity, it's not either/or. It's all of the above. So the proposed broad-based land development policies are among the most profound in Austin's 179-year history. If enacted, they will affect every person, every property, every business in Austin for the next 50 years or longer. And once enacted, they cannot easily be retracted if you find they're not doing what we want. Once you grant the entitlement, you cannot go back. So I'm asking that you take -- be deliberate in your discussion of these policies and not try to hit an arbitrary deadline that we've got to do it by tonight or next week, but that we get the policy right, even if it takes another meeting or two to get the policy right. We complain that the legislature gives us very few tools to help us address these issues of displaced low-income families, displaced communities of color and small local businesses and a market that is providing virtually no affordable housing to low-income families and made Austin among the most economically segregated cities in the U.S. My concern is that these broad-based policies of granting these entitlements, these development entitlements with no community benefits in return, it's giving away that tool. It's basically putting that tool aside and not using that tool, yet it is the most important tool that we have to use. So that's really my pain point is, let's not give away these entitlements. These entitlements are worth billions of dollars today. That can translate into trillions of dollars over the next 10 to 20 years, impact on our city and on our families and businesses here.

[12:03:10 PM]

That's why I think we should be careful and deliberate. My concern is that some of the policies will result in the demolition of most existing or older affordable workforce homes. These demolitions will accelerate the displacement of low and middle income families and small local businesses in these neighborhoods. I know you care about that.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> So I'm asking that you incorporate those policies to help stabilize those neighborhoods. Help prevent the displacement.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> And hel our city. Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you, Mr. King.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, Mr. Flannigan.

>> I want to thank you, David, for being positive and acknowledged, -- I think we've all acknowledged that the process W went through last time is we didn't do this and really set out our objectives from the beginning. Thank you. Also I wanted to point out a couple of things we've heard just so far. This is R impyant and I want to make sure that themmunity is understanding what we are and not doing. So to Mr. Montgomery, you referenced historic structures. I have not heard anyone in the community say we would touch O change historic zoning. It's not been proposed, not by me, not by anyone. I think part of the challenge is, as I was engaging with a constituent they would say, well, we didn't hear that in the media, we didn't hear in the media about what you're going to do with house forric structures. It's -- historic structures. We agr the media's going to cover the sff where there's debate. I wanted to reassure you on that. Also this notion that we're going to turn developers loose, we're not eliminating zoning, building codes, nobody's getting turned loose. And I'm glad to hear that judges hill at one point did accept a collaborative process upzoning their neighborhood.

[12:05:10 PM]

Part of my issue with the ncdds is when you look at the high park ordinance it was primalyri about downzoning properties and it's in the list. It went from mf4 to sf2, kind of all throu that ordinance sh and the gentleman -- and the gentleman from walkability did a good job in ning a lot of the stuff we're frustrating about is a result of the current code. When things see what they don't like now, we should be working together to ensure we don't get the things we don't like and get the things we do like. And I want to remind everybody that getting housings a community benefit. We need the housing. That is a community benefit. So I'm not going to do this after every speaker, mayor, because I also want us to finish today, but I just think it's important that as we've tried to do on Tuesday and not insight kind of elevated emotions, that we're being very clear about the measured and thoughtful process we're trying to go through.

>> Mayor Pro Tem: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Mayor Pro Tem: And I don't want to put words in Mr. Montgome's mouth, but I think what he was trying to highlight, areas like judges hill, you're dealing with areas of town that are some of our oldest in the city, so as we're looking at the land development code sh it's important to keep that in mind,

because certainly rezoning areas that have lots of historic houses, though they may not be landmark -- if they're not landmarked they don't have the protection of zoning and they are then vulnerable to redevelopment. And the other very important point he was raising is that within that very small area, you have a substantial number of housing units. And I think that's not always recognized and acknowledged.

>> And those homes would be vulnerable to redevelopment now, if they're not historically designated.

>> Mayor Pro Tem: But less so if they have zoning that is changed. I mean, right now they are -- I would need to look again back at the Judges Hill zoning, but many of those houses that are duplexes or single family are zoned single family.

[12:07:16 PM]

If they become zoned in a transition -- if they become part of a transition zone that is rezoned and upzoned, we have incentivized the redevelopment of those structures.

>> Flannigan: Sure. And I was mostly just reacting to what we heard testimony about things that had designations and had historic markers.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. All right. Prelude of this to come, I'm sure.

[Laughter]

>> Mayor Adler: We'll get through it all. Let's go ahead and get the citizens communication in. Richard Spencer. Is Mr. Sernc here?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: And then to Mr. Spencer, I have Declan Kim, why don't you come on down. You'll be at the next podium. Go ahead, sir. You have three minutes.

>> Thank you so much for taking this meeting.

>> Mayor Adler: Would you turn on the microphone, please?

>> Ka -- can you hear me? I'm Richard Spencer. I'll get to the point, I've got three minutes. I'm a big fan of your recent affordable housing resolution, I actually love it. Good job. We basically recognize the need for affordable housing with families being displaced from high-end development. After a year and a half search, we put 10 acres under contract. It's in Bastrop County, 6.5 miles from the circuit of Americas. It's in the Austin area. And we had several preliminary meetings with the city of water, water control quality reviewer, we were told it was a simple replat subdivided -- subdividing 10 acres into nine 1 acre plus lots. There are no new roads, just subdividing.

[12:09:16 PM]

Approximately at 0-foot wide lots for affordable housing. After going through the approval process, costing us well over \$50,000, we're told we need an additional 365,000 to deal with storm water regulations. With the city of Austin reasoning was that under their guidelines, we could use up to 45% impervious cover. This means on a 1 acre lot, there would be approximately 19,000 square feet of impervious cover. These are large 1 acre lots, plus. Long-term goal -- we're being held to the same standard as 55 -- 50-foot wide lots, dense development in the city. Our long-term goal is to develop affordable housing within a reasonable commute to Austin. With these hidden stringent storm water controls is economically impossible for us to do this. I love the resolution you passed, big fan of it. And I'm hoping we can work together to reach a mutual goal here. And just briefly, this development has road frontage on three sides, we're just cutting it up like so, and there's N new roads. And we're being held to the standard of if we're doing something inside the city with small quarter acre minus lots. But I really need your help and guidance here. I'm at a standstill.

Questions? >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. After Mr. Kim speaks is Kelsey Barlo here? Go ahead.

>> Okay. Hello. My name is Declan Kim I'm an eighth grader. I have a plan to improve the safety of firearms with children. First of all let me clarify that I'm not opposed to the ownership of firearms.

[12:11:18 PM]

My uncle is a gun collector, and enjoys shooting them with him. I understand why people like guns and I respect those wanting to get them for self-defense. However, there is a problem. Guns are the number two killer of children in Texas. Around 200 children in Texas live in homes with unlocked and loaded guns. 75% of kids know where their parents hide their guns and 1 in 5 have even played with them without their parents knowing. Section 46.02 of the Texas penal code already states that, quote, it is unlawful to store, transport or abandon an unsecured firearm in a place where children are likely to be and can obtain access to the firearm. Unfortunately upon speaking to multiple gun owners I have discovered that many are not aware that they are legally required to secure their weapons. Moreover, these could be safeguarded with a biometric safe as easily as your cell phone. Some provide familiar -- pamphlets. Of the places I've looked at none of them mentioned 36.14 of the Texas penal code. I would like to propose an ordinance to the city of Austin that would require all licensed firearm vendors to provide some info graphics or pamphlets regarding the safe storage of firearms, two, the youth handgun safety act from the gun control act of 1968 and section of the Texas penal code. Since this is a public health issue, this could be enforced by the city health department. Any person, corporation or association that violates this could be charged with a class C misdemeanor punishable of up to \$500. These pamphlets and many others that meet these criteria can be found online as free PDF files. I've given you two example pamphlets as well as an infographic that I created myself which also meets these requirements. In fact, the pamphlet about firearm safety comes directly from the national shooting sports foundation's website.

[12:13:32 PM]

As can be seen, the cost of the gun vendor will be minimal. I've already met with Travis Coty sheriff Shelly Hernandez and she says she supports this. I hope we can improve gun safety awareness and support Austin's children. Thank you.

[Applause]

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Kim, thank you very much for coming. We appreciate it. Hold on. Councilmember Alter.

>> Alter: Mr. Kim, thank you for coming down here today. I wanted to see if you could send the material to my office. We're working on a gun control related resolution and we might be able to incorporate some of the things that you mentioned into that. Councilmember Alter, if you send it to district 10 at austintexas.gov. That would be much appreciated.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilwoman Tovo.

>> Tovo: I wanted to let you know this council passed a resolution to have our police department pass on free gun locks at vest falls. That was up in the range of 500 or so that they have contributed. I hope that continues. As you go throughout the community and you've given this message so persuasively, I hope we can give you information about where those gun locks distributions are taking place so you can get the word out. As our city officials are out festivals is to distribute a familiar pamphlet that's called moms demand action, a pamphlet that talks about how to talk to the parents of your children's friends, if they have guns in the house, how they're storing it to make sure that before parents send their children off to another house, that they're aware of whether or not there are guns in the house and if so, whether they're being properly stored.

[12:15:33 PM]

So, again, we're happy -- my office or I'm sure councilmember Alter's office or if you're in touch with her office, we could make you aware of that information as well. Thank you so much, I appreciate your advocacy on this really important issue. As a young person, you have a really powerful voice among your peers, but also among adults. So thank you for using it.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: After

[indiscernible] Speaks, Owen Shoyer, why don't you come do. Mayor pro tem if you would C take over recognizing who's going to speak, if you're going to leave, I'll get somebody else to take the chair. Ann, would you do that?

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, I have to step away to accept a reward at the central library but I can stay for a couple more minutes

>> Mayor Adler: Mrs. Barlo, go ahead.

>> My name is Kelsey Barlo and I live in district 5. I've been volunteering at Austin animal center since April 2016. I'm here today to respectfully request the following changes to the spay and neuter program at Austin animal center. Number one, please restore the policy of requiring spay/neuter of most intact pets returned to owners after second impoundment as allowed by Austin city code. That provision in city code was successfully used by animal services directors prior to December 2016 to spay and neuter most repeat offenders. Number two, please adopt a performance measure in the budget. A percent of all pets leaving Austin animal center whether through adoption, foster, reclaim or transfer to a rescue group who are spayed or neutered and set at 95%. Number three, revise the organization chart at animal services to have one manager or supervisor in charge of spay/neuter programs and responsible for overseeing the achievement of performance measures related to spay and neuter.

[12:17:36 PM]

Number 4, use the unclaimed spay/neuter deposits which are currently transferred into the donations fund to ensure that all animals leaving the shelter are spayed or neutered to fund pilot programs that increase the number of spay/neuters provided in the community. We ask city council and city manager to restore the program that our community used to place on the animals leaving the shelter. Turning off the spigot is the only way to decrease animal population. Specifically, Austin animal center must take action to reverse the trend of returning dogs to owners intact. The implication this has on our pet overpopulation problem is huge. In animal center stopped us from provisions of city code to require reclaimers to pay spay/neuter when reclaiming their pets. We are asking to restore the policy on second impoundment. We are asking that animal services go back to requiring deposits on unaltered animals leaving Austin animal center and that a report be posted online as part of a monthly data indicator on how many adopters and reclaimers have sent in proof of spay and neuter. A vital part of this is that someone at animal services actually follows up to ensure pets are being spayed and neutered. We ask that this be a performance measure that is the responsibility of a manager or supervisor for spay/neuter programs. We ask that the unclaimed spay/neuter deposits part of the donation's fund be used strictly for spay and neuter. Thank you for considering this request. Mayor pro tem Mairee THA you. So after Owen, we have Julie Marquee. So Julie, you can come up to the podium. Go ahead.

>> The Austin city council, my favorite city council, thank you so much, Mayor Mairee sticking around to hear me out. It's so nice that the mayor always sticks around to hear from the citizens during citizen communication. Well, as I hope you guys are all aware, there is some legislative momentum happening right now to stop the taxpayer funding of planned parenthood abortions but I'm going to highlight here this anyway for you.

[12:19:49 PM]

Senate bill 22 would prohibit Texas cities and counties from contracting with abortion provirs. This passed by the senate of affairs by a vote of seven to 0 and will now be sent to be passed by the end of the legislation I mn. We do expect that to pass and there are certain things in place right now that would violate that. You also have the new regulations on title 10 grants require financial and physical separation between entities that involve family planning and entities involved in the abortion services. While this is getting litigious and nitpicky here, this is what we have to do beca ous all the loopholes found. I was just curious with this new legislative momentum, has this city council or the mayor, who has decided to leave us, have you guys discussed at all the current 1 dollar rent for planned parenthood in Austin and the potelia violations of that? Have you guysiscussed that

>> Mayor Pro Tem: Owen, during citizen communication, we're just hearing from you, so please go ahead. Okay. So you're not going answer, if you have diussed this or not. Do you guys -- I mean, it's simple yes or no. Do you guys want to pay for abortions? Do you want to pay plant parenthood's rent, come on, Mr. Renteria, we're good friends. Do you want to pay planned parenthood's rent, you guys can shake ahead, shake a hand, yes or no. Would you guys want to pay my rent. Q. Just curious. Would anybody like to pay my rent. Yes or no? You? You said somhing. Oh, no. What was that? You over here. No. So I'm glad that you guys really take citizens communication seriously here. You clearly do. Mr. Renteria always has a good laugh, he lik to toast to me when I come up here. This is a man I caught illegally campaigning.

[12:21:51 PM]

Mayor Adler always seems to Ave, you can't even answer a yes or no question. I come up here all the time, you pretty much jus ignored the last speaker. So, you know, I'm just wondering why we even have this when you guys don't even listen to us? But it's fine, I'm going to keep coming here and making a big deal out of this and you're going to start to see protesst on the street and maybe then you'll ten to us. But until then, I'mng to keep coming here and keep putting it out there for millions of people see how this mayor doesn't listen to his citizens and how this city council laughs and jokes and thinking it's a big joke when I represent hundreds of thousands, if not millions of Texans that want to start paying for murder, baby murder. Thyou guys once again for exhiting your total futility and negligenc would Imrie you guys like today something? Anybody?

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Great. I'll continue to fight for the un.rn and you guys will continue to ignore us.

>> Mayor Pro Tem: After Julie, we have ramesis. Is he here? He or she? Okay. Then next we have chuck Reynolds. Chuck, if you want to come down.

>> Jul, you can go ahead.

>> Okay. My name is Julie marquee, and I live in district 10. I have been volunteering with cats at the Austin animal center since September 2018. I am speaking on behalf of myself and Jessica albatol, the cat volunteer liaison at the Austin Animal center. I'm here today to respectfully ask the following changes to the cat program at the Austin animal center. One, please stop putting cats under six months old back on the street as part of the shelter neuter program also known as snr. Two, please add a performance measure in the budget that removes a cat that goes through snr from, quote, live outcomes, and instead counts that outcome as unknown.

[12:23:55 PM]

Use this performance measure to move away from returning cats to the street. This is important because a cat that leaves Austin animal center through the snr program may not survive being put back on the street. Three, please revise the organization chart at the Austin animal center so that there is one manager or supervisor in charge of all cat programs, including oversight of the assignment of performance measures relating to cats. 4, please use the donations fund to establish pilot programs that promote rescue programs so fewer cats go through snr unnecessarily. Five, please strictly enforce the minimum three-day hold time for all cats and kittens so owners have a chance to find their lost pets. The current at program shelter neuter return is considered successful because it results in a high live outcome rate for cats, but returning a cat to the street without a caretaker should not be considered successful outcome. Many of these cats are friendly, previously owned, possibly indoor only cats who cannot fend for themselves outside. Thousands of kittens and cats have been returned to the streets during the last eight years. This includes many cats under six months old. Austin's shelter neuter return program was modeled after the feral freedom program in Jacksonville, Florida. However procedures used at Austin animal center have departed from the Jacksonville program. For example, the Jacksonville program required someone in the neighborhood agreed to be a caretaker for a cat returned to the street. We do support trap neuter release or tnr for feral cats. For tnr is the right community action and we are glad our community supports tnr. However, placing friendly adoptable cats and kittens on the street without a caretaker is not right. We ask that this end immediately for cats under six months old and be phased out for cats over six months old by implementing the changes listed above.

[12:26:01 PM]

Thank you for considering this request.

>> Mayor Pro Tem: Thank you. Next we'll have Barbara Zala, you can come up to the podium. And, Chuck, you can go ahead.

>> Thank you very much for the time here today. My name is Chuck Reynolds. I live in the River Place community in HOA, but not the limited district that was recently created last year when the remainder of our community was annexed by Austin. The agreement the City signed was to replace limited district gave the limited district responsibility for all our community amenities, including parks, athletic

facilities the trails. As their first act, the new limited district board essentially expelled the Rest of the HOA from the neighborhood by levying excessive fees on these amenities for those of us who are not in the limited district. This was a departure from the more than 15 years of precedent where the entire river place community enjoyed equal treatment and the trail was publicly available and free. More egregious was that the parks and trails now under the limited district control were built from funds of Texas parks and wildlife and the LCRA. Indeed the contract signed with TPWD in order to obtain about half a million dollars in grant money specifically states they cannot discriminate based on residence. They gladly take tax dollars but use the authority handed to them by the city of Austin to disenfranchise us from everything that makes our neighborhood a neighborhood. We have reached out to the city pleading for assistance and the response has been disappointing. There seems to be little concern about citizens who have lost access to their local parks and trails, and no enforcement even of the limits -- or the limits enumerated in the SPA with respect to reasonable charges. We get a few sympathetic records, some resigned shrugs but not much action. The limited district is now using hired county deputies, not only to guard the trails but to prevent access to the trails in our neighborhood which is on city of Austin property.

[12:28:10 PM]

They threaten us local residents, who are a short walk from the trails and parks with criminal trespass. For a city whose residents love the outdoors Austin already has a shortage of public parks and natural spaces. Are we fine with just letting wealthy communities wall themselves and their nice things off so they don't have to share them with other city residents? Are you fine with them taking tax dollars from all Texans and then turning all Texans away? What does it really mean to be a citizen of Austin? Austin city government needs to either stop entering into these limited district agreements or you need to retain some ability for the city to control access to public spaces and you must be willing to actively enforce these agreements. You need to start now by using your considerable influence to deal with the situation in river place head on. Failing that, you should at least resolve that the river limited district, unless it begins to behave differently, will be dissolved when it next comes up for renewal. Thank you very much.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Kitchen: Thank you. Matthew Kim, you'll be next. Go ahead.

>> I'm from district 8. Thanks to those of you who show us respect by staying. We did notice. I use the archaic form of threat in my synopsis of what I was going to say as a verb on purpose because you all are using verbiage that is in turn archaic, old, tired, predictable, worn and lazy. The state is passing some property tax caps. One could say Austin occasionally needs such slapsch it's not a cap outright. It's important to note, if you need more revenue then we'll likely have a vote. Yes, the state may pass some limits on tax, but let's not freak out, let's look at the state. The city budget can't afford some trimming, the spending is bloated, the budget needs slimming.

[12:30:12 PM]

But absent mayor ad letter loves to fear amonger. I ask, let's please not do that any longer. I would urge you not to lie or disen geneouslyhine or falsely outcry with endless predictable offensive threats to cut our police, fire and ems. How dare even hint the cuts ss the board when the police only jt now got their bonuses restored. In some, there's no reason a tax decrease has to mean we have fewer police, nor does our annual budgetary mess mean we need to slash ems, and cutting back fire must be a joke, if so, I'd have to say you're blowing smoke. Pandering to voter fear is never funny. There are other ways to save some money. The police in particular are ru a tight ship ec omically, do any of you drive a car built in the '50s? The police military chopper was built back then. Did you know that with the other chop chopper, the police can only fill it half full of gas because otherwise it won't get off the ground? With only two officers and gea on board? If latin isn't safe or in this you fail, it doesn't matter if we had the millionth bike trail. Or the dreams of autonomous cars that fill your head, we can't enjoy those if we're dead. Please make cuts elsewhere, please stop using our des to have a strong and vibrant police, fire and ems as a too to frighten us intortinpo endless tax revenue. Thank you, and thanks to councilmember Flannigan for going along on a police Rideout. >>Itchen: Thank you. Our last speaker to come up to the podiu wl be Ricardo Trevino. Mr. Kim, you can go ahead.

>> Okay. Good afternoon, CI councilmembers, it is a privilege to speak to you again during citizens communications. My name is Matthew Kim, and I'm currently a sophomore at St. Stevens episcopal school and I live in district 8.

[12:32:17 PM]

Alsom the current president for the students for climate action Austin chapter. Our organization, the students for climate actionroduced ourselves to you at the March 28th citizens communications or discussions. Since that day we've grown in numbers, solidified our goals and connected ourselves within the Austin community. In terms proofess we have made in the last month, we now have members representing four different Austin area schools a E we're looking to add many more to that list. Each student is committed to 100% sustainability and isdetermined to educate fellow students about this city' actions tos sustainability. We are not only interested in interacting with other high school students but we also want to develop a relationship with the Austin community as well. I have personally attended 350 Austin and Austin sunrise movement meetings to educate myself on environmental issues and to connect our organization to others like in Austin. As of now, we're still working to establish new connections with other influential groups. My point is, that weo not only understand the important issues occurring in atin,usut we are also confident inur O research and are willing to take action. Yesterday afternoon we had a great meeting with assistant city manager Christopher and chief sustainability officer, and we discussed our goals and sought out common intests. We were very excited forshi opportunity and discussed austin'sommu cty climate action plan and Austin's strategic mobility plan. However, we questioned why some environmentally friendly policies have been removed such as the Bann plastic bags. Even thoh state level officials voted to remove it, we urge you to stand strong for the legislation that you have already successfully implemented. As we told Mr. Shorter yesterday, we want T participate and help you create that new legislation. I would like to end with governmental panel on climate change predicts in the next 20 years the world will have to reduce its carbon rate by 40%.

[12:34:24 PM]

I hope Austin will continue being fearless in creating new legislation because my generation will have to deal with the consequences of your town today. I'd like to acknowledge that it is a privilege to live in such a forward-thinking and dynamic city, and I thank you for your vision leadership and the students for climate action look forward to working with you in the future to achieve our goals. Thank you.

>> Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Trevino?

>> My name is Ricardo Trevino, live in precinct 3. I'm a volunteer with social cycling Austin and I'm here to voice our concern on the lack of acknowledgment on the recent deaths of cyclists not only by you, city council, but by our cycling advocates. Advocates and councilmembers who the cycling community are asked to support are not supporting the cycling community. Just recently we at social cycling Austin took it upon ourselves to take action and acknowledge the recent deaths with memorial silent rides. While these silent rides memorialized the loss of life, they also act as a reminder to all who travel by bike that we have a long way to go for this city to be bike-friendly. As we approach bike month, social cycling Austin would like to remind council that promoting the great service cycling does for body, mind and community should go hand-in-hand with the somber realistic view that cyclists die on the streets. Most often at the hands of distracted or drunk individuals in cars and buses. The recent deaths of Tony Diaz and another saddled around the past deaths of other Austin cyclists at the hands of a car and bus drivers are unacceptable. The cycling community and our families have been stunned by the two recent deaths. We are all trying to relate and find answers to why these senseless deaths have occurred.

[12:36:30 PM]

We, as a community, rely on our representatives to find answers to these deaths, yet there aren't any questions being asked by council. I'm asking you to please discuss this matter with your fellow councilmembers. Take seriously the suggestions brought to you by the B, brainstorm solutions, invite the cycling community to discuss and find solutions, start a bike safety campaign similar to the don't mess with Texas campaign. Seek the advice of people who commute and use their bike as their mode of transportation. Do something. Every one of you as a member of our city council are in a position to do something about this before more people on bikes die from inadequate public transportation, inadequate infrastructure or at the hands of a distracted or a drunk driver. To add, I've reached out to capital metro who's driver ran down Tony Diaz to see if they were interested in reaching out to the community. They are interested, although they have not scheduled an event as of yet. Sincerely.

>> Kitchen: Thank you. So, colleagues, that is our last speaker. We have an executive session on the land development code, and then we also are -- I'm also understating that people would like some time to go on amendments. So I'm going to call us into executive session and then I would imagine that we wouldn't be back on the dais before 2:00. I'm not certain that executive session would last that long, but we'll start

in executive session and then believe if everyone wants to, will take time to review the amendments on the land development code. So I'll go ahead and read the -- did you want to ask something first?

>> I do.

>> Tovo: As in role review, we'll take time to review the amendments individually or as a council.

[12:38:35 PM]

>> Kitchen: Indily balore we come back.

>> Tovo: Got it.

>> Kitchen: I think the mayor acknowledged when he came back re cfoizen communication that the 20 minutes that we had wasn't sufficient, so we can do that -- we can take some additional time after our executive session and we can decide how much in executive session. Does that make sense to everyone okay. All right city council will now go into closed session to take up one item, pursuant to section 551.071 of the government code, the city council will discuss legal matters related to item 11, discuss and take possible action on policy direction and guidance related to the land development code revision. Any objection to going into executive session on the item announced? Hearing none, the council will now go into executive session

[2:02:23 PM]

session] Test test test test test test

[2:17:38 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: all right. We have a quorum. Today is still April 25, 2019. We're out of closed session. In closed session we discussed legal matters related to item 11. We're going to go ahead and start with the plantation and zoning matters -- planning and zoning matter M. Let's do consent and we may handle the item that's left and get that done, too. Why don't you take us through consent, sorry.

>> Thank you, Mayor, Councilmember Greg Guernsey. First consent item is 58, c14-2018-0102, ready for consent approval on second and third readings. Item 59, c14-2018-0151, ready for consent approval on second and third readings. Item 6c14, 2018, 0115, applicant requested postponement to May 9 agenda. Item 61, c14-2018-0004 ready for consent approval on second and third readings. Under the 2:00 zoning and neighborhood plan amendments, public hearings are open and possible action, first item 62, c14-2018-0141, staff is requesting postponement of this item to May 9 agenda. 63, c14-2018-, we've a neighborhood request for postponement to May 9. The applicant agrees, postponement of item 63 to

may 9. Item 64, mayor, Believe you have at least three speakers signed up, discussion item on Norwood park, cc14. 2018-0140. Item 65, c14- 2019-0006, staff postponement request to may 3.

[2:19:38 PM]

Six item item c14-2019-0001, staff postponement to may 23. Item 67, c14-2018-0108, this is an applicant request for postponement to may 9. Item 6, c14-2018-0109, applicant request for postponement to may 9. Item 69, case c14-2018-0149, the applicant has withdrawn this request, no action is required on item 69. Item 70, case npa-2017-0018.01, staff is requesting postponement to may 23 agenda. Finally item 71, this is for consent approval for case c14-2018-01118.

>> Mayor Adler one question, item 63, is that a postponement request by the applicant Ory the --

>> It's a neighborhood request.

>> Mayor: Okay.

>> And the applicant does not object to the postponement.

>> Mayor: Okay. It's a neighborhood request. Okay. All right. Mr. Nigaan

>> Flannigan: On item 61, I want to make sure that we're doing the staff recommendation on consent.

>> Mayor Adler: . Is that correct? Staff recommendation on consent on item number 60.

>> Flannigan: One.

>> Mayor Adler: 61, rather.

>> Understood. I have one correction, mayor. I understand there's been a zoning case filed in association with item 70, so it's actually a staff postponement request of item number 70, to June 9 -- oh, 6, June 6.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there a motion to approve the consent agenda? Renteria makes that motion. Is there a second to that?

[2:21:41 PM]

Mayor pro tem. Ready to take a vote? Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed. Okay. That leaves us one item to consider, item 64. Is that correct?

>> It's correct, mayor. Case c14-2018-0140, otherwise known as Norwood park. This is a rezoning request to gr-manufacture mu-mp. The property address is 916 and 918 Norwood park boulevard, the property is approximately 11.2 acres in size. The planning commission did recommend this zoning change request a vote of 9-0 for the staff recommendation, staff did recommend the gr-mu zoning request, conditional

overlay would include a building that ntaico residential dwelling units, are now permitted within 175 feet of existing facilities with more than 660 gallons of outdoor aboveround storage of class one flammable or class two combustible liquid storage unless protective measures are approved by the fire department. This is a condition added by our fire department so it is brought to you B they commission staff with a favorable recommendation. The properties to the north are sf--3, mp zoning, with single-family homes. To the south is ch-mp zoning and sf--3-mp zoning with a txdot facility and goodwill store. To the east is retail uses including Walmart and zoned gr-co-master plan and further to the west is a data cr. The proposed project is approximately 228 state tax credit rental units, 100 and 60% mfi rate.

[2:23:43 PM]

There was an educational impact statement that was submitted with this request, and aid states all schools would be able to accommodate the projected student population from this development and other developments that exist in the area. There is a neighborhood association that has voiced opposition as well as others and the's a valid petition in opposition to this rezoning request that stands at 26.28%. I'll note this is only ready for first reading today. So a summer majority vote of cil is not required for first reading, only a simple majority vote of six. The applicant's agent is here, as well as those that would like to speak. If have any questions we can answer them at this time.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Annifln.

>> Flannigan: I feel like we've had some conversation about residential buildings and their proximity to dangerous materials. Is that not something that shld be done at the site plan stage I would hate to think zoning is the only tool we have.

>> I think this has been highlighted by our fire department because at the time si O plan they may not be aware of exactly where those facilities are. They have checked it with the zoning case, putting that out there to make the property owner aware that they will have setbacks from these existing facilities if they still exist on the date of the site plan approval.

>> Flannigan: Puts this property owner on notice they might have residential buildings that might have to sit further back than what you would normally have by setbacks and compatibility standards.

>> Flannigan: I'm finthwiit in this context but it just seems like the worst possible tool to use in this atiotu as requiring a zoning case in order to protect residential units perfect dangerous materials. If the fire department is not resourced enough to check for these types of things I would thinke'd want to solve problem and not rely on rezonings to ads it.

[2:25:44 PM]

Thank you.

>> So the applicant's agent is here to address as well as se neighbors.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's call up the applicant. Applicant, you've got five minutes

>> Good afternoon, councilmembers and mayor R. Thanks for being here to hear the case, my name is Steven Buffum, project manager at Costello, the applicant for Igb development. I don't have much color to add on the introduction of the case. I understand you are all fairly well briefed to the merits of the case. Going into it we of course did the usual thing, consulted the future land use map. We see this district is dedicated to be -- or intended to be a mixed-use area, and so the zoning request is really just bringing the existing zoning in line with the future land use map. So early on, when the notifications went out, we found out that the neighborhood was opposed to our particular project of in just residential in this area. So, you know, we then made a concerted effort to meet with the neighborhood and start hearing their concerns directly and attempt to formulate some sort of reconciliation. So our project wasn't so negative in their eyes. I can tell you that a lot of progress has been made between our developer and the neighborhood, and I understand a couple of them are here to talk, and I believe WOU back me up on that. As long as they can iron out the final details. So other than that, I think that the case stands on its own, as far as merits are concerned, we believe that it's a good, sound planning principles.

[2:27:45 PM]

We believe that providing a residential use here, not only meets badly needed housing need in the area but given that it's an affordable product, being next to transit and the Walmart there, provides the need for that type of use, that type of housing, as well as providing a good buffer from the commercial uses in the area, transitioning into the single family neighborhood. That being said, I'm here to help answer any other questions on a technical basis and just since you brought it up, Mr. Flannigan, so I think the intent from the fire department -- I understand that they are trying to get more into review in the zoning stage and try to weigh in on potential issues, and it's just to add that additional check. Just trying to play devil's advocate for them. So certainly I actually got to weigh in on the type of language that was written in to just give that extra red flag that a reviewer might have missed it or even -- say this project never happens, some future applicant comes in to do a site plan they can kind of see that on the front end.

>> Yeah, I think this is the wrong day to play devil's advocate on land use policy because these are larger questions that I have brought up multiple times. It's not about your case. It's about whether we would require rezoning in order to protect our community against dangerous materials. It's not about what you're saying.

>> All right. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Sorry. Is Courtney Graham here? Why don't you come on down. Is Carol Stevenson here? All right. Ms. Graham, you have five minutes. Corey Boden is on deck.

[2:29:45 PM]

>> Thank you. Good afternoon, my name is Courtney graham. I'm the president of the heritage hills Woodbridge neighborhood association, and the issue here surrounds the definition of mixed-use. So the neighborhood had planned to have this 11.29-acre tract to serve its needs, to have true mixed-use. And for -- when W got the notice, Wender uood that the developer desired to put a multi-unit afford housing complex, which we are not against after councilmember Casar utilized his incredible mediation skills, but the deloper has agreedo offer us concessions, and I have provided you each with a of etx pages, and those concessions that we desire are on the first page. So we are here today to ask each of you to approve this development subject to the conditions and the concessions that are on tt first page. And we're frankly excited that with those concessions the neighborhood will have some amenities to utili and it will unify the neighborhood as a whole. Which, I mean, goes to the definition -- it would make us feel better about the mixed-use.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Thank you.

>> Mor Adler: Thank you. Mr. Boden. Good afternoon. And thank you. I'm here to -- we've had a lot of discussions between the neighborhood group and Idg andtellos and they have been very amenable to listening to our concerns and working with us to make the development more palatato the neighborhood. Neveheless, a large number of members of the community have come back to, as we were canvassing for petitions and talking to the neighborhood about the develop that was going to go in was that it did not adhere to what was set forth in the neighborhood plan, which specifically calls that tract to be a neighborhood urban center.

[2:32:01 PM]

Which is defined in the neighborhood plan as a mixed-use pedestrian oriented transit center. Our neighborhood, heritage hills, is small. It's a beautiful neigorhood, but we're bounded on the west side by the I-35 frontage road. The north side by little walnut creek, the east sideby an elementary school no connecting roads oside of the neighborhood. Sohe south side of the neighborhood is our only opportunity to have any kind of retail or commercial access by walking or biking, places where we can go and meet other neighbors, members of our community, members of the existing affordable housing near the Walmart. With this piece of property going to strictly apartments, it removes all possibility of that ever happening. Which, again, does not comport with the desires of the neighborhood plan and the time and effort that went into developin that plan with the neighborhood and with the city. So I'm here in oppositio not necessarily to the zoning, but to the zoning for the purpose of this particular project, as I don't feel it meets the needs of the existing community, both the single-family houses and the existing affordable housing in the neighborhood. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Es the applicant want to close? Anything else?

>> Thank you for the opportunity to say one more thing about it. I want to bring up that O developer is also here if you had any questions. I also believe a member from the Austin housing authority is here if you had any particular questions for them on this discussion item. So aside from the concessions that

you were just given, just to address the final part of this particular use in a mixed-use district and, yes, this single site is a solely residential use, but in looking at it from a global planning perspective, if you look at the future land use map you will see a large block of tracts designated for mixed-use in its ultimate development.

[2:34:25 PM]

So while we're getting this zoning in Lincoln for the use of residential, we look at the district as a whole and see that we're adding that residential component in the mixed-use block and for those reasons believe that we're still keeping in line with sound planning principles. So that's the only thing I would add for that.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Casar: Mayor? Quick question, sorry, sir.

>> Mayor Adler: Sir? >> Casar: Just to confirm what it is handed out by Ms. Graham, you all discussed this at the neighborhood meeting and you all are good with this?

>> So my understanding is that has been presented to my developer as well. I personally have not seen all of those yet. I just wasn't CC'd on the email. They are not agreed to as of yet. I didn't think there was a serious time crunch on that since this was first reading. I think we will have a couple days to work through that.

>> Casar: Got it. Mayor, I'll move it on first reading if that's all the speakers

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar moves pass online on first meeting, closing the public hearing. Is there a second to that motion? Councilmember Renteria -- I'm sorry. Was there a second? Mayor pro tem seconds. Any further discussion?

>> Casar: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Casar: So we're moving this on first reading before we go on to future ones. My conversations with Idg have made it pretty clear that it seems like we're pretty much at this -- pretty close to this level of agreement, there's nothing here that seems to stand out to me that hasn't tentatively been agreed to, so I'm sure that with more conversations between some of these neighbors and the developer that we can land at the right spot. But I really want to just appreciate you and folks at Idg and the neighbors and housing authority for coming together around this tract and hopefully getting it to place where everybody can really be proud of that. It seems to me -- from looking over this it seems very similar to what it is we've talked about at meetings and I think we'll be able to get this wrapped up expeditiously so thanks to everybody for going the extra mile and putting extra energy in to make this something that people can be proud of.

[2:36:42 PM]

So thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor, I have a question also.

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on. Let's get to staff.

>> Staff just received this as well and we'll look through this, speak with the law department and see which things might be incorporated into some restriction T city would be able to enforce. There are some things I see very quickly on this list that would be difficult for --

>> Casar: We'll work those INGs out.

>> Harper-madison: I think you might have answered my question. I'm trying to figure out how you go about determining whether or not a son is a resident of a certain neighborhood. But aside from that, I just wanted to offer a point of clarification because councilmember Casar is, it seems as though people are referring to him about this case because this is in fact, despite what it says in the agenda, this is not district 1. This is district 2. There was a clerical error there so just clearing that up.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I'm curious and Mr. Mr. Guernsey can help me with this, the need for commercial amenities in this part of town, and I'm familiar with it having lived on Lora Linda back in the 80s, I was there when Norwood park was put place and there was the promise of commercial and retail in THA area on the south side of register Ford -- Rutherford lane, if this is approved as is with changes to affordable housing, which of course I support, what impact will this have on attracting additional development that would in fact fulfill the vision for this part of the city with regard to commercial and retail?

>> On this tract, it is mixed-use so this is the proposed residential, is in accordance with that. In the neighborhood plan, there's a reference that recommendation 47, support a creation of a vibrant neighborhood urban center with shopping center/walmart currently exists and that is pedestrian oriented, neighborhood friendly, neighborhood scaled and serves a variety of neighborhood needs above that there's reference that the community also supports redevelopment of this shopping center the adjacent commercial properties to an urban village which has a mixture of uses including residents and commercial uses.

[2:39:02 PM]

Spoken in the plan generally to be residential, maybe not in the form that is being proposed by the applicant. I'm not aware of a lot of residential that exists in this area. I think back in the '80s it was gonna be

[indiscernible] Mall or if I remember something like that, like a mall-style use. It didn't turn out that way but there are several commercial uses, small restaurants, retail uses that are adjacent to the walmart

that's to the east of this project, it does serve this and other residences in the area. So this particular tract is within -- it's still S undeveloped in this area and that's not to say that the Walmart wouldn't be redeveloped and have residential and commercial uses that have a different focus in the future.

>> Pool: Thank you so much. I really like the vision for that area that's articulated in that document. That's really great. And maybe if we have an increase in the number of residents who are living in that area that the additional crime and retail will be -- will naturally come pass, if we have more folks there who could take advantage of them. And I do note that having the additional amenities there for the community would keep people from having to drive any distance. They could simply walk out of the neighborhood and across Rutherford and go to a restaurant do some shopping and anything that has an Austin flavor aside from a big box, I think, would be a real asset in its part of the city and elsewhere. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. All right. Let's take a vote. Those in favor of this item please raise your hand. Those opposed. Passes -- sorry. Announces on the dais. It passes. All right. That gets us, council -- sorry? And the public hearing is closed, it was approved on final reading.

[2:41:03 PM]

Council, we have two items left, 72, which is a public hearing which we can't take up until 4:00 and then the land development code. Let's figure out where we are on the land development code. The -- I want to first make sure we have all the amendments.

>> Kitchen: I really, really apologize for doing this to everyone, but this is my amendment one updated so you can take -- you can take this big document that you have from me and throw it under the desk and replace it with this. So there you go.

>> Does that include the amendments?

>> Tovo: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Tovo: Councilmember Kitchen, could you help us understand what you've done today?

>> Kitchen: Sure. When [indiscernible]

>> Tovo probably I'm not alone.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's hold that for a second.

>> Tovo: Okay.

>> Kitchen: There are minor changes I'll be happy to point out when we go over this one.

>> Mayor Adler: So I guess the point that -- so let's do that. Okay. So I want to make sure that we're all looking at the same stuff. I have an amendment from councilmember Ellis and me. I have an amendment motion sheet from councilmember Flannigan. I have an amendment sheet from councilmember Tovo,

questions one, page question two, question three, and question four. Councilmember tovo. I have kitchen, which is amended 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. No number 4.

[2:43:03 PM]

I have councilmember pool. I have motion sheet one and motion sheet 2 and 4 combined. I have councilmember harper-madison. I have a sheet from councilmember alter. And I have a sheet from councilmember Ellis. I think those are all the ones that I have.

>> Renteria: Mayor

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Renteria: I'd like to ask my colleague, if the amendments and all the documents you gave out this morning are the ones that we should discard?

>> Kitchen: Yeah except you're just going to rce one, the one that says amendment 1, which is the thicker one. You're going to replace that with what I jt handed out that says amendment 1 updated. Keep the rest. Does that make sense?

>> Renterieah.

>> Mayor adler:okay. Now what we're going to do is we're going to go through the amendment -- we're going to go through the amendments. We're not going to discuss them. But we are going to iify which ones people want to pull either because they have concern with it or because they want to discuss it or because they do not stand it, whatever it is. If no one brings any O those things for the Tim ebeing they go into the document. I say for the time being because there multiple moving parts here, and someof these changesre a being made in anticipation that other people will be making changes in places.

[2:45:06 PM]

So as we go rough this, if something ends up in the document, it's subject to ING pulled out of the document later, if that makes sense, as were what gets brought in and not brought in.it S going to be kind of iterative but I think that will keep us moving forward. Ann.

>> Kitchen: Just a question. So I'm assuming that if I have language that I want to D toad a particular section but I'm fine with the language, for example, in your amendment, I will just leave that alone until you get to mine because it will be added instead of repling?ac

>> Mayor Adler: That's correct

T. >> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Aer wft go through the amendments in this process here, will we be able at that point to hear from the speakers who have signed up? Or is that being held until later?

>> Mayor Adler: Well, we could hear from some of the speakers. I'd like to have us -- I think if we can get through some of T we could narrow the parameters for people and they could see what was happening, but certainly we want to hea from speakers, too. Yes, councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Yeah, just thanks, councilmember kitchen, for your question. I think as I went through everybody's amendments last night and again today in some cases I can support it if I amend it, so I think in those cases I'm going to -- I think it's easiest to retail uses it like an itemwe're pullingrom F the consent agenda because I didn't write out an amendment sheeator amendments to somebody else's amendment.

>> Mayor Adl: If people understand it, want to talk about it, pull it because you hate it. Councilmember alter.

Lt a er: Very quick. I just wanted to note that I just passed out a motion sheet for one amendment for question 2.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: Yes. And I have one from -- another one for question 2 but other folks have a similar thing, so if those pass then I won't need to pass mine out.

[2:47:30 PM]

>> Mayor adler:okay. All right. Let's start with the ones that we have handed out previously and then we'll get to the two that were just handed out. I want to begin now lookingat the councilmember Ellis and my amendment a. So let's go through this and see what we Ed to discuss. Does anybody want toiscuss anything on the first page? Councilmember Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: So this is something that this kind of threaded throughout. I have -- I want -- my preference when we refer to draft 3, I don't like referring to draft 3. I think staff should be determining what the baseline is based on community testimony and whatwe do in our direction. So I'd prefer to say something like instead of --

>> Mayor Adler: So we're not going to make amendments now. So if you want to pull ityo can pull it and then we'llo back and discuss it. Right now we're trying to find thingshat just go in.

>> Flannigan: So okay. Yeah. So I'm pulling a lot of stuff if -- jt Fus little tweaks, yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So what do you want to pull on page 1?

>> Flannigan: Page 1, so overall scope, time line, communication --

>> Mayor Adler: Hang O a second. You're going way too fast. So you're pulling --

>> Flanniganlal of it, one, two, three, four, five page 1.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Flannigan: Sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. One, two, three, four five are all pulled.

>> Harper-madison: Mayor, could you offer clarity about the exercise we're doing right now? I'm not entirely certain.

>> Mayor Adler: We're saying if there are any things people are generally in agreement with -- it's like the consent agenda. So we're going to go back and discuss 1-5 but if 5 hadn't been pulled, then that amendment would just be incorporated into the base document.

[2:49:32 PM]

>> Harper-madison: I understand. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: So the base document is what we handed out on -- what was it, April 13 or something like that. Sotha motion -- councilmember alter, you want to make that motion for adopting the base document? I mean, councilmember Ellis?

>> Ellis:yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Ellis makes a motion on the base document. Is there a second? Councilmember Casar does that. We have a motion in front of us. Now friendly amendments to that. Mr. Flannigan pulled items 1-5. Does anybody want to pull anything else on page 2?

Kitch>>: I do. I want to pull -- it's UND question two, number 1b.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is that okay? All right. That one goes in --

>> Wait, wait, wait.

[Laughter]

>> Harper-madison: Sorry. 1a.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Here's my concern. I'm concerned until we start making some of the base decisions we're going to end up pulling everything.

>> Flannigan: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Maybe the thing to do, let's take this -- I'd recommend we take amendment a and we go ahead and deal with amendment a. At the end of amendment a then we'll double back and do the exercise we were just starting to do because that might make things clearer at that point rather than going through and pulling all these things. That's the process I would recommend that we do. Yes, councilmember Kitch.

>> Kitchen: So that would mean for each -- we're really taking question one, starting with amendment a.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct.>> K Chen: I might have an amendment in mine so basically we're going that way, question to question?

>> Mayor Adler: If you have an amendment to the amendment that's in Ellis we would take it but if you're amending a different section, different concept, we'll get to that when we get to your amendment.

[2:51:39 PM]

>> Kitchen: Gotcha.

>> Mayor Adler: Certainly elements to this language for anything else that would be -- absolutely. Let's try it that way.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? Does that make? All right. Let's try that. So we have the first one here. Jimmy, you pulled this one. Councilmember Flannigan, do you want to address one, overall scope?

>> Flannigan: Yes. So one change is, as I've listed on my amendment, striking the part that references draft 3 and just saying the code revision process, direction below. And then so would strike your addition from 1 and ours has language referring to leveraging community engagement, consistent with the policy direction, and references simplicity. Which I think is important.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Flannigan: It seems pretty straightforward

Rd>> Mayor Adler: As I look at this I'm fine with your amendment B I was going to say I like that. But I also would like to have 1 as written amendment a, because I think that what staff is going to do with this is to really work off of draft 3. From everything that's been indicated. And I don't want to mislead the community. I don't want people to be surprised if when they see something in three months it has a lot of draft 3 in it and people say, wait a second, you were supposed to start all over again and all you've done is give us backdraft 3. I recognize there are a lot of things in draft 3 that don't work so it's really important that they -- that they not feel bound by anything that's in draft 3 because we didn't approve it because it wasn't ready. And I want them to engage that. I want them to be really rigorous about that. But I also want to make sure that the community expectation, is that that did when they see something that looks a lot like draft 3 and has a lot of those elements in it that they're not surprised and when people say, did the staff do that alone in the dark rooms of staff building somewhere?

[2:53:47 PM]

I'd like them to say, no, that was the instruction that we got from council. so I would recommend the language that's in amendment a, but when we get to yours, I'm going to vote to add your language as well.

>> Casar: Alternatively, could I make an amendment to the amendment to add the Flannigan language in but leave the draft 3 language in? So we can just dispose of it all at once.

>> Flannigan: That's what the mayor is saying.

>> Casar: You're saying do it later.

>> Mayor Adler: We can do it both now.

>> Casar: Let's do it all at once.

>> Tovo: Mayor? With all due respect, this is wildly confusing.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: For the public that maybe hasn't been following this, we've had various amendments posted throughout the week, we had a slew of them posted last night, we have slightly different in some cases this morning. I've got comments on three different sets of some of your amendments that I'm trying to collate, so if we're doing a couple things at once I'd ask if we could do them A, then B, one potato, two potato kind of thing. As I understood what we were just talking about we're looking at the mayor's language for question 1, overall scope.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct.

>> Tovo: Then, after W

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan.

>> Tovo: -- Address that councilmember Flannigan has changes to your language beyond draft three?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. He has recommended the change that is his question one, section 1, overall scope that's in WHA he's handed out. Would ask that at this point you just let that stay the way it is and when we get to yours we just add yours, only because I think that would be the simplest thing on the table. Are you comfortable doing that or no?

[2:55:50 PM]

>> Flannigan: Sorry, there's a lot of voices. I'm not comfortable with referencing draft 3, but I'm not going to make a stink of it unless other folks want to join me in making a stink.

>> Harper-Madison: Okay, I've taken the opportunity to make a stink and I'd like to be as consistent as possible. I'm also not comfortable referencing draft three.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I think that's true. I think your points were conveyed that way. My sense is that there's well over a majority of the people that are, but I think we need to establish that here. So is anybody else uncomfortable with it? Okay. So given that, can we --

>> Flannigan: Yeah, that's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: -- Move forward with number 1? Anybody else have any problems with number 1? Yes.

>> Kitchen: So we talk about number 1 as in your document, right? Yours and council member Ellis'.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct.

>> Kitchen: And if we have additions to it, we're going to address the additions later?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, when we get to yours.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: If someone had problems with mentioning boards and commissions, for example, you could strike boards and commissions. If it was something other than boards and commissions -- so if you're uncomfortable with draft 3, now would be the time to strike that.

>> Flannigan: Are we not adding language now?

>> Mayor Adler: No, no. I understand -- but on that issue only because if we don't do it that way --

>> Flannigan: Understood.

>> Mayor Adler: Everybody will flood in all at once. Okay. So there's -- when we -- there's nothing here that limits you -- we're going to go to your amendments.

>> Kitchen: Okay, got you. >> Mayor Adler: Absolutely we'll get to your amendments. It doesn't limit that at all. We'll get to Jim's amendment as well which I've indicated I'll support when it comes up and I think there will be support on the dais for that to happen as well. Okay. So for -- at this point in our deliberation process, one is staying the way it is. Number 2, any changes to ?

[2:57:51 PM]

Okay. What about number 4? Any change to number 4?

>> Kitchen: Number 3. >> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, number 3.

Flannigan: Just changes, not additions?

>> Mayor Adler: Right. It's a different kind of concept, then let's get that

when we >> Flannigan: -- If it doesn't conflict with this, if it's not a change in this --

>> Flannigan: Got it.

>> Mayor a: There will be time to do that. Okay? What about number 4? We're at -- Ann and then Pio - let's go Pio first.

>> Renteria: Who do you mean reduce citywide and various

[indiscernible] What does that mean?

>> Mayor Adler: I want to make sure that everybody knows that it is one of our values in doing this code that we want to reduce citywide impervious cover, that -- and it will -- and that's important to us, and that overall we're going to improve citywide water quality. I think those are important things. At the end of this process I want to be able to say that we did a code and it helped improve water quality. Did a code and it helped us with impervious cover. Okay? Yes, councilmember pool.

>> Councilmember M when you said number we you talking about question four or --

>> Mayor Adler: I'm talking about page 1, number 4.

>> Pool: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Code text.

>> Pool: We're still on question one, thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I think we should pull this one because my understanding is if we want to talk about it further we're not talking about it now, we're pulling it, if we want to change

>> Mayor Adler: If you disagree with this sentence and think that it --

>> Kitchen: I want to modify the sentence.

>> Mayor Adler: If you don't think it goes far enough that you agree with this, then I would suggest we wait till we get to that place where you say -- and -- we did that but I want to go farther than that too.

[3:00:00 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: And there is language going farther than that I've seen circulating in plus that I would support.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? All right. Then let's go to the next one, no. 5. This is the one that concerns n.cc and cos. Anyone have -- let's pull this one. Number 5 is going to get pulled. I think that is the way I thought that one would go. Okay?

>> Mayor, is it pulling out A and B or just A?

>> Mayor Adler: Does dan-- a at least. Does anybody want to pull B? Yes, it's a and B. Gets us to question no. 2. Question no. 2, any issues with 1-a? Or 1-b? Yes?

>> Harper-madison: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Which one, or both?

>> Harper-madison: Both.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So we're now discussing -- actually we're going beyond that. So let's talk about that. You know -- I'm backing up, because I started treating this as the pulled thing, and I'd not doing that here. So 1, 2, 3 and 4 on the first page are in. So let's now talk about no. 5. Zoning map. A, nccds. Let's talk about that now, because we, that was the change in process we just decided we were going to do. So let's talk AUT 5-a. The intent of the section that was put in there was to let nccds continue, preserved and carried forward in the new code, use there are a lot of things/in nccds that have been negotiated in those neighborhoods and areas like design standards and the like, and I thought that the general consensus when we were trying to come up with this kind of consensus document, was that they should be carried forward.

[3:02:02 PM]

I recognize there's -- there's dispute with that, so we can certainly talk about it. But pulling it forward, this language also provides that as an overlay, in essence over those nccds, would be the ages that I anticipate that we're going to be making with respect to ads and parking, the preservation of existing homes, bonuses to ensure that, and the transition area mapping. That's the purpose of that amendment. Does anybody want to change that language? Council member Flannigan

>> Flannigan: So I've got language in my amendment that talks about nccds being reevaluated in the --in this context, and what -- what I want to understand is where nccds have design regulations might be fine. I'm not even entirely sure what those are, size of porches, but were they represented significant down-zoning of entitlements, then I don't necessarily want to codify those zoning categories in those nccds are going to be one to one mapped. I understand what you're saying on the ads, parking preservation transition area mapping, but, you know, I think it's important when we talk about nccds, an email from the current I believe, president of the contact team for Hyde park based on my comments from this morning. And she noted that the neighborhood was built out with single-family in the '30s and then was zoned for multi-family in the '60s, so before the current code even existed. And then between the '60s and I would assume 2002 or 2005, when either the main Hyde park or north Hyde park were passed, over 40 years evolved into what it is today.

[3:04:12 PM]

So even though the entire neighborhood, according to the county team president -- the entire neighborhood was zoned I-family in the '60s, it didn't immediately get bulldozed and turn into multi-family. It took 40 years to get to the condition that it's in that we recognize is great, that people point to and they say, Hyde park is a great neighborhood and it's mixed this and mixed that. So my hope is that we can look to Hyde park as an example of how a neighborhood evolved gently and incrementally over many decades by applying zoning equitably across the neighborhood, which was then eliminated when the NCCD came in. So to the extent that an NCCD is design guidelines or other types of things that aren't just about the number of units, I don't know that I particularly care that much. I don't care about those any -- I don't get any of those in my district, but nonetheless, I don't want to be codifying what was a down-zoning of the 1960s. To be fair to the folks in Hyde park, a zoning that was matching the current condition, right? So they didn't down-zone an existing multi-family and zone it single-family, but anything that was zoned single-family was single-family even since the '60s, so over the years it had been zoned multi-family. So I struggle with this because I really want to understand what we're saying we're preserving and carrying forward. Is it just the design guidelines or are we carrying forward the zoning that undid the gentle and incremental growth that those neighborhoods experienced over 40 years.

>> As a housekeeping matter we have a main motion that's on the floor council member Alleyist do you move your amendment a?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: That's been moved, seconded by council member Casar. That's the amendment that's in front of us. The first page has -- no one has chosen to amend that yet. That gets us then to --

>> Kitchen: I would like to amend that.

>> Mayor Adler: No, the first page.

>> Kitchen: I have amendments to the first page.

[3:06:13 PM]

Bugout and finish. Finish what you're talking about now. We'll come back to that.

>> Mayor Adler: And we're going to get to everybody else's amendments on the first page to the degree that they are adding things, so we're past that at this point. I think the issue that's been raised by what's shown on page 2, that Mr. Flannigan has raised is with respect to the NCCDs, and what's in amendment a is NCCDs are carried forward but with the [inaudible] Adams and transition are and Flannigan is suggesting that be changed so NCCDs are reevaluated in light of the balance of the rest of the code. That's Mr. Flannigan's suggested change has the Ellis amendment. Is there a second to what Mr. Flannigan proposes? Council member Harper-Adison seconds that. Is there any discussion on that amendment from council member Flannigan? Yes, Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, I just want to clarify, is the amendment the same language from the Flannigan, Renteria and Harper-Madison document? The word saying specialized zoning district such as PUDs, regulating plans which exist today and are a type and should be carried over, zoning should be reevaluated?

>> Mayor Adler: Well, I would look at that. I mean, I -- I would divide the question on that. I'm fine with that first sentence because I think those things should be carried over, along with the nccds, but I have a problem with the language that begins with "Unique" and ends with "City." Because that's what conflicts with the language that was in there.

>> Caci think there's two conflicts. The two conflicts are, one, you changed -- I didn't read the -- there's the -- unique should be through the word city and contain no F 25 or

[inaudiblecont] Ning F 25. So we should just decide those two questions. I'm okay with the special -- word specialized all the way through the word citywide, but would also want to leave F 25 the way that you've described and I'm fine with cutting the sentence from the word unique to the word city.

[3:08:28 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We'll try to hit all these issues, we'll hit them all. It's going to be trouble if we're trying to juggle them all at the same time. So one issue in this is whether we carry F 25 forward. That's going to be decided to a degree on E question we make about nccds. I think that -- I'm not limiting just to this. If other people see other issues that are contained in this language, we can certainly parse it out and come to it, but let's first make the decision in front of us on T issue of, do we want to continue nccds with the overlay, or we could take a vote on continuing nccds without the overlay, but I think that those are the choices we have. But that's -- what we're going to talk about right now is continuing the nccds. Council member?

>> Tovo: Yeah, I have a lot to say on this issue, but I know that we have several members of our public who are here prepared to speak to nccds as well, so it's a little unclear to me whether we should actually have our deliberate now or afterward, but I guess, you know, I'll be glad to say my piece now, but again I would --

>> Mayor Adler: I think you raise a good point. I think if we have people here that want to speak --

>> Tovo: But I'll start by -- but I do want to make one point before it percolates out there. I think council member Flannigan, you're citing the rezonings that were done in, when was it, 2005. It's my understanding, and I think the public can fill this in, that those were requests of the owners, so that as you rightly said, so that the zoning would match the conditions on the ground. We have a lot of situations where in a neighborhood plan or in some kind of other general planning effort there were attempts -- no, there were desires that the council recognize to rezone tracts so that they matched the conditions on the ground. It's really typical. And so to come back 14 years later and start rezoning them back to what they were prior to a planning process would be a very odd diversion to take.

[3:10:38 PM]

But -- and I think our speakers will be able to speak to this, but as I mentioned on Tuesday, we have an area that is zoning very well. You know, as we look at the housing capacity, and we've had lots of conversations about who we're trying to provide housing capacity for. There's a majority renter class, as I've pointed out multiple times, the senses that Hyde park matches to most directly is in the 70% renter rate -- rate of renters I mean, that's who is the majority occupant of housing in Hyde park. So I guess I really need to understand why we would be going into an area that has developed in part through this nccd and take what has been a successful tool and eliminate it. It just seems to fly in the face of what we've said we want to do in areas that are -- anyway, that's --

>> Mayor Adler: So let's hear from some --

>> Tovo: I'm happy to through -- I'm sure our speakers will go through this as well but for those who missed our conversation on Tuesday, Hyde park is one of the highest density neighborhoods in Austin, at 9,416 people per square mile compared 3,769 per square mile. They have plentiful capacity still for further build-out. They have a diverse mix of housing types, and I believe they can quantify this with regard to the number of duplexes, the number of multi-family properties, the number of ads, condos, in addition to single-families. I think there are a lot of benefits. I would say, mayor, it's not clear to me because all of -- each of these nccds is different, and I do think there is some consistent, as I mentioned, the Hyde park nccd, for example, allowed ads before there was a citywide ordinance that made revisions to that. The lot sizes are different.

[3:12:38 PM]

I think asking our staff to go back and recommend some changes to bring those into consistency is appropriate. I do think the transition Zones, based on all of the different proposals around about transition Zones, is -- would be a challenge for the nccds because fairview park, nunes, nccd, possibly the nccds that are in your district, council member harper-madison. I'm not as familiar with those. They are -- they have a transition. I mean, part of the regulations were to provide for a transition from the commercial to the residential, and so I think that that is -- I think that that does undo what was an important provision of those nccds, and again, as we have in both of those cases, the nuna and Hyde park, you have small commercial centers, you have corridors with commercial centers. It's doing the job of providing for that transition. So I do want to talk about that piece of -- our amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: And we can certainly talk about it. My sense is, and the intent of this amendment, I think that generally speaking, and I know there are gradations -- there will be some people that just want to keep nccds the way that they are. There will be some people that want to allow for nccds to go away for the historical and other reasons. We know that at the very least that council member Ellis and I are not going to support either of those two options. We're going to support an option that is in the middle of that, that says we're going to continue nccds, and those nccds that are going to continue will be subject to those overlays. So my guess is there's not going to be votes to approve an amendment one side or the other side. I could be wrong, but that would be my -- that would be my guess. Yes, council member kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Thank you. So there's a couple of different questions here, but I'll speak to the one that you were focusing on.

[3:14:40 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Thanks.

>> Kitchen: With all due respect, I don't see what you're suggesting as a middle ground, and let me explain why. I think that when we talk to -- I'm looking specifically at the language that you all have that says that zoning map changes related to ads, parking, preservation uses and transition area mapping should be applied to the nccds. The problem that I have -- or it's really more of a question that I have is in some cases, depending on the nccd and depending on where you end up with, you're actually significantly changing the nccd. So you're not really keeping the nccd if you're going to put transition area mapping as an overlay. You're also not necessarily keeping the nccd -- that's the one that probably, as far as I can tell, and I'm certainly not an expert on nccds, so I guess my point is that I really appreciate the effort to -- to think here some middle ground might be, but my thought is it might be more of a middle ground if we just said that we need to evaluate and look at nccds with these kinds of principles in mind and -- because we don't have them yet. I'm not comfortable saying that -- that we're trying to map all of these areas -- all of these things on to nccds because I don't know what the effect is.

>> Mayor Adler: And I understand that, and -- and you had also expressed that earlier, so I would anticipate that this isn't something that you're going to be a no to support, but where council member Ellis and I were in looking at this was trying to figure out kind of the operational issues. I think we believe that if we're going to adopt as a policy in the city a citywide policy with respect to ads and we want them to be available in more places for people. If we're going to adopt as a city the policy that says we want to make sure that there are preservation bonuses so that it's less likely that people are going to tear down existing homes and we want to have this preservation bonus in the city, if we want to -- say we want to have the citywide policy with respect to parking applying citywide because we have a city policy associated with that and the transition areas so that we get additional missing middle housing, then where we were, we were saying okay, we're going to do those citywide, then everybody should be subject.

[3:17:14 PM]

I recognize that some people will disagree with that, and it could be that there will be seven votes to say let's not put any new burdens or indicate that we want new burdens on nccds at this point and it could be that there's a majority of the vote people that say they want to get rid of nccds. I don't know. We'll see how this plays out, but that was our thinking behind this at the place where we could get seven votes, or six votes, and then -- and then move on. Council member Harper-Madison.

>> Harper-Madison: I want to make certain to convey to the residents of Hyde Park that -- I know it probably feels like you're getting picked on, but I'm going to refer to this just because it was brought up. We

recognize that Hyde park is a neighborhood that's a stable community in Austin but that to say, we also must be honest with ourselves and remember that multiple history records indicate that the neighborhood was intended for whites and for whites only. These records that is de facto restrictive covenants that maintain the comic and racial segregation of the city of Austin. I'd also like to point out that they carve out special antigrowth exemptions for individual neighborhoods that only exacerbate the continuing equity divide between the eastern and the western halves of our city. If we as a council are truly committed to increasing Austin's household affordability, its housing stock AOC undoing the wrongs of racism and classism that have checkered our city's past, we should not grant more privileges to those who are already privileged. I'd also like to point out that while Hyde park might be 70% renters, Hyde park rent is 10% higher than any other part of Austin.

[3:19:15 PM]

I'd also like to say I would love to have staff go back and help us to determine if 70% of the people in Hyde park rent because they can't afford to buy there. That's all. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Do we want to hear from the people in the public to testify? Let's call some people up to talk Mr. Hersh? Why don't you come on down. Mr. Pena, you're on deck.

>> Mayor, members of the council from district 2. I want to share with you some comments that are a result of what I've been trying to follow in your work sessions in the planning commission deliberations on Tuesday night relative to affordability, code amendments, and how they tie into your directions today. There appears to be a lot of confusion about us changing accessibility standards, and if I'm reading your drafts correctly, the technical codes, like the international building code, which sets out the number of accessible parking spaces related to the number of parking spaces on standard. None of this changes from the act on your agenda today. And so the only way you get to a conflict with the Americans with disability act or the fair housing act is if you were trying to put something in your ordinances that conflicted with state law, but haven't seen anything on the message board that suggests that. So I've given you a package that shows you what the accessibility standards are now and what will happen if for -- if your direction at the end of today is to eliminate all parking, for example which may be one of the things on the table or may not be, what that would look like in terms of its interface with the technical codes and what it will look like if -- on all the sites will have at least one parking space.

[3:21:23 PM]

So I wanted to highlight that for you. I also want to tell you what I think you all know anyway, because you support housing affordability. The more THA we entitle the land without linking it to affordability the more valuable the land is and the more expensive the land is. I live in district 2. We are a 55% home ownership district. Our housing sales price is \$100,000 below the citywide sales average, and our income level is \$30,000 below the city median income. So we're doing something in district 2, which is -- a lot of us are living in 1970s divisions, '70s, '80s, kind of subdivisions with relatively small lots and homes

that are generally not being demolished except when they're being removed from the floodplain, and I'm hoping that we end up at the end of the day with the kind of opportunities citywide that a lot of us now have in district 2. I didn't buy my first house until I was a renter here for 40 years and I was 65 years old and could claim a senior exemption, so it takes a while to get the down payment, but I want to see a lot of other people who aspire to be first-time home buyers and don't have to leave the city to go to Kyle or Buda or Manor or some other place to be able to remain here. So when you give directions, please take those goals into account. Thank you much.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Pool: Mayor, I have a question for Mr. Hersh. Thank you for the pages from the international building code. Could you clarify for me I'm looking at the two pages that you have here. If -- if no parking is -- and it shows that if you have 51 to 75 units, for example, then the minimum required number of expert roll-in showers -- and which is the parking?

[3:23:24 PM]

Is it on the next page?

>> Parking is in the third column forward -- there's two parking tables. One is for housing. That is table 1107.6.1.1, column 3, and if you provide 1 to 25 spaces then you're required to have one accessible unit. And -- and then on the last page, accessible parking requirements, so that talks about accessible units.

>> Pool: Right.

>> On the last page, accessible parking spaces are a function of total spaces provided, not total spaces required. So the only way you end up with no accessible parking spaces on a site is if you're not -- if you don't put any on there in the first place because you're not required to.

>> Pool: Exactly, which was the point -- that was what I had understood as well, and I think that some of the concerns that we have been hearing from the community, folks who have disabilities, is that there is the potential, and we have talked about this repeatedly in work sessions and everything, we don't want it to happen that those folks inadvertently don't have a place for them to park their vehicles when you recognize that sometimes that is about the only way that they can get around our community, and we need to have provisions that align with the Americans with Disabilities Act and don't violate it at all, which none of us intend to do at all, to make sure that we keep our community of disabled residents in mind when we are looking at parking minimums and whether we require any parking at all.

>> And the solution I pose is based -- since I've left city employment I primarily build affordable housing at 30% median family income with seniors and people with disabilities. That's most of my work, and what I've found is that the lenders will not allow you to have zero parking.

[3:25:29 PM]

You generally have to have one parking space for every four beds. So if get to a place that is generally consistent with that kind of standard, we can address the concerns about people with disabilities not having accessible parking spaces on-site, and the balance of it will be preserved by what we already have in our technical codes and in federal law.

>> Pool: Thank you so much.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Pena?

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor? I just want to mark that I have some language that we'll get to later, that addresses the -- and thank you, council member pool. I appreciate that, Stewart. I think that the language that I'm going to suggest and talk about later is -- I don't want to leave that till later, so we'll get to it. I think at this point in time if we're talking about -- if we're talking about changes to our parking requirements, we need to -- we need to address the ADA issues now. So -- but we'll get to that later.

>> Mayor Adler: If there's nothing inconsistent with that then we'll get that when we get to those amendments, and a lot of your amendments I agree with, including the amendment I think that you raised that said even if we don't require any parking, there should be some spaces ADA. I think there will be support for that and when we get to your amendments we'll be able to cover that. Thank you, Mr. Pena goes, and then after him Hank Smith.

>> Good afternoon, Mayor and Council members, Gus Pena again, native of East Austin, 2327 East Fifth Street. Council member Harper-Madison, you're right on target, Kathie, Council member Tovo, you came on with some good points. Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> All I can tell you is this. Since Bruce Todd was -- peruse Todd was Mayor I've been supporting housing for homeless people. Affordability has been a key point in my life even when Bruce Todd was Mayor, subsequent Mayors else, Bill Wynn, and right now Austin is not an affordable town.

[3:27:36 PM]

You can see it's affordable in some parts, but affordable for whom? People are being driven out of Austin because of the lack of affordability. It's too expensive. They're going to Pflugerville and if you go south it's going to be even worse. It's getting worse everywhere. I have not been able to buy -- I mean, the -- the VA says I can buy now, but it's been very tough to find a unit with what the VA provides us with. You cannot purchase a home with a voucher from the VA, but you know what? Council member Harper-Madison says it's right true, it is difficult for many. It's not even a dream anymore. It's a nightmare for a lot of people. They're in the streets. And I cry, and I tell you, it ain't good for our people. The city is on the map to be one of the most precious cities in the United States of America. It's not good for the people of low socioeconomic status. We can't afford it. And it's going to take all of you all to come back together and brainstorm to provide a good process, and I know you don't like it, but I'm going to stay with it again. Council member Harper-Madison and Kathie Tovo said it's not our town anymore. It's more expensive. So any kind of plan that you have, please make it real true -- and when people say

affordable, I say affordable for whom? Give me a definition of affordability, please, that I can give to my veterans, the single family veterans that are homeless with children, not just apartments, something -- you know, it's -- it's not a dream anymore to own. It's a nightmare. I can't grasp it. It's too far away.

[3:29:38 PM]

That's why a lot of people think about it that way. I'm not -- Stewart is the expert. I'm not. All I can tell you is what I told Bruce Todd subsequently and others, Lee Leffingwell, Will Wynn, and I'll wrap up, and just please me it affordable for everybody. Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Smith? Hank Smith? What about Rick Collins? Mr. Collins? While he's coming, ey mmswood, is Ramsey midwood here? You're going to be up after Mr. Collins. Mr. Collins. You haveeehr minutes.

>> Thank you. My name is ray Collins. Today I'm addressing you as the chair of the south nchaca neighborhood plan contact team. I have a request for a council direction to city manager cronk. Sometime in the spring of 2017 after the release of the codenext draft 2 text there was an unfulfilled promise of architectural models of codenext draft 2 open house at the codenext draft 2 open houses. Assuming that there will be open houses for the land developmen code reboot, I want to see what a triplex looks like alongside 40 to 60-year-old homes built when 11 square feet was considered family home for three toive people. I alsoeque R modeling for the eastern side of the 4400 to 5500 blocks of manchaca road B on the density-depetrant tion Zones ranging from 2 to 7 lots deep discussed at last Tuesday's council work session. In the segment of manchaca road, which is our geographic area, what will be behind the gas station, the small professional office complex, single-family homes, duplexes, condos, apanttr complexes and the restaurant that's present there.

[3:31:47 PM]

From the 4500 to T 5200 blocks of manchaca, our drainage infrastructure is R one the road itself flowing into Williamson creek, where it enters our area in the 5400 block of manchaca. So last, but F from least, I want to kno the impact of car or development on the ever expanding William creek floodplainns dream, particularly in sthwood districts -- Southwood districts 2 and 3's portion of the south manchaca neighborhood plan. Thank you . >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Mr. Midwood? And is Sarah cook here? You'll be up nex you have time donated from Betsy kubien. Is Betsy here? And what about Laurie wedlock? So you'll have seven minutes youenet called up. I think we're at eht speakers right now. Remember the first 20 speakers get three mutes and after that the speakers get ainut you have three minutes, sir.

>> Good afternoon, mayor and council members. My name is Ramsey midwood and I'm the current owner of Sam's town point, which is a bar, slaughtert a manchaca region part of an kitchen's deal over there, and -- Ann kitchen's deal over there, and I know that there's a tremendous amount of

development that's going to go on down in that region. I just wanted to introduce myself and try to become part of that planning area because we've got a lot of park-deficient areas kind of right around there that -- I don't know, I kind of have a vision, I guess, of how things would develop there between the tower and Indian roller and Sam's town point and -- there's kind of a -- I wouldn't call it an entertainment district but it's an emerging entertainment sort of situation, and would look to be able to create, I don't know, areas where folks can kind of -- pedestrian traffic and kind of commercial zone I'm very unfamiliar with speaking. With council, and the colonel is here and I got my partner Scott Mason here, and you guys want to -- got a minute?

[3:34:10 PM]

Help me get this situation -- I would just like to invite everybody down there to kind of take a look and walk around and perhaps I can kind of illustrate some of the things that we're thinking about down there in the future, and I know that we're not really included in the future plan as I look at the maps, but we would like to be, and there's kind of a plan sort of emerging organically there that I think that if we all work together we could make it a pretty cool little scene down there a kind of address affordable housing from the point of creating more wealth for the artistic class and also entrepreneurs that want to come and kind of generate some income so they can afford to be housed.

>> Mayor Adl: Thank you. Council member Kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Yes, thank you very much. Thank you for providing this information. We'd love to talk with you further. I asked my staff to come down if you're going to stay for a few minutes. If not, we'll reach out to you later.

>> Okay, we'll stay around.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor? Mayor, I have a quick question for you before our next speakers come up, for you and council member Ellis. Something you said made me wonder if I was interpreting a provision on amendment A incorrectly, and so I think it's helpful to clarify for the public's benefit as well. On page 3, so when you were talking about nccds you talked about changes regarding parking and transit and other -- and the preservation bonus applying citywide. In provision on page 3 under the code text, talking about provision incentives, preservation incentives and the ability to construct an additional unit, is it your intent -- how does that sentence read? It says preservation incentives should be expanded everywhere in the urban center, or defined as the mansion area, and outside the urban core, but within a quarter mile walk shed from an activity center, et cetera. So that -- is it your intent that preservation incentives apply citywide just within a quarter mile?

[3:36:19 PM]

And does that -- is that quarter mile consistent in the urban core and outside the urban core? As you were summarizing -- summarizing things you said that those things would apply citywide. As I read your document I didn't -- I didn't necessarily see -- I got a different impression, that some of these were just applying in particular areas of the city.

>> Mayor Adler: You are correct, the preservation incentive, which is saying we'll give somebody an additional unit but only if they maintain the existing home by way of incentivizing or helping to preserve homes so that people don't tear them down in order to be able to get an additional unit. When I said applied citywide, I meant the policy is a citywide policy, but you are correct, the citywide policy does not have that particular bonus available in every place in the city. So what it says is that it would be expanded everywhere in the urban core, it would be everywhere in the urban core, find as the mansion, and it would also be outside of the urban core, but only in the places outside the urban core that are within a quarter mile walk shed of the activity center, activity corridor, transit priority network. And it was done in an effort to add a preservation element. So to the degree that you had an nccd area that was one of those defined areas, then this would apply to that nccd as well.

>> Tovo: Okay, so I -- well, it would apply to it because the --

>> Renteria: Are we just jumping around now or are we just -- I thought we were focusing on 5 and then we went into accept public comment, and now we're all the way down here to question -- what is it? 3?

>> Tovo: I'm happy to explain why I raised the question, because there was just a comment that these would apply citywide -- I mean, we were talking about nccds, we have speakers here who are going to talk about nccds.

[3:38:21 PM]

I think to the extent which the policies we're discussing are going to apply citywide and the extent to which the amendments, including this one, that really -- really limit those changes to the urban core and not citywide are -- are relevant --

>> We had an intention of pulling that one.

>> Tovo: I'm sorry.

>> Renteria: We had an intention of pulling that one.

>> Tovo: But because the mayor had made a comment I wanted to make sure -- I thought I wasn't reading it correctly and I needed to clarify that as we're moving forward.

>> Mayor Adler: And it's correct, we have some rules that apply citywide, but that doesn't mean they apply to every parcel within the city. We have rules that apply citywide with respect to how tall sf-2 can be, but that doesn't mean that it applies to tracts that are not sf-2. So this is a citywide proposal with respect to preservation ordinance, but it doesn't apply to every lot within the city. And it describes which lots that this citywide policy applied to. Let's continue on with the discussion. Ms. Cook, come

occupy, you have seven -- come on up. You have seven minutes. Is Frances Mac entire here? No? What about Timothy Baray. You have seven minutes, Ms. Cook.

>> If I was feeling nes before I am now. My name is Sarah cook. I'm here to talk about neighborhood preservation and plan combines districts I'm will co-president of the Hyde park neighrhoobo association. I'm here to speak with you again. I want to first address councilwoman harper-madison's opinions. I hope we can talk about this later. Hyde park shares the shame the rest of the city around racial THAs that was provided. A number of our people worked to get the D restrictions lifted from every property even though they're not enforceable. We were told that couldn't happen without an act of the legislature but maybe we can take that up again.

[3:40:27 PM]

But I want to say the reasons when Hyde park was platted. I want to taltouk the second point about rents being higher. I don't think that's the case. One of the problems is they pull only with apartments that list wteh them. I think I've sn rent cafe before as a place that data is taken from. That doesn'tdelu I the smaller accessory dwelling units and the garage apartments that we believe provide a lot more rental opportunities. I think one problem with those units is that they aren't listed on these larger sites, which means they can be less accessible to the public and persons in the know. I don't know if any of '6 read Matthew Desmond's book evicted but he makes that point that a lot of rentals D folks who might benefit from this don't know how to find them so we can address that. T I I wanted to mention those two points and we're happy to talk about rents and look forward to it. But now for the first, S please, I think that you've gotten -- do I advance it? Thank you. I think you've got some of the hiy, torse are a national tool used here in Texas. There are 20n -- 20 in Dallas, nine in San Antonio. Ey'rthoften used for commercial like on 11th and 12th street but they're residential and commercial as in Hyde park. We have two of them in Hyde park as you know. I want to make a mention about the multi-family housing there are at least 35 fivus unit properties including rental and ownership opportunities in the southern Hyde park portion. I did a ltle count of my own in my census on Tuesday, returned 18 multi-family properties with 755 multi-family rentals in south Hyde park. As you heard from compleb council member tovoo.

-- Nccds create cesive spaces anden sses of place. For us I think tshi means we have homes that are in conversation with the street, and with one another. Weo not allow privacy fences within Hyde park and we have fewer homes that are much higher than others as we've seen in other neighborhoods as they're redeveloped.

[3:42:31 PM]

We believe they protect and encourage density, again, we've talked loot a lot about the ads and the garage apartments. One interesting feature of the nccds in Hyde park is they have actually a parking maximum so while we carried forward the conversations around park we mayant to consider

understanding what happened there in that conversation. And I want to point out that over 50% of the lots in northern Hyde park are multi-unit, currently built that way, not just zoned that way. And of course we're looking for affordability applying across the city and Hyde park as well. I want to talk a little bit, council member Flannigan, about the council zoning question. I know you've had conversation with the chair of the contact team. I think she mentioned that this multi-family zoning was applied 31 after the spheamtion homes were built out. It's interesting there's a tension here between the very built areas of Austin and those being developed and built out in and out now and this represents that. No multi-family structures were down zoned as a result of nccd. Some were moved from mf-4 to sf-3. Let me show you why. Ness a property built in 1908, zoned multi-family in '31. Down zoned to sf-3 in 2002. It's a contributing structure to Is 3. I think a lot of neighbors at thee didn't have a protection of a lhd used the city process to preserve the historic homes that ultimately became contributing structures. Here an example of a great cute duplex on Duval street, built in 1937. This is allowable use under sf-3 in 2002. The property changed hasn't 2014, an out of state owner from California, but Weder if some of the provisions of T nd to keep this as sf-3 has preserved this market affordable duplex rental that's in the middle of the neighborhood. I want to quickly show you some of the stuff that's buildable under the nccd. Two new units replaced a single-family on one lot.

[3:44:31 PM]

This W built around 2016 after the north -- 2006 after north Hyde park. That's an intrated duplex that's single-family and to the right you can see there's a duplex already existed and new ones being added. This is an accessory structure that has 400 feet of square feet in it replacing a simple two-car garage. These are two new fourplexes that were built with 1929 dges right in the -- cottages in T heart of Hyde park. We have new missing middle housing. These properes were rezoned from sf-3 to multi-family 4 with neighborhood support we've created two new multi-unit neighborhoods. Is is an evolving neighborhood and we're pleased to how that. One example, here's a four-story 23 unit building on Guadalupe and the rest of Guadalupe is zoned for this structure. All this is possible under the nccd. Also want to make the point that the nccds are amendable. We incorporated state land and worked with developers to add 135 units at waller eek side. We've amended it twice in the past two years, one to upzone helping hands, added residential capacity for the children there also we rezoned baker school, in fact, we zoned it to include a housing opportunity with aordable housing provisions. There are future opportunities to evolve this doment to meet the goals of Austin that we all share. This isn't -- this isn't something that is preserved in amber, as one of our steering committee members always warns us against. Don't preserve the neighborhood in amber. Well, we're not. I want to quickly pnt out that the transit corridors and transition zones will be an important conversation that the neighborhood was built out before the '60s, and the auto-focus development that occurred then, only five blocks, that purple line, on one street within the neighborhood, this is both north and south Hyde park, do not fall into that quarter mile transition zone, so we want to be thoughtful about that. And in summary, I want to be clear that this isn't about keeping development out of Hyde park. This isn't about preserving our neighborhood in amber. It's also about not relegating our conversations to Facebook and Twitter. It's about iingit you to come visit with us and see this plan neighborhood. It's about understanding what we've done to create this complete and walkable community.

[3:46:35 PM]

Coming to conversation, and watching the principle of zoning become the practice in person. We're excited for the visit we scheduled in June and we invite every one of you as we have in the past to speak and talk with and address these issues and see what they look like in Hyde park. Thank you.

>> All right. So I was going to talk today about, you know, you all -- I want to talk specifically about why housing in the urban corridor is important, for transit -- I had, not just in corridors but building central in corridors. So, you know, most of us, like we have -- -- choice to use transit or choice to drive, for those of us that have that choice. You look at the advantages of each -- driving intends to be convenient timing, easier point to point and faster -- for public transit, no parking, don't have to drive than at the key thing is faster per mile, generally it's one T bus, you have to go slower, makes more stops. So that affects the equation -- length you have to go affects the equation. So I used an example here, just some Times from Google maps. At 11:30 obviously during peak times it will be way longer than this but the time it takes driving from downtown to Guadalupe and 39th, and, you know, to driving or the bus or biking, the transit center, the department of land on north Lamar, as you can see the distance between the times becomes a lot more, for example, on the next slide, if you were making the choice whether to take the bus or to take -- to drive, if you're at Guadalupe and 39th it's like a four-minute difference. Now, you look at your equation and say, it might take me five to ten minutes to park downtown.

[3:48:38 PM]

Well, five minutes will still be faster to park downtown -- sorry, to take the bus downtown because, you know, the difference between the times transit length time isn't as much. But if you're north Lamar -- panamer lane you're like 25 minutes and this is by the way off peak again, so probably like 30 to 40 minutes regular time. That five minutes of parking is a lot less than that 25 minutes. And a similar thing with biking. You know, if you -- six minutes, not a big difference, especially if you have to consider things like parking but almost an hour, yeah, you're very unlikely to bike. Also I wanted to talk about some of the other advantages of living central, walking, biking, taking a scooter. Do you have any statistics off the top of my head but I know biking over three or four miles most people are less likely to do it, so -- in a lot of cases also when you're commuting you might have different choices that you want to make. Someday if it's raining outside you're not going to want to bike as much but you might take the bus, you know you might -- like what I used to do, I would bike in the morning when it was cooler and then take the bus back when it was 100 degrees out, at 4:00 P.M. Another advantage of being more central is if you wanted to use rideshare as one of your modes, rideshare is a lot cheaper, if you're closer in, the shorter distance you have to go to go. If you're driving, shorter distance I think they get dismissed in this conversation, it's not about getting people out of their cars for driving center, it's about if you're driving, if [inaudible] ten miles. Anyway, that's what have.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Is Chris Wadsworth here? Is Kevin mcglove Lynn here? You'll have five minutes. Is Austin Talbert here? You'll be on deck. Go ahead, you have five minutes.

>> Thank you. I have a presentation. Thank you for giving the opportunity to speak today.

[3:50:39 PM]

I'm [inaudible] A resident. Day I'm speaking for myself. We need more housing for more people. We're in the middle of a housing crisis. And Austin for everyone. Put that in your mind today when you're debating amendments. Will this amendment help make an Austin for everyone or not? If the amendment won't help give more housing for new people, for the next generation, for immigrants, for refugees, you should oppose the amendment. Again, we're in the middle of a housing crisis. Look at this map. All the green on the left, that's single-family zoning, and then on height, that that's multi-family zoning. That's the status quo. That's what we're living with right now. Almost 90% of residential zoning in the city of Austin is single-family. This is a city of Austin document, by the way. So I'd like to ask everybody here, where have you lived? Now, with the status quo, think about this. Austin is 55% renters, and now we have renters on council as well. Where in the audience is a renter? Who has lived somewhere that wasn't a single-family detached house. I have, my parents lived in a mobile home in four points. I've lived in subsidized housing, on Lake Travis, in dorms and barracks, and in the rain on multiple occasions, lived in an apartment and lived in a single-family house. I'd be okay with any form of housing next to me. Compatibility concerns are grounded in the idea that certain types of homes and a certain type of people are incompatible with single-family housing, with the idea that people in single-family housing shouldn't have to live next to people in apartments. Strengthening compatibility going to help make an Austin for everyone? I don't think so. On Tuesday there was concern about people who live in between two corridors. I mean, it sounds great to live in between two corridors but I don't see why we should be protecting these areas against duplexes, apartments, barbershop pay C des and the like.

[3:52:46 PM]

Compatibility. In other words, it's part of the reason our city is so expensive. Transition ones are part of the reason the city is so expensive. Now let's talk housing capacity. Instead of asking ourselves what should be the housing -- zoning target, we should be instead asking ourselves why should we have housing capacity target in the first place? If the first Austinites had instituted an equivalent set of ordinances, many of us wouldn't be here today. Again, upzoning is costless. If we're going to plan for the future we need to stop giving in to the impulse to make outsiders pay a pro tem premium to live in our great city. We need an Austin for everyone. Also while we're talking about housing capacity, Jack Kramer made an excellent point on his blog. So please ask staff to bring an analysis of the housing capacity as many housing advocates point out, we need a housing capacity that's three to four times the total number we want to create. Staff should provide the calculations they used. We get two-thirds of housing inside the core that the status quo. It must be rejected. Staff should present several scenarios to

meet the housing goals and costless to upzone and cheaper to provide the much needed public esicse inside the core than in the suburches. Missing middle. So is T Chicago three flat, so is the six unit three-story brownstones. This is the miss middle that we've been talking About with codenext for five years plus. And there's no difference between housing -- or neighborhood scale and transit scale missing middle. It's all needed. All across the city. No this is triplexes and fourplexes in 2014. Is is where they're at in the city right now, and they -- I have no -- I had no clue they're all over the city like this. So in conclusion, please make an Austin for everyone. Please support amendments that help us get more housing for more people.

[3:54:49 PM]

Thank you.

Ayor Adler: Thank you

>> Mayor, if I may real quick, they're not here yet but we're about to have some special guests. Girl scout troop no. 596 from the walnut creek service unit is about to come and visit us, and I wanted to Rea little note from their troop leader real quick. She says they are all extremely exit toed meet their city government. They acted like I told them they were going to meet one direction. They might be shy and quiet, but please know that this means so very much to them and they might feel a little intimidated. Thanks again. So just giving you guys a heads-up, when they get her we'll give them a quick knowledgment. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds goo Mr. Talbert, Ron thrower is on deck. Why don't you come on down.

>> Hi, everyone, thank you for having me. This is my first time I thought I should bring a gift so I brought some pictures. This is the map from 1928 and that infamous plan that started legalized segregation in our city. If you look at it, that's also where our 15 most walkable neighborhoods, all but one are on THA map in 1928. This is according to walk score. The online is brentwood, and it was shortly platted right after it was outside the city limits. So if you talk about the core of our city where we need that is connected, it's walkable, it's already there. The only problem I the last 20 years those areas have be me less dense. 'S TRE census data. It's -- the people are having to mov further out. Those neighborhoods are filtering up to nicer, nicer neighborhoods, right if you look at our whole CI it's the same in Hyde park, it's theme in north university. The missing middle is shrinking, right? In 2009 we had 15.1 missing middle, now we have 13.3% from the latest acs. Imagine Austin housing blueprint, it says we need missing middle.

[3:56:50 PM]

I won't read all of these. It's everywhere. We all agree. U'veaid it in your work sessions. I'm thankful everyone is in agreement we want missing middle. Some of you expressed you don't quite understand what it is. But it does fit with our VALU. So we have to have a code that fits those values, and the zoning

to fit those values, and it has to be simple enough THA it can empower small-scale indeenpe and local developers, to build it. Your neighrs to build it. So I want to learn more about missing middle, so last week I drove down to San Antonio and attended a workshop put on by the incremental developers alliance. This is a nonprofit that was founded and run by practitioners that have been doing this, building naturally affordable missing middle housing for decades. They're in Dallas, they're in Atlanta, they're all over the country. We have a lot of things going for us. We're diverse, we're weird, we're innovative, we're community center. Edthat's my name, I'm also all those things, and we need housg choices that fit all this, right? So that's got to have a variety of sizes. We need more lots. Hyde park has small lots. That's awesome. We need to legalize that everywhere. When you legalize things that made Hyde park judges hill and looking at these amazing things, council member tovo, I wt to thank you for what you did on Tuesday, walking through your neighborhood, we need that legal. It's not legal everywhere. We need to relegalize things that made it great. This is what it could look like. This is beautiful and amazing and it's going to provide more housing for more people and this could be in all of our city. They got to be smaller. We need to get rid of parking minimums. We need to be able to walk and bike and take transit. We need to most important empower small scale developers, me, you, your neighbor, your friends. There's the imencal development alliance wants to help empower people in Austin. I invite you all, I'm going to sponsor a workshop and invite you all to come attend. You're going toearn a lot about it and I hope you and your staffs will attend.

[3:58:54 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is Karen Mcgraw here? You'll be up next after Ron

>> Mayor, mayor pro tem, councilmembers, Ron thrower. I want to thank you for the efforts y'all are doing to move things forward. If there's anybody that realizes we need a new code, I think it's myself more than anybody. For a little bit of relief I'm not going to be speaking about housing, more about process and it's not the process you'rengoihrough now. It's the process I'll be faced with in the end. We deal with zoning, site plans for properties all around Austin so we'n the trenches every day, not a day goes by we don't reference the codes ten to 20 times and our office is 500 feet away from one Texas center where we walk over there anywhere from 5-10 times every day. I'm Ver concerned. This is all with the 750 pageode that we have today with an 11-12 point type and if Y look at version 3 it's a 1500 plus page code, it's a lot of words, very verb boast. I have a lot ofcernon about what that will cost in the end. Jokingly I have said the code is going to make me a lo money. I want y'all to me the code as simple as possible so that I can get 30660 projects permitted every year instead of 10-15. I K thin would be great for Austin. So I want y'all to please concentrate on the simplicity of the code cause planning commission even looked at it and says parkland take a third of the works out of the codwe eed something that's gonna be Thi, something we can get through a lot easier so we can get projects done a lot faster. And, again, I don't want to make as much money as I'm making right now. Help me make not as much money as I have right now.

[Laughter] That would be great. I know, Mr. Flannigan, it sounds odd. I think I'm the only developing consultant that's saying this, that's true. I'll also point out and I'm ry appreciative and not trying to call

you out on this but I'm gonna take credit for about ten years ago I had a case at this very podium and I said density a community benefit.

[4:01:03 PM]

It is very much a relief to hear it coming from the other side of the podium for a change. Thank you.

>> Flannigan: Mayor. I think I said housing is a community benefit, just to be clear.

>> Mayor Adler: Is Jared Blaca here? No? What about Debra

[indiscernible].

>> Thank you. Mayor, councilmembers, Karen McGraw, architect, it's been here a long time, lived in Hyde Park over 40 years. If you don't know me I chaired all the neighborhood planning work for that, been in many neighborhood meetings. I find our citizens in Austin to be creative and hard working and willing to help you figure out how to densify our city without destroying their neighborhoods and I hope that we all have respect for that and for those people being involved in this process. I'm a little concerned that we're bringing this thing back. We've got to Reay hurry and we may be consulting some of that out but what I really want to do is to see what we can do to maintain that greatest place to live in the country and not damage it as we go forward. My main concern today, and I could talk to you about many things, but I'm going to talk to you about neighborhoods. Because when you brought draft three back, it took out neighborhood planning as a program and CCDs as a program. That means there are no neighborhood planning programs in the code. And that means you have tools. And I really think that's a big mistake. I don't know what to tell you to do about it. I think if you keep the programs we have that's a start. I think instead of tossing them, the better thing to do is say, how do we improve these programs?

[4:03:04 PM]

One thing you need to keep in mind and Mayor Pro Tem mentioned this the other day, why are there CCDs in some areas and not other areas of the city? I will tell you why. Because that code came into the code in 1985. The city did not CCD in fair view, said they'd do more but they dropped the program. So an CCD is a tedious process of conservation of a neighborhood that all has to be done by the neighbors. It's either done by experienced volunteers or paid consultants because the city does not offer conservation or preservation to neighborhoods. The city staff will not do those things. So if you want to help neighborhoods, you really need to get serious about what tools you have and what tools your city offers. Because when these are gone the city will offer no help to neighborhoods at all. So I hope you will keep that in mind. The neighborhood planning process that's 20 years old is an infill process. That's all it is. It's intended to infill the city. It's not even intended to address conservation or preservation. So you don't have a program to help neighborhoods with those things. And I think that's a real shame. I also want to mention when you talk about, well, we're going to keep CCDs but change all these things, I want to say their overlays in the current code. That's not as simple as it sounds and because they were done with

tremendous stakeholder participation and notification and everything I think we want that same process for their amendments.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Thanks so much.>> M or Adler: Okay. Debra, come on up. Is Sharon Blythe here? Why don't you come on down.

>> My name is Debra, I've been an architect for four years.

[4:05:08 PM]

I live in Allandale. I'm sort of in the same situation as she was, I'm here to discuss keeping these neighborhoods, particularly those of that natural resources that need to be maintained. For example, along Shoal Creek Boulevard near the Shoal Creek area, which is where Allandale is, we have really old, big trees that if development is allowed to come in and build greater areas, those trees will go. The trees provide shade. They provide -- they take away carbon dioxide from our air, and they -- so they give an amenity that is equal to reducing traffic or to -- you get more cars off of roads. So I would like to see something like a nccd or something to allow for various neighborhoods that have these areas of greenery to be maintained to keep our -- the environmental success that they bring rather than building greater areas. My other greatest concern is flooding. We have expansive clays in Austin. Expansive clays don't absorb much water after we get a little rain. We all know that. Therefore, they start acting like concrete. If you start -- it's not difficult. If you put more impervious area on a site, the amount of water that was on -- that was being absorbed by the ground before will be less. That's it. So if we start doing these development with more impervious coverage you're going to have to go to surface drainage do make it work developers generally don't include that simple residential developer don't include that in their pricing and I don't know if the city has subsurface drainage system to take it over, which brings up - - so as to keep water on your site as the law requires and to prevent it from being drained on to the street, you have to get it off some way, and the soil is not going to absorb it so it has to come off into subsurface drainage.

[4:07:26 PM]

Developers don't do it. This morning I was walking down the street and a developer just bulldozed a single-family house where young students are living four at a time to be able to afford living in Austin. So don't forget, single-family houses have four people in them, which sometimes requires more cars because they have to go to different jobs. My own house, my sister and son live with me in a single-family residence. Single-family residences are not all bad, okay and could be multiple people. Anyway, if the developers, back to developers, they come in and they cut the trees.

[Buzzer sounding] To fit their buildings.

>> Mayor Adler: Finish your thought.

>> Saying they'll live. They don't. To we have to protect the trees, enforce our heritage tree policy.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> And developers should pay for the infrastructure required.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Thank you.

>> For subsurface drainage.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ms. Blythe, you want to come up here? Our last three minute speaker, is Carlotta Garcia here? Wh you's name? I'll give you both three minutes.

>> Sharon Blythe, I live in district 6. I want to thank this council for your proposing this plan because itgoing to make me an extremely wealthy woman. It's gonna make my property extremely wealthy to be able to subdivide it, put duplexes, triplexes, high-rises in it and it willmake me an extremely wealthy person so just think about what you're Doi. You're making people that already have means more wealthuseecf this code. You're notelping anything that you think you're helping. And I would appreciate it also if we would get some information out to district 6, really what's going on at city hall, because most of the residents out there don't have a clue. So, again, I want to thank you all for making me a very wealthy person.

[4:09:29 PM]

Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Blaca and then

[indiscernible] Garcia will be next. Is Enrique Sanz here? Is Michael Floyd here? You'll have three minutes when you're called up.

>> My name is Gerald blaca, I live in district 10. Thank Y forou allowing me to speak.

>> Mayor adln yca pull the microphone toward you?

>> Okay. I'm concerned because I'm not hearing a lot about preventing excessive storm runoff during this process. E wasn't a lot of talk about it during codenext. There's not a lot of talk about it now. And the reason'm here is I'd like tow S you an example of what was created because of poor planning by the city. This is the block I live on. Originally, it was plated with an alley, and you can see down the middle that's where the original alley was and there's proof that it existed. Eventually the city took away that alley. But what they probably didn't realize was T they took away the ability F about half of this B tlo be able to drain. Now all of the water flows through the adjoining properties. This all happens because th street reaches a high point and then all the --T actually goes down a hill, all the way to shoal creek.and so just the water needs a place to go and it's been blocked since the alley was taken away. And so now it

goes through the neighborhood. And my driveway turns into a major river, like when I first moved in, I had this idea of putting down crushed mpedeed granite, and I did.

[4:11:38 PM]

And it all ended up in shoal creek because I get so much water flowing through my property and it's all because they took a this alleyway and they didn't really plan it properly. So all I'm really asking is that you take into consideration local issues like this during this process and notus look at a map and say, okay, we'll put this zoning here, but, you know, there's information like this that's useful and, you know, we have to take into consideration what's happening in individual areas, and that's my -- what I have to say. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> That's my driveway after storm. But during the storm it's a river.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is Richard rip here? Mr. Rip? And then is Isabel Guerrero here? And is Trenton Henderson? You'll have three minutes, after Ms. Garcia is done.

>> Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Carlotta Garcia, I'm here with central Texas interfaith. Our organization is expanding from five to ten counti Thies year with the intent of doubling our leadership base to ensure that central Texas is hospitable and supportive of all types of families as we're discussing today, including fromleid and lower-income backgrounds and people experiencing homesteadness. For your information we' en spending considerable time fighting for local control and pushing back against the proposed tax caps. So we know from our conversations at our institution that's affordable is a key issue affecting our people. Our organization is conducting resrchea around ciesli impacting homelessness and implementation of the affordable housing bond, which we supported expanding to 250 million last year.

[4:13:48 PM]

We're also looking at tools that are articulated in the UT study on gentrification, uprooted and expngrihose options for our folks.ou intent is to continue to educate and engage our constituency around portunities to expand affordability in Austin. So last year our ganiortion raised a number of concerns around revisions to land use code and these are concerns that we think are still relevant today. We recognize that any land use code will not entirely solve the affordability problems. However, we believe that our code should be guided by two basic principles. The first is on displament. Displacement due to skyrocketing land values, housing cost rents and taxes should be minimized. Recognizing the historic injustice of previous land use practices that discriminated against whole segments of a community, including many from our congregations, recognizing we've got to take care in preventing further discrimination and displacement. Second, for Austin to he an inclusive and diverse population and be welcoming to both oldnd N a residents, there must be wide range of affordable housing options

based on the preservation of existing affordable housing stock. Encouragement of S alternatives as mobile home parks and incentivizing new construction for the full spectrum of incomes. Last month, we were pleased to see broad support from y'all for the expansion of the density bonus program, the downtown density bonus to promote affordable housing construction across the city and include multi-bedroom units targeted at those making below 60% mfi or even as low as 30%. We hope this expanded density bonus program will be implemented as designed. We do have some concerns about the convocation at hand and my colleague, Dr. Rib, will speak to those.

[4:15:54 PM]

>> Good afternoon. Hope everybody is eating their wheaties because y'all are on for a long slog with what you're starting here in public today. Thanks for doing it. My name is Dr. Rushed Rib, I'm with Austin Central Texas Interfaith. We are concerned. We're concerned the proposals to increase base density and others could undermine incentive for developers to participate in the proposed density bonus program because of state restrictions, density bonuses may be the best way to directly incentivize the construction of affordable housing units. Entitlements in residential zoning categories above and beyond those provided in the present land use code should not be granted by right but calibrated to incentivize the construction of affordable units in all parts of the city. Furthermore, something more or less equivalent to the present SF-3 zoning category should be retained and compatibility should be defined or redefined in terms that allow neighborhood to limit undesirable uses, particularly those such as bars and nightclubs in clusters. Similarly, we must ensure that changes to transition areas around our corridors do not exacerbate displacement pressures on communities that have already undergone drastic and rapid change. New development along transit corridors in central Austin has already contributed to the displacement of African-Americans and Latinx communities, families, and a further disrupting community traditions and congregational life. We hope that you will take our concerns into consideration as you deliberate on guiding principles moving forward. Increasing the affordable housing bond to 250 million and working to have it pass have led to a housework opportunity to address critical housing issues.

[4:18:04 PM]

We ask that you not lock yourself into a narrow path today. Your work today will have considerable influence on the bond's effectiveness in this once in a generation opportunity. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Thank you all. Jay Crawlsy? Is Beth [indiscernible] Here? Why don't you come on down. Let's be at the other podium. You have one minute, Mr. Crawlsy.

>> One minute? Hi, Jim Crawlsy live in D7, traditional 700 square foot duplex, I have to talk about what equity sustainable growth would mean, 5000 people a year about 2.5% growth every year so planning for ten years, every single neighborhood in our region, every place we have human habitat today should add housing for 25% more. If you asked your staff to develop a map that had zoning capacity of three to

four times, 25% more for every single neighborhood, that would be the equitable map and the sustainable map as well if you didn't include green field so that is the baseline for all these discussions of what would be equitable and sustainable, and we should go from there. All parking requirements are dangerous. Please stop -- and especially on small little streets where parked cars make them safer.

[Buzzer sounding] Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is [saying name] Here? Why don't you come on down to this podium. You have one minute.

>> Hello, council, thank you for hearing our thoughts day. My name is Beth, and I live in district 5. I've come to speak about housing cooperatives as they are an incredibly efficient and enriching affordable housing solution.

[4:20:07 PM]

I personally live in co-ops for eight years, not just as a student. There are at least 22 co-ops in Austin and many have been around since the '70s. A sense of how they run residents make decisions through democratic voting, pool resources and operate at cost upon comparing rent with neighboring properties we have seen they cost 40 to 60% of market rates. My sister lives in a co-op in the Bouldin creek area and her rent, utilities and all food and household costs \$700 a month. It's a beautiful well kept house with eight residents ranging from age 28 to 55. I believe that co-ops could be a great solution for Austin for all of these reasons, but we need to ensure.

[Buzzer sounding] That density is allowed in areas that won't just be bought up by wealthy developers and allow for these more democratic and resident-led solutions. Thank you

>> Mayor Adler: Is Francis Acuna here.

>> Pool: Mayor, I wanted to make a comment to our last speaker.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Pool: Thank you for your advocacy for cooperatives. Later on today, I know if you'll be here for this or not, but one of the amendments that I'm bringing forward will be to include cooperatives as one of the middle housing types in the list of permitted middle structures so I just wanted to let you known case you're not going to be here later on.

>> Okay.

Pool: Okay? Hopefully it will pass.

>> Mayor Adler: Is Francis Acuna here? You'll be up at this podium. You have one minute.

>> Hello, city council, mayor. My name is [indiscernible] And my request is simple. Austin needs more housing. We need more housing so that my children, grandchildren will have a place to live here in Austin.

[4:22:10 PM]

We need more housing because it helps with affordability, density, and diversity. So let's just make it easier to do so. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Is [saying name] Here? Go ahead. You have one minute please.

>> Good afternoon. My name is Francis Acuna. I'm a resident from Dove Springs. And as you may know already, we've been risking our homes with impervious cover in the mapping of the Missindlemi encouraging -- I encourage you to engage the community in all of these decisions that you're about to recommend. Demolition of homes that, you know, we have worked so hard in our community, it's -- you know, this is our home. We bought it. And we think of growing our kids in there, and if all of these recommendations, you know, building fourplexes and everything that you guys are going to recommend --

[buzzer sounding]

-- That is not a fair thing because --

>> More a thank you.

>> -- We are -- we have a voice.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Ms. Nas, you are our last speaker. Onut M

>> Oh. I'm sorry to --

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry

>> No worries. Thank you so much to everyone for your hard work. I know you stay long hours. So thank you for everything you do. I'm testifying here because I haven't had a chance to read through everything, but I do want to make an impassioned plea that we really need more housing and it can't all be in east Austin. I grew up in Austin, north Austin, and I've seen the city change and a lot of the diversity is -- has left the city, unfortunately.

[4:24:20 PM]

I don't believe that it's as sustainable as it used to be. A lot of my friends can barely afford to live here. I'm lucky enough to live in the city, but I worry for a lot of friends who barely make their rent. I trust you'll do the right thing. Thank you so much.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Yes, mayor pro tem.

>> Garza: While she's still here I wanted to comment briefly on I guess our responsibility as councilmembers and leaders of this city and much of the reason why Ms. Seguna came down to city hall

today after calling my office this morning was because of an email that was sent out that alarmed much of my district because--it one could read that email and be worried that we were about to pass things today that was going to create great flooding and great density and do all these bad things that people in district 2 really are rightfully afraid of. District 2 has phased horrific flooding. Where family members were lost. Where homes were lost. Where the city has had to invest significantly in buyouts to make it right, what was done. I've sat down with Ms. Francis and we've cried together over the things that have happened in district 2. And I just want all of us on this dais to be aware of the impact of the things that we put out there, whether be through your email list, whether it be -- however you decide to put information out there. Please be aware of the impact and the fear that can be created by things that are said by leaders of our city. And so I understand we all have the prerogative to say what we will and to address our constituents, you know, as we should.

[4:26:23 PM]

That's all our prerogative. But I just hope, you know, this -- I was really in this didn't become as divisive as it has so quickly. I've had a chance to significantly cool off from seeing that email this morning and hearing from very fearful constituents, and I want my constituents to know we are not making decisions today that will create flooding. In fact, the base motion right now includes a line that says the revised code text and map should result in reduced citywide impervious cover and improve citywide water quality. I intend to support that and I'm pretty sure there are more than six on this dais that will support that. So, excuse me, I have some allergy stuff going on. So I just want it clear to those watching who couldn't come down from district 2, we are not making decisions that will affect -- this is guidance to staff that bring back a draft, and there will be plenty of time to comment going forward. There's time to comment, and there's time for us to make it right and make it a code for all of Austin.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Harper-Madison, do you want to introduce girl scout troop 596?

>> Harper-Madison: I do. Welcome brownie try to have 596. I'd like to say welcome to you and your leaders and co-leaders, and volunteers this afternoon. Did guys get to take your tour yet? Oh, so I understand that you're gonna get one of the most fantastic tours of city hall, and I hope you really, really enjoy it. My colleagues and I are so happy to have you join us today and we look forward to you guys letting us know how your tour went. Thank you for coming.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. I think we have hi. Good to have you with us.

[Laughter] I think there actually is one more speaker. Is Michael here, Nahas? Come on down. You have a minute

[4:28:27 PM]

>> I'm sorry. I haven't seen anybody do this. Is it this up?

>> Mayor Adler: That's good.

>> Hi, Michael Nahas, an economist, I worked as Julie Oliver's advisor, some of you may have known her running for Texas 25. She is running again, and I've seen a few of you out on the campaign trail. So I'm an economist, worked at UT, worked here downtown. I live on a street that's less than a mile and a half from the university, less than 2 miles from the capitol building, less than 3 miles from where standing right here and it's a street with single story buildings. Yeah, that's just inconceivable for me. Like, if there's so much demand to be in Austin, why are these houses small? They're single story. They should be fitting multiple families. They should be allowed to do threeplexes or fourplexes, a huge amount of this city is spending a huge amount on rent and by increasing the supply we will lower the amount of money they spend on rent and give them more money to spend on food for going out to restaurants, to keeping the businesses running here in Austin. The economists, the magazine recently published an article. I can get the name for it here. But Ty talked about it's sorry we're full, city politics. They mentioned that San Francisco over the last three decades has created fewer than 2,000 new homes per year. And we know about supply and demand. That's the basic thing from economics. There's no new supply in San Francisco. And the demand is going up so the price goes up. And without supply here in Austin.

[Buzzer sounding]

-- That's going to keep being the same and it's going to have large environmental side effects because people are not living close to where the work.

[4:30:29 PM]

They drive it further. Which means more pollution. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Those are all the speakers that we have. Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: Now that we're done with speakers I was coming in off the dais and I wanted to thank the mayor pro tem's comments, but then we of course introduced the girl scouts and brownies so thank you guys for coming but I also wanted to mention that during work sessions things sometimes get a little testy or difficult, and then as we head into the difficult amendment process looking at all these pieces of paper I think we need to have an -- I'll commit myself to as much patience as we can as we go through this important document. And refrain from the kind of hype hyperbole that the mayor pro tem mentioned because I think we all have our motive to help and take care of folks. We don't want to spread fear, and I really appreciate your comments, mayor pro tem.

>> Mayor Adler: So I think the issue in front of us right now is whether or not we want to continue the CCD and this could be we'll continue them with an overlay and I'd propose we take that vote on the first and we have a vote on the second question.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, say it again.

>> Mayor Adler: That the first question I think is Do we want to continue and preserve nccds, and if we do, do we want to impose the overlay on top of them or not? I think those are the two questions. And I'm mischaracterizing that.

>> Flannigan: I think a little bit.

>> Mayor Adler: Help me characterize it.

>> Flannigan: In the amendment language I provided, I don't say to remove them end of sentence. I say that they should be evaluated in the context and allow staff to come back and say these are the parts of it that work and that are not and that address, you know, no fences in the front yard, as we saw speakers say.

[4:32:32 PM]

Not just a blanket removal point I don't think that's what anyone is proposing.

>> Mayor a: Would you be okay with something that said at this point by way of direction that WRE keeping them in, this that did we put the overlays on but ask staff to come back with any other thoughts they would have with respect to nccds, to take a look at those and take it further than that if they wanted to or come back and talk to us about better ideas they may have or additional ideas they might have with nccds.

>> Flannigan: I think that's ultimately what I may say just to speak for myself, which is nccds that exist might be fine, but I want staff to come back and tell me that these are the parts of them that work and these are the parts that don't work. And I don't want to lose the part that I think -- mostly what your language says, which is we want the general planning principles across the city to apply.

>> Mayor: I certainly want that, too. I would like to give them some direction so, again, there's like an expectation in the community so that if they come back with that -- if they come back and preserve nccds they know that there was at least a critical mass to do that at this point, that if they did that we actually wanted them to apply overlays on top of that and not just the nccds and not cover them with the overlays but asking them also to take a look at nccds, I would support as well, and certainly apply overall planning tools. I don't know if that works. Councilmember Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I'm thinking -- I'm thinking that at this point in time I would want to go as far as you suggested because I think what is important is to get the information back. So I think the wording that councilmember Flannigan has used and councilmember Harper-Madison and Renteria, if you just stop before the last sentence and add a different sentence there, you can get it.

[4:34:33 PM]

Because they do talk in terms of reevaluating nccds and then you could add language about -- and Harper talks in terms of identifying what's beneficial. You could take out the last sentence that says unique

zoning districts should be mapped and replace that sentence with WHA councilmember Flannigan just said, you know, in terms of -- I don't remember how you said it, in terms of the staff providing information back to inform the council. I would prefer to have that information before I made any kind of directive, and I think that the language you have, mayor, is too much of a directive.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So let's get a vote on that. I'm fine in putting in language either before or after the vote if the vote for the amendment a language continues to include T language that says we're asking staff to evaluate unique zoning districts, nccds, in the current context of Austin's housing and transportation needs. I would support that language. But I do want to vote on the language that says we're gonna preserve nccds and I want to vote on whether or not we're going to apply those elements to it.

>> Kitchen: Those are two separate votes, right?

>> Mayor Adler: Two separate votes.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Ready to take a vote on those? So the first question is whether we're going to continue -- whether we're officially going to state at this point -- at the end of this I'm going to suggest that we include the language that S that staff has asked to evaluate nccds in the current context of Austin's housing and transportation needs. Because I would like that analysis. All right? But first I want to take a vote on whether or not we're going to preserve and continue nccds and then whether we're going to put those overlays on top of them.

>> Casar: Mayor, I'd like to vote on putting overlays on top first because if that passes I will vote to keep the nccds.

[4:36:36 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Let's first amend it that way. Question if we're going to continue nccds do we want those overlays to apply.

>> Kitchen: I would like to change that a little bit because councilmember Casar asked for that be first I'd rather ask the other to be first, and the reason is because he would characterize it as -- I would characterize it as putting the overlays over -- to the extent that evaluation comes back to us we decide based on that evaluation that that's the best way forward.

>> Casar: It sounds like they'll both pass -- if it sounds like then they'll both pass we should put them in whatever order is fine.

>> Mayor Adler: I think what she's saying is she doesn't want to put the overlay on it.

>> Kitchen: I don't want to put it on in the absence of information. We have zero information about the impact. >> Mayor Adler: Let's take that vote. Do we want to put the overlays on top of the nccds.

>> We're going to take it over way.

>> Mayor Adler: We can atake a vote on the order I take the vote on.

>> Kitchen: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm calling the order of the meaning of the sentence in the way I think will move us forward on the substance of the issue. The first question I'll call if we do nccds do we want the overlay on top of it? Those in favor please raise your hand. It is --

>> Harper-Madison: I'm going to abstain.

>> Mayor Adler: Flannigan, Ellis, Casar, Renteria, me and Garza. So that's included. The next question is, do we want to include preserving nccds with the overlay? Let's take a vote on that. Those in favor please raise your hand. First we will -- first whether we brought the amendment on, whether we included the overlay. Now we're taking whether we're preserving the nccds with the overlay.

[4:38:36 PM]

Those in favor please raise your hand. It is everyone on the dais except for councilmember Naash Madison Harper

>> Flannigan: I voted no.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, Mr. Flannigan voted no. That amendment makes it in. I also want to now put in the language that says that staff has asked a to evaluate nccds in the current context of Austin's housing and transportation needs. Is there any objection to that being included?

>> Kitchen: What is the language exactly?

>> Mayor Adler: Staff is --

>> Kitchen: This language here in front of us?

>> The zoning districts should be reevaluated in the current context of Austin housing and transportation needs. That language.

>> Kitchen: The rest of the sentence, right? The whole sentence?

>> Mayor Adler: Any tools that are beneficial to said needs -- I'm not going to say should be codified so no, only the first part, unique nccds should be reevaluated in the current context of Austin's housing and transportation needs. Is there any objection to including that language? ING Arne that language included. Still on nccds are these zoning districts does anyone have any additional amendments they want to propose? Yes, councilmember Tovo.

>> Tovo: I'm doing this language on the fly so I'm not sure that it will be fully as articulate as it would be otherwise. I think as the staff are doing that evaluation in the current context of Austin's housing and transportation needs, in addition to analyzing the extent to which nccds currently contain missing middle housing.

>> Mayor Adler: Say that one more time, I'm sorry.

>> Tovo: I don't know that I can do that. [laughter]

>> Kitchen: I wrote it.

>> Tovo: Did you? Thank you, councilmember Casar.

>> Kitchen: In addition -- oh, no. In addition to analyzing the extent to which nccds currently contain missing middle housing.

>> Tovo: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: S isff also asked to evaluate that. Does anybody object to having them take a look at that?

[4:40:37 PM]

Hearing none, that is also included. Okay. The next topic area that's raised by this after nccds are common cos. Does anybody have objection to that language being included? Councilmember Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: So the unique cos, the first half is fine, generally incorporated zoning classifications not carried forward. The last time unique cos carried forward, it was -- the challenge is that there are a lot of those. And my hope is that based on other I'm sorry that are in the guidance document here, specifically somewhere where we talk about user restrictions, which are some of the more commonly wild and crazy cos we can address use restriction that's in W that reflects what those cos say even if they are unique. So it's not just common cos. Maybe the way to do this, mayor, is say cos that are generally incorporated into the new code are not to be carried forward.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that's fine. I don't think it really has meaning in that sentence.

>> Flannigan: To say not just zoning classifications but in other ways we might address those cos in the code.

>> Mayor Adler: Cos that are generally incorporated into the new code are not to be carried forward.

>> Flannigan: Yeah.

>> Mayor a: Okay. I'm fine with that change. Anybody have objection to that? Yes, councilmember over

>> Tovo: I don't have an objection to that but I don't understand the sentence, edited or not edited.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry?

>> Harper-madison: We just took out zoning.

>> Tovo: I have a question about what your intent is with this.

>> Mayor Adler: My intent is if it's carried forward otherwise without the need for the code because it's been incorporated into a zoning classification or otherwise in the code, then it's not necessary to carry it

forward. But to the degree it's unique and not otherwise carried forward, then it would be carried forward.

>> Tovo: Thanks for that classification.

[4:42:39 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that? Hearing none, that change is made. The next amendment is down in question two.

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor? So I have a suggestion, and I know we talked about this before, but in my mind, going through number 1 and deciding what we were keeping and then having long conversation and getting into the details and then going back to your amendment is -- I would rather just get number 1 done.

>> Mayor Adler: And I hear that, and I don't think that's the best way for us to go because when we're done with this we're now going to go back to the amendments and see what amendments we can just agree to. We're going to go back to what -- the exercise we started doing before. I think that's going to up the amendments. When we amend something -- and this is the amendment that's been offered, just because there's an amendment in section 1 doesn't mean that section 1 is necessarily open. We have an amendment on the table, and someone can then amend that amendment. I may be overruling the dais if the dais wants to do it differently but I would continue through this amendment, raising issues raised in this amendment, and then I would go back to look at all the amendments to see what we can agree to and not, and that will narrow down the issues.

>> Kitchen: If I could explain.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: I'm happy to go -- I don't have a problem with going through it like we started out to, to identify what we wanted to keep and what we needed more conversation about. It's the back and forth that's causing me some concern. The back and forth between identifying what we agreed to and the areas that we need more conversation about. Because as we get further along into our questions, I know there's gonna be a number of questions here we really have to dig into it, and if we start digging into it there and we haven't finished with one or two, which really relate to the layer ones, it's just gonna be harder to do. So I would just like to do it one way or the other. I'm happy to just go through and figure out what we all agree to and put in a parking lot the stuff that needs more conversation.

[4:44:46 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We tried that a second ago. It didn't work so we're gonna try this process. They're distinct questions. The next question we have is, it says do we want to go to increase the housing capacity to

three times the blueprint. Three times is the number in the amendment. Does anyone want to move to change that, or is that okay? Councilmember Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: I'm satisfied with three as long as we add the phrase "At a minimum three or at least three," whichever version people prefer.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody have a problem to saying "At least three times"? Councilmember Alter.

>> Alter: I don't agree with this method of -- as a useful target but I don't think I don't have the votes but I don't want to be recorded as agreeing with that. But I'm not gonna stop everyone else from moving forward with it.

>> Mayor Adler: So noted. Anybody have any objection to saying "At least three times"? Councilmember Pool.

>> Pool: I wanted to understand why the two to three -- why the two was removed.

>> Mayor Adler: Because some people wanted two to three and some people wanted three to four and it looked like the thing that would get the best votes and carry the sentiment that was the overlap of where people were was to say three. That's why. Councilmember Tovo.

>> Tovo: I think regardless of whether we say two times or three times or some other number, I hope that we'll proceed along this process with some understanding based on the pretty extensive information that's provided in the past your planning department of what the existing capacity is, and the existing rate of housing construction so that we are not going in and making decisions based on a real -- what one of our city staffers called an intoxication with the numbers.

[4:46:47 PM]

I mean, I think that we need to ground our land use decisions in the existing information we have, including the capacity studies that have been done, and they're mapped by district -- well they're not mapped by district but they're mapped by neighborhood areas throughout so I think it's a source of very useful information.

>> Mayor Adler: And I agree with that. I think one of the neat things about what we're doing here is not deciding anything, just asking staff to go and give us our code and as part of that they're also gonna be asked to tell us what numbers are, what the yield is associated with that. When they come back to us we'll see whether they hit the mark or don't hit the mark and whether we want to give additional or different instructions, as will the community because they'll be given a chance to do that, too. We're not deciding anything today. We're just giving direction. So I agree, councilmember Tovo, with what you said. Does anybody have any objection to saying at least three? Hearing none, that's gonna continue that way. The next speaker talks about.

>> Harper-Madison: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

Harper-madison: I want to be certain you're not moving on from number 1, when you say the next section you're not moving on --

Mayor Adler: I am on question number 2. We just did 2a.

>> Harper-madison: In which case -- I'm sorry. Objective number 1.

>> Mayor Adler: We were still in objective a.

>> Harper-madison: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: But objective a -- the objective -- one objective also has a B, and this is the concept of where are we adding additional entitlements. And this amendment says we're only going to add additional entitlements to increase the supply of missing middle housing or through a density bonus that requires some measure of affordable housing. So in a non-missing middle context, it requires the density bonus. That's the amendment in front of us.

[4:48:47 PM]

Councilmember Harper-Madison.

>> Harper-madison: Actually, I had my hand up before I did.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Language that I have that I want to make change to, yes, want to pull this for discussion, and 'S B, the first little I. Shall I go ahead --

>> Mayor Adler: Where are you? What the amendment to that you want to offer.

>> Kitchen: That's right.

>> Mayor Adler: WHE is it.

>> Kitchen: Where it says to increase the supply of missing middle housing I wanted to insert -- let's see. Small scale missing middle. So just the term.

>> Mayor Adler: Small scale." >>Or Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: I'd be happy to

explain that. >> Mayor Adler: Let's see if there's a second for it first. Councilmember Kitchen suggests that we should add the phrase "Small scale." It's seconded by councilmember Kitchen, do you want to second it?

>> Kitchen: Yes. This builds off our conversation that we had at work session, and it acknowledges that the smaller scale missing middle housing, it doesn't work to attach those density bonus programs, but at some level missing middle housing is appropriate to attach affordable housing to, so I wanted to put -- I wanted to -- we had a long conversation about the wide range of size we were talking about with missing

middle. So that's why I'm proposing small scale. I'll leave it to our staff to let us know where that break point is. They had some suggestions at the work session, but I don't think we should tie it to any particular number at this point. I think we should say small scale and then our staff will be able to provide us information about what that is.

>> Mayor Adler: Let me see if I understand it, if I could. So it's with respect to missing middle housing so interested in some missing middle housing that we would be adding -- that obviously would not have a density bonus attached to it.

[4:50:52 PM]

>> Kitchen: Right. >> Mayor Adler: What you're saying is anything above small scale missing middle housing by the categories we have would have a bonus density tied to it.

>> Kitchen: Yes. I don't see any reason to treat those differently because what we have said is our goal is to secure affordable housing so we're not leaving anyone behind. And the -- so we want to -- wherever it pencils out, we want to be sure that we are tying entitlements to affordable housing. So to my mind there's no reason to leave out the larger missing middle housing from that requirement for affordable housing. And so we need to distinguish between the size of housing.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: So I'm generally in agreement there. Would you accept smaller scale instead of small scale.

>> Kitchen: That's fine.

>> Flannigan: That would help me. Thank you.

>> Hmar-ardison: If I may, mayor, both councilmember and the Flannigan touched on what my concern was but I wonder if you guys would be comfortable with us just removing the words "Missing middle" and just using "Smaller scale," the sentence would read "to increase the supply of smaller scale housing." As you pointed out part of the confusion is the term "Missing middle."

>> Kitchen: That's fine with me. >> Arper-madison: See what I'm saying?

>> Mayor Adler: I'm concerned Minnesota somebody would read that to read the smaller scale housing which is smaller than missing middle. Right now we have small scale housing, missing middle -- [overlappingeakers] Something in the middle. Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: I think the challenge is, I don't want to be calibrating the affordable housing bonuses on the fly here. I would want every time that it works for it to be applied and when it doesn't work for it to not be applied.

[4:52:52 PM]

And right now we are -- I think that the existing language hits that because we have a 60,000 --

>> Kitchen: Go ahead, finish.

>> Casar: I want to explain why it is I think that.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Casar: I think that because -- because we want to create missing middle housing, we want to create density bonus that's require some measure of affordable housing. We have a 60,000 unit goal that this code will never get us to on its own, and so of course the staff, I think very clearly in many places in this document, is being directed to create as much affordable housing as we can, while also creating missing middle housing. That's throughout this document. And so I don't want to be calibrating the density bonus on the fly, guessing right now whether it's three units or four units or six units where affordable housing requirements start lock in. If we could have language into this that makes it very clear we want the bonuses calibrated appropriately to create missing middle ndmissing middle with bonuses, I think that'hat W we all want. And so my concern is if we say smaller missing middle means a density bonus it's not clear whether we're saying smaller missing midd means density bonus on top,therhe it means a density bonus in the middle of it. That's why I don't want to be crafting density bonuses on the dais since we have nsultants to try to help us do that while I think we actually have the same goal.

>> Kitchen: I think councilmember Flannigan may have been first but I have --

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan.

>> Kitchen: Then you --

>> Mayor Adler: He has waved it off to you.

>> K: Yeen. So councilmember Casar, that would be fine, except if you wanted to suggest some language that said what you just said. Because right now we're not -- the way the language is written, that's in mayor Adler and couilmember Ellis', ds not connect the affordable housing to any of the missing middle.

[4:54:58 PM]

So I think that the way you explained it is what I intended. I just used shorter words for it, but we could have a whole sentence if you wanted to use that.

>> Casar:as I write the sentence cane go to the next amendment and I'll do David ondich my best T write it.

>> Kitchen: I'd rather finish we -- rather we finish this right now.

>> Casar: I know you would but I donant wo make up the sentence on the fly. I wan to make up the sentence on the fly just

with a little bit more time. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, why don't you start wri. Yes, councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Yeah. So I know -- I had some amendments to this section that are -- that may be in sync with the conversation we're having, and I thought, councilmember alter, you had one interlocal to Thi section. And so I don't know if I'm remembering that correctly or not. And I'm happy to -- I think

[indiscernible] [Overlapping speakers]

>> Mayor Adler: I'm trying to figure out what the issue is here? What's at issue? What's different about these? At's the question? Are we all agreed that we want entitlement to create additional missing middle housing and that we also wanted to thes -- T new code to increase opportunities for affordable housg?

>> Tovo: Can awer that question.

>> Mayor Adler: Sure.

>> Tovo: Those are two different questions. Yes to the second. I'm in agreement that we should be creating and identifying more opportunities for affordable housing. I am not in agreement that we should include by right entitlements for missing middle housing unless it's -- unless there is an affordable housing component. And I had written language on my draft, too, that is no longer relevant because now the language is all different in the base motion, but I had suggested that by right entitlements using the initial language, by right entitlements should be granted where -- only when that entitlement creates with it the requirement to provide additional income restricted affordable house units or in smaller projects in lie fees.

[4:57:06 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Let me ask this --

>> Tovo: I have two issues with how we've been talking about missing made. One is the one councilmember kitchen identified in that we talked extensively about Tuesday, which is if you ask one person we're talking about an Adu, if you ask the staff they went from kind of four units to six units Toten units. So I think that we -- if we want to be nonrescriptive about how we're defining that, that's okay for now, but I think for me, I do not agree we should include by right entitlements for missing middle housing wioutth that component of affordable. So --

>> Mayor Adler: So help me -- I still trying to understand questions. The amendment to the amendment that's proposed by councilmember kitchen says that -- here's my question. We can't require anentitlement to any entitlement we give to require affordable housing. Because that's inclusionary zoning. We can't say you get this zoning classification only if you do rdableaf housing. What we can do is we can say we're gonna give you a missing middle category that has a bonus with it to provide affordable housing. So I seems to me -- and, Greg, take a look at this, I'm not sure if I actually calibrates anything, the language that Mr. Flannigan offered with councilmember kitchen says that -- thawe should allow to increase the supply of smaller scale missing middle housing or through a density bonus require

some measure of affordable housing. If be-- if we if we zone anything as a missing middle, not smaller, but larger missing middle housing component, that always carries with it a bonus provision so far.

[4:59:07 PM]

So it see to me that by having a language here with a smaller scale still is okay because it still -- we're not calibrating anything, we're just saying if you give us smaller scale, it may not be able to have a bonus because bonus doesn't work, we can talk about that later, or if you do anything else, you've an additional entitlement, it needs a dash a, it needs the ability to be able to scale up to give us greater affordable housing. That's my questio. Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: My suggestion, now that I measured down by five or six sentences to a clause, differentiating between small scale or missing middle scale, would be just to say increase the supply of missing middle housing, which -- which should include affordable housing bonus programs that are calibrated in all missing middle Zones because all missing middle so then will have of a dsity bonus, in prior drafts they all did have a density bonus, and we just want em all properlyalib ted.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: So I'll probably have to come back to another point but I wantedo just respond to your question, mayor. There's nothing to stop us from zoning something single-family the single-family equalent or sf-3 and saying we have a density nus that allows you to go to theext N level or missing level level -- it could be a fee-in-lieu or missing middle. You could start at esteem which has a duplex or Adu in that zone, or both, depending on the zone, and we could say if want to go to a fourpou Y could contribute X amount of money or if you contribute something else you would get whatever they would want in terms of zoning entitlement.

[5:01:12 PM]

So we don't have to from missing middle to missing middle, you could have a bonus because you're doing something fordable. It may not be if you have the abilitying to three to four units, we can have it, otherwise, we're just giving the entitlement and we don't have that opportunity to take advantage of that. And, you know, for me, you know, looking at the places this would be in my district, we would be re mislyng opportunities where, financially, they could they could pencil it out. And given demand and prices of housing in that area, if they can't me thak pencil out, then I mean, we're just missing opportunitieo T improve our ability to deliver affordable housing.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: So this is where councilmember Renteria and Ms. Harper-madison and I originally started saying three units as a flow, and that's to my mind is what smaller scale refers to, probably four units, nonetheless, that's where we were starting, then go to the second tier,hich these smaller complexes, 6,

8, maybe 10 units, depending on the size of the lot, there would be an affordability component that. That's where my comfort level is. To me it's the three tiers, by right, missing middle, three, maybe for units, depending on context, then missing middle at sth bigger than that which has an affordable component, maybe fee-in-lieu, then projects bigger than that which require moron site affordability requirements. At's how I was thinking this through.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, city councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: And so I got a little confused with the discussion of the bonus fees, but I think as you just explained it -- how about language that says missing middle housing, something like ss N middle housing larger than three units, which is where my comfort level is, will require -- will require an affordability component, either a fee-in-lieu or income restricted, depending on the size of the project.

[5:03:29 PM]

>> Harper-madison: I think I have language.

>> Tovo: I think you do too. I think it's relevant here and I think it captures what councilmember Flannigan was saying as well.

>> Alter: I had it motion sheet 1, st qn 3, but it could be applied here, any increase in residential entitlements for single-family lot should be allowed with an affordability requirement which would be fee-in-lieu. Requirement should be calibrated to incentivize restricted affordable housing. We could add any entitlements beyond three units per single-family or missing middle lot -- we probably need to add something to get -- we probably need another category beyond single-family lot for addressing this part but I think the rest of the language would meet the need here. But --

>> Kitchen: I think that's what it is.

>> Alter: Maybe it's per lot.

>> Mayor Adler: Does Stephanie have any idea how we would wrestle with this?

>> Kitchen: I think the language councilmember alter has U her amdm one -- motion sheet 1, question 3, amendment 1, we could take that language.

>> Alter: We'd have to take single-family out before lot.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem?

>> Garza: Sorry, it's so incredibly frustrating how weedy this is getting. I don't understand what the problem is with leaving the language as it is. I can't believe I'm wordsmithing stuff and say leave it as is woulsay staff could come back with recommendations when they believe it is not economically viable to have a density bonus.

[5:05:30 PM]

Just leave it open.

>> Martinez: I appreciate the economic viability part of that. That has been my concern. Some of what's been suggested --

>> Garza: We're increasing entitlements or through a density bonus that requires some affordable housing, and staff can bring back recommendations when they believe it's not economically viable to have a density bonus for affordability.

>> Kitchen: May I ask a question?

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Then we want to get staff.

>> Kitchen: So, councilmember Garza, are you reading -- maybe I'm reading this differently than you all. I was reading missing middle, since it was in I, versus in II, I wasn't reading that to include missing middle, but looks like you are. In other words, I was reading that to say you get by right entitlements on missing middle, then you only get by right with a density bonus on other kinds of housing. That's why I thought it needs -- I think it needs further clarification. I don't think it says what we all seem to be saying right now.

>> Mayor Adler: I think the second one was just not missing middle housing, it was everything. It was saying if you get additional entitlement, it has to be something that would provide affordable housing through a density bonus.

>> Kitchen: But it says "Or."

>> Mayor Adler: That's right, either missing middle housing or the other issue.

>> Kitchen: That's what we're saying, we don't want it to be --

>> Mayor Adler: Do you have any other questions?

>> I'm with W planning and zoning. What we had done in the past in previous drafts is, with a consultant, looked at missing middle housing and how the bonuses would pencil out, and here they didn't pencil out, they just were not the code.

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> For instance in the R3 Zones, we didn't have a bonus but they started in the R4 so then.

[5:07:32 PM]

So I think we would look at that, of course, and just let you know where it works and where it doesn't work.

>> Mayor Adler: But what you have in the code is, if you -- if you map R3 zone or R4 zone, it has with it a density bonus. If you have that, then you can build more with a density bonus. But what's being discussed is

the concept of you only get the r3 or the r4 if you have a density bonus so it's kind of like an sf-3 as a density bonus that gets you to r4, is, I think, the question. Is that right? I think that's the issue.

>> So in that case --

>> Mayor Adler: In other words, you do it as a house -- the thing is, should we have a house 4 zone, house 4 zone that lets you get to that next level only if you provide affordability. We can't require that as part of just r4 because it's inclusionary zoning. The question is, if we step it up, can we require it and is that a good thing to do. Councilmember Harper.

>> Harper-Madison: I would just like to respectfully ask that the terminology we use reflect the current code and not draft 3, please.

>> Mayor Adler: Can you respond to that?

>> For purposes of this discussion --

>> Harper-Madison: I wasn't here for the last council meeting, so not being -- not having land use as my subject matter expertise, I'm just, you know, familiar enough with the terminology to understand what's in the current code, but when you start to revert to the terminology that was in draft 3, then I have to use my handy dandy guide book, and I'd rather just have you say it in a way that I am aware and informed, that's okay.

[5:09:34 PM]

If everybody could just use the language in the current code, please. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Do you have any thoughts on that?

>> Well, certainly for the purposes of this discussion, I can -- we can do our best --

>> Mayor Adler: I mean do THA as best you can, sure. The question I'm asking you to respond to is the previous question --

>> Well --

>> Mayor Adler: In other words, can we require a missing middle upzoning something that's not missing middle if you're going to go into missing middle, there's a requirement for affordability, either a fee-in-lieu or an on-site, whatever calibrates.

>> So I think conceptually, it's appropriate and makes sense and we'd have to look at where it would go, but I think more than that, we'd have to try to figure out with a consultant if it would pencil out. I think previous discussions on previous drafts indicated that the at the lower missing middle three units per lot, it was not as viable when you got -- as compared to when you got into higher zones. So we would just have to look at that concept.

>> Mayor Adler: So I think I would support the language of the smaller scale issue if there was an element of calibration put in there somewhere. Councilmember Tovo.

>> Tovo: I have a proposal, that we keep little I, to increase the supply of missing middle housing, semicolon, any increase -- now I'm jumping to councilmember alter's -- any increase in residential entitlements beyond three units per lot should only be allowed with an affordability requirement which may be on-site affordable housing or fee-in-lieu. The requirement, however, should be economically viable and should be calibrated to incentivize -- sorry, let me reverse that. The requirement, however, should be calibrated to incentivize the development of income-restricted affordable housing and should be economically viable.

[5:11:38 PM]

I think that captures -- that captures -- you know, we want the consultants or whoever is doing the calibration to tell us if that's economically viable and then they can figure out where and when that would apply.

>> Mayor Adler: As far as Greg's question earlier, is there where three lots or four lots would be the right number? Seems like that's a calibration issue. I wonder if there's a way to not pick the number of units but just do it where it calibrates --

>> Casar: Is there a motion on the table? Is there a motion on the table? Rehe an amendment? Because I can make that amendment.

>> Pool: I have some suggested language.

>> Tovo: I think Ann has an amendment, councilmember kitchen has an amendment, which is to add the phrase smaller scale.

>> Kitchen: And I accept councilmember tovo's amendment to that amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: It would be an amendment to the amendment.

>> Casar: I'd like to move an amendment to the amendment.

>> Kitchen: But I've already accepted hers.

>> Mayor Adler: You don't get to accept the amendments, the amendments belong to the table. They're not yours when they come out. Let's talk through this and see if we can figure out what it is --

>> Casar: Mayor? Ed 1.

>> [Off mic]

>> Mayor Adler: I'm not going to take it.

>> C: I think we could say to not be picking bonuses on the dais, to have it say increase the supply of missing middle housing, just the way it says, which shall include a bonus program when economically viable. That way, it could be on a small scale, large scale, mid scale, whichever scale where it's economically viable so we not picking what size here on the dais, since it's going to pencil in different ways in different parts of the city.

>> Mayor Adler: Your suggestion was to increase housing --

>> Casar: Which shall include an affordable bonus program where economically viable.

>> Mayor Adler: Which shall include an affordable housing S where economically viable.

[5:13:42 PM]

Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I have someguage that is already written down, but it captures all of this so that we can allow the staff to do T calibration and bring it back to us. It says, if look at my amendment sheet, the one that's motis to 4 combined, on page 2, it lists the objective, the revised land development code should provide for housing capacity, it says two to three times, we've taken out the two and it's just three. At I want to point you to is the last sentence that begins with however. However, the measures used to achieve these housing capacity goals must be consistent with direction provided throughout this documt and should be carefully calibted with applicable density bonus programs. Generally,dditional by right entitlements provided throughmapping and code revisions should only we used to increase the supply of missing middle housing. This has the virtue of being language that was suggested by the staff for us to capture all of these comments that we're making here and allow the staff the ability to come back to us with what approach may be -- what they recommend. D also may keep us at a higher level, perhaps, in the discussion so that we can get through to the end of all the amendments that we're going to offer today. So, again, that'sn page 2 of the stapled motion sheet that I provided on motions 2-4 combined, and it's the second sentence in the first underlined in red that begins with the word "However."

>> Kitchen: May I make a --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Continue the discussion. Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: Thank you for -- thank you for signaling us to that passage. I think for me, that doesn't resolve the funntal issue that was in the first draft of the missing middle housing not being tied to income restricted units or family units.

[5:15:50 PM]

So I think I'm comfortable with councilmember Casar's with the caveat that as our discussion today and Tuesday revealed, those -- we still are -- we're sort of proceeding with vueneag around what that missing middle is going to be. I would hav felt more comfortable tying it to tee units as we were starting to, but at this point I think we've recognized the fundamental principle of tying -- increasing the supply of missing middle to income restricted affordable units and tt resolves the concern for me.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Councilmember, could you read that again?

Casar: Yes. So it's -- it's just additional words on the Ellis-Adler, where the order says to increase the supply of missing middle housing. I've added a comma, which shall include an affordable bonus program where economically viable.

>> Kitchen: Affordable density or --

>> Casar: Affordable bonus program.

>> Kitchen: It could be.

>> Casar: We should just say nubos because it was beyond

density. >> Mayor Adler: Affordable housing bonus program where economically viable.

>> Kitchen: I think that's okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody have objection to that? Councilmember Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: My only concern, I don't want to include it without a bonus if we say which shall include, if it was -- may include where economically viable makes more sense to me.

>> Casar: I think shall include if it is viable. If it's not viable, it won't be included.

>> Flannigan: But my concern is the way the construction -- maybe staff is paying attention --

>> Casar: Or we could say when viable.

>> Flannigan: Say we'll still do missing middle by right if the bonus is not viable.

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> Casar: I think that's the intent.

>> Flannigan: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: This is what it says that. Right? Which shall include affordable housing bonus when economically viable or where economically viable.

[5:17:55 PM]

Where economically viable.

>> Flannigan: Staff gets the into now.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I think the point is made. I think weird that well. Oops, maybe not councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I cannot really imagine a scenario where it was a small fee, you couldn't do this in some area or certainly in a lot of areas. I still think there are situations where, the way that we have this set up, we

are going to provide miss middle by right where we are just going to miss this opportunity to capture affordable contributions of some kind because if you go from a fourplex to an eht-plex, and we're just putting that down by our initial mapping, you ought to be able to get some affordability program in there to get from that four to that eight, and if we just give them the eight, we don't get that. It doesn't have to be a huge amount, but all those things do contribute to affordability. And for some parts of the city, it is going to be the only way that you're going to get a affordable housing.

>> Flannigan: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: I think, just to be clear, it sounded like weha were talking about is three or four units, by right, depending on calibration, not eight. I don't think anybody was saying we're going to do eight units without a program involved.

>> Alter: But are we doing that on a lot behind --

>> Mayor Adler: What you're saying is, you're saying you could hardly imagine, give this sentence, there uld ever be a place this could happen because it's going to be economically viable to some degree everywhere, and I understand that. If staff comes back and says that, Hink that's great, but at least this language allows for the possibility otherwise, which I think gets us where our diagrams cross.

>> Alter: But I think when you then overlay this with S discussions about the transition, you get in situations where you are giving by right the0 or 12 unitsith W no affordability requirement when that is the only way you will get any affordability units in those areas, and that's the part that I'm very --

[5:20:05 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I think when we get to the transition section, let's make sure that the language there reflects this language here. Okay? Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I would just say my hope is that the calibration will come back pretty close to what it was before, so four units actually does have an affordable housing component, but IST' certainly my intent not to support any kind of larger scale beyond three units th doesn't have an affordable housing component. But I agree with you that it becomes an issue with the transition that I hope we can collectively fix by the time we're done here at 4:00 in the morning.

>> Mayor Adler: Cool. All right. So that language is going too G in as suggested by councilmember Casar. No objection? That's done. Should we go to the nextlement in which? Which was code text.

>> Alter: Before we get to code text, I ted to get some clarification for the part that was on the corridor. So you original language I understood. Can uyo walk me thrgh what the range in language, either mayor or councilmember Ellis, means with respect to the corridors and by-right entitlements? Because I thought I understood and we had gone through the other language, but --

>> Ellis: Which section again? Sorry.

>> Alter: In question 2, objective 1, there were sections that were deleted. On page 3a, I and II, which seemed to help clarify what was happening on T corridor, and I'm not sure if that's carried over in the new language. I'm just trying to understand what you meant when you deleted those.

>> Ellis: Mine was, I believe that what was put into C does cover that, so if it's not clear, it seems like we were just trying to make something a little smoother, in discussing new entitlements and areas like gentrification and displacement and things like that.

[5:22:24 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I think the -- yeah, I think that the intent was that, you know, with respect to corridors, because we're no longer talking about missing middle, that additional entitlements on the corridors would be a result of a density bonus.

>> Alter: Okay. And are you in work session, you had come to the conclusion that that should also be in terms of when you relax entitlements because you're getting increased entitlement. Is that still your interpretation of this?

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah.

>> Alter: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen, then councilmember policy, then councilmember coffee.

>> Kitchen: I just had a question about the language, just for clarification. Where it says currently are susceptible to gentrification, can I assume that what we mean here is tied back to the uprooted study?

>> Mayor Adler: I would certainly think that would be one source

-- that they would reference.

>> Kitchen: The reason I'm asking, in some places we use the term and we do talk about the uprooted report. In other places we don't. I just want it to be clear -- I just wanted to understand that because the term currently are susceptible to gentrification, I just think we should tie that back. And I think the uprooted report is fine. I mean, that's the data point that we have.

>> Mayor Adler: And I would say -- I was just trying not to limit them to that. Certainly uprooted is a good document, but if there's another study that comes out or another study that informs that issue, don't want them to be precluded from that. But we all know we did the report that talks about the issues, but the general statement, we don't want to grant new entitlements in areas that are currently susceptible to gentrification as stated here.

>> Kitchen: Okay. That's fine. I just wanted the staff to explain to us when they come back how they defined because we need to know what we're talking about.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that would be reasonable. Councilmember pool was next.

[5:24:24 PM]

>> Pool: So on the change to code text a, am I correct-

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. We not to code text a yet. I called that but I didn't kw if people were Rea to go yet.

>> Kitchen: I thought that's what we --

>> Mayor Adler: It's now 5:25. We have a public hearing that I said we would try to knock out before dinner, three people to speak, then everybody can leave before dinner. Do we want to -- before we get to a new issue, do we want to D that fast? You>> Read my mine. I was going to suggest --

>> Mayor Adler: Suggest that?

>> Pool: Could I object the one to pick up when we come back? I just wanted clarification.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah. Unless something has thing new in 1, you'll be the first person to raise something in 2.

>> Pool: Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: But before we want to raise 2, do we want to do the public hearing and come back and finish 1?

>> Tovo: I do have amendments before we get to 2.

>> Mayor Adler: The amendments would not be -- this is not the time to do amendments to 1c, generally. I mean, or 1 generally. It's to address the amendments that were raised. We're trying not to just open up this section. I think if we get through this, we'll have gotten through a lot of the other issues that we have, and I think that it'll enable us to move more quickly. And I think even though these things are hard, I think we've just solved two of what were two of the really tricky issues that we had in a way that works. Let me go now to the public hearing. Let's call that. This would be item number 72. Is staff here for that? Or I want to give you a chance so you can take home.

>> Harper-Madison: Mayor, need to step away. My daughter just got here. It is her ninth birthday. Happy birthday, Magnolia. I'll see you after dinner.

>> Good evening.

>> Mayor Adler: Good evening.

>> Mayor Adler, councilmembers, I'm Amber Mitchell with the development services department.

[5:26:25 PM]

For your conversation is item number 72. This is the appeal of so 20180281, which involved an outdoor music venue for yard bar located on Burnet Road. For sections 9254b and 92 -- pardon me, 56 of city code, owners of a single-family use may register as interested parties and appeal the approval of said

permit to city council. Yard bar is an existing restaurant and dog park. The applicant's goal is to have low intensity live music on weekends, not to have concert oriented events. The music office recommended the approval of the permit contingent on the impact plan and development services department accepted that recommendation, approved the application under city code 92-53, and notified all interested parties of the approval. Per city code 9253c and L development code section 252808, staff cannot deny an initial application to an outdoor music venue permit located within the footprint of a restaurant use general. Staff recommends upholding the approval of this permit. The decibel limits approved in this permit are consistent with chapter 9-2 of the city code, and in an effort to reduce sound impact on neighboring properties, sound is limited to 65 decibels and amplified sound is limited to 8:00 P.M. On Fridays and Saturdays and 6:00 on Sundays. Ample sound is permitted with general use if it does not exceed 60 sounds per day, and amplified sound within 600 feet of single-family use until 8:00 Sunday-thursday and 10 Friday and Saturday. For the sound impact plan to the site, the sound equipment is directed away from residential uses and there's an eight foot tall wall around the back. The maximum duration of an event is four hours and number of events per year shall not exceed 30.

[5:28:31 PM]

This is the first request for outdoor permit by the applicant, and the applicant must reapply annually, at which time staff will mail notice all single-family uses registered organizations within 600 feet of the site and reassess the applicant's request. Your back includes staff reports on this case. The outdoor music venue application and permit, the music office's record and sound impact plan, and all relevant notification and appeal documentation. Brian block with the music office is here to answer any questions you may have regarding the sound ordinance a permit sound impact plan. Development services staff is here to answer any questions you may have regarding application and the permitting process.

>> Mayor Adler: Great. Thank you. Thank you. This is a permit that was granted. There's been an appeal of the granted permit. E person is the person here who is the appealing party. I'm going to let you open. You have five minutes.

>> Hey, thanks for letting us come in. My name's Brandon. I live pretty much exactly adjacent to the yard bar. First I want to say that Kristin and Brian block, they've been really good, they've been working with us. We've been good neighbors. She's been good neighbors. We really tried to work this all out and come to some terms that we can agree on. And I'll say that in the sound impact plan, we actually -- we agree on it, the number of concerts, the decibel levels, the duration of stuff, but we're kind of missing the big picture here. So the big picture is what kind of impact does the live music venue permit have overall. We're just talking about sound decibel levels and number of concerts you can have, but there's an overall effect that it has on us in the neighborhood. It is a really unique place so this is a business road venue, but it actually operates from the back side of it, which is a residential street, Daugherty, it's a residential street. So for all intents and purposes, have a business that operates from the residential street.

[5:30:35 PM]

You can access it from burnet road. There is a sign out there and you can access it, but the parking and the traffic, the dump trucks that come in and out, the delivery trucks that come in and out, it's accessed from the residential street. So we have people that are directly next-door and adjacent to residential lots that are next to a live music venue. We're okay with the stuff that's in the sound impact plan, but we're overlooking the bigger picture. We've turned our residential street into a parking lot for a business on burnet road. Not fair. It's not what we bargained for when we bought homes on THA street. Kristin has been fair, trying to work it out with us, and we're good with the agreement we have in terms of the sound. But I'm asking you as city council, help us out some way. How can a burnet road business have access from the residential street that it backs up to? To my knowledge, and I've lived in Austin for 40 years, I live on the same street that my grandparents bought a house in 1953, so I know the neighborhood well and I know burnet road well. There's no other business in the whole burnet road corridor where you can access that business, me to and from it, from the residential street it backs up to. So, you know, I'm just asking the council to take in the big picture, the whole effect of granting a permit. Yeah, there's sound decibels and hours, and we're good with that, but it's having a bad effect on us as the neighbors. I've also had people leaving the yard bar -- and this is not the owner's fault. She cannot control the behavior of people that are leaving, but because they access the business from the residential street, I've gone out to people urinating in yard when they're getting in their cars to leave. You know, they've been drinking, they've got to go to the bathroom. I get it. They chose my yard. Not cool. You know, there's all sorts of issues. One neighbor had a person pass out in their front yard that came directly from the parking lot and into the street. And I didn't know we had such cool technology down here or I would have brought a video of what I have when the yard bar is having a big event.

[5:32:40 PM]

It takes the residential street and narrows it down, because traffic is parking in the ways on the residential street. You cannot get two cars down the street at one time. You can't do it. We get blocked in our driveways. People park right up to the edges of it. I have a truck, I can't even pull it out of the driveway when there's two cars parked right up to the edge and one parked across. I've been blocked in the driveway many times. So something else has got to be done. You know, we're trying to work with the city to get our property parked on the street, but this is just such a unique situation because again, this is the only business on burnet road that essentially operates from the residential street behind it. It's a burnet road address, but it's a business that's on a residential neighborhood street. I know none of you guys probably live immediately next-door to a business that operates right on your residential street. And, again, Kristin has been good to work with in terms of the sound permit, and we're in agreement with the stuff that's in the plan, but we've got to do something. In the future, I don't think the site plan should ever have been granted in the first place. Why would you grant a site plan that makes a one-way exit from a bar into the residential street? My kids walk up and down that street to go to school. We live in Allandale. There's lots of people out walking, riding bikes, it's just not cool that a site plan has been approved that funnels traffic off burnet road and one-way exits out onto our residential street. So I'm just -- city council is here to help us; right? So I'm just here to ask you to help us, help us do something about it. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you, sir. The respondent? The person who was given the permit, I'll give you five minutes as well.

>> Hello, city council. My name is Kristin. I'm the founder and owner of yard bar, which is Austin's first dog park with a restaurant and bar located on Burnet road and Allandale.

[5:34:40 PM]

I'm also an architect and member of the E. Cesar Chavez neighborhood association. I think Brandon. I think whatever records you guys have I hope reflect all of the hard work that we did to come to an agreement about the sound. As a member of the East Cesar Chavez neighborhood association, I'm very clear about what the impact of outdoor music is in our neighborhoods. The real reason that yard bar was interested pursuing this is because we have a lot of events at our facility where we can adopt dogs, do fund-raising things, keep up with ASN's no-kill agendas, those types of things. There are a couple of large events about twice a year, our anniversary party, and also the puppy bowl live where we get to bring adoptable dogs out to play football, it's super fun and a lot of people come out for that. Most of the parking concerns that do happen as a result of our business being successful, have to do with the whether being perfect outside. What's not addressed in -- let see, how did I say -- and also, I think -- I think what we heard just now was that there's no argument that we've worked really hard to get the -- the approval of the neighbors related to the sound. The neighbor that is directly behind us, that's also the president of the neighborhood association, dropped his appeal with the addition of some additional things to the sound impact plan. So we know that we're winning on that front. We have -- we addressed the concern about the site plan. We developed this property under a site plan exemption, so we didn't -- we inherited one-way access from Burnet road and out to Daughtery. Our business does operate as a restaurant, not just a bar, and we do close at 10:00 P.M., currently all nights of the week. So I just wanted to address that. I've given my full support to the neighborhood regarding the residential parking permits that they're pursuing, and if there's any action that council will ever have to take in the future to help move that forward, I would ask for your support in that, and I certainly ask for your support in helping us prove that we can be a good neighbor and prove that we can honor the restrictions of this outdoor music venue permit, which I believe are probably the strictest in the entire city of Austin currently.

[5:37:10 PM]

And we're happy to have them that way because we know it means that it works for the neighborhood. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is Elaine Robinson -- come on up.

>> Yes, my name is Elaine and I live three houses from the yard bar. I appreciate the fact that the yard bar -- it's hard to run a business that's as weather-dependent as an outdoor bar, but Allandale is a peaceful family neighborhood and quiet is a rare commodity, and that's why the neighborhood association last year

voted against the sound permit. I've seen how bar and restaurants scene in the east Austin has besieged east Austin with cars, that just doesn't seem to be a compatible use for a quiet family neighborhood. So've written best places to live articles for magazines, and what I've found is that contrary to the idea that live music is what makes Austin a great place to live, what actually mak it great is such equalities as storic neighborhoods, walkable streets, and thoughtful governors. I hope you'll continue protect these qualities. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is Kaz Woodridge here?

>> Hi. Thanks for giving me the time. I saw this item on the agenda and I've been to yard B, so I figured I'd come and talk to y'all. I think it's a great place. I can believe there's contention, like live music capital of T world; right?

[5:39:12 PM]

That's all that should really need to be said. But I'll expand on tt. We've got to reject the idea that residential areas need protection. Did the vmu residence across the street oppose this? What I heard from the appealee was, it's the neighborhood association. I'm curious if there's any people in the vmu the apartments or other multifamily -- if they had a say. I bet that many of them like this venue and would like to have LE music close to them. Going further, many people want to live nex to live music venues. We've also got to oppose these Ps. The public right-of-way is for public use. If there's cars that are pke dar on the street and only near can go down the street, that's very safe. That's safer than when there's no cars parked on the street and then people can drive really quicy. But also, to be clear, I agree we need safer streets, but that's a separate issue. They could probably use some sidewalks like many of our older neighborhoods in Austin. And I would fully support THA areas that have nice amenities are -- have more sidewalks. And a bar next to a neighborhood means less people have to drive. A musicen next to a neighborhood means less people have to drive. There's a bus stop literally in front of this business. 'S aat great thing. People C ride transit or ride a bike. Hopefully they can ride up protected shoal creek boulevard and get over there to yard bar. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Does the F seeking the appeal -- filing the appeal want to close? You want to say anything else? Okay. That gets us back up to the dais then. DI ussion on the dais? Yes,ounc cmember pool.

>> Pool: Thanksmayor. The yard bar is in -- is in district 7 so I thought I would open up the conversation here on the dais with a couple of comments to kind of help everybody on this one.

[5:41:19 PM]

First, itan to thank all the neighbors and the Mr. Fotts and Ms. Heeny foromin C to speak to us. My staff have been looking at this permit question really carefully, reviewed the sound impact plan with our city staff and with Ms. Heeny and talked with many of the neighbors who have appealed this permit

approval. I'd like to point out that the yard bar has already been operating with an outdoor music venue permit. It's just that up to this point, the permit has been a temporary one. And so while this is a permanent permit, the yard bar has demonstrated that they're a good actor through the series of permits that have already been granted. A significant benefit that the neighbors and our city staff brought to the permit sound impact plan are conditions styled to fit the needs of both the applicant and the community. The decibel levels and the hours, for instance, are conditions that Ms. Heeny agreed to, and which Mr. Fotts has mentioned and spoken to. They fit the general family-friendly atmosphere that Ms. Heeny is going to promote. I have questions for staff. I see our staff over here, if I could just ask these questions and then have some conclusions. Yes. Come on down. And you too, Mr. Block, if you'd like. Since the permit has an annual review, can adjustments be made to the sound impact plan if any major problems emerge? You can use the podium here if you'd like, whoever wants to speak.

>> Brian Block with the economic development department, and the code does allow sound impact plans to be modified. It just requires notice that the intent to modify.

>> Pool: And that's an annual review? Is that right?

>> That does not require waiting for the annual review.

[5:43:22 PM]

But they do, in fact, need to be renewed annually.

>> Pool: Okay.

>> It's a one-year permit. >>L: Do you have an annual review, but also the ability to raise concerns during the running of the annual permit.

>> That's right.

>> Pool: Okay. Great. Thank you. I understand that the permit allows outdoor music Friday evening and then Saturday and Sunday for limited hours. Is that right?

>> That's right. And I think Amber mentioned it, but the hours are limited to 0:0 P.M. to 8:00 P.M. Friday. That was to accommodate a request from the adjacent day care to not be going during those weekday hours so that was in place. The hours are Saturday, 10:00 to 8:00, but as you heard, it's limited to four hours at the time, based on agreement from neighbors and business owner. And 12:00 to 6:00 Sunday.

>> Pool: Okay. And then I'd like to understand the parameters of the outdoor music permit. Do the permit process or the sound impact plan cover any aspect of parking or driveway access?

>> No. At this time, the development itself has existing permitted driveways through the site plan exemption so if we were to have recommended something different before we recommended approval as the development services department, we would have gone back to the music office to ask them to consider things like decibel levels, hours of operation, occupancy. The development permit is what -- grants the access, so...

>> Pool: And that's the point that Mr. Fotts had made about the site plan exemption.

>> Correct. >>L: P some of the neighbors' concerns have to do with vehicular access and parking and these are important issues, but as we note here, they are outside the permit process, so we can't address them here. I do find them relevant and of great concern.

[5:45:24 PM]

I think probably all of us would admit to being concerned about children who live in this neighborhood and they're walking on the streets and there are no sidewalks, and so we need to do something about that. So I want to work with the neighbors and with Ms. Heeny further and with other staff, not municipal office staff, in order to mitigate the safety and vehicle concerns. So the point I want to press here is that Daugherty has no sidewalks, and I'm surprised by the argument that children who live in homes and play there and go to school, they deserve protections, so let's work on that. And I understand that every neighbor will not be pleased with the permit being granted or even with the conditions included, but I believe that an appropriate compromise has been struck. I appreciate everybody working together so hard and long on this, and so will support the permit as presented by staff. There may be some other comments on the dais, but after that, I'd be happy to make a motion.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll go ahead and let you make a motion. You make a motion to approve this item, close public hearing?

Pool: To close the public hearing --

>> Mayor Adler: And deny the appeal.

>> Pool: That's correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Deny the appeal. Is there a second to that motion? Councilmember Kitchen seconds that motion. Is there any discussion before we vote? Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? Those abstaining? The mayor pro tem voting no, councilmember --be okay, councilmember --tovo voting no, councilmember Garza abstaining. The others voting with councilmember Alter and Harper-Madison off the dais. The appeal is denied. All right.

[5:47:25 PM]

We're going to take a recess, 5:47, we're going to handle one proclamation real fast here because we have someone who's still as we set up the mic, then we'll do the balance of the proclamations. It is 5:47 and we're in recess.

[5:52:52 PM]

Reces

[recess]

>> Good evening, everybody. My name is Natasha harper-madison and I am the council person for district 1 and I get to do something really cool today. First of all, we are breaking code and we're going to do a proclamation before the music this evening. It's a very special proclamation and I'd like to say -- I'll give you guys a second to get on in here. All right. So I get to do the evening's first proclamation. Be it known that whereas the roots of Blackshear elementary go deep, back to 1891, when it was established to provide free public education to African American children and regory town Friedman's community, and whereas the ivy league educated long-time principal known as professor friendly R. Rice faithfully served Blackshear elementary school from 1931 to 1972, first under the formally segregated public school system, then under the admtration of Austin independent school district, which was established in 1971; and whereas Ryan runcy is completing a mural celebrating Blackshear fine arts academy and the lesscy of friendly R. Rice, and whereas all austinites are invited to attend an unveiling of the mural at 8:00 A.M. Tomorrow, that's friday, pril 26th, at Blackshear elementary school, followed by a renown from 8:15 to 10:15 A.M. Of former Blackshear students, family, neighbors, and staff, now, therefore, I, Natasha harper-madison, on behalf of the city of Austin, do hereby proclaim April 25, 2019, as Blackshear elementary legacy of principal friendly R. Rice day.

[5:56:21 PM]

[Cheers and applause] Thank you. And accngti this proclamation is Ms. Bonnie rice garner.

>> Thank you.

>> You're very welcome.

[Applause]

>> Harper-madison: Mayor Adler, where did you go? He's all the way back there.

>> I am so honored by this. My father worked long and hard. I did not know a lot of what he did, but I saw a lot of results of what he did because he never bragged about anything THAT he accomplished, from starting the hot lunch program to starting the very first library for black children here in Austin. And from even as a child when I went to Tennessee, my father had a garden that they maintained and it's something that he brought that same knowledge and love that which we now have the friendly garden. But the most important thing is that I wish to thank my family, I wish to thank all the Blackshear bridge, all my friends and neighbors, and you, thank you all for being here to honor my father in acknowledging what he did in the community. So I'm so very, very privileged and so I want to say thank you again for this honor and for giving me an opportunity to say thank you.

[5:58:24 PM]

Thank you all.

[Appl] au

>> Mayor Adler: all right. One of the neatest things we have here at city hall, in Austin, is that we stop a part of our city council meetings to make sure that we can bring a little live music into this place.

[6:00:29 PM]

If you have watched this debate on the land development code over the last four hours, six hours, you know why it's so important that we bring music here. We have the absolute gift today of having the Parks Project with us. The Parks Project is a jazz-based group led by drummer Aaron Parks on the drums, Tommy on the alto saxophone, and Daniel on the upright bass. This project focuses on original instrumental music. The first album, which is space jazz, came out of Aaron's desire to record and perform original tunes that are a slight detour from most of the bands that he supports. Please join me in welcoming the Parks Project.

[🎵 Music

[applause]

[Music]

[6:06:04 PM]

[Applause]

>> Mayor Adler: That was great, thank you. If people watching here, or watching on TV or watching this later want to find, can they find the project is this.

>> They can go to aaronparksdrums.com, also search the Parks Project on Bandcamp and find the album that way.

>> Mayor Adler: That answers the question if they want the music that's there they would go to be able to get the tracks. Sounds good then if people wanted to hear you live, do you have any gigs coming up?

>> Yeah, playing Monday at the Volstead at 11:00.

>> Mayor Adler: Cool. I have a proclamation. Be it known that whereas the city of Austin, Texas, is blessed with many creative musicians whose talent extend to virtually every music genre and whereas our music scene thrives because Austin audiences support good music, produced by legends, our local favorites and newcomers alike and whereas we are pleased to showcase and support our local artists, now,

therefore, I, Steve Adler, mayor of the live music capital, together with my colleagues on the council, hereby proclaim April 25, 2019, as parks project day in Austin, Texas. Congratulations.

>> Thank you very much. [applause]

[6:09:56 PM]

>> Adler: all right. We have a proclamation that's going to be accepted by Sylvia Holt-Rabb. She's the assistant director of the economic development department here in the city. Proclamation. As I know that whereas national small business week is May 6 to May 10 of the year 2019, and as is tradition the city's small business program and several business resource partners are proud to set aside this week to honor Austin's hard-working business owners with free classes, panel discussions, and inspiring speakers, and whereas over 91% all Austin's businesses have fewer than 100 employees and the Austin metro area ranks number 1 as the best place in which to start a new small business or branch and whereas to kick off this week long celebration on May 16, hometown favorite Bobby Jenkins will share the remarkable growth story of B Seaholm to inspire and recognize eight local businesses for excellence. Whereas Austin enjoys a collaborative small business ecosystem which jointly creates innovative opportunities for local entrepreneurs to acquire new skills and increase their business acumen, we are proud of the entrepreneurial footprint of our capital city and we want the public to share in celebrating Austin's unique small businesses that give our city personality and charm while creating over a third of all jobs. Now, therefore, I, Steve Adler, mayor of the city of Austin, Texas, do hereby proclaim April as national small business week here in Austin, Texas.

[6:12:05 PM]

Sylvia, thanks for everything you do. >> Thank you, mayor. As mentioned last week U.S. News and World Reports announced again that Austin is one of the best places to start a small business. With the incredible support by the city of Austin's small business program, along with our service providers that are here through Greater Austin Hispanic Chamber, Austin Community College and People Fund, we're dedicated to offer a variety of programs to help small businesses grow in our community, and we work collaboratively. Nationwide, the national small business week is celebrated annually to honor the country's top entrepreneurs, small business advocates and champions across the U.S., and Austin, too, joins this significant celebration. So today's proclamation recognizes this week, and we are grateful. So as the mayor mentioned, please join us on May 6 at the grand opening celebration at 10:00 A.M. in our beautiful central library, where our very own Bobby Jenkins will be telling his story and other free events are also offered around the city and we ask that you go to smallbusinessaustin.org to register and ask any questions. Again, we are here to help you grow, help build that economic base in Austin, and we just say thank you, mayor. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you

[applause]

[6:15:06 PM]

>> Good evening, my name is Alison alter and I have the honor and privilege of representing district 10 on the Austin city council. We have a proclamation today in honor wildfire anniversary month. It's really important we pay attention to every step we can take to reduce that risk. So proclamation, be it known that whereas Austin and Travis county residents value our natural environment, enjoy living near the wild lands and green belts in our community and whereas wildfire continues to be an ongoing and persistent threat, it is not a matter of if, but when a wildfire will occur, and whereas may traditionally -- may traditionally brings hotter, drier weather conditions that increase the risk of wildfire throughout Texas and the beginning of a heightened wildfire here and statewide and whereas the national fire protection association has declared May 5, 2019, Austin community wildfire preparedness day and where we call on all residents to make Austin a fire aware community to mitigate actions to themselves and their property, I, therefore, I, Alison alt, accompanied by Mayor Adler, one half of our colleagues proclaim May 2019 as wildfire awareness month. This proclamation will be accepted by --

>> All of us.

>> Alter: All of you.

>> Thank you, councilmember. Hello. My name is Battalion Chief Joe, with the Austin fire department. I have two staff members, fire chief Joe Baker and Linda Heeney with our wildfire division. We accept this proclamation with pride. Wildfire is an issue that has been going around for many, many years. We've heard of structure fires, car wrecks but now wildfire is a threat to community. We all moved to Austin because of the beautiful scenery, beautiful landscape, but that comes with danger as well so we wanted to educate y'all and we want May to be the month that we learn from each other, learn what to do, learn how to protect ourselves.

[6:17:16 PM]

We're having our seventh annual symposium Friday, May 3 and you can sign up at atxfire.com, there's a link. To close it out we want to say we participate in helping everybody and appreciate the support from the city council, city officials and more importantly our residents to learn, educate yourself and keep our community safe so we can keep being the most livable city in America. Thank you.

>> Great job.

[Applause]

>> Mayor Adler: so we have another proclamation. This one is going to be accepted by Erica Leak. She is the acting assistant director in the good housing and community development department. Proclamation. Be it known that whereas the U.S. Department of housing and urban development's community

development block grant program has provided the city with up to \$13 million annually in grant funding to meet the needs of persons of low and moderate income for nearly five decades and whereas the cdbg funding has significantly invested in the redevelopment of our affordable housing stock, neighborhood sustainability, job creation and strong partnerships with profit agency that's provide services to our residents, and whereas the week of April 22-26, 2019, has been designated for national recognition of the cdbg program in meeting the needs of low and moderate-income residents, now, therefore, I, Steve Adler, mayor of the city of Austin, Texas, do hereby proclaim April 22-26, 2019, as national community development week.

[6:20:21 PM]

Erica, thank you for everything that you and the department D want to say.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, good.

>> I am honored to accept this proclamation in recognition of national community development week in the city of Austin. The neighborhood housing and community development department is pleased to join with community development programs across the country in celebrating our amazing partnership with this. Department of housing and urban development's community development block grant program. The program has made it possible to elevate Austin's representation as a place where -- reputation as a place where people want to raise a family, grow a business and become part of a vibrant community. The cdbg funding of over 36 million over the past five years is invited in our community to help literally thousands -- tens of thousands of low and moderate-income austinites and their families while also providing significant benefits for our city. For example, just this past week we were notified that Aldridge 51, a mixed-income apartment community located in Mueller in east central Austin was chosen for the 2019 multi-family excellence award from the national association of low -- local housing finance agencies. Partly funded through kilogram funding, combined with \$4 million in the city's affordable housing bonds Aldridge 51 has become a model for balancing strategic community growth with housing for seniors and people with special needs. Another example is the city's architectural barrier removal program with which just last year served nearly 100 austinites with mobility or disability issues. This free program made possible through the cdbg grants modifies both rental and owned homes about things like wheelchair ramps, handrails and accessible shower grab bars and sinks.

[6:22:37 PM]

This program provides funding to ensure that homes are safe, livable, and healthy, and it also makes sure that people who might have otherwise been displaced to stay in their homes and live independently. These are merely two instances that represent the dozens of projects and programs made possible by cdbg grants each year. Neighborhood housing and community development looks forward to continuing our

partnerships among the federal agencies, nonprofits, and the private sector to focus on community development, affordable housing, preventing homelessness and public services to provide economic opportunities and resources to help meetustin's needs for accessibility, affordability, and diversity in our neighborhoods. Thank you.

[Applause]

>> Mayor Adler: Let's take a picture.

[6:24:40 PM]

>> Alter: Good evening, I'm Alison Honor, representing district 10 on the Austin City Council. I'm joined in this proclamation by Mayor Adler and colleague Greg Casar, who is here. I'm honored to present this proclamation addressing and preventing sexual assault is one of my top priorities as a councilmember, a woman, and as a mother, and it is a pressing concern throughout the country. For those of you who are not aware, April is sexual assault awareness and prevention month. I'm proud of our community, our advocates, and our city for working so diligently on reforming the sexual assault prevention and response system here in Austin. Austin, we must acknowledge and remember that history. However, on days like this, I'm reminded that we can have a bright future if we continue to push for progress. Many of the steps we need to take towards addressing sexual assault require funding, contracts, facilities, and resources that take time. However, we can help take significant strides towards transforming the culture around this issue without a need for these resources, too. We can start by believing survivors. Let me say that again. We can start by believing survivors. When we receive these stories with open minds and open arms, we send the message to survivors that it is okay to come forward and that they will find the support they need as they seek healing and justice. So today let's start by telling survivors, we hear you and we are here to help. I will now read the proclamation. It is known that whereas the Austin/Travis County Sexual Assault Response and Resource Team, started, shares a critical concern for victims of sexual violence and desire to support their needs for justice and healing, in 2018 the start agency membership served the needs of approximately 2,136 survivors through crisis intervention, counseling sessions, law enforcement interviews, legal services and provided medical care and/or evidence collection to 638 survivors.

[6:27:05 PM]

Whereas according to the Texas statewide study conducted in 2015, just over 9% of Texans statewide reported their sexual assault to a law enforcement agency. Let me repeat that. Just over 9% of Texans statewide reported their sexual assault to a law enforcement agency. Victims are far more likely to disclose their sexual assault to a friend or family member and when these loved ones respond with doubt, shame or blame victims suffer additional negative effects on their physical and psychological well-being, and whereas the start by believing public awareness campaign, a program of ending violence against women internationally, is designed to improve the responses of friends, family members and

community professionals so they can help victims to access supportive resources and engage the criminal justice system now, therefore, I, Alison Alter, on behalf of Mayor Adler and my colleagues on the City Council hereby proclaim the first Wednesday of April as Start by Believing Day in Austin. This proclamation will be accepted by Sydney from the Austin/Travis County Sexual Response and Resource Team.

[Applause]

[6:29:11 PM]

,

[7:17:38 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. It is 7:17. We're still here on April 25th. There are a few more people that have signed up. If they're here I will give them a chance to speak. Roy Whaley. No. Trey anywaysier.-- nazier. Is Cesar Acosta here.

>> Hello, my name is Craig nazier and I live in district 7. Here are some things I believe are important to keep in mind for a new code. In most capitalist societies density does not equal affordability. If it did Manhattan island would certainly be the most affordable place in America. It's not. Even so what is meant by affordable? If you cannot be exact by that, you offend the very people you are trying to help. It would make far more sense to increase the minimum wage to a living wage, make good education affordable, make health care more affordable and ensure a reasonable retirement. Unfortunately these are all very hard things for this city of Austin to do. I also want to mention impervious cover. Climate change is upon us and it is likely to be worse than our politically impaired reports are able to convey. Trading the more restrictive impervious cover limits demanded by climate change for more density will kill people, destroy property and eventually cost the taxpayer millions. Please don't do it. Now, a couple of weeks ago in my neighborhood we had a rain event that was three inches of rain per hour for two hours. It happened to be an unfortunate position where I had to walk down Braker Lane to I-35 to rent a car because my car wouldn't work.

[7:19:42 PM]

And it was just astonishing the amount of water that was on the street. There are areas of Braker Lane that had four inches or more of water on them. Water was running down these little creeks and streams, and the older developed part between North Lamar and I-35, the distinct smell of sewage was coming up as old sewage systems were overflowing. As you know, Walnut Creek where Al Thil Place runs is still out of compliance with the Clean Water Act. I think after seeing that -- I was really, really shocked.

by that event. And T was just three inches rain per hour for two hours. That was six inches of rain. Rain bombs like that are going to become more common and we just need to be ready for it. We cannot let the demands of the developer community mean that the rest of us have to pay in the end for the damage that climate change is going to do. And I don't see us really moving ahead yet to really address that. And I don't think the city council can either. You've done a good job already as far as you can. So now I think we have to prepare for what's coming.

[Buzzer sounds] Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Okay. Those are the people we called that had signed up. Colleagues, did you sign up too? I don't see your name.

>> My name is Cr Acosta.

>> Go ahead. You have a minute.

>> [Inaudible - no mic].

>> Mayor Adler: It was three minutes for the first 20 speakers that spoke and -- oh, donated time.

[7:21:46 PM]

Ah, I now see you popped up on my calendar -- Sule, Tyler Markham and Josiah seven son. You have three minutes. There's a third that signed UT there's a limit of two. Go ahead. I appreciate your time. The thing I want to view is that the land development code should be seen in decades. The cost of living are not the result of sudden changes, but rooted in developments that have been going on for tens of years that are rooted in code that's been in existence for 30. So we need to make sure to look at land development code in the sense of those time scales. If we want to make sure that we're planning for a community in Austin 30 years from now that is diverse and integrated we need to plan housing that also diverse and incidentally integrated, it is important we have missing middle nexts, triplexes, four-plexes across the city and if for nothing else we make sure in the time between now and then there's opportunity for those places to exist for families to mount them. If you allow for only one type of home to exist in an area, that means only one type of income will live in that area, only one station of LI can be in those areas. I strongly encourage you to consider that in the terms that -- it's not the envy of you that you have to make a decision for people voting 20, 30 years from now, not the people of today. The things that will benefit the people who are most vulnerable are going to be high investments in public infrastructure like the affordable housing bond that just passed. But you need to think of people that will be here in a while from now. So we need to make sure that we're investing time and resources into the kinds of housing and mixing of incomes across the board.

[7:23:46 PM]

So those are really just the things I want to make sure to consider. I've been privileged enough to live in Austin for four years and in that time I've lived in St. Johns that entire time I've seen the changes in my community as they've happened. And again, these are not things that have happened suddenly. They've been in the works for awhile. And because of the restraints of housing that exist in other neighborhoods that have been more privileged economically to organize, they are now the ones pressured to get the increases in density, but you have the opportunity now to put a more fair playing field next round of development that occurs. So I strongly encourage you to consider that today. And make that part of your process.

>> Mayor Adler: Great. Thank you very much. And then I think there may be another person who has signed up. Mary [indiscernible].

>> I'm Mary [indiscernible]. And I'm going to keep it short because I only have a minute. I'm really concerned about climate change as I'm sure you know we have 11 years to stave off the most extreme impacts of climate change and the best way that we can do that is by not mandating parking. Parking causes impervious cover. It causes additional flooding. It causes heat island effects and it encourages people to drive. So we need to completely eliminate parking minimums citywide. We already have it in downtown and magically Google is suddenly going to build a 16 story building -- 33 story building with 16 floors of parking. So I don't think the parking minimums are -- and removing them is necessarily going to solve all the problems, but it can do a lot. And then in addition, if you think about all this impervious cover, if we can have three thousand houses on top of each other instead of three houses spread out, that's less impervious cover. So I think about that a lot and I really hope that you consider less parking and less impervious cover. Thank you.

[7:25:46 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, that gets us back we have on the floor is the main motion and then we have a series of amendments to the main motion and we can consider those and amendments to those amendments. And then we can consider other amendments as we go through. Just by looking at what's left on the amendments on this section in terms of just timing and speed and issues that are coming, we've hit two of the really hard issues. As I look at the amendment document, we were on page 3, halfway through. We had hit all of the amendments in that section above that were part of the amendments on amendment A so there's nothing left in that section to amend the amendment because we're now amending the amendments, we're not amending the base motion. In section 2, which is on the second half of that page, it looks like the chief issue front of us that is covered by an amendment that we'll discuss is the issue of prioritization. The second big issue that looks like it's coming up is at the bottom of the page, the preservation incentives. There's an amendment on that. And on the next page there's an amendment that went to kind of the geographic percentages, you know, do we want to have a percentage in a certain part of town or not. The next amendment that councilmember Ellis brings to us at the top of page 5 the one that talks about the transition area and describes that, so that would be the topic then addressed there. And then down below that we talk about -- I'm not sure -- then I think the real thing is after that is the criteria to take into account in transition areas if we have one which is on page 6.

[7:27:51 PM]

When we consider these amendments to come up with respect to the preservation, the residential uses being allowed in commercial zoning categories, we're probably going to recommend that alter number two amendment be incorporated into that language. I think that's a good thing to happen. Natasha hadgu with respect to kind of the percentage in the geographic area, which is on the top of page 4 that I would recommend that we look at. And councilmember kitchen had some language on the transition area that I recommend we take a look at. That would take us through the amendments that have been offered by Ellis and that would put us in a position then to go through the other amendments and see what's still relevant, what can we just immediately accept and what do we need to discuss.

>> Kitchen: There's one more. I had one in the parking.

>> Mayor Adler: Oh, I dropped that one out. Yes, because it takes it away from no parking.

Kitchen: It changes what's in there.

>> Mayor Adler: It's the elimination issue, yes. More globally set. So, councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I think we agreed at the end when we were taking our dinner break that we would start with the question that had on code text a. Code text on question 2-a.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, we still have to go through the other ones after that.

Mayor Adler: The problem is she didn't make any amendments to code text.

>> Pool: I had a question.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Elli we're considering her amendments now. We have a base motion which was the thing that was filed back in April and then we have some amendments that were offered by councilmember Ellis and me -- yes, the two of us -- and those amendments are in front of us and we can certainly amend those amendments. But she doesn't have any amendments to code text state of Texas section so you can't amend --

>> Pool: I'm sorry, mayor, I'm looking at code revision to provide additional housing capacity could include, and a is in red and it's underlined.

[7:29:56 PM]

It looks like it's an insertion.

>> Mayor Adler: All it is is intent from lower case a to higher case --

>> Pool: It looks like the entire thing is underlined and --

>> Kitchen: I have an amendment to that one.

>> Pool: So I wanted to start with question about intent because I think we may be on the same page but I don't yet know and no punish intended, councilmember Ellis.

>> Kitchen: And mayor, I have an amendment to that one.

>> Mayor Adler: My mor is evidently different.

>> Pool: I'm looking at the llowye document, page 3 that's the Adler Ellis --

>> Mayor Adler: I'morry S that was the wrong code text section, the one with the prioritization. Yes.

>> Pool: Great. So my question on a where it talks about parcels within activity centers for additional housing capacity, is this intended toify non-zoning regulations to allow for higher unit yields on parcels within activity enters D fronting activity corridors, not corners, corridors. Because there's -- that's a shorter way I think of saying T B I want to kind of get a sense if that is the intent.

>> Mayor Adler: So now we're lookinon page 3, code text 2.

>> Pool: And it's a and it's the new language underlined and it says for parcels within activity centers.

>> May Adlor: And on activity corridors. And wt's your question.

>> Pool: My question was is this intended to modify non-zoning regular layings to allowor higher unit yields on parcels within activity centers and fronting activity corridors?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Pool: Okay. Is that -- councilmember Ellis, is that your intent too?

>> Ellis: Yes.

>> Pool: Two questions would that be simpler to say it that way?

>> Mayor Adler: I have no problem with adding -- and fronting on, adding the word fronting.

>> Kitchen: I have an amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll get there in a second.

[7:31:57 PM]

>> Kitchen: Thought you were done. Sorry.

>> Pool:nd my second question, does that incde utilities? The modification of non-zoning regulations, would that include utilities to be considered in the calculation that would allow for higher unit yields? Bee I think the answer would be yes, but I would like -- I would like to make thatlarification.

May>> Adler: In the earlier version of this it listed specific this that would be taken into account.

>> Pool: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: And his amendment takes those things out and basically punts that back to staff and says that prioritize these things, but we're trying to -- we're trying to get greater potential housing unit yields. So it doesn't -- it leaves that ability for staff to

take a look at. >> Pool: That's really good to hear and I would like to make sure that it's memorialized that we're interested in including utilities. My concern is that in this case, for example, we are moving some of the more descriptive, some might say prescriptive language and leaving it open, but in some areas we're being more prescriptive. So I'm trying to find a balance between those two. And in this case I would like to specify that that include utilities.

>> Mayor Adler: I would say it means everything. If start calling out --

>> Pool: Well, all non-zoning regulations, which would include utilities is what I'm specifically honing in on.

>> Mayor Adler: I have no problem saying utilities because it includes everything. Unclear member kitchen.

>> Kitchen: The way -- I have an amendment for this one so it's a page from my document, number two. I may have been reading this a little differently, but you're saying your language to say that it does establish a priority, it does establish the top priority for higher potential housing unit yields.

[7:34:02 PM]

So to my mind that was giving direction that in all cases you were going to -- in all cases the direction would be to give greater priority to the potential housing unit yields over protecting the environment,, over sustainability, over public safety, over transportation, over all of that. So maybe that's not the intent. I was reading it that way because it says -- here's how I was reading it. You can tell me if I misread it. It says for these parcels, application of non-zoning regulations should be prioritized in a manner that allows for greater potential housing units. So what I had suggested instead was something that said non-zoning regulations -- okay. Code revisions to provide additional housing capacity should include non-zoning regulations that provide flexibility to allow for higher unit yields for parcels, et cetera, et cetera, when alternative means can be determined to ensure the balance of needs while protecting environment and sustainability, landscaping, parkland preservation, public safety, transportation, utility and right-of-way. So to my mind what I was thinking that the difference was is that the language that's in -- that you guys have is saying that you will always prioritize getting more unit over anything else, any other non-zoning regulations, where I was trying to say that you would want to be able to prioritize over non-zoning regulations, but you would be looking for alternative equivalent means. So you ensured the balance of needs. So in other words, I'm not prepared at this point in time to say that in every case that the balance between additional unit and environment and sustainability, for example, is always going to be the additional higher unit.

[7:36:18 PM]

So I was concerned that because I felt like we needed -- I wasn't prepared to say that in every single case I want to allow us to look at those circumstances.

>> Mayor Adler: Greg?

>> Casar: I don't read it that way, the way you just described. So let me see if I can -- not having written this thing give you a sense of what I read when I get this and see if it helps. For me it does not say prioritize housing unit yield over public safety. It doesn't say prioritize housing unit yield over flooding when I read it. It says -- because of course we have to make sure the housing is safe. Of course we have to make sure the housing is

[indiscernible]. So when it says looking at that broad breadth of things make sure there's some prioritization to there are different yields. So when you look at all the different stuff make sure that all the different things don't get prioritized so much that you end up with lower housing yields because we're always striking balance. We'll never say we don't mind if it catches on matter or if it doesn't flood. This isn't saying prioritize housing above all else. It says make sure that the non-zoning stuff is balanced in such a way that you will get higher housing yield.

>> Kitchen: Then I would like for the language to be a little clearer because it doesn't read that way to me. Reads to me as-- it says non-zoning regulations should be prioritized in a way that allows for more units. So --

>> Mayor Adler: If what you're saying is there are some situations -- as a general rule I think that's where we were coming from.

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: As a general rule. But your point probably is one that there may be situations where that's not appropriate.

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: So what I would be comfortable with is taking the language that's existing there and just say should be prioritized in a manner that, and then I would add the word generally.

[7:38:23 PM]

That generally allows for greater housing potential unit yields so as to allow for situations where that's not appropriate or -- but to say generally that's the goal we're trying to really hit here is that focus.

>> Kitchen: I'd like to suggest the language that have.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. You certainly can.

>> Kitchen: If we can look at the language that I have that is on page 4. I'd like to work off of that language if it's okay for folks.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Flannigan?

>> Flannigan: I don't think we're really that far away and I think councilmember kitchen's language is pretty good and it satisfies my issues on this. I have separate amendments that will address administrative variances on setbacks to do better tree preservation, but not lose a unit. And then the ability to do overlapping regulations like drainage fields and open space where it's safe. So we'll get those T when we get to the addition portion of that process, but I'm satisfied with councilmember kitchen's language because I know I've got those other amendments coming.

>> Casar: Mayor? My only concern, and again this might be just like you raised, maybe it's because I'm reading wrong, but it has to do with the word "When" the word when, because you say non-zoning regions that allow higher unit yields when, and when I read when I means only when there are alternative equivalent means to get ething else.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Is there a BETR word that would make more sense to you?

>> Casar: I want to raise that. I haven't -- I'm fine with adding the word generally into the mayor's. So let me see if there's a way that I can get this to mean something similar to that. Give me aoment to look at it.

>> Mayor Adler: You're not trying to change the higher priority for higher unit yields. Th's the focus.

>> Kitchen: No. I'm trying to say that we want our non-zoning regulations to be flexible. And -- and we want to look for alternative equivalent means to ensure that balance.

[7:40:32 PM]

So...

>> Casar: So would it be okay if we ended the sentence where the word wn is and create a break there. Non-zoning regulations that provide flexibility to allow higher unit yields for parcels within activity centers andronting activity corridors, period. The staff should create a code that allows for alternative equivalent means to, and short.

>> Kitchen: That sounds okay. Can you say that again?

>> Casar: Replace the word when with a period and then say the code should create alternative equivalent means anthen cut the words canbe D ermined.

>> Kitchen: To ensure.

>> Casar: To ensure.

>> Kitchen: That works for me.

>> Mayor Adler: That works for me. That's fine.

>> Ellis: Works for me.

>> Flannigan: Eept for the word fronting, which was not in yr language.

>> Kitchen: I have fronting out.

>> Flannigan: But when Greg just reread it he included the word fronting.

>> Mayor Adl: So let's go to the question Leslie asked a second ago so we need to take a vote on the fronting question. And what's the issue with spect to fronting or not fronting?

>> Flannigan: Because I may have corridors where I also want higher unit yields in the property that is behind it tn some corridors is also commercial. So I don't want to include this just the fronting parcel.

>> Pool: Mayor, I'm okayvingmo moving without the word fronting at this juncture.

>> Mayor Adler: So period after corridors and then say the code should create alternative equivalent means to ensure the balance of needs?

>> Kitchen: Right. And then the rest of the sentence.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. People okayit? Okay.

>> Aer: Mayor, I'm going to need to -- we can move on.

[7:42:34 PM]

I'll need to think through that a little bit. I think it's definitely better than here we started started, but --

>> Mayor Adler: Let's do that. There's nothing here we're doing we can'teom back to. Okay? All right. So yes,ilmencer tovo.

>> Tovo: I need to ask a clarifying question. We're taking up some amendments and not others. And as I stand the distinction, we are not Ta up the amendments that are amending the base -- we're only addressing right now amendments to the amendments on this page? Not amendments to the base document.

>> Mayor Adler: Not amendments to the base cument, but amendments to the amendments in front of us and the amendments in front of us are Ellis' amendments.

>> Tovo: And yours.

>> Kitchen: Is that the same as saying the ones that ear additive as opposed to changing language? I would say ifhe took something out that's also an amendment. Someone would amend something she took out. To put it back in or we can handle that when we get to the language that people are putting back in. I think that may be an easier thing to do. But we certainly won't miss anything and people can double back if something got lost in that push. Matters so that's then the change to 2-a. Okay. That gets us then to -- I see on D, residential uses should be allowed in commercial zoning categories. We were looking at councilmember alter's amendment 2. She had added language that said draft 3 mapping

including mobility requirements for commercial properties residential uses are not permitted and these amendments should be contained in the new draft.

>> Kitchen: Which one, I'm sorry?

>> Mayor Adler: This is councilmember alter, motion she'd 2.

[7:44:37 PM]

-- Motion sheet 2. Question 2. So in lieu of D we would be comfortable in substituting councilmember alter's amendment 2 on her page.>> Kitchen: I see it now, got it.

>> Mayor Adler: So --

>> Tovo: I think some of us don't have our materials organized in the same way you now do. Would you mind M telling me again? It's not sheet 2 and it's residential uses should be allowed in commercial categories existing language draft 3 mapping?

>> Mayor Adler: Those first six words that she has there are the six words in D on code text.

>> Tovo: The whole of -- we're considering putting in all of amendment 2 --

>> Mayor Adler: In place of what's in D. Because what councilmember alter did was to add a sentence to D. Okay? Any objection to that?

>> Ellis: I just have a clarifying question. Could you go into a little more detail into exactly what this is? I know being newer to this process digesting it all, I think I'm on board, I just wanted to kind of see your thoughts.

>> Alter: So there were underlying -- I'm kind of

[indiscernible] In my own amendment now. Thank you. So draft 3 included that if you were zoned commercial and you were given residential rights as happens I think with vmu, that you would be needing to do affordability in order to have -- to be able to do the residential when they thought that was appropriate.

>> Ellis: Okay.

>> Alt: And it was mapped in draft 3 and there were some suggestions of changes that were -- they were in the process of when we cut off that where they missed it that would be assumed to move forward by this.

>> Ell: I appreciate that. I'm supportive of that.

>> Alter: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? So that change will be made.

[7:46:38 PM]

Councilmember alter substituted for D.

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor, I had something for C.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So on my document it is on page -- it's on pag4 under code text, it's C. Is everybody there?

>> Mayor Adler: No, there is N amendment to C.

>> Kitchen yes, there is, I've got an amendment to C.

>> Mayor Adler: N but there's no -- there's no Ellis amendment to C that you're amending. There is a preservation incentive in.

>> Kitchen: I'm not undetanding -- I'm sorry, I'm not understanding the distinction.

>> Mayor Adler: We are amending councilmember Ellis amendments. If she didn't -- and mine. I'm going to call it amendment a because it's also titled amendment a. There is -- it's not the base motion, it's the amendment a to the base motion. So we are now amending amendment a to the base motion. And amendment a doesn't make any changes in C.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So it has to be red lined on this order O for us to --

>> Mayor Adler: Correct.

>> Kitchen: Sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct. Red lined.

>> Kitchen: Okay, I got it now.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? So we've changed that D. That gets us to E. E provides an additional preservation incentive that says when you expand -- should be expanded. Right now there's a preservation provision that would be in draft 3. The existing pservation in aft 3 really only applies where there isdus and not every place there's ads. And it says Adu doesn't count toward F.A.R. And it limits it for a househat are 10 years old.

[7:48:40 PM]

So paragraph E was an attempt to expand the incentives for preservation of existing homes.

>> Flannigan: Mayor?

>> Kitchen: Could I ask a question? So on does that mean -- so does that mean -- preservation incens, what does that mean? I mean, you're not talking about the historic preservation, are you? Or is THA what this is?

>> Mayor Adler: No, preservation of the existing house. With the preservation of an existing structure, the last line, it actually on the next page as it carries over over. So there's an incentive that is allowed with the preservation of an existing structure. So if you don't preserve the existing structure you're retro entitled to additional unit. This provides an additional unit --

>> Kitchen: So preservation incentives, do those incentive right now? Is that what we're saying?

>> Mayor Adler: There are some preservation incentives that exist now in draft 3.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: That allow for an Adu not to count toward an F.A.R. Limit. When an existing house is -- when an existing at least 10 years old is preserved. And that's in some zoning districts. Not in every zoning district.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Well, then the language that I had in C could go here.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: In some ways they -- they work together. So I think it would be appropriate to look at that language right now.

>> C or E?

>> Kitchen: C. The C that I have

Mayor Adler: On page four of eight.

>> Kitchen: The C that I have in my document looks like the E that we're talking about right now I guess is what I'm saying.

>> Mayor Adler: That's what I said, the appropriate place for that was in E, not C.

[7:50:41 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay. Well then can -- can we talk about it now?

>> Mayor Adler: Uh-huh.

>> Kitchen: So what I've got is remodeling should be very simple so it is much easier to preserve an existing home than tear down and replace it with another larger structure, provide on options to revise the mcmansion ordinance, that provide for the ability to add room or limited remodel, but constrain ability to demolish existing home and replace it with another larger single-family home. If an existing affordable home is preserved, the balance of the lot's entitlements can be used to add more dwelling units. So I think that could go --

>> Mayor Adler: To me could that -- let me look here one second.

>> Kitchen: It may go together.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm not sure they're mutually exclusive.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, I don't think they are.

>> Casar: Mayor, I'm supportive of this language. I would suggest so that it best fits in with the preservation bonus of a unit that we add, remodeling or adding units should be very simple. So it is easier to re-sep rather than tear down to replace with one big one. The idea being we don't want to make it so complicated to add the unit in the BAC that people just prefer to tear it down.

>> Kitchen: I'mine.

>> Mayor Adler: So what are you saying?

>> Casar: I'm very supportive of adding the kitchen language, but I think to fit it into this section we should add remodeling or adding units should be very simple.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And I don't see this as being contradictory so I would port adding this to that section.

>> Kitchen: That's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that? Mr. Flannigan, no objection? That one will be added as well. Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: One change I would like to make is remove the word walk shed and be a half mile sense the preservation tools should be more expansive than just the quarter mile.

[7:52:43 PM]

Anbeing so narrowly fined in the walk shed.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anybody have an objection to that? Okay. No objection, then that one is added. Sore deleting the word walk shed and making it half a mile. Okay. Any other changes to this E? Yes, couilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: I actually am going back to D and I T it's very simple. I need a little clarification. That birthday cake got me sluggish. It says should be allowed in residential zoning categories. I'm trying to figure out what dictates the commercial zoning categories. Where is it, has that corridors corridors exclusively? Is there some way to define what is commercial zoning categories?

>> Mayor Adler: I think the intent was anywhere W allow commercial used to be that you couldn't put residential there too. You'dn't put an apartment above it, a ground floor commercial use because it was determined to be inconsistent with a commercial area. But the trends now are to let people live in

commercial areas, to live above stores, to be in and among. It's a more cctpa and connected way for people to bible a live astmo that kind of activity.

>> Harper-madison: So this doesn'te any clearly defined boundaries or specific -- okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Is just says if you have a commercial zoning let's let people live there too. Okay. So that's D and E --

>> Tovo: No, sorry, I had my hand up as well.

>> Mayor Adler: That's okay.

>> Tovo: So I am absolutely on board with preservation requirement, but that's not the only thing that this provision is doing. It's actually -- as I understand it, it's allowing an additional unit to the base zoning in any category but not -- but it is differently applied wn the urban core to outside. And I need to understand especially in light of imineagustin and our high opportunity areas why THA distinction is being drawn.

[7:55:04 PM]

And actually, I would like to -- to bring up first the growth concept map from imagine Austin and I've again misplaced my boundaries for the mcmansion area, which is basically the urban core plus I Thi somereas in -- if I'm correct, in district 2. But as I seehe growth concept map, we would be -- we would be missing the regional center north of 183. We would also be missing those two regional centers that are up closer to 45 and then over in that other area and then in the south we would be missing activity centers for redevelopment in environmentally sensitive areas in the green south of 71. We would be missing the neighborhood center --

>> Mayor Adler: Why would be missing --

>> Tovo:he regional center. Beuse the urban --

>> Mayor Adler: Why would we be missing those?

>> Casar: It says inside of those centers corridors you just listed as well and within a half mile ofhem. T

>> Mayor Adler: It's everywhere in the urban core --

>> Tovo: And it says outside -- I thought from our conversation earlier it was outsidehe T urban core within a half mile of those.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Tovo: Okay. So it would be within --

>> Mayor Adler: So it would cover all those things.

>> Tovo: So it seems to me -- again, we're doing this kind of without mapping. So it's hard for me to tell how much of thats G ING to be --

>> Mayor Adler: The corridor itself.

>> Tovo: Yeah, I get that, but if we could see the . The next map, please. The high opportunity areas. We don't have a layer mapping, as I understand, we don't have a layer mapping the high opportunity areas with the half mile -- with the half mile we just described from activity centers. But I guess the fundamental question remains, why are we -- why are we handling within the urban center differently from outside of the urban center?

[7:57:07 PM]

>> Flannigan: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: Because it's part of what we did in the asmp, but access to transit.

>> Tovo: I thought the point of having our transit system was to get people throughout the city.

>> Flannigan: Yeah, but we're never putting transit in the areas that you're describing that are in between the centers, the corridors and areas outside the core.

>> Tovo: To me if we're trying to build capacity for transit, we should be treating these exactly the same. If we're having -- if we're considering a measure that is adding an additional unit, I mean, I think you were the one who used the language the other day of not -- of making sure that areas are not opting out of density. I guess I really need an explanation of why we would have a measure that's different in one part of the city than another.

>> Flannigan: I just gave you explanation and it's about access to transit.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Kitchen. Richard I guess my thought was that --

>> Kitchen: I guess my thought is this is for preservation incentives and of course my only perspective is the districts that I know so I may be totally wrong about this. At least for the areas in my district that are further south, preservation is not the -- is not the need, it's -- so that's why it isn't concern me. For me the preservation is really the problem. In the urban core. But again, all I know is my area, so I could be missing something.

>> Mayor

>> Mayor Adler: Do you want to propose an amendment to change that?

>> Tovo: I would make them the same, in and out the urban core. Preservation incentives should be considered citywide allowing a -- allowing a unit beyond what would otherwise be allowed with the preservation of an existing structure, and put the -- yeah, the.

[7:59:09 PM]

So preservation incentives could be extended, and then somehow enmesh the half M walkshed from the center activity corridor or transit priority.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So it would say preservation center should be expanded everywhere within a half mile from an activity center or activity corridor or transit priority network so the additional unit beyond what we're talking about be allowed --

>> Tovo: With the preservation of an existing structure.

>> Mayor Adler: An existing structure. Is that a second on this amendment? Councilmember pool seconds that. You want to say anything else, Kathie?

>> Tovo: Nope.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further discussion on this?

>> Tovo: I guess I would just emphasize again, if you look at the map, I think this allows us to make sure we're hitting the high opportunity areas that the presentation on Tuesday highlighted, the area -- map I'm lieutenant. Looking at. Again, it doesn't have it mapped so it's hard to tell which areas would be missed, but I think having the same tool apply everywhere is the best route, especially if WRE trying to build enough density for transit, so that a transit system can go all over, all over the city.

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion? Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I like what councilmember tovo is recommending, and it also makes me feel like this really a future-looking document that will take us into the next 30 years.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Adler.

>> Alterso I'm not sure that I'm totally understanding this tool, but I have a concern on this that -- how do we know that if they built this other structure it would be another living unit? There are a lot of people in these high opportunity areas of means who could easily take advantage of this just to build their houses.

[8:01:15 PM]

This is not the same example, but I'm dealing with a situation in my district where somebody had a house -- I'm trying to see -- it was an SF-2 lot. It was so large that they were able to subdivide it, and they claimed they were building another unit of housing, and they're actually building a 3,000-square-foot -- they built a 3,000-square-foot pool and gymnasium that's now next-door to somebody's house, and it's not -- you know, it's not even a bedroom in it. And I understand this is happening under the current code, but it's something that we need to fix and somehow we need to know that they're going to create another unit or it's not necessarily to be achieving the goals that we have in mind. I'm not saying it's not a good idea to preserve, but at some point we have to figure out how we can put some guardrails on that because I don't think that's what we want to be incentivizing.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, could I --

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I think your point is well-taken, but I think that's what we need to look at when this language comes back to us. You know -- how we act get this done is something we need to look to our mistake of to propose to us. I think the basic idea in the language we have here is preservation of the existing home. I know I've seen the same kind of -- or not that exactly, but I understand what you're saying, and that's somewhat the problem with the current mansion ordinance. But, you know, I think that the statement that we want to make, and then we need to look to what comes back to us in terms of options and really think about whether it's going to work or not.

>> Alter: And I guess I'm not necessarily objecting to the idea of trying to come up with preservation.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Alter: And I don't necessarily have language to put in the but as staff is looking at this, have to be able to make sure that we are not going to just get even larger mansions under the guise of creating additional --

[8:03:24 PM]

>> Kitchen: Sure. >>: -- Units. I have no idea how to do that, per se, but if we don't do that, unless enough wealth in this town that we will see a lot of that happening, and we will never be able to reach our goals of 100% impervious cover and less flooding and all that other stuff, and we won't achieve the additional units.

>> Mayor Adler: I think your point is well-taken, and obviously the good thing is, we don't have to know how to draft the actual rule here. These guys will do it later. But I think it goes without saying that we're trying to preserve an existing home and don't let people abuse it. So draft it in a way that doesn't allow for abuse. I think that covers that.

>> Alter: But even -- >> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry?

>> Alter: In the case that I'm dealing with, like the site plan didn't even have to bathroom in it, and it was still allowed.

>> Mayor Adler: I think we can say existing home structure, with the preservation of existing home structure.

>> Alter: Right. But the home was preserved, but in building the other unit -- so there's a part of this, whether you're preserving the existing home and part of it, what kind of unit you're building, is it another unit or is it some other big part of the home. And in the case that I -- we're dealing with, the site plan even said there was no bedroom, and it was still allowed when they subdivided it.

>> Mayor Adler: So a home unit -- preservation of existing home unit?

>> Alter: I don't know that we have to mess with the language. I just want to make sure that staff is aware that we have --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: -- To do that, and I wanted to bring the issue up because it's a weird example, but it's one of the ways in which the market will not necessarily follow our guidance if we're not careful.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So noted.

>> Casar: Mayor? Are we still debating councilmember Tovo's amendment?

>> Mayor Adler: We are debating councilmember Tovo's.

>> Casar: I lost track of what it is and what it is. I just to clarify, mayor and councilmember Tovo, is what this amendment is essentially doing is creating a half mile from corridors and centers, all over the city, but not having the urban core?

[8:05:34 PM]

Is that what the motion does?

>> Tovo: I don't think so.

>> Casar: And that's why I admitted to having lost track of what --

>> Tovo: No, it would be within a half mile walkshed from activity center, activity corridor, or transit priority network, which is all over the urban core asked which is what? >> Tovo: All over the urban core.

>> Casar: But it does not say all the urban core. You're amending it to just say half mile from activity centers and --

>> Tovo: Making it consistent throughout the --

>> Casar: Correct. The way it's currently structured I'm voting no because this would remove sections of the urban core, it would just essentially -- because it already is half a mile from all corridors and centers and transit priority network, plus urban core, and then this would actually be removing --

>> Mayor Adler: This removes the area in the urban core, not half mile proximate.

>> Kitchen: Can I speak to that?

>> Tovo: To be clear, I think we saw a slide earlier about half mile from transit priority -- I mean, if we -- and this is why some mapping would be helpful. A half mile from transit corridor city and corridors, pretty much covers a good deal of the urban core. I don't think there will be much left. I think we saw a slide earlier from the Hyde Park neighborhood representative that showed there was -- there were a couple blocks left if you map from a half mile from transit priority corridors in that area. Probably the same is true of a lot of the other neighborhoods in the urban core.

>> Casar: I understand. I just probably won't support an amendment that reduces this area.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I can support that, either. I mean, this is -- this is about preservation incentives, and my neighborhoods that are in the urban core, they need preservation incentives in their entire neighborhood. Not just within -- because we're seeing tear-downs of single-family homes, older single-family homes that are being taken down and replaced with a larger single-family home without -- I know the concern that councilmember Alter raised will only be able to do so much given the market, but we should do whatever we can.

[8:07:47 PM]

And that kind of preservation is needed all throughout the neighborhoods in the urban core that I represent. So I can't support limiting this to just within a half mile.

>> Mayor Adler: Any further discussion before we vote?

>> Tovo: Well, I would just say to councilmember kitchen, that's not the only -- I have an amendment somewhere later about preservation incentives as well. This is --

>> Kitchen: Well, maybe we should --

>> Tovo: This is to add an additional. So if you have -- if you have the ability to do three, you can then do four. I mean, we could build in preservation, and I think we should, and I think we should task the staff with doing exactly that, coming up with incentives for how we -- how we retain the existing structures throughout our urban core, absolutely. I mean, that's a primary concern of mine. But this is to allow an additional -- whatever -- whatever the base ends up being, if it adds three, then they can add four.

>> Kitchen: With the preservation of existing structure.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead and take a vote.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, I have one question. So you have other amendments? Shouldn't we take --

Tovo: They're not on the amendment -- [off mic]

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's take a vote. Councilmember Tovo moves to take out the urban core, not half mile proximate. Those in favor of the amendment, please raise your hand. Alter and councilmember Tovo. Those opposed, raise your hand. It's the balance of the dais. Amendment does not go forward. Okay. Anything else on E? Okay. And then could we vote -- did we vote on Jimmy's -- I think we voted on Jimmy's without objection. Yes, councilmember pool. Oh >> I was just wondering if what councilmember Tovo recommended, if there were no limits, would that have achieved a positive vote on this dais? Because if that were the case, then maybe we should consider that.

[8:09:48 PM]

Because the limiting factor was the piece that I was opposing. I would like to see what she was recommending but with no limits.

>> Mayor Adler: What do you mean? I'm not following you.

>> Pool: Your other amendment. Okay, well, I'll wait till that comes up then.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. Continuing on, I think that gets us then to the zoning map. I was going to recommend that in place of the language that we have at the top of page 4 under zone map, that we bring in councilmember harper-madison's language from her amend, which is her amendment in response to question number 2, where it says the majority of new housing capacity should be within a Half mile.

>> Harper-madison: Where did I put that paper?

>> Mayor Adler: You did a good job. Within half mile transit priority network -- I would like to know, councilmember, if you would allow us to put at the end of it, city corridors -- councilmember Harper, are you okay with addin imagine Austin activities and rridcos? The majority of N housing capacity --

>> Harper-madison: The majority of new housing capacity Id bit within a half mile -- half as identified by the Austin strategic mobility plan.

>> Mayor Adler: Right. And the imagine Austin activity ers and corridors. And the reason I say thats because our blueprint had us trying to put 75% of our new housing within a half mile of imagine Austin centers and corridors.

>> Harper-madison: I'm comfortable with that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Tovo: I'm sorry, what would be the -- what was your amended language to her amendment?

[8:11:53 PM]

Do you remember?

>> Mayor Adler: Add to the end, Austin strategic mobility plan, comma, and imagine Austin activity centers and corridors.

>> Tovo: Yeah, I am not going to be able to support this. For one thing, I think what we're now looking at is puttin something -- I mean, we've asked them to create zoning that would support 405,000 units, and

as I see it, we're back to directing most of that in particular areas. Your amendment extends it to a bit, but it's still, I think -- you know, as I look back -- I mean, for one thing, we're operating really without going back and reflecting on some of the work that was done. As I look back to some of the housing capacity work they did for us, looking back at draft one, they had estimated how much housing capacity they could get on vacant land, how much redevelopment and other means, and it's very clear that in urban core neighborhoods, especially those in the central city, you'll only get that increased capacity through wide scale redevelopment. And the only way to achieve this much capacity in the area that's been developed is through what we call transit priority networks. I want to revisit what we just took up. I think I got a little confused and I now understand what councilmember Pool was suggesting. When we're done with this --

>> Mayor Adler: We can go back to that then. Reference all over the place that we're trying to operate this code in support of our strategic housing blueprint, and one of the strategic housing blueprints that's specifically, we want at least 75% of new housing units within half mile of transit priority networks and corridors. So let's put that to -- Mr. Flannigan?

[8:13:54 PM]

>> Flannigan: So shouldn't we say three-quarters?

>> Mayor Adler: But it was a wider area, it included the transit priority networks as well.

>> Flannigan: So that would be less intense than focusing 75% just to transit priority networks. I mean, it does kind of create a conflict for staff between the asmp and this document. I would just as soon go with the asmp. You've expanded it

--expand it slightly to include the priority network.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I'm comfortable with that.

>> Pool: Mayor, I'm missing -- can you say it again? I'm sorry, I didn't hear.

>> Flannigan: In order to match the asmp, which says 75% of new housing goes on corridors and centers, to take councilmember Harper-Madison's and say 75% new housing capacity should be half mile of transit priority networks, asmp, as well as transit priority networks. Because that would be in rough compliance with asmp. >> Pool: Mayor?

>> Harper-Madison: I'm sorry, could you do that one more time? 75% --

>> Casar: Half-mile transit priority networks as identified by asmp, including, however we want to do that, centers. Activity centers. Because that's what the asmp basically says.

>> Pool: Somayo, on this one.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Pool: That goes to my request that the staff help us with identifying all of the C activity centers and regional centers because the imagine Austin document is at least seven years old, and the areas that were mapped back then have changed and expanded and if I am going to support this, then I have to have some certainty that we're looking at the reality on the ground and not a vision that was crafted seven years ago.

[8:15:55 PM]

So I want to make sure that this includes the updates to where activity centers are currently. And also where we imagine them to be in Austin, which is what I think the comprehensive plan was hoping to accomplish through planning efforts to accomplish. So I'd like to amend this in order to be supportive of it to include some statement with regard to direction to staff that says we want to engage in a process of identifying additional activity centers that have shown themselves through -- surfaced through imagine Austin was first adopted seven years ago. That way, we can have some sense that we're working with currency and also looking forward, so again, we have a future-looking, forward-looking comprehensive plan and that we are responding in that way to it.

>> Harper-Madison: If I may, Councilmember Pool, I think what Jimmy said was including imagine Austin activity centers and corridors, because the emphasis for me on here is the Austin strategic mobility plan, which just passed unanimously. So.

>> Pool: Right.

>> Harper-Madison: I think my primary focus is the ASPM.

>> Pool: And going in the imagine Austin activity centers and corridors throughout all this refers back to a document that is now seven years old and one of the things that I've challenged staff to do and this new manager to do is to come back to us with an acknowledgment that our city has grown and there are city centers on the ground currently functioning really well, but they're not memorialized in our imagine Austin map. And I think that that's -- that is inhibiting some of our efforts here, and I would like to get beyond that and just simply agree that that isn't an effort that our staff -- and I think they want to do it, too -- the city has evolved since we adopted imagine Austin, but the activity centers are static in that document, and whenever you look at that map, they don't change.

[8:17:58 PM]

But we have changed. That, and the strategic mobility plan, as you point out, that was newly adopted and it reflects the reality on the ground now and the future -- our future hopes for where we want to see our transit lines and our transit corridors to be in the future. I'm just asking for the same thing.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Pool: The same effort with our imagine Austin --

>> Mayor Adler: I don't think those things are inconsistent with one another.

>> Pool: I'm sorry, they are or not?

>> Mayor Adler: Are not. So I would propose -- S's asking for staff to look at whether not we should be doing more, given today's situation, and I think that's fine. So it would say 75% of new housing capacity should be within a half mile of transit priority networks as identified by Austin's strategic mobility plan and imagine Austin activity centers and corridors. Then there would be another sentence that says staff is requested to look at whether it is appropriate to add or change the existing -- add to or change the existing imagine Austin activity centers.

>> Pool: To acknowledge the growth that has occurred since we adopted imagine Austin.

>> Mayor Adler: I would say growth or whatever they think is appropriate. So I would just ask them to look whether it's appropriate to add or change -- I don't want to limit the things they can consider.

>> Pool: I don't either. And maybe Mr. Lloyd can help --

Mayor Adler: If we don't list anything, we just say, staff, take a look at it and see if it's appropriate to add or change something, and they can consider anything they think is appropriate to do. They can look at demographic patterns, look at economic patterns, anything that's happening regional, they can look at new business centers, look at where Apple is moving, they can look at anything. If we start listing; I'm grade -- I'm afraid we'll leave something out.

>> Pool: I'm okay with not doing the list. Maybe Mr. Lloyd can help us with that.

>> Mayor Adler: Are you okay, Mr. Lloyd, with the sentence that says 75% of housing passage be within half mile of housing networks, imagine Austin activity centers and corridors, staff should look at whether it's appropriate to add to or change the existing imagine Austin activity centers.

[8:20:10 PM]

>> Pool: I have a problem with that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let me hear from staff and we'll come to you.

>> Pool: When I would say the language is, I don't know if we should ask staff if they think it's appropriate. What I would say is, rather than the language that you offered, would locate appropriate changes to the future land use or the growth map that is in Austin -- imagine Austin, not whether we think -- not whether we're asking them if they think we should do it, but rather to show us where it is on the map currently.

>> Mayor Adler: I'd like to ask -- I mean, I'm not asking them in the sentence here, it just says staff should look at whether it is appropriate to add, but I would like to have an answer to that. They could come back and say it's not appropriate to add because we have everything it is that we're supposed to have, or they could come back and say we need 15 more.

>> Pool: It doesn't go -- you're only ask them is it appropriate and I'm saying tell us where it is appropriate to expand our future growth map.

>> Mayor Adler: And if so, tell us where.

>> Pool: Sure. Absolutely.

>> Mayor Adler: So recommend additions.

>> Pool: Absolutely.

>> Mayor Adler: If so, recommend additions. But does this concept make sense to you? Is it a good concept?

>> Rent Lloyd, development services. In principle, I think what you're getting at is basically including some other recommendation on plan amendments as part of this. And I think that's something that we, staff, can certainly look at as part of the development exercise, but one point I think that just needs to be clear is, like in imagine Austin, when the centers were mapped, it wasn't necessarily just a matter of looking at where growth had occurred, but really looking at where we wanted to channel growth, and councilmember pool, when you describe it, the emphasis seems to be a little bit more on sort of looking at where growth has sort of naturally happened.

>> Pool: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> So in we were go -- if planning staff were to go look at where centers should be located, it would be more than just looking at where sort of growth has naturally occurred in the last seven years.

[8:22:11 PM]

Itou really be given our policies, given infrastructure, given all the factors that are generally considered where ideally --

>> Mayor Adler: I think councilmember P was okay with not putting in particulars. It just says staff should look at where it is appropriate to add or change existing imagine Austin activity centers and if so, to recommend it.

>> Harper-Madison: I'm sorry, can you say the sentence one more time.

>> Mayor Adler: 15% of new housing capacity should be within a half mile of transit priority networks as identified by the Austin strategic mobility plan and the imagine Austin activity centers and corridors.

>> Harper-Madison: And/or including? I thought at some point we changed and to including.

>> Harper-Madison: Staff is requested to look at --

>> Mayor Adler: Staff should look at whether it is appropriate to add or change the existing imagine Austin activity centers, and if so, to recommend it.

>> Pool: So again, we're not asking them if it's appropriate and I don't necessarily want to change them because they are on the ground, but I do want to review them to see if we are adding to them because of organic agreement and I think that Mr. Lloyd understands that. But we are not asking them if it's appropriate, we're saying where has that change occurred. And further, he has said that planning staff would also like to look at where, based on our policies, we would like to have growth additionally. That is both of those things. Just update the -- just update the growth maps is really what I'm asking for, and not whether they think we should but rather asking them to do it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Staff should update.

>> Pool: The growth maps.

>> Mayor Adler: So we'll just make the second sentence, staff should update the in-city Austin growth maps.

>> Pool: Growth maps, yes.

>> Harper-Madison: And corridors.

>> Pool: That includes that, yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Update the growth maps.

[8:24:13 PM]

>> Pool: Thank you.

>> Harper-Madison: Can we please add corridors to that?

>> Mayor Adler: All they could be doing is coming back to us with a recommendation. I'm just trying to move past this.

>> Pool: I think we're all looking for the same thing. We want fresh information.

>> Mayor Adler: Should staff recommend updates to the Austin growth maps. Wait a second. Councilmember Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I have a concern. I think the language is okay as long as we're on the same page in our understanding. Imagine Austin went through a lot of conversation and a lot of public input and a lot of long the future to designate and say activity centers, and I'm not understanding -- we should not be revisiting that. In other words, I don't want to change the activity centers that are identified right now. If there's appropriate to update and add, that's one thing, but I would not go back and revisit whether we should have activity centers where we've got them -- okay. I see the staff -- okay. I just want to make sure that that's the understanding.

>> Pool: And I agree with that, too. I don't want them -- we can't change the policy that we already have in place. And I'm not intending that. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Casar: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Casar: Without editing language, the two regional centers I have in my district are very fuzzy, and they could really more closely defined like the activity center in the arboretum is more closely defined to condition. That's something I would like to see in how this goes. It's just sort of a random circle, it appears random to my community, really fill in the gaps.

>> Mayor Adler: And to this end, I don't think it's going to hold up the process for rewrite of the land development code. If you came back and made recommendations, as councilmember kitchen says, there's a long process that would be involve changing the imagine Austin strategic. It's not intended to do that, but while you're doing this work, if there are additional ones that you think should, bring it to our attention.

[8:26:14 PM]

That's what this is intended to be. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I think this is fine here. I think it's also, when we get to the amendment that relates to planning, we might remember this.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. All right. Is there any objection to adding the amendment as we've discussed?

>> Harper-madison: The teeny tiniest little objection. I'd also like to add if we could revisit some of the missing corridors from imagine Austin and add that as well. So where it says uate growth map, can we do update growth map and corridors? Is that a possibility?

>> Mayor Adler: Imagine Austin corridors. Okay. Got you. Okay. To the imagineustin growth ps. Okay. Because the growth maps contain both centers and corridors. Okay? All right. Councilmember tovo objects to that amendment so we need to put it to a vote.

>> Tovo: Yeah. Can you just verify, is it 75% or the majority?

>> Mayor Adler: 75%.

>> Tovo: Okay. Yes, I object.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. The motion -- the amendment to the amendment as to say 75% of new housing capacity should be within half milef networks as identified by the plan, activitycenters and corridors, staff should recommend updates to the imagine Austin growth maps, including both centers and corridors.

>> Pool: And can we divide the question to take the separate elements.

>> Mayor Adler: Sure. To the first sentence. In favor of the first sentence -- what?

>> Alter: I'm reading the first sentence.

>> Mayor Adler: 75% of new housing capacity should be within half mile of transit priority networks as identified by the Austin strategic mobility plan and imagine Austin activity centers and corridors. Those in favor of that, please raise your hands. Those opposed? It -- councilmembers alter, tovo, and pool vote no, the others voting yes, that is accepted. The second sentence, staff should recommend updates to the imagine Austin growth maps, including centers and corridors.

[8:28:16 PM]

Those in favor of that, please raise your hand.

>> Tovo: Can I just make a comment to that, please? Sorry, I know it's late and we've got a lot to do. I guess I'm now reflecting so what councilmember kitchen said. This was the product of such an extensive public process, and I think to try to do this without putting -- you know, in the time -- to be a component of what they're doing while they're rewriting the land development code I think is kind of --

>> Mayor Adler: We expressly said it was not that. If they identify things, then that might mean that we should adopt the resolution or do something --

>> Tovo: And come back later and deal with it?

>> Mayor Adler: Or if they come back and say, hey, we're good, we wouldn't do anything else -- it is independent and doesn't hold this up.

>> Tovo: Okay. That's fine. I'm not going to support it for those reasons.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Those in favor of the second sentence, please raise your hand. Those opposed councilmembers alter and tovo voting no, the others voting yes.

>> Alter: I just want to clarify, I don't really understand what this is doing, and --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: Rather than hold everybody up I'm just --

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Appreciate it. Councilmember Casar. Asar regarding the 75%, I appreciate the amendment being brought up, I voted for it because it's what's in our strategic plan. Having reviewed this last year, it seems like a very, very high bar to reach and frankly if the staff do their best and come back to us and tell us what they've got, we just set the bar, but we'll have to see what they bring back. It's a very high number the way our city has unfortunately been built

>> Mayor Adler: I'd say that is with respect to all things on this you want to come back to us and say we couldn't get what you wanted but this is as close as we could get, or whatever.

>> Pool: Pair mayor, I wanted to say I would have voted yes for the first sentence if we'd left it with the majority because I think that may be more attainable, but we'll see what

staff brings. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's keep going. All right. Yes.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I have a -- I have an amendment to this section also, but I'll take it up later because I think it's additive, not changing.

[8:30:17 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Great.thank you. So that's taken care of then. Question 2, let's go to question 3. In question 3, the first amendment is on the top of page 5. It describes -- it says we should map traionit Zones. Any objection to this one? This is top of page 5.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I think we stipulated on page 4, zoning map.

>> Mayor Adler: That's what we just did.

>> Tovo: No.

>> Mayor Adler: We substituted Natasha's language for that.

>> Tovo: I didn't understand that was a substitution. Okay. Well, then I need to make a -- then I need to make an amendment that we include back in there the language that says at the same time all parts of town should be expected to contribute to reaching -- or all parts -- let me just start what part, all parts of town should be expected to contribute to reaching our ashp and Austin strategic mobility plan housing and mode shift goals.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody injection to that being added? Hearing none, that's added S. Anything else here? Okay. Then that gets us to transition areas on the top of page 5.

>> Pool: I have changes to zoning map.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Pool: That starts at the bottom of page and goes over to the top of page 5. So we're still in question 3. Right? Zoning --

>> Mayor Adler: We're in question 3. The change you can see underlined, it's on the top of page 5.

>> Pool: Right.

[8:32:18 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: What's the language in front of us, top of page 5.

>> Pool: Yeah. So that's --

>> Kitchen: So that's a section that I have a change. Yes so it's on my page 5. Under number 2, zoning map. And what I've said here -- I have to think about how to meld it with this, but basically, it's insuring opportunities for missing middle housing will be a continuing going or future district level planning projects, and then provide options and a timeline for mapping changes to zoning because this is about mapping, and so what I've added is, provide options and a timeline for mapping changes to zoning to achieve additional housing capacity and affordable housing to include provisions such as use of upzoning, future land use maps, and/or zoning upon sale of a property, especially to achieve beyond the ten-year housing sales.

>> Mayor Adler: And what -- how is this changing the transition area?

>> Kitchen: Well, because the way this is written, this is not -- I'm changing the zoning map at the bottom of question 3 because this says just map it. So I'm saying, no, don't just map it, come back and provide options and a timeline for mapping it. And you can consider a whole range of things, including immediate upzoning, flumes, zoning upon sale of property, there might be a combination of tools. So it's clarifying the language that's here.

>> Mayor Adler: Tell me if I understand. What this says is, as part of the work they're doing now, we're asking them to map missing middle housing, adjacent to activity centers, going two to five lots deep, and to consider contact-sensitive factors.

>> Kitchen: Right. Uh-huh.

>> Mayor Adler: And you're saying -- I mean the timeline is set, when they're coming back with a map. That's what you want to change, you want it not necessarily to come back with a map.

[8:34:26 PM]

>> Kitchen: Well yeah, the not necessarily. They could come back with a map. Basically I'm saying provide options and a timeline for mapping changes. So you've got the term map here, so I'm saying what does that mean? And so I'm suggesting that that could mean a range of things and I'm asking the staff to provide the options for the range of things, all the way from going ahead and mapping it now or to suggesting that there may be --

>> Mayor Adler: I understand >> Kitchen: -- Some areas that are appropriate for a flume or for zoning upon sale of the property.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm not going to be able to support that because I want them to come back with the transition zones mapped. But first that. Is there a second council member kitchen's amendment?

>> Kitchen: Could I speak to that?

>> Mayor Adler: Let me get a second for it first if there is. Council member pool seconds it. Okay.

>> Kitchen: What is -- okay, well, then tell me what that means, mapping, now.

>> Mayor Adler: That means when they come up with the maps, I want it -- we want it to show transition Zones. Transition areas, rather.

>> Kitchen: Okay. But does that mean -- does that mean that when we map, we are immediately upzoning every place in the city? Immediately? Because this is what this saying. It's not allowing for the potential that in some places you -- I mean -- and I also have here, especially to achieve beyond the ten-year housing goals. We've got a multiyear goal here. and so it may be appropriate -- I mean, it will be appropriate to upzone immediately in some places, but it may not be in others. And so this doesn't give us or the staff any opportunity to have a conversation about what our options are.>>

Casar: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: I would be -- I would be willing to accept saying we could have options for achieving beyond our ten-year goals, beyond the two to five lots. But the idea being, want to get generally two to five lots done this year, and if we want have future land use maps to go beyond our ten-year goal, then it should be beyond the two to five lots.

[8:36:34 PM]

>> Kitchen: Well, I think THAs good. I think that's better than what we have here. But it's going far enough for what I think is important. But, you know, I mean, it's up to everyone else, of course on what y'all think, but the bottom line here is, we -- and I can get into this more when we get into the transition Zones. We don't know the impact of what's being proposed for these transition zones. So to just say that we're going to map them without giving the staff the opportunity to come back to us and say, well, for these particular parcels, it makes sense to go ahead and upzone them right now, for these others, because of various reasons THAs include our goals, it might make sense to consider other options. That's all I'm asking for.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. There's been a motion and a second to necessarily map the transition Zones now -- transition areas now, but to have staff come back and make recommendations to its appropriate timing and methods.

>> Kitchen: That's not what I said.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry I'm not being clear. Staff can come back with a map. I'm not saying they shouldn't. I'm just saying that they can come back with a map or they can come back with a partial map if they think there are areas that should be mapped later. Or they can come back with a Flum. I'm not saying they shouldn't map. I'm just trying to acknowledge that there may be some circumstances under which it is important to have more tools.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I understand better now thank you. Councilmember kitchen motion is to say you don't necessarily have to map now, you can, but you can also come back with a future plan for alternate ways that it might be handled. Yes, councilmember Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: So I'm -- I like the language that Ann has in the context that Greg laid it out, where we're talking about -- but it seems like a planning tools paragraph, and so I'm not sure this is the right place for it.

[8:38:41 PM]

But to have these tools be how we get past the ten-year, given it's a 30-year code but 10-year blueprint, that stuff is really, really like. I'm agnostic to not in love with defining the two to five lots, but I've got amendments on the compatibility question that address the transition Zones, which to me is as much a compatibility question as it is anything else where we've talked about that before.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay we have an amendment in front of us. It's been seconded. Yes, councilmember Garza.

>> Garza: I'm not going to support that amendment and I'm just, again -- I know you probably didn't mean it, but even if they do come back with a map, it is not immediately doing anything. It's just a draft of a map. It's not fully implemented until we finish this entire process.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Tovo.

>> Tovo: So I think that, you know, as I thought about what are going to be the real -- the real pieces of this that could make it challenging for us to get through this process this year, I think it's the direction we're headed with regard to transition Zones and the direction we may be headed with regard to compatibility, just based on some of the -- some of the amendments I saw. I think that -- I think that two to five lots is maybe not significant in some of the areas you were talking about, councilmember Casar. You talked about 50 lots on a street. Well, that's not typically true of other -- other neighborhoods in other districts, including mine. You're talking about, you know, if it ends up being five lots on one of the streets that I was, you know, walking and taking photos of, there were about 17 lots, so then you're talking about 10 on that street, potentially. I just -- I think that -- I think that this is going to be really a challenging -- a very challenging point that we're trying to get through this.

[8:40:45 PM]

I also think that if part of -- we had speakers today and we've had conversations about, you know, needing to increase his level of density to support transit. I think it is going to be -- if people in the areas that are most impacted by these transition Zones see this as connected to our plans for high capacity transit, I think it's going to potentially not be the positive embracing of that that we want. I also think that in many

of our existing central center neighborhoods, this level of transition zone is actually going to replace exactly the kind of housing that we're trying to encourage. I showed one example of that the other day, if we had, you know, 12 more hours, I could take another 30 minutes and show you 34th street or 35th. We have a lot and lots of streets in my districts and probably others as well, where you have exactly the kind of housing we would be encouraging the redevelopment of with transition zone that is this big. When we started talking about it, it was kind of the L in back, was with regard to compatibility, and then maybe another lot, but five is -- five is a lot. And, again, I think there's a lot of advantages to trying to come up with something that, with the understanding that this is -- this is going to be a long process of creating -- of creating a level of capacity, we don't need to create it all out of the box. And allowing some level of more specific context level planning, councilmember Kitchen has suggested, I think appropriate, especially if we want to make those choices about where the best areas are and where we want to -- where we want to have those.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Three quick things. One, when we get to the next section, I'm going to continue to support one criteria that is trying to listen or address the concern you raised, which is for neighborhoods that are smaller than never more than a majority of the single-family area will be zoned transition, so then the example you gave, it would not be 10 out of the 17 lots. I'm going to continue to support that, out of acknowledgment that there's a lot of public interest and questions, but trying to get us moving forward today.

[8:42:54 PM]

And then second, I think to the older ultimately question, I think we have some stuff in here trying to protect that, and then -- and then third, to a final point, I think that when we just -- because we provide the zoning, it's going to take some time for that transition zone to develop. I don't think that you're going to be getting immediate -- sort of immediate change that I think some folks have worried about. I know when we get to compatibility, I also have -- I want to pass something out to start incorporating some of the criteria or concerns that councilmember Kitchen has raised, but I think maybe it's best to wait till we get the compatibility standards a priority matrix for that part. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I have a suggestion. So what if we said this. In addition to mapping, provide options and a timeline for making changes to zoning. So, in other words, the map would come back to us and we would understand -- because there's a two-step process; there's mapping and then us voting for the upzoning and the mapping. So I would just like more information as part of the mapping. So could we not say, in addition to mapping, provide options and a timeline for making changes to zoning to achieve additional housing capacity, and then go on to -- finish the rest of that sentence? Because what's going on here is two-step process, as councilmember Garza pointed out. There's the mapping and then there's the act --

>> Mayor Adler: Before you describe it, help me locate the language again.

>> Kitchen: It's on page 5 of my document.

May>> Adler: Okay. Page 5 of 8. And what were you recommending?

>> Kitchen: I was recommending, leaving out the first sentence, and then just -- of my red underline, and then saying: In addition to mapping, provide options and a timeline, and then instead of mapping, say for making changes.

[8:44:55 PM]

I don't then I there's a better word THAN "Making," but for making changes to zoning, to achieve -- and then go on with the rest of the sentence.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I'll be fine with that. It gets added to the other language.

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> Mayor: Are there any objections to THAT?

>> Kitchen: No, it's added.

>> Mayor Adler: It's additive.

>> Harper-Madison: I'm sorry, you

have to read to me again. >> Kitchen: Okay.

Are you ready? >> Harper-Madison: Yes.

>> Kitchen: In addition to mapping, provide options and a timeline for making changes to zoning, and then you just go on with the rest of the sentence there.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So we could make that -- okay. It's on page 5.

>> Harper-Madison: I'm there.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So leaving off that first sentence in red --

>> Harper-Madison: Leave or increasing opportunities for middle Hou-

>> Kitchen: Yeah. If people want that, we can keep it, but --

>> Harper-Madison: Start where? At provide?

>> Kitchen: Yeah. In front of provide, say in addition to mapping, comma, options and a timeline for, delete mapping and replace changes.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. This could be a section B after the section A in the document. A is about mapping.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, if it fits better, I would go there if you want to do that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Does anybody have any objections to that?

>> Alter: I have a question. I have a question.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Alter D: 'T understand what that means. I mea this whole exercise is supposed to be zoning in the map, so what is the timeline for?

>> Kitchen: Whathat T means is that when -- the staff is going to bring us back a proposed map that we then have to vote on befo there's any zoning change. So this just means at the point at which -- they'll bring us back a map so we can see.

>> Alter: Uh-huh.

>> Kitchen: Then they can say we recommend that you upzone it all now, or we recommend that you -- here's your options about what youo right now. Th's all.

[8:46:56 PM]

But it would -- it would map it so that people could see what the mapping is.

>> Alter: Okay. And it's giving us options?

>> Kitchen: Well, you know there's a range --

>> Alter: So I understand when we get the map, it doesn't rezone it, but WHE we adopt the map, it rezone it -- I'm just not fully unrstanding it.

>> Kitchen: At the same time they're bringing the mapping back they bring us back -- at the same time they bring the mapping back, they bring us back options for actually making gech and they might say that for this particular area -- I't know, because we don't know the impact on these areas -- they might say for Thi particular area for various reasons, you know, one of your options are to go ahead and vote for the zoning change right now, or perhaps to vote for the zoning cng at another time. I just want us to see the full range of tools. So, for example, the planning commission, what they recommended when they had -- when they described their transition Zones, they recommendedse of a Flum as a way to get towards those changes. I don't have a recommendation at this point about what we should being D I'm just saying that we need to understand what our tools are and what our options are.

>> Mayor Adler: Andbe clear, and this, staff, what this would have is a majority of the council is saying, giv us the map, the transition, map it. At the same time you bring that back to us, if there are other options, especially as relates to, Yo know, going beyond the ten-year plan, which is part of that, but not limited to that, bring back optns, and that way, if someone duringghe deliberation later says there's a better idea than the way you've mapped it, they have the abity to be able to present that and argue that.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, but I'm saying something a little different I mean, that is part of it, but I'm saying that mapping -- mapping does not equal zoning changes. Weave to vote for the zoning changes. So they may bring us back a map and then we say, okay, here's -- here's what this will look like at the point which you

make the change, for whatever reason, we're -- your options are to make that change today, vote for it today, or to make that change in a year or two, to make that change according to a plan or to make that change when the property is sold -- there may be various reasons.

[8:49:22 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: But that be true for any part of the map? Anywhere in the city? They're going to come back with a map of the city.

>> Kitchen: Sure. I'd like to see everywhere.

>> Mayor Adler: We could take it or not take it but a majority of the council is intending to give us a map that would adopt as part of this.

>> Kitchen: But giving a map, giving us a map -- I don't think you can say that the majority of council is saying give us map and we're automatically going to vote on it because we don't know what the map looks like.

>> Mayor Adler: No, no, no, clearly not.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: No automatic. But there's nothing special about transition Zones. I mean, it's true that when they come back with a map and a code, we can either adopt the map, change the map, delay the map, anywhere in the city, but the map that comes back, this is asking you to map transition Zones as part of the map that you bring back -- that you bring back, just like you're going to map corridors activity centers, you're going to map the city, you're going to map transition Zones as described in this. Councilmember Garza.

>> Garza: I just want to say again, we could not adopt a map, to give it to us. We'd have to do notices. We cannot be rezoning the entire city the day they bring us back that map. I'm going to keep saying that.

>> Kitchen: And I did not say that. What I said is, I want to understand what our tools are. In other words, come back and tell us -- there's a range of ways in which to map. There's a range of ways in which to vote on the zoning. That's all I'm asking for, is to give the information about what those are. Instead of just giving us a map with no information on what our options are.

>> Mayor Adler: How does that give us the kind of options everywhere in the city.

>> Brent Lloyd, development officer, dsd. Just a couple points of clarification. So when -- the option you've chosen in the first question, in the scope question, is to adopt a new map and a new code.

[8:51:26 PM]

So we will be bringing you back an entirely new zoning map. And to mayor pro tem Garza's point, it will not require mailed notice like a rezone does, when we're bringing and law has advised previously, publicly, that when we're adopting a whole new code and a new map, that can be done through published notice. To councilmember Kitchen's point, the way that the city would potentially leave areas in current zoning and not have new zoning go into effect with the map would be through the f25 classification. So the way to have certain areas where the new zoning would not take effect would be to label them on the map as former title 25, and that has the effect of freezing the current zoning in place. The other option, though, which I feel like may be what councilmember Kitchen is getting to, but I just want us to be clear --

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> -- Is to bring back a zoning map that does apply new zoning, but in certain areas, applies new zoning categories that are fairly close to what we have today, deferring the process of more intensive rezoning to a later process. And if you would like staff to, in sort of bringing back mapping options, to do that, that would certainly be an option that staff could consider in looking at the different transition zone scenarios. But in order to completely defer any new zoning from taking effect, the tool would be the former title 25 f25 category.

>> Kitchen: Okay. And at that point what I'm saying. So what I'm saying -- I appreciate that. But I want to make it really clear, I'm not saying don't map the transition zones. Because we all need to see what that looks like. I'm just saying that mapping does not automatically mean voting for it, to councilmember Garza's point, but I would just like to understand what options are, just from a -- know, just from a tools perspective, you know, and I think -- that's all I'm asking for.

[8:53:32 PM]

Go ahead and bring us back the map that's mapped, but just bring us back -- even if it's -- I'm not suggesting that the map is even different, I'm just suggesting a conversation and a discussion of what other communities have done in terms of tools that they have used for when they actually make the changes. That's all I'm -- all I'm talking about.

>> Mayor Adler: My only concern is that we create an ambiguity with this conversation about whether we mean a. And I think we mean a. We want to map a transition zone. I'm fine with asking for more options. We could take B and say that applies to the whole code, everywhere. But by this section, I want the instruction to be that we're asking it to be mapped for transition areas as described. I don't have any problem with them giving options or information or other kind of data that someone could then give before we start adopting anything that we do alternatives, but just to be really clear and not ambiguous, the direction from this council in a is to map transition zones as part of the Mapping G and code drafting. Ok? Do we need to take a vote on a?

>> Kitchen: Could I --

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I have several questions on a, but I just wanted to point out an example it might be something at least that I would be interested in. So depending on what we adopt for the transition zone lot number, there will be communities where that more than a majority, but we have kind of very vague direction on what T means. And so one might imagine That may be given -- it may beled out that this area, we can't do it because of that, and the map may have one possible version of it, then we might be given alternatives, ways that we could look at that because it's not very clear direction. It's important direction, but it's not very clear dection. And sohat likely -- that might be one of the places where here's a place this comes in, and we don't have fully clear.

[8:55:39 PM]

This is our first recommendation; here's another option look at.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. On the next page --

>> Alter: Wait, wait, wait, I have stuff one lots.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Alter: I have some questions fo you. So, could you please clarify your intention byingav the language that the transition zone should generally by two to five lots deep, was meant to cap the zone at no me than five lots.

>> Mayor a: Okay. With respect to the first question you asked, it's very clear under the direction on the next page, item C that isn't before us yet, but it's contemplated, it's part of the same amendment package, says the depth and scale of transition Zones, should be areas, the depth and scale of transition areas should be reduced so transition areas do not overlap with the majority of existing single-family neighborhood area. That means that staff, in mapping it, ill not map more than half of the -- any neighborhood in transition areas, no matter where the corridors are. So that's something that, by the -- by the description here, cannot happen. To answer your first question.

>> Alter: I was --

>> Mayor Adler: The second question --

>> Alter: My first one wasn't a question, it was just a comment --

>> Mayor Adler: I just don't want anybody watching to think there was anybody proposing to do anything in more than half of the neighborhood and transition Zones, to the agree that five would make more than half in the transition zone, nt's not going to be five, it has be something lesshan five, so I don't want anyone to see that and think that is being contemplated that a transition zone -- transition area could be more than half the neighborhood. To the next point, the generally means generally. That means that that's what we want to do, but if staff felt like there was a situation because of, don't know what the ctor would be, because of a particular block, because of the location of a commercial area, because of -- I don't know what it would be. I wouldn't want T tmfeel constrained that they couldn't come back to us and say in this once, we felt like we needed to vary from the rule.

[8:57:42 PM]

But generally, the rule is two to five lots.

>> Alter: So it doesn't cap it at five.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, what? >>Er aso it doesn't cap it at five.

>> Mayor Adler: Except for a rare situation, that's correct.

>> Alter: So can we cap it five and have staff provide circumstances to us where they might want to exceed that and call those out for us, and then we could make decision?

>> Mayor Adler: I think that I'm comfortable with language that says generally the area should be two to five lots deep.

>> Alter: Okay. Then I would like to make my amendment on motion sheet 1.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: Amendment 2, which say notwithstanding any other contact sensitive criteria adopted in this document that mapping of millimeters should not extend from 1 to 4 lots, the interior of existing residential neighborhoods, this may be revisited in the future in the context of planning efforts.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there a second to this? Councilmember Kitchen seconds that. Is there any

>> Councilmember: I'm comfortable generally because I want to give staff some discretion.

>> Mayor Adler: Any further discussion? Yes, councilmember O'Connell.

>> Councilmember: I think that's a very good compromise, and, yeah, especially given the issues we talked about earlier, I think that's a very good compromise.

>> Councilmember: I'm comfortable generally meeting the original language.

>> Mayor Adler: I'd point out the language that says generally five lots is already a significant compromise. Councilmember Flannigan and then councilmember Ellis.

>> Councilmember: So I'd just repeat my issue with defining the number of lots, only because lot sizes vary very widely across the city, especially lots on corridors where sometimes the first lot is really, really big, sometimes it's really, really small.

[8:59:43 PM]

And I'm also curious about what the definition of existing residential neighborhoods might mean because there will be parts of corridors that are residential but not single family that we will want to zone

transition because they're kind of already transition. There will be parts of neighborhoods that have some mixed small multi-family, so are we talking about a majority of the existing single-family homes? Is it a majority of -- I think I'm just struggling with the borders of the thing by which we are saying a majority of. When there's such a diversity of building scale and building uses along these corridors and centers.

>> Mayor Adler: I trust staff to where wrestle with that and come back with something reasonable I don't think we could describe through all of that, but I think this states what the general intent, what the direction would be for the staff.

>> Flannigan: And I might fine just moving forward since we've kind of aired all this out. That's why my preference was just to stick with distance from corridor and let staff work it out from there because I think that's the primary metric as opposed to number of lots.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Ellis was next.

>> Ellis: I'd like to clarify I'm more comfortable sticking with two to five. It was higher in our work session and as we were trying to work on this document we already pulled it back a little bit. But we'd also add a line in the next section that talks about staff coming back and tell us if we're hitting our housing goals. So there may be other places where more density is appropriate, you know, and neighborhoods where we've added language about not having a majority being upzoned too far.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Councilmember Renteria: I'm going to support that also because I think there are going to be areas where it can give lots and there's some they're not gonna be able to but I want to keep it in there.

[9:01:52 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Tovo and councilmember Kitchen.

>> Tovo: I needed to ask a question about what councilmember Ellis just said. You suggesting in some areas maybe we'd -- maybe it's best to address it in the next but were you suggesting there might be areas in which it's -- the staff could come back and tell us it's recommending to bend the majority of the -- the majority of the neighborhoods being mapped for transition? Was that the example you were using?

>> Ellis: I think staff is going to do the best to follow our directions as given, but we wanted to make sure we were hitting our housing goals. So when we do see some sort of mapping and direction on where things are actually playing out with the rules that we are trying to guide towards, we need to keep in mind that we are trying to increase our housing goals and to have them help us estimate exactly -- if we're achieving that or not.

>> Tovo: Even if it means going beyond the majority of the neighborhood being mapped?

>> Ellis: I would still be supporting not having a majority of the neighborhood be affected by that.

>> Tovo: All right. Thank you. I guess I wanted to make a observation -- thank you for clarifying that. I appreciate it. I wanted to make sure I understood what you were saying on that. I just want to make an observation that as we're continuing down this path, one of the reasons I'm supportive of councilmember alter's amendment think we've said again and again different places that we're starting with draft 3. I think several of these amendments are really taking us back to draft 1 where we had t-4 zoning, the kinds of things we're contemplating now are really not -- are really gog -- going beyond draft 3 in terms of the zoning we looked at in that. As we looked at the report, I believe he estimated that with the -- in the transect Zones 25% of that would be redevelopment and displacement, so I think that that's -- should continue.

[9:03:56 PM]

Again, that body of work that was done I think should continue to be a guiding body of work for us. But we are getting further and further away from draft 3 and closer and closer to that first draft, which I think got us -- set us on AATH P where it was really challenging to get community support and buy-in.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen it may be -- I would suggest we set this aside and go straight to talking about the transition Zones because I'd like to make an observation also. I'm -- a couple of things. One of my major concerns and the reason that I'm suggesting the language that I am under transition Zones is we're making -- we are suggesting prescriptive kinds of language without information. As councilmember Flannigan just pointed out, to say between two to five lots deep when there's such a huge difference across the city on what that means, and we don't know what they are, so we're saying, generally, we're telling staff to generally go between two to five lots deep. We haven't given them any criteria for what that means. What does "Generally" mean? So that's one concern that I have. And I just think that -- I just think that we're trying to go down a road to prescribe something when we don't have information and it's not necessary to prescribe at this point. When we get to the next section, what I'm going to propose is starting with something that unbersen Flannigan, harper-madison and Renteria suggested, which is to say, you , we want our -- we want O density along the core and we want to step down from there. And this is the kind of criteria that we want to use to step down from there.

[9:05:59 PM]

Staff go, come back and give us options. But I actually prescribe exactly what that step down is, without any information about what that looks like, and given the differences across all of these areas, it just doesn't make any sense. I don't see how and why. I don't even see why we would do that.

>> Mayor Adler: I think this gives -- I think it generally gives the staff direction to be able to come up with a map. I think they can take into account -- Jimmy there may be areas this doesn't work this way but when they go through the mapping exercise I think we'll be able to identify those. By asking them to do

that I think we force that exercise. Since we're not voting on the ordinance at this point I think this is gonna be the best wayo daylight anywhere that does not work that way. A lot of the things that you put later on in the amendment I'm ao going to support Beuse ca think they also will giv direction and guidance to the staff when they try to sort through these issues when they come up with this map.what's in front of us now is still section a. Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: Thank you. When think about what proked anxiety when we were looking at codenext, it was ambiguity and the fear of the unknown. Under this language, I will not be able to tell the community that we won't go deep off the corridor more than five lots. And I will have to be honest with them that it could go further, and I just -- you know, if we had a cap at five at least I could say it won't gourth F than five because it's still veryvagu to say it won't cover a majority. While I appreciate that caveat, you know, I don't -- if I answer honestly that it can go more than five, you know, that is possible under what we're putting forward by not having the cap. So if Wead a cap, we would at least be able to tell them it wasn' going more than five lots in, and I think that WOU allow us to be able to be not engendering fears even when we tell the truth about what's going on.

[9:08:11 PM]

And I Thi as we're making the rest of the decisions tonight, wch are some of the thornier issues, I think still we need to remember that when we interject uncertainty and ambiguity into this process between now and the mapping, we are going to face folks who are going to respond to that very similarly than what they've responded to before under codenext. So, you know, if you would entertain a cap I would eciapr that. I would also say that, you know, you srtd at seven and some of us were already uncomfortable with one lot in, and fours I halfway between there, not five. So that's why I put forward my amendment. If we're not going to have a cap I would like at least a vote on mymendment.

>> Mayor Adler: We can rtainly have a vote on your amendment. I hope when you talk to your constituents that you don't just paint the worst possible case.

[Laughter] That you also tell them it could be less than that, and I hope when you talk to your constituents like when you raised some concerns in the email that you just St out and some of those are not going to be realized by the action that's being taken here, I hopeou Y report to your constituents that while you had email that something was possibility when the council got togethyheer rejected that possibility and came up with somethin else. I hope that when you're talking to your constituents that you present --

>> Alt: I think that you should know me well enough to know that when I talk to my constituents, I am very honest about what we've done and I try my best to educate them.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. The amendment in front of us is councilmember alter's amendment. Rther discussion? Councilmember kitchen and en let's vote.

>> Kitchen: I'm sry.or I just have to say this. It- I - can -- I'll be showing my constituents the language we end up with, but I can't answer the question about what it mns in terms of generally the transition areas should be between two and five lots because this doesn't tell me based on what.

[9:10:27 PM]

What is the determining factor or criteria for staff to determine whether it goes two lots or three lots or four lots or five lots? So there's no criteria here.

May Adl>>: The criteria is in the next section.

>> Kitchen: Okay. When we get to that I'll be able to explain why I don't see criteria in the next section either.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's take a vote. Those in favor of the alter amendment to a please raise your hand. Councilmember alter, kitchen, tovo and pool. Those oosedppaise your hand. The balance of the dais. Okay. Do you want to propose something in B? Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Yes. Could I -- I'm sorry, could I clarify where we ended up here? I was a little confused. We kept a1 and 2 without change, right?

Mayor Adler: Correct.

>> Kitchen: But we added part of one in.

>> Mayor Adler: We added what.

>> Kitchen: We add part of my language in.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Say what?

>> Oic]

>> Mayor Adler: We haven't added B yet. All we did was a and a1 and 2 are the same. Then the question I asked Ms. Kitchen was did she want to add B --

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry. Ayor Mdlr: Councilmember pool asked us to divide the vote. We divided the vote.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry. The B was the language we talked about before.

>> Mayor Adler: In addition to mapping and then it was kitchen on page few of of a32 and I'm comfortable W that language so long as you understand this is not in any way questioning or coloring the instruction in a. T it certainly would give additional information for someone who is trying to evaluate or consider that at the time. Councilmember kitchen moves section B. Is there any discussion n?ready to take aote? Yes?

>> Harper-madison: Can we please reads the latest, last thing we agreed upon on that section?

[9:12:30 PM]

The bouncing back and forth I got to tell y'all is triggering my add.

[Laughter] Let's try to stay as Lear as possible.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Ready?

>> Harper-madison: Yes.

>> Kitchen: It says in addition to mapping, remember this is B, so it will refer to a, in addition to mapping provide options in a time line for making changes to zoning to achieve -- then it goes on with the rest of the sentence do you want me to read --

>> Harper-madison: Options and timeine, but --

>> Kitchen: In addition to mapping.

>> Harper-madison: Then you excluded mapping there.

>> Kitch: Ienhanged it to making.

>> Harper-madison: Making changes to zoningo achieve --

>> Kitchen: Yes, et cetera, et cetera.

>> Mayor Adler okay? B has been moved. Let's take a vote. Those in favor of B please raise your hand. cilmember Flannigan and alter, kitchen, tovo, and pool. Those opposed raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five, six, thealance of the dais.

>> Kitchmaenr, I thought you said earlier that you would take this language.

>> Mayor Adler: I was trying to makehe language better. I was concerned a theut ambiguity that was created. Okay. Continuing on. That gets to question number 4. The first amendment in here is in section 2. Anybody have any changes to that?

>> [Off mic]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Let me get to it just a second.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: Son question four, two, code context that's where we're on now.

>> Mayor Adler: The language that's underlined.

>> Flannigan:s it in order to strike the first half of that at this time?

[9:14:32 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: No. Because that's not part of her amendment. Strike the first half of what she's underlined. That's you can do.

>> Flannigan: We can't remove things.

>> Mayor Adler: You can remove her underlinings.

>> Flannigan: Then I'll come back and do that later.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. >>Itchen: Do you want me to go ahead?

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So we're uer question four code text, right? Is that what we're under?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So I have some suggested ages that are on page 6 of my change. So -- and is to -- let's see. Okay. I'm inserting as well as "Oer compatibility triggers" and I've listed those there, and those are andards related to noise, uses, utility screening, trash, loading and pickup Zones, aelsas shielded lighting, and then I speak in two to green infrastructure from draft 3 and continue the tree preservation policy as well as increasing tree canopy. So basically what it's saying is maintain draft 3's no B and vegetative buffers between residential and comrcial uses as well as other compatibility triggers, and then it goes on to describe what those are. Does that make sense or --

May>> Adler: I'm trying think if that's an amendment to code text generally or if that's an amendment to her language. She's proposed that the highest density residential house zone shouldn't trigger compatibility on to the lowest density residential multi-milyfa zone, that in this instance --

>> Kitchen: I see what you're saying.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't think yours is an amendment to yours.

[9:16:34 PM]

I think we get to yours when we get to yr amendments because you're proposing something different for that. >>Arper-madison: Just for point of clarification there are a lot of hers and shes up here and I don't know which E reoneferring to.

>> Harper-madison: No worries. But which one are you referring to? Paige? Ay.

>> Mayor adlerpaig:

>> Harper-madison: Councilmember Ellis.

>> Pool: I think the confusion is because it's the Adler Ellis amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: From here on out amendment a.

>> Pool: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: Amendment a. The amendment a language Eaks to the relationship of two residential [indiscernible] Trigger compatibility.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I can see what you're saying so mymend ant is not on this.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct.

>> Kitchen: But I do have a question about it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: So I'm trying to understand what the goal of this sentence is.so if -- does it mean that an r-4, for example, would not trigger compatibility on to an r-run.

>> Mayor Adler: Rm-1, yes.

>> Kitchen: When it uses the term.

>> Mayor Adler: Compatibility" is it using that only for height or does it also include the other things that are compatibility, like noise uses, trash, that kind of thing?

>> Mayor Adler: It would include some of those other things, except that it specifically says that no build vegetation and buffers between residential and commercial uses have to be maintained. But between residential uses it would not trigger compatibility.

>> Kitchen: Okay but there's other things besidesvegetive buffers. There's compatibility standards include noise, uses, utility screening, trash, loading and pickup Zones as well as shielded lighting. So is this saying that between a high density like an rm-4 and an rm-1 that there's no compatibility related to trash, loading and pickup, shielded lighting, and those kinds of things?

[9:18:39 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Casar: I think you're sang -- talking past each other potentially. This is between two multi-family Zones.

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> Casar: Or the highest end -- highest end multi-family something like r-4 and to not just use draft 3 text, a four to sixplex and the smallest apartment building.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Casar: We don't want tonot be trigger compatibility between those two so that's not related to single family.

>> Kitchen: But okay so I have two different questions. So that helps me understand. So basically that would be like a four or six plex versus a duplex.

>> Casar: Compared to say a eight to ten plex, right behind the cordor zoning you would go down to smaller apartments potential than four to sixplex. We don't want that four or sixplex to knock out the corridor --

>> Kitchen: It sounds to me like when you talk about compatibility you're not talking about the standards like noise, et cetera.

>> Casar: It looks like the staff has something on that.

>> To address your question, councilmember kitchen, in draft 3, those standards, like, shielding and screening were taken out of compatibility and were just general standards. So compatibility I draft 3 really refers more to the setbacks and the tent only.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So with that -- thatrs a my question. And I jt wanted to make itclear that that's what we were talking about here. This -- okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: So then what would be the -- M sorry. I still have another question.

>> Mayor Adler: Setback nt.te

>> Kitchen: So what is the impact of this then?

>> It appears that -- so if you remove compatibility between the highest residential house scale and the lowest residential multi-family, it would just mean that screening, shielding, those requirements would still occur.

[9:20:56 PM]

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> But that the setback and tent would not be imposed.

>> Kitchen: So in other word thes height difference between the large apartment complex and the smaller multi-faly,mi there's no standards that would apply to that?

>> Right. There are no standards that would impact the heights for instance.

>> Kitchen: So you could have -- okay. So --

>> Mayor Adler: You said large multi-family. It would be the smallest multi-family and the largest house scale.

>> Kitchen: Oh, okay. So the highest density residential house scale. Give me an example of what that is.

>> That would be, like, a fourplex building.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So between a fourplex and a -- what's the lowest density residential multi-family?

>> That would typically be, like, a 12plex building, something like that.

>> Kitchen: You're talking about the difference between a fourplex and a 12-plex for example, there wouldn't be any height restrictions other than what's on the --

>> Casar: Other than the zoning.

>> Mayor Adl and: heir heights are very similar.

>> Kitchen: They are?

>> Yeah. I don't know them off the top of my head but they're cle. They're not that different. Because they're right next to each other in the zoning intey Taite.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Well, I mean, you probably know it off the top of your head. What is the height difference.

>> I actually donnow K off the top of my head, but I can check.

>> Kitchen: That's all right. I've got it here.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else on page 5?

[9:22:58 PM]

Now that --

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Amendment a.

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes?

>> Kitchen: Are we going on to the zon map now?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: On the zoning map, I have chaes on page 6 of my document.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. You don't want to add the transit priority network?

>> Kitchen: I didn't say that. I'm trying to -- I'm trying to --

>> Mayor Adler: So the amendment in zoning map offered in amendment a is to add the transit priority network.

>> Kitchen: Okay. But it starts at a minimum, doesn't it? I'm not talking about the part above it.

>> Mayor Adler: You've gone on to --

>> Kitchen: Ye.

>> Mayor Adler: Skipping down to a, okay.

>> Kitchen: Yeah. >> Or Aayer: Number 4a. Okay.

>> Kitchen: That's where I have the changes. I have additional changes but they're in addition.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: So if you look at page 6, so what I've suggested here is that what we do is in a what I've suggested is that -- okay. So I'm suggesting here to define the maximum height allowed by right plus affordable housing bonus along activity corridors and in activity centers and then sustain regulations that create a stepdown effect so I've picked up language from councilmember Flannigan, harper-madison and Renteria for that portion. Then I'm going on to say that in defining the condition for mapping the stepdown, I go on to suggest conditions that some of them pick up the language that you have, and then I add some additional condition that are taken from the planning commission's draft 3 recommendation report to the council on June 22.

[9:25:22 PM]

And those -- so I've kept the location on the transit priority network, which I think relates to the conditions that were proposed before. I've kept location in the higher opportunity area. And then I've added orientation of blocks relative to corridors, residential blocks side by main street or mixed-use type zoning lots, bound by other Zones using environmental features such as cliffs and other topography and localized flood. Let me say I'm writing this including but not limited to. So it allows for the staff suggesting additional conditions that would be appropriate. It's just saying that these are some of those and they pick up the ones before -- they pick up the four that were suggested. The other two are picked up in another way in here. So it's basically taking the four conditions that were suggested, adding a couple more from the planning commission recommendation and leaving it as an including but not limited to kinase ce staff, in bringing back information to us, suggest additional conditions. And then it goes on from there to include the city manager shall also explore the following conditions, and it keeps the -- what we've been talking about about not overlapping the majority of a neighborhood. It keeps the reductions related to vulnerable areas. It puts the stepdown transition areas as quickly as possible. And then at the last one I suggest considering split zoning, and then finally as B, I suggest that the city manager shall provide to council an analysis of the affordable housing and housing capacity yield when presenting the proposed mapping.

[9:27:23 PM]

So etialen what I'm doing here is saying that -- ind of saying Thate're only going to map according to these four criteria, I'm suesting that we go back and say to staff to map based on a S of criteria thats including but not limbed to, and I've suggested criteria that I think --

>> Mayor Adler: I have questions for clarification for me. I think I can support it.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Is the language that you have here in 3a, 2 and 4, is it the same language that was on the other draft?

>> Kitchen: Yes, mm-hmm.

>> Mayor Adler: That's the same language you brought forward?

>> Kitchen: Yes.

May>> Adler: Okay. With respect to that, I think I might able to agree with the language in blue about employment and then a and then the changes with respect I. 2 I have difficulty wit but then the next items that you have, the bullet points that you have, next six bullets, think I'd be okay with thosf you move those down to section 4.

>> Casar: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: As factors to consider.

CAS>>: I have something written down so maybe I can hand out something written?

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Casar: I pink or something so it wouldn't match with everything we've already got. I similarly am okay wit everything that is in sort of the blue section that seemed to be from Renteria, harper-madison, Flannigan and your work. What'm suggesting -- maybe once you've got it, what I'm suggesting is I don't like removinghose T four as the primary four criteria.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Casar: The four that we've already suggested. But then because I do think that street grid, highoppportunity area, transit or activity corridor, ervule should be the primary way of evaluating transition Zones.

[9:29:35 PM]

However what I'veone is taken your other criteri and created a new section that says the city manager shall also explore the following conditions, orientation, residential blocks that are sided by main street

or mixed-use blocks bound by other zoned localized flood, whether it's appropriate to split zone or not split zone. I've added those in as secondary leaving the organize document criteria as primary.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I have a slight change to suggest.

>> Casar: Sure.

>> Kitchen: Okay. City manager shall also use the following conditions as appropriate, when mapping transition areas.

>> Casar: I think that's the same meaning.

>> Kitchen: So you're okay with that?

>> Casar: I'm happy to hear

from other folks. >> Kitchen: The city manager shall also use the following conditions as appropriate when mapping transition areas and then use those bullets.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm fine with that.

>> Kitchen: And so you're moving that -- are you moving that under --

>> Casar: That would become 4I in -- as an amendment to the amendment a. Does that make sense so this would not remove anything. It would just be added in as 4I.

>> Kitchen: ohl at the end, okay. Okay.

>> Casar: If that makes sense. Then of course as amendments also the agreed upon things, which was the very beginning and the last line that you moved. Which I think there was no objection to.

>> Kitchen: The last line meaning the city manager shall provide to council a analysis of the affordable housing and housing capacity yield when presenting proposed -- okay.

>> Casar: Everything before the two little iis I think also wasn't objectionable, the way you're --

[overlapping speakers] Correct.

Ch K: Employment and other uses to create complete communities, that nguala?

[9:31:40 PM]

Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: So help me understand. Let me catch up to you.

>> Tovo: Mayor, is it possible for us to take it from the top on this item. There's just no way -- I think the challenge here is some of you have sort of talked with one another and have a sense of what documents you're talking about. It is impossible to catch up with these documents. We've got embedded within embedded. If we could start with -- if we could start with the --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So --

>> Tovo: Amendment a.

>> Mayor Adler: All right.

>> Tovo: And then councilmember then had proposed -- you had proposed substituting yr zoning map edits.

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Tovo: On these?

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Tovo: WHE areere we with that?

>> Kitchen: Well, what's being proposed instead of taking all of mine in the way that I suggest I it is taking parts of mine and parts of what councilmember Casar.

>> Tovo: Parts of councilmember Casar. Can we go from the top and say what of your -- what of your page 6, number 3 is proposed to be in.

>> Kitchen: Yeah.

>> Tovo: Then when we get to councilmember Casar's F or whatever -- L, it's easy for me to see where THA inserts. It's not clear for me -- we could go one by one by one.

>> Ken: .Ayso if you look at zoning map, there on my page 6 there's some language in blue.

>> Tovo: [Off mic]

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: I have the same question. I was going to ask the same question you.id

>> Renteria: M?or >> Mayor Adler: So there are two documents you should have in front of you.

>> Renteria: Yes. One of our -- on our -- we had taken out and seen in place [indiscernible]

>> Kitchen: Yeah, exactly. Yeah.

>> Harper-madison: We keptclarksville.

[9:33:40 PM]

>> Renteria: There on the zoning map --

>> Mayor a: Just a second. So I can catch up. On amendment a I am looking atage P all right, where it has three zoning map. Okay? I'm sorry down below that, 4a. The revised map shall include transition Zones

that will [indiscernible] With active centers. Then there's a, at a minimum. Okay. I'm looking at that. I'm also looking at councilmember kitchen's page 6 of 8, which has a zoning map.

Renteria: This sentence here, we took it out.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Okay. So Greg and Ann, I wasn't following what you guys were talking about. So if you guys could help me understand.

>> Kitchen: Okay. The language of -- Ave that right by zgon map that's in blue, iking the end of it, striking Hyde park, north loop and tarrytown, so that blue that starts with employment and other uses to createco let units --

>> Mayor Adler: And goes down to --

>> Kitchen: Clarksville.

>> Mayor Adler: [Overlapping eakers]

>> Tovo: Can you explain why we're removing Clarksville, Hyde park, north loop and tarrytown?

>> Harper-madison: [Off mic]

>> Kitchen: Well, this is from you guys.

>> Harper-madison: Well, so essentially what we didn't get the opportunity to do is just introduce a revised version of this. So within our group we decided that those neighborhoods weren't necessary for this particular example, especially once we start to consider what the implications of those are. Clarksville is a perfect example of what we're talking about when we're talking about the village center complete center and for the sake of simplification one example was sufficient.

>> Tovo: Okay. I mean, they're all examples. I would suggest of complete communities.

>> Harper-madison: I wouldn't necessarily argue with T T. I just think one example was simple and sufficient.

[9:35:47 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: So, Ann, you were proposing as seen in places like Clarksville.

>> Kitchen: Yeah: I was picking up language that was posted by councilmember Flannigan.

>> Tovo: I'm going to suggest that we keep the original. I think it's --

>> Mayor Adler: I just want to understand first. Before we start parsing it, I have the same question you had. I want to know what we're doing here.

>> Casar: So I --

>> Mayor Adler: Where is it going.

>> Casar: Regardless of which neighborhds weoo name, we are generally accepting the word "Employment" all the way down to the word "Transition Zones" at the end of II. From the word employment in blue to the word transition Zones at the end of little II accepted.

>> Mayor Adler: So how does that compare then to 4a? So 4a where it says the revised zoning maps W race the language that begins "At a minimum" or does that language stay in? I'm looking O amendment a.

>> Casar: WRE is the word --

>> Mayor Adler: I'm trying to figure out where in amendment a it goes. Does in addition to --

>> Casar: I think we just want to add -- I don't know if -- I didn't understand this as changing intent. I thought this was just compatible and more, so I bad pun, that it was just more description. I thought was just more descriion.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm trying to figure out how to place it on here.

>> Kitchen:t'replacing a. And then --

Casar: Replacing 4a.

>> Kitchen: It keeps B because that's where you say should map so it's replacing a.

>> Mayor Adler: You're proposing a and then I.

>> Kitchen: So you -- son I take a stab at it? As councilmember Casar said,you're taking 3 all the way down to ai and stopping there at Zones.

[9:37:48 PM]

That's replacing what you have as 4a. Then you're picking up 4b going back to yours, keeping yours, because that's the -- right, councilmember Casar? You wanted to keep

>> Casar: Right. Leaving existing amendment a language but adding 4I.

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, just a little slower. I'm following up. Beginning with zoning map 3 D you mean to take out the transit priority network or can that language stay in?

>> Kitchno.: That can stay.

>> Mayor Adler: From fronting activity corridors, comma, the transit priority network --

>> Kitchen: Wait, no, I already have transit priority network in my language. It's just not capitalized. So it's a straight replacement of my language 3 down to a little I replaces three -- replaces evething on page 5 and the top of page 6 and then you start again with your B.

>> Mayor Adler: So the way you have transit priority network I'm looking at compatibility standards a initial maping should work their way that maximizes using capacity on parcels fronting activity corridors and in exhibit a or amendment a at that point that as the words "The transit priority network"?

>> Kitchen: Yeah, line two.

>> Mayor Adler: But it's not there, it's down below somewhere, right?

>> Kitchen: Well, it's in a, yeah, it's in a.

>> Mayor Adler: So it's not there. It's down bow?

>> Kitchen: That's why I said you take all of this --

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, yeah, I'm just trying to compare to what's in a. I'm reading amendment a. Amendment a says compatibility standards and initial map should work together in a way that maximizesousi H capacity on parcels fronting activity corridors, corridors, comma, and then it adds the transitpr rity network.

[9:39:53 PM]

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: But you're saying not add it there?

>> Kitchen: It's in --S in --

>> Mayor Adler: Because you've included itomhere down below.

>> Kitchen: I'm including it in a.

>> Mayor Adler: Right, okay. Now I want to look at that and see if it has the same meaning moved down into a lower paragraph.

>> Kitchen: It says the reviserred zoning map should reduce the impact of compatibility standards O development forarcels along the transit priority network, then goes on from there.

>> Mayor Adler: Should it be in both places the same way corridors and actity centers are in both places?

>> Kitchen: You cou, Yo know.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's put it in both places. The transit priority netrk and corridors, both places.

>> Kitchen: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: Then it gets to the revised zoning map should reduce the -- eliminate the impact from [indiscernibevel dment, I see that's blue. So that's -- for parcels along [indiscernible] As the code should and then, councilmember Casar, you're recommending accepting I. Is that right?

>> Casar: Yes. But my accepting of this, I didn't see any strike-throughs of the adler-ellis language so I'm just saying I think this all sounds good to add into amendment a, not to -- a I would be interested I hearing whether that --

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Casar: Whether you mean any strike-throughs, in which case I want to know what the point is of strikethrough. If this is all in addition, then it seems fine. Because when I read this it seems to align with the intent of the existing adler-ellis language.

>> Mayor Adler: So I think this is to provide the see of the trigger so I think that 4a still needs to remain.

[9:41:58 PM]

>> Casar: That's what I'm saying.

>> Kitchen: But I have an objection to 4a. And I'll explain why.

>> Casar: Okay. Can we take that once -- if we are good with this, can we go to that objection I that might be the only objection on the table?

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Casar: Then we can of course vote and debate that issue.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. We'll have a vote on 4a on amendment a in just a moment. So we're going to park that for a second. We'll come back and vote that. What about the kitchen language?

>> Kitchen: I'm taking that out.

>> Mayor Adler: This is coming out, it is being cut out.

>> Kitchen: Well, because we're because I'm understanding -- I would love for you to accept it.

>> Casar: Little bit all the way down to consider split zoning on the next page comes out and instead is replaced with the language here that --

>> Mayor Adler: I don't see -- okay. All the way to consider from the top down to -- and does consider split zoning stay in?

>> Casar: No. We have split zoning considered on the second page.

>> Mayor Adler: What's happening is the amendment would be to begin with the zone map language on kitchen, adding the transit priority network, striking Hyde Park, North Loop and Tarrytown, keeping a, keeping I. Right?

>> Kitchen: That's right.

>> Tovo: Sorry, when is the appropriate to talk about the striking of the examples?

>> Mayor Adler: In just a moment.

>> Tovo: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: In just a moment. So I'm trying to daylight what it is that's being proposed. And then a and then I.

>> Kitchen: Right. >> Mayor Adler: Those things would be moved on top of amendment a3 and the first sentence of four. We go to come back and look at a in a second because you're proposing to strike a.

>> Kitchen: We can talk about it.

>> Mayor Adler: So you're proposing to strike a.

[9:44:00 PM]

And then -- >>enitgo back to your --

>> Mayor Adler: Then we have Casar's, then we go back to amendment a, adding a L down at the bottom.

>> Kitchen: That's right.

>> Mayor Adler: That L is a higher case L, but it would actually a lower case L to also use as Tse things and then there's B on yours.

>> Kitchen: I wouldn't use my B unless --

>> Mayor Adler: We don't need B anymore.

>> Kitchen: Well, I would love to include B but I don't think -- wait a minute, B, we said we'd keep B.

>> Casar: Little B at the ends fine.

>> Mayor Adler: That stays at.

>> Casar: That just gets added into amendment a.

>> Mayor Adler: Does it become M? It's a different deal. Okay. Got it. All right. So the -- really the two issues seem to be the taking out of the examples and what happens with lower case a.

>> Kitchen: No, I think -- wait a minute.

>> Mayor Adler: If we accept the amendments as just offered, what we need to discuss is taking out examples after Clarksville.

>> Kitchen: Got you.

>> Mayor Adler: And whether lower case a is included.

>> Kitchen: That's right.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's talk about those two things now. Councilmember tovo, you want to raise that issue? >>Ovo: Sure. We lost track who have actually introduced this language, but I'm supportive of it, and I think these are good examples, and I think removing them suggests in some way that they are not good examples of village center low density mixed-use, or that the regulations shouldn't continue to allow them. I think it was Hyde park that was actually called out by our consultants as a great example of a complete community because people live within walking distance, many of -- local services. And various other things. I'm going to propose that we keep it as it was introduced in councilmember kitchen's amendment.

[9:46:08 PM]

And I -- [off mic]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So the first issue in front of us is do we keep --

>> Kitchen: Height park, north loop, tarrytown.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, Hyde park, north loop and tarrytown. How strongly do you feel about that, councilmember harper-madison? I mean, I couldn't tell if you thought there was a substantive reason to take it out or not, and I'm just trying to follow.

>> Harper-madison: Considering this is the latest I've been in this building and I don't intend to be here any later than I have to be it's certainly not something I want to argue over unnecessarily, but I would be willing to go ahead and put this out there, that I think we could come up with better examples of complete communities. The truth of the matter is in terms of what my opinion of how we should move for a great example of complete communities, great examples of village centers, I don't think the city of Austin has them yet. We need to create them. So I stopped at Clarksville because I thought it was a good example without introducing any contention. I don't know if you were here earlier when we had the conversation about hydepark, but it wasn't exactly the most contentious conversation we've had thus far, so I really just want us to keep moving in the direction of progress and not get hung up on things that could potentially be contentious, but I don't want to fight about that if --

>> Mayor Adler: What if we took out all the examples.

>> Harper-madison: Sure, sounds great.

>> Tovo: Okay. I'll remind the group that you were the ones who introduced those as examples.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand. But I understand -- we know what a complete community is.

[9:48:09 PM]

>> Tovo: I thought that came from your document initially.

>> Harper-madison: No, ma'am. It says kitchen right on top -- simultaneous.

>> Mayor Adler: Hey, hey, well know what a complete community is. Let's just strike the example and we don't have to worry about which --

>> Tovo: But I think the point was that it came from the document you all introduced, councilmember Flannigan and harper-madison.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand. Let's take it out. Now let's get to a, whether a gets -- a stays in or not. Can you tell me what your objection was to it?

>> Kitchen: Yes. Okay. So I think it is not necessary given what we have under B and because B says the Idc revision should P properties for missing middle according to the criteria that are listed here. And we've already said on the previous page X number of lots X number lots deep. I think it's overall prescriptive to say the ecific mapping for T parcel right behind because I think all of these criteria, the four that wereme ioned, and then -- which will definitely used, and then the others that will be used as appropriate, that's better -- T so I'm suggesting that you strike a.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: 4a.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar?

>> Casar: I would just --

>> Mayor Adler: Section a.

>> Casar: I WOU keep section a in because I think it's useful to set the pectexion that it will be rm of some level behind the corridor so that the whole transition zon fews.

>> Kitchen: So can I speak to that?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: So what I'm suggesting is this is -- well, the way I'm reading it, okay, is it is saying -- this first - you know, this first lot behind, regardless of any circumstances whatsoever, will be mapped with a residentialmulti-it zoning category, regardless of whether it's on a -- know whether it's on a transit pity network, urban core, well connected street grid, hig opportunity area or any of the other five.

[9:50:24 PM]

So I just don't think it's necessary to say that at this point. Because we've already said in the previous sectionow deep the transition zone may go. So it's gonna include that rst lot. I just think that there's no need to specify what goes on thatirst F lot. You're not going to miss the first lot. In terms of the transition zone. So, you know, it's just not necessary topeci S what goes on INT.

>> Mayor Adler: I think the intent was to have something that wouldn't act as a trigger for the --

>> Kitchen: Or you can say that. But just don't say what it's going to be zoned as. Just say it doesn't act as a trigger.

>> Harper-madison: [Off mic]

>> Ellis: Then why wouldn't Pell out what we want it to be zoned as?

>> Kitchen: Because there may be reasons why you wouldn't want to zone that property that way. I mean, the point you're trying to make is the triggering.

>> Casar: So I think when I look at this it seems like the debate is actually just two words and one hated word. Residential multi-unit. It sounds like you're agreeing that a minimum lots adjacent to parcels fronting the activity corridor will be mapped with a zoning category that does not trigger compatibility.

>> Kitchen: I would say lots fronting an activity center do not trigger compatibility for purposes of reducing what you can get on the corridor. Or something like that.

>> Casar: Basically the way we're going to do that if we have transition areas off of each -- I'm comfortable going this way. In the end I think that

[9:52:25 PM]

[indiscernible] It sounds like the majority of us don't think we want to trigger compatibility on the corridor, which is main goal.

>> Mayor Adler: That's the main goal. Lots adjacent to the corridor will not trigger compatibility. Is that what you're saying? And don't say how to do it

>> Kitchen: Definitely say how to do it. I would like the whole thing but if y'all are insistent on keeping it -

>> Mayor Adler: I think so. Let's change the language to say fronting an activity corridor will not trigger compatibility and is in scale with an adjacent residential house scale Zones.

>> Kitchen: And will be in scale.

>> Mayor Adler: And will be in scale. Okay? Any objection to those amendments here to this section 3 zoning? Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Just so I'm clear, we -- kitchen's small a under zoning map three.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Pool: Is that completely replaced by the small a that is in the --

>> Kitchen: No.

>> Mayor Adler: Let me describe the full amendment.

>> Pool: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Number 3 where it has zoning map, that paragraph with zoning map goes to kitchen page 6 of 8. It's her language beginning at zoning map. It adds the words transit priority network and the period goes after complete communities. It continues O with her a and her I.

>> Pool: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? The -- there's a new -- I guess at this point it would be B.

>> Pool: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: And it would say at a minimum. Now we're back to amendment a.

>> Kitchen: You're striking at a minimum.

>> Mayor Adler: At a minimum comes out. And it just begins with lots adjacent to. That becomes in essence B.

[9:54:28 PM]

>> Pool: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? And then what happens to then -- then --

>> Kitchen: Don't have any objection to little I

>> Mayor Adler: Everything II is stricken, beginning with II, it's stricken from there all the way down . B

>> Pool: Right. And does that -- does that B then become C? I think it does. Because --

>> Mayor Adler: I think --

>> Kitchen: No. It's actually an M.

>> Mayor Adler: Then you go back to the -- then you go back to the amendment a. The B on page 6.

>> Pool: Mm-hmm.

>> Mayor Adler: Becomes C at the top of that page. That becomes C. And then we are adding in that list down at the bottom an L.

>> Pool: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: It's what was handed out by Casar.

>> Pool: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: Then we're back to kitchen, the thing that says B will be D.

>> Pool: Now D? Or

>> Mayor Adler: I think it's C, right? Is it M or is it D?

>> Kitchen: Well, it's on par with --

>> Mayor Adler: I think it's D. It's on par with A, B, and C. It's not one of the factors to be considered.

>> Pool: Gotcha. That is now --

>> Kitchen: When it comes altogether we'll get the appropriate --

>> Mayor Adler: We'll let the Scribner do that but my guess is T's probably can D. You can look and see if it's more appropriate to make it M.

>> Pool: To be clear it's lower case D and city manager shall provide to council an analysis.

>> Mayor Adler: That gets us to the last question, question five --

>> Casar: Mayor?

>> Flannigan: I have an objection to F, G, H, I.

>> Casar: Mayor, we won't get to that objection if it's okay something you just went which was this sheet that council member Kitchen passed, but the L sheet.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Casar: I've heard from our environmental and drainage folks that as opposed to the words localized flooding putting the words "Drainage considerations" would be more helpful.

[9:56:35 PM]

>> Kitchen: That's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection? Hearing no, that change is made.

>> Casar: Thank you.

>> Kitchen: What did you say? Drainage what?

>> Casar: Drainage considerations.

>> Mayor Adler: Drainage considerations. Ok Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: So I talked about this on Tuesday. I don't know why we would want transitions in scale or Zones to end -- transitions to end midblock as opposed to streets which provide a natural buffer from adjacent scale of buildings, and then the sidewalk to residential house as quickly as possible, I feel like we've covered all the various ways that we're stepping down and I don't know that as quickly as possible. It's something I want to say without any context on where kingly is and quickly isn't.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's consider each of these in turn. Okay. F, transitions and scale should occur midblock. I don't know what the right planning policy I do we have those things in midblock or are they at streets? I think that language is -- as we've heard from someone that that is a --

>> I think that generally if we're talking about streets that are parallel to the corridor, we would want the street to be more of a delineator between where those transitions are occurring. But if they're perpendicular to the corridor, the transition may need to end midblock somehow.

>> Mayor Adler: So I would agree with taking out F. Any objection? Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: I agree with taking out F. Any objection? It doesn't preclude him from doing it, it doesn't prohibit. Prescribe it.

>> Tovo: So we have transitions and scale generally occurring mid block, then we have transition zones generally ending mid block in I, which may be one that you pulled.

>> Flannigan: Yeah, I see them as the same.

>> And I think -- yeah, I think that we're getting into a level of prescription that is really challenging because like you were talking about, streets and --

[9:58:43 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: So you agree in --

>> Tovo: I think I'm most comfortable with a point THA councilmember Flannigan, I think you raised concerns about, but the point about getting down H. I think I would stick with H.

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. We're talking about F. And I think.

>> Tovo: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: I think the question is, is everybody okay with taking out F and we would take out I for the same reason. Hearing no objection, F --

>> Kitchen: Which ones are those again? I'm sorry.>>

Mayor Adler: F. It talks about mid block.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: It doesn't say they can't do it mid block, doesn't say they have to do it. We're going to leave that to them.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Then that gets us to-g parcels and is generally wrapped as Zones of similar scale.

>> Flannigan: That's basically the same thing. >> Mayor Adler: Being prescriptive, we're going to take out G. Okay. Then I'll look at H. Transition areas should step down to residential house as quickly as possible while providing for a graceful transition and scale from the activity corridor.

>> Flannigan: I think what I struggle with is the difference between quickly and graceful. I mean people are going to interpret those very differently, and if we're already providing ranges and -- I mean, I feel like this is -- I'm not sure what we accomplish with H.

>> Pool: Or just remove to say two segments, quickly as possible and providing for a transition?

>> Flannigan: Yeah, as quickly as possible, we want transitions to step down, we said that elsewhere, we want the transition to be graceful, so just take out the quickly. Yeah. Take out the "As quickly as possible."

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. What?

>> Tovo: Just voting.

[10:00:43 PM]

I like it in. I think if it's a transition and we're moving from one use to another, it should happen as quickly as possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's take a vote on that I would probably keep in it just because I think it gives it direction. I recognize it build in some measure of flexibility I don't know how they would resolve that but I'm fine on this particular area, allow some ambiguity to exist.

>> Pool: The only thing we're doing with H is taking out as quickly as possible?

>> Mayor Adler: That's the motion. Councilmember Casar?

>> Casar: I'm fine with taking out as quickly as possible because we are actually saying that in some cases, we want it to be a little less quick and in some areas we want it more quick based on the criteria. The criteria says some are more quick, some are less quick, but if you can square that for me, it would be useful.

>> Mayor Adler: And I squared it by saying we have both quickly as possible and graceful in the sentence and that means they're going to have to figure that out. Let's take a vote so we can move forward on this. The question is whether or not to strike as quickly as possible. Mr. Flannigan made that amendment. Mr. Casar seconded it. We're ready to take a vote. Those in favor of taking out as quickly as possible, please raise your hand. Flannigan and Casar, Renteria, Haer-Madison. Those opposed, please raise your hand. The balance of the day, those words stay in. All right. Anything else on this section?

>> Tovo: Yes, mayor. Sorry, I keep missing --

Mayor Adler: That's okay.

>> Tovo: In fact, think that at various points, I've missed things that it wasn't clear to me in the moment whether it was amending an amendment or amending the base so I'm hopeful we're going to go back through rather carefully. On whatever we came --

>> Alter: Can I make a point of order? It is after 10 o'clock, and I would like to make a motion to postpone until next week and have a special called meeting so that we can all be fresh when we handle this and we have some idea of what we've voted on today.

>> Mayor Adler: I could keep going the very least, I'd like for us to keep going to get done through this document. We're up to the very last one. It really has only one vote on parking, I think, but it would stay at least for that, but I can certainly stay longer.

[10:02:53 PM]

Councilmember Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I think a good stopping point would be to make it through with -- you know, with this base document, but then I think it would be useful to stop because when we would actually know what we have as a base because there would be time to put all this stuff in. We would know what we have as a base. I could do a special called meeting next week. We would start with that and then start going through everybody's amendments.

>> Ellis: I just got my second round. I'm ready for the late night meeting.

>> Harper-Madison: I was just going to say, I just drank six ounces of red bull. I think we should just get it done. We have one thing left, seriously, can we just get it done?

>> Kitchen: No, we have a lot more than one thing.

>> Pool: I think if we can do what Councilmember Kitchen is suggesting, we will find that we can finish getting the base document into shape, give staff an opportunity to figure out all of that, and then we could come back -- because we do have considerable number of amendments that we haven't even begun, and I do think that red bull aside and coffee aside, that -- I think we all deserve to have a bit of a break. It's been a really hard day, for everybody.

>> Mayor Adler: Let me recommend this. Let's finish this, we get through 5, then let's do one more exercise, which is just go through the amendments and see what's still alive because it may be we can agree on things that just get pushed in. In other words, we're not going to discuss any of them at that point, let's go through and see what gets pushed in, and then at that point, let's make a decision about whether we stop at that point or keep going because we'll know how much there is that's left. But at the very least, even if we were going to meet next week, people should know, I don't have to worry about these 10 things because they're already in. Not to discuss any of the amendments.

[10:04:53 PM]

So let's do this, let's finish 5. Let's go through that quick exercise, just going through -- then let's see where we are.

>> I clearly to have a second for my motion but we need another motion.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool seconds that goes no. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? Councilmember alter voting no, the others voting aye, we're going to go -- let's do 5, then do the quick exercise and see.

>> Tovo: However, mayor --

>> Mayor Adler: Did you have another thing before --

>> Tovo: I did.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's do that. It's a little B on councilmember kitchen's, I think it was in amendment as a well. Is the -- I think it made it in. It's -- yes, it's the city manager shall provide to the council an analysis of the affordable housing --

>> Kitchen, taht made it in.

>> Tovo: Yeah. So what I would like to add to that -- I'm so sorry, I rlyea have no idea at this point, it was D or M, the thing we couldn't figure out what to number it. It is on councilmember kitchen's 7 of 8, and it was --

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, the city manager shall provide a council analysis --

>> Tovo: I Thi we made it C. We made it C.

>> Mayor Adler: D, probably.

>> Tovo: And I would like to add th language, the city manager -- just "And potential redevelopment using the envision tomorrow tool." I referenced this earlier, that when we had the different drafts, John fraganazy did the analysis using the envision tomorrow to show us how much of that would be redevelopment of existing structures, and I think that's really critical to understand.

>> Pool: I could support that.

>> Mayor Adler: Is this something that you would be doing anyhow?

[10:06:59 PM]

>> [Off mic]

>> Mayorer: Dlyes?

[Laughter]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Then let's put it in. Any objection? Hearing none, let's P itut in. All right. Let's go then to question 5. The issueere H is parng. This says tt parking requirements should be eliminated in certain areas within a quarter mile walkshed of corridors, ks,or except where parking would be particularly disruptive. Conditions to be determined by staff.

>> Kitchen: I have an amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: And then there was another section that said Ada compliant parking should be required even if no minimum parking is otherwise required. Okay. Yes, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: My amendment is to B. So do you want me to start with that or --

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. That's fine.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So, it's on page 8 of mine, and, basically, I would be replacing -- replacing what is in the Adler-Ellis amendment with my language. So you want -- I can run through that language. Basically, it says that the city's visibility ordinance should be retained and expanded to ground floor missing middle housing in the new code. Ada compliant parking should be required for commercial and multifamily, and it strikes for larger scale developments, even no minimum parking is otherwise required, to ensure an adequate number of dedicated parking spaces exist to safeguard those with permanent disabilities, temporary illness or injury, are afforded a place to park near where they live, shop, or visit others. Off site or on street parking may challenge safety and accessibility and should be carefully considered before being used as means to provide for this parking.

[10:09:09 PM]

And then it just says that it is of critical importance with an aging population and generational health.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Flannigan seconds that. Discussion? Councilmember Pool. >> Pool: I just wanted to note that this was a key piece that Stewart Hirsch brought to us earlier today and I had that conversation with him, so we do want to make sure that we acknowledge the Ada compatibility and ensure that the public understands that we recognize that, especially the piece about aging population and generational housing. So I really like what councilmember kitchen has brought for us here.

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion in.

>> Ellis: I just have a clarification question. As far as expanding it to ground floor missing middle housing, where is it lacking currently and where would this change?

>> Kitchen: This is just saying for missing middle, we want it extended because otherwise it wouldn't be. We were just wanting to make that clear. But we acknowledge this just ground floor because -- because, you know, you won't -- I didn't want to go so far as to say that it had to be, like, for top story or something because we're not suggesting there needed to be elevators in a -- you know, in a two-story or three-story missing middle. S?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Casarso does it currently not apply to the ground floor of missing middle?

>> Kitchen: I don't think it currently applies to missing middle, unless I'm mistaken. That's why the language is in here, to make it clear that we're retaining it.

>> Casar: Yeah. I'm fine with retaining it. If we're expanding it to missing middle and it doesn't currently apply to missing middle, I don't know why it does or why it doesn't.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Casar: So I would want the options provided or the best way appointed to it because I would love for the bottom of missing middle to be visitable, I just want to see what those options are rather than -- because --

[10:11:17 PM]

>> Kitchen: Oh, you mean maybe the ordinance might need a little adjustment? Is that what you're thinking?

>> Casar: Yeah. I would love -- I would like to expand visitability and missing middle but I don't want options to do so, or analysis to do so if it's not currently -- because right now there are places where fourplexes or sixplexes are allowed, and I visitability for some reason doesn't apply to parts of it, I would just want to understand that.

>> Brigid Lloyd, development services. The visitability ordinance, just FYI, does apply to new single-family or complex dwellings with habitable space on the first floor. So I think it would capture some of -- it would capture duplexes, but it wouldn't, without the amendment, capture other types of missing middle.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, and that was the reason for the language.

>> Casar: So how about the visitability ordinance should be retained and provide options to expand to ground floor or missing middle just to tell us different ways that it could. If it currently doesn't. I'm not opposed to expanding it to it, it's just creating an ordinance change here that we haven't debated.

>> Kitchen: What about the city should be retained and expanded to, you know, ground floor and missing middle housing in the new code and the staff should appoint options for how that expansion would occur.

>> Casar: That sounds great.

>> Mayor Adler: The city's ordinance should be retained and expanded in the new code and staff --

>> Kitchen: Shall provide options for how it is expanded.

>> Mayor Adler: Shall provide options for how it's expanded.

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: Any other changes to this? Any objection to adding B with this change in to the exhibit "A"? Hearing none, that's added. Any other changes to parking? So how does this -- this says A, B -- so how does this -- does

[10:13:30 PM]

this change the existing text? >> Itchen: Yeah, it replaces

T. >> Mayor Adler: All right. Were there any changes T a?

>> Kitchen: I didn't have any, but --

>> Mayor Adler: No, no, I what's here. B, C -- I see. So the only change you made was to a and C, the I know the ting language -- okay. This repces B. I understand.

>> Kitchen: And then I have --

>> Mayor Adler: Msol?

>> Pool: I have an amendment to a under coat textuestion 5. So if you look at my packet that was 2-4 combined one very back page,t's I very similar to what is listed -- what's already in there. The change picks up at "Except that some parking requirements may be maintainedor areas where elimination of parking requirements would particularly disruptive," raerth than saying, "Except for areas where reductions in parking would be particularly disruptive," tn it says, for example, neighborhoods with narrow streets and no sidewalks, areas near urban schools. I've taken out the specified examples and tried to make it a little bit more general.

>> Mayor Adler: Let me compare. Minimum parking requirements should be -- you had -- you added the word "Generally."

>> Pool: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Should be generally eminated in areas that are within quarter mile, you took out the word walkshed? Did you mean to take that out?

>> Pool: Walkshed?

>> Mayor Adler: Uh-huh.

>> Pool: I don't -- I don't -- maybe I'm tired because I'm not - I'm looking at the struck-through language. Is that where you see walkshed?

>> Mayor Adler: I'm look at the exhibit, at amendment a, it says the minimum parkingrequ ements --

[10:15:32 PM]

>> Pool: Oh, I see, I see. Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Pool: But I don't know if I MI that. I'm sorry, I can tell I'm tired.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So let's put it in. Walkshed activity centers, activity corridors, and transit -- they have transit priority network? Is that okay to keep in too?

>> Pool: That's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Keep that in, then you add transit stations with high frequency --

>> Pool: So that --

>> Mayor Adler: Oh, you add that back in, that was taken out? >> Pool: Right. But if the transit priority network is in there, I don't know that we need and transit stations.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's take out transit stations and high frequency service.

>> Pool: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Except that --

>> Pool: This is where T changes --

>> Mayor Adler: Elimination [indiscernible] Particularly disruptive.

>> Pool: I have, except some parking requirements may be maintained for areas where elimination of parking requirements would be particularly disruptive. So TRE's a little bit more direction in that area but it takes out the specific examples, although I am not wedded to that. Can keep the neighborhood with narrow streets and no sidewalks because they certainly occur in significant portions of our community. Werd about that this morning -- this afternoon with the yard bar sound permit.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I'm okay -- I would be okay with Yo language.

>> Pooy.ka >> Mayor Adler: I would still leave out the example just because that was great example so I would just have the period as you have it here. So your amendment, adding the word walkshed, the word transit priority network, striking transit stations, high frequency service, gets us up to generally eliminated, and the question is, do we want to add the word "Generally."

>> Pool: I could go --

>> Mayor Adler: Does anybody object to adding the word "Generally"?

>> Pool: I'm trying to remember what we've done with the word generally previously tonight, if we kept it in or --

>> Alter: We've kept it in.

>> Pool: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's keep it in. Okay.

[10:17:32 PM]

So the amendment is to replace a.

>> Pool: Then I do think that there is some interest in retaining the eg neighborhoods th narrow streets, so that piece maybe we should put to a vote.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Question is whether to -- the amendment strikes nborhoods with narrow streets and no sidewalks. The amendment is to add back in neighborhoods with narrow streets and no sidewalks and areas nea urban schools.

>> Kitchen: Could I speak for that?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: It could be more narrow because it's not really the whole neighborhood. So perhaps the eg could be narrow streets with no sidewalks and leave off the "Neighborhoods with." From M perspective, that is he ful to have that kind of example, or at least some kind of example thatelates ro that because -- particularly disruptive doesn't of what does that mean?

>> Pool:I'm fine with keeping in the examples but deleting the words "Neighborhoods with."

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Does anybody have any objection? Mr. Flannin?

>> Flannigan: Yeah, so I prefer without T example because I think those situations, we should also be weighing how those sidewalks are rated in the sidewalk master plan and the sequence of funding. You know, we just did a big bond and there's money coming sidewalks, so I wouldn't want to say that the only solution to narrow streets with no sidewalks is to have parking requirements when some of those streets are going to get sidewalks.

>> Kitchen: Could we say particularly disruptive for publ safety or something like th cause I'm trying to modify disruptive in some way.

[10:19:35 PM]

>> Pool: It does say in the amendment a from adler-ellis, conditions to be determined by staff. D then their amendment H Ken out those examples sell. W

>> Kitchen: Well, I would want the condition to be determid byne the council. I mean, the proposed conditions could be determined by staff.

>> Mayorer: That's all this is.

>> Flannigan: That's it right there, conditioned to be proposed by staff.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, that's fine.>> Pool: Okay.

>> Flannigan: That's the end.

>> Pool: I think we have a bingo.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So it's not going to have the examples, condition proposed by staff.

>> Flannigan: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. So code text, area a.

>> Alter: I have a question on that.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Alter: I just wanted to clarify if this is the elimination of minimum parking across all zoning types within that area or is it any zoning type that falls in that area or -- I just wanted to get some clarity on what was meant.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, say that again?

>> Alter: Is this proposed tax eliminating parking all zoning areas that fall within that watershed? Et cetera.

>> Mayor Adler: Generally.

>> Flannigan: No, mayor, it is not eliminating parking. It is only eliminating minimum parking requirements.

>> Alter: Thank you. I appreciate that. At that point.

>> Flannigan: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: Minimum parking requirements should be generally limited. Only speaks to the requirements.

>> Alter: Okay. So is it eliminating minimum parking requirements across all zoning categories within that watershed?

>> Mayor Adler: All zoning categories within that watershed area, yes.

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else?

>> Casar: Mayor, in my comments for question 5, I have in a sub item under objective, but I think it works better under code text, say the manager should explore options for maximums necessary to ensure sufficient development, if parking should be

[10:21:54 PM]

[indiscernible] -- Parking requirements, explore options for utilizing public parking in row 38 compliant, which references back to what councilmember kitchen amended.

>> Mayor Adler: Where is that?

>> Casar: Number 13.

>> Mayor Adler: Number 13.

>> Casar: Page 8, abc which works better as bullets under the manager should explore options, makes more sense to me to be under code text than objectives since we added it in code text.

>> Mayor Adler: So D would be, the manager should explore options, determine if, explore the feasibility of, explore options for. Any objection to that? Hearing --

>> Tovo: I'm sorry. Yikes. Sorry. I need to be sure that I understand what we're adding in.

>> Mayor Adler: That's fine.

>> Tovo: So this is number 13?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. But it's 13a.

>> Tovo: Explore options --

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, just above a, begins with "The manager should."

>> Tovo: The manager should explore options for setting maximums and minimums in areas necessary to ensure sufficient transit supported development, just a, or the rest of the provisions as well?

>> Casar: Abcde, not the paragraphs at the top, just starting with "The manager should." Abcd.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. With that objection, that's added. It comes in D, abcd will have to be renumbered I, II, III, IV -- you know what that is? Okay. Anything else? Yes in.

>> Tovo: I have a question and I don't know the answer but I want to just flag it as something that we might want. I'm remembering this correctly, for B, determine if parking in certain areas should be prohibited against -- I believe that we've heard from some of the affordable housing providers that that would hurt their ability to do their project, and I don't -- I can't articulate why right now, but I just want to flag, that I don't think that's something that we would want and that it would hurt, you know, exactly what we most want to incentivize.

[10:24:08 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Flannigan, then councilmember Casar. >> Lannigan: I would say I think certain areas is a key cause there because my understanding is, that's something that's more about downtown than it is about other places. And affordable housing developers, as we've seen, the moments, the brief moments they affordable housing downtown are not doing parking. So that's -- to me, this is like the Google building issue where they're doing 16 floors in areas that don't have minimum parking requirements. This might be a tool to ensure those developments, but this will be determined if -- give us options, that's all the framing.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: And more than anything else, we'll bring up affordability at the next council meeting where we can nullify that issue.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. anything else? Okay. Those are the amendments to amendment a. Let's take a vote on amendment a.

>> Ovo: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Tovo: We had taken up an issue earlier and I said I wanted to go back and revisit it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: So before we move on. So, yes, I got a little muddled and I think there was some support for a different version

of it, so back on page 3. >> Mayor Adler: .

>> Tovo: Where we were talking about the preservation incentives, this would simply make the -- this would make preservation incentives apply citywide. End of story. Not within a quarter mile outside of the urban center, not within the urban center and match it, just preservation incentives should be expanded citywide, and then pick up so that an additional, et cetera, et cetera. I still don't understand the distinction that was drawn by Beto between the urban core and other areas, and if it's a beneficial thing for the urban core, I think it would be beneficial everywhere, and so I would propose changing it that way.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Tovo proposes that the preservation incentive that was in section E at the bottom of page 3 apply citywide. Is there a second to that? Councilmember Flannigan seconds that. Any discussion?

[10:26:10 PM]

Okay. Those in favor, raise your hand. Those opposed? Is that everybody on the dais voting yes?

>> Harper-Madison: I didn't. Frankly, I abstained because I don't exactly understand the implications there, and I would rather abstain than make a vote that I regret later.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All voted aye except --

>> Alter: I would like to abstain also because I did not follow.

Adler: Okay. Councilmember Alter and Harper-Madison abstain, the others voting aye. Let's take a vote on amendment a. Those in favor of amendment a, raise your hand. Those opposed? Tovo and Alter voting no, the others voting aye, amendment a passes. Now what we're going to do is we're going to just go through the amendments and let's see what Cabe accepted or not accepted. I'm going to begin -- I'm sorry, what? We voted on amendment a and it was -- the vote was 9-0-2. Okay? So let's pick up Mr. Flannigan's first, a let's see, Mr. Flannigan, I think -

>> Alter: The vote was 9-2, two of us voted against, not abstaining.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry . >> Alter: Two of us abstained on the prior amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. That's what it was. The record should reflect on the preservation amendment change the vote was 9 her 0-2. On the vote onmend ant a, it was 9-2. Thank you. All right, Mr. Flash flood warnings I don't know if -- which of these arell game to go give the decisions that we made. Does anybody havebejections to the amendnts 1, 2, and 3 on page 1?

>> Flannigan: Hold on. Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes fills I think we can jump to the ones we haven't adopted as part of amendmt a.

>> Mayor Adler: Just tight ends what on your list you would like to still urge.

[10:28:15 PM]

>> Flannigan: Does amendment a include urging simplification? Did wdo the simplification language?

>> Kitchno:

>> Flannigan: So I'd like just the last sentence of number 1.

>> Mayor Adler: The last sentence of number 1, the manager shall work to deliver a new code that will simplify -- any objon to that being included? Hearing none, that's included.

>> Flannigan: Okay. Next page.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Flannigan: This is stuff from councilmember kitchen that I agree with, age had of friendly policies, the land use and zoning categories which talks about use restrictions should continue but hopefully be improved through a framework that identifies uses as opposed to just the by-lot situation to n,e extent it can be de. The bii is the self-storage or other uses that doesn't contribute to policy goals. C is developments using transportation demand management tool so those. It's basically all the blue, a, B, and C.

>> Tovo: Sorry. Not the red?

>> Flannigan: The red -- I think the simplicity weus jt covered. The only thing I'm asking for now is public transit that's part of C.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So odenext on the base motion right now has -- provides

(reading) W quality.

>> Flannigan: What?

>> Kitchen: What?

>> M Aayer: Page 2 of 8. What is that amending?

>> Kiten: The mayor was reading from amendment a, and yes, mayor, that's correct.

>> Mayor Adler: These are all amendments to amendment --

>> Kitchen: It's page 1 of our base motion amendment a.

>> Mayor adlbase motion, amendment a. Yeah, yeah, yea I got that, but I'm trying to figure out where it's amended in to and I'm looking at --

[10:30:21 PM]

>> Kitchen ITIs under that.

>> Mayor Adler: Code text, that's the section we're amending. We keep the text shown on code text on a, including what's in red.

>> Flannigan: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Then below that, we have then a, B, and --

>> Flannigan: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: C. Is C included?

>> Flannigan: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. A, B, and C. Any objection to that? Okay. Those items are included. A, B, and C. Okay. Anything else?

>> Flannigan: So now I'm jumping ahead to page 4, which is -- on my page 4, which is amendment to question 2-1, objective, I'm specifically look at CIII, options to allow some level of administration variance for some building formegulations to help maximize the shared community values of, and then IV on the following page, fsibieaty of how regulations can overlap.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. This is -- where's this on the amendment a? This is question -- section 2, objective, so it would come before codenext, on page 3? So we'd bedding a section D?

>> Flannigan: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: And which ones are you looking at on yours?

>> Flannigan: So for the section D we'd start with C, general housing affordability should be the primary licy driver, which I think we said elsewhere, then the sub of that is 3 and 4, III and IV.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm missing -- where does the sentence begin? I'm sorry.

>> Flannigan: The middle of page C, inner G.

>> Mayor Adler: Oh, I'm O the wrong page, I'm sorry. All right. C. That would become tn D?

>> Flannigan: Yep.

>> Mayor Adler: And it wld be in general?

>> Flannigan: Yep.

>> Mayor Adler: And it would add III and --

[10:32:25 PM]

>> Flannigan: And IV.

>> Mayor Adler: Just IV.

>> Flannigan: III and IV.

>> Mayor Adler: IV.

>> Not V.

Mayor Adler: I'm sorry --

>> Flannigan: I iovered elsewhere in --

>> Mayor Adler: We don't need I.

>> Flannigan: III and IV. 3 and 4.

>> Mayor Adler: 3 and 4. Thank you.

>> Fla: 3annd 4.

>> Mayor Adler: 3 and 4 and not 5.

>> Lannigan: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that? Hearing ne, tont's included. Next?

>> Flannigan: All right. I do want to talk Abou limb lot size.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Flannigan: Th a harrier debate. My intent here, in my language, options for eliminating minimum lot size and width, but my intent is to ensure we are allowing flag lots a lot sizes that could support tiny homes. This would be in concert withsome F the other -- some of the things that we've done elsewhere in amendment a where we're king about preservation and allowing stuff in the back. It would be great if those -- if people could also subdivide and sell instead of having to do condo regimes. That's my intent with this part here.

>> Kitchen: Can I ask a question?

>> M Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: So, how does it read now? Options for eliminating minimum lot size and lot width to --

>> Flannigan: So I would support saying options for reducing minimum lot size and width to achieve the goals elsewhere in this document. So not indiscriminately, but as a tool to achieve the other things we've id out.

>> Kitchen: And would you consider while also considering or complying with public safety concerns or something --

>> Flannigan: Absolutely.

>> Tovo: Mayor, can I just ask about process here?

[10:34:26 PM]

I thought we were just laying out did the are we laying out amendments, deliberating amendments?

>> Mayor Adler: Good point. Good point.

>> Flannigan: Wouldn't.

>> May Adlor: We're ING to flag this one.

>> Flannigan: Almost got that one.

>> Tovo: I need to know are we going to try to power through this?

>> Mayor Adler: You're right, U're right, you're right. You're right. Allht. So we're flagging 7-2.

>> Flannigan: 7 her 2a.

>> Mayor Adler: 7-2a, reducing minimum lot size, so let's fla that. What else?

>> Flannigan: Next page, I'm not sure if this isovered in amendment a, but where we talk about making - - so this is my number 9, which is question 3, section 1umbe nr a, which would make it easier to permit and develop missing middle in areas where allowed. It used to say all residential Zones, nowe're just saying wherever they're aowed. This is more of a non-zong and process directive and not so much a zg directive. I can't recall if we mentioned the -- this part of missing ddle in amendment a.

>> Kitchen: It wasn't changed in amendment a.

>> Flannigan: It may be someerewh else in amendment a. I want to make sure what we're saying is we cou D zoning but we should also make sure we're looking at -- that the perm ting andhe development process be easy, easier.

>> Mayor Adler: Are those -- those are not site development standards.

>> Flannigan: Oh, it might be the same thing.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm looking at once you reduce site developme standards.

>> Kitchen: So is this another on we should flag?

>> Mayor Adler: I don't know, let's see if we have agreement or if it's something we need to discuss. I'm just trying to understand it.

>> Flannigan: Oh, I see.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Yeah, I wasn't sure how to read this. I wasn't sure if what you were saying, councilmember Flannigan, was, like, improving the pcess have that, yada, yada, yada, can be permitted and more easily developed, I didn't know if -- I didn'tnow kif the emphasis is on moving them through the process more easily.

[10:36:38 PM]

Or if it was -- or if you're saying they should be allowed more places.

>> Flannigan: No, because.

>> Tovo: Becaue C were that elsewhere.

>> Flannigan: We covered that where before, I'm not saying that now. I think what's in amendment A1C is sufficient, reducing --educe site development standard for, accomplishes this goal.

>> Tovo: Well, then -- okay. I'm fine not taking about it, but I -- okay. That's fine. So you're just remove it from consideration?

>> Flannigan: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: What'sext?

>> Garza: Quick question. I'm sorry. Not taking any more votes; right?

>> Mayor Adler: If we get through here, we on have one thing to decide, then I'moing to recommend we decide that one thing, rather than calling a special session next week. >>O we are still trying to power --

>> Mayor Adler: Potentially. Let'go ts ough the process and see what hasn't been accepte let's keep booking.

>> Flannigan: I'one.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We're done with Mr. Flannigan. Okay. Let's talk about Kathie tovo.

>> Tovo: Okay. Let me just say that I have amendments to other people's amendments as well, and so I'm pretty happy with the idea of -- I mean, I'm -- you know, I've been here 3:00,0 in the morning but I'm pretty happy with the idea of, like, wrapping this up soon so we have a base document that we can all work from, but -- okay. But I'll work through --'ll work through mine. Question 1, and these are again just

my amendments that I'm bringing forward, not amendments to the other amendments, which I have as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's ask a question, does anybody object to question 1 amendment? Anybody object to that?

>> Flannigan: Wait, wait, wait.

>> Tovo: The nccd was a psed one that is not --

Mayor Adler: Right.

>> Tovo: That has been diently changed, so to my regret, so we'llle on to additional 6.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: This is the amendment that I talked about at some other point.

>> Flannigan: Oh, yeah.

[10:38:39 PM]

>> Kitchen: I do have any objection.

>> Ellis: I just -- clarification. I'm in support of everything in the water forward plan but I just wandered its benefit in being codified, if we change, you know, land development codes thrghout that process, or the water forward plan is updated, I didn't know how those would work over time, together, to be kind of locked in place in thisay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's ask -- staff, can you address this?

>> Kitchen: We're going to

talk- - >> Mayor Adler: I'm going to find out if this is something we need to talk about or if it's something we're going to be able to handle quickly. That's what I'm in search for.

>> Brent Lloyd, development services. And I do not have councilmember tovo's language in front of me. I had a minute ago. It got lost in the shuffle. But --

>> Tovo: Here you go.

>> Water forward, we spoke with the WER utility earlier, and they feel tt water forward is not close enough to being complete or in a form that would lend itself to a regulatory amdment, so I think their again, and I think watershed staff is I agreement that we should sort of -- we would recommend that council not include direct related to water forward as part of T land development code revision at this time, simply because it's not far enough along.

Kitch>>: So, mayor, I think we need to talk about it.

>> Mayor Adler: Tovo, question 1, number 6, we're going to hold. Okay. Anything else that you want to urge?

>> Tovo: Yes. Hi tkn the language on page 2, question 2, Hsing capacity, and this is where I guess having - - so this is question 2, this is my amendment sheet that says question 2. I think the language of granting new entitlements still remains in here and I would suggest we alter S I've proposed. And once I find where it is, I'm going to point it out.

[10:40:49 PM]

>> Kitchen: I thought we cnged that.

>> Tov okay. So on page -- in amendment a, the base motion, pag 3c,e I would propose Makin the following

changes: Basically, the point of 3 is, the granting of new entitlements should be limited to reduced displacement, disincentivize the redevelopment of multifamily housing. I've made a couple changes to broaden that so that we're saying espeallycin areas, but I think we want to reduce it in all areas where we have existing housing, especially multifamily residential.

>> Kitchen: I' sorry, councilmember tovo, which --

>> Mayor Adler: So --

>> Tovo: Oh, I'm sorry, I jumped -- yeah, I should have said it is on, on mine, little 3.

>> Kitchen: Are you putting in under objectives?

>> Tovo: Yeah.

>> Kitchen: Because we already changed objectives.

>> Mayor Adler: So if you look at page 3 of amendment a, in the middle of the page, there's a C there.

>>Chen: Oh.

>> Mayor Adler: That begins the granting of new entitlements --

>> Tovo: Yeah, we made so many changes to that, I got confudse confused too, but that's where the changes would go.

>> Mayor Adler: So you would add the word "Cially.

>> Tovo: I would add and, dash, existing housing, especially, tcrach older. Two M dashes, two especiallies, one existing housing.

>> Mayor Adler: Does anybody have a problem with adding the word -- the dash especially and adding existing housing, especially older, in this C?

>> Tovo: Yeah, I changed --

>> Mayor Adler: Especially multifamily.

>> Tovo: Yeah. >> Mayor Adler: Existing housing, especially multifamily residential development.

[10:42:53 PM]

>> Casar: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Casar: I would like to talk about that more so if you would like to put a pin in it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's put a pin in that. Okay. Anything else, Kathie?

>> Tovo: Let's see, on the next page I was recommending we staff language -- I think we've changed it several stages, so I'm going to stipulate that one.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: This is on the back page of question 2. And so it would add new language, reviewing regulations related to Austin energy and Austin water other than fees that have -- review and suggest -- well, review and suggest changes to non-zoning regulations that may encourage demolition rather than redevelopment of existing structures.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that language being included? It's the paragraph under staff recommended language, says review non-zoning regulations related to. Anybody have any objection to that?

>> Flannigan: I don't understand what this does.

>> Tovo: Sure. We had an instance, and I've got a little written-out example I can give you details about, but I believe it was a co-op, and they were trying to make some changes. This is a co-op in west campus. They were trying to do renovations, and they were actually being asked to -- they were asked to provide a certain amount of infrastructure for the -- for the area, and it was going to cost more than \$100,000, and so those are the kinds of things I think we should look at closely. I'm not suggesting that we look at fees because I think we went through a real thoughtful process of making sure that those are 100% cost of -- cost recovery. So these would just be to look at some of those other non-zoning regulations to see if there are any opportunities there to not -- you know, not pass those costs on to other rate payers, but to reevaluate some of those. So that's the first part. The second is to look at our -- to look at our non-zoning regulations that may be encouraging demolition rather than more creative reuse of properties because I think it is a very valid assumption that new housing is going to be more expensive than existing structures, and I think we make it extremely easy in this city to demolish a house, and we should look at ways in which our structure, our fee structure and other -- among other -- well, other non-zoning things, make that the easiest, fastest, cheapest alternative.

[10:45:27 PM]

>> Flannigan: Yeah. We've had plenty conversations on demolition. On this sentence, is it only referring to energy and water or all non-zoning regulations.

>> Tovo: No, just those two.

>> Flaigan: I think it's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm fine with this. Any objections to this? Hearing none, that's iluded. Kathie, next?

>> Tovo: City lead testing process. I think we talked about these changes in the work session as well that we'd add in just to make it very car that the public, the general public will be involved as well. And I think that's important because people kw their communities very well and can suggest examples and particular cases that would -- that would rod ounut our testing. He then alsit adds in a line, just articulating what I think was the understanding that staff should completehis testing before the review by boards and commissions.

>> Casar: Mayor, I'm okay with this ife say initial, instead of this testing, just because there wl be continued testing.

>> Tovo: Great.

>> Mayor Adler: Do what now

>> Tovo: That's good. Initial testing.

>> C ar: I'm fine if we change the word this, before the word -- before the word testing, to initial.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. This initial testing should examine.I' M sorry?

>> Tovo: This inial testing -- staff should complete this initial testing prior to review by board and commissions.

>> Casar: Change the word this to the word initial.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. Got it.

>> Flannigan: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Flannigan: I have an objection to the end of substanal involvement of the public because the testing process is intentionally about design of technical professionals. I understand councilmember tovo's point T about the public knows good examples, but I think the testing process isbout the engineers, development professionals getting together and seeing if a plus B equals C through the code.

>> Tovo: We can flag it.

>> Mayor Adler: Staff, how is the public involved in testing process?

>> Tovo: I mean the reality is just based on -- I'll just answer while rney is coming out, but my understanding -- you know, I've been invited to these testing things, other people are invited, usually there are members of the public involved in those as well.

[10:47:39 PM]

But I think it's important that we involve the public in testing.

>> So for the first -- >> Mayor Adler: Not asking them to run the scenarios but I'm asking them to provide useful input.

>> Sure. Rodney Gonzales, assistant city manager. For the first two jobs of codenext, W actually did it with design professionals. It was in-house and we got a lot of really good information in that and fmed the next drafts of the code. For draft 3, council had asked us to expand that broader to the public. Then we encountered issues where some design professionals didn't want to participate because of that broadened preach. Broadened -- reach.we wt limit it to design professionals, and we can report out the results of that testing council and to the public so that way, everyone knows what happened that testing and what changes, if any, resulted from it.

>> Maydler: I would call that, too, as a burden. Yes.

>> Kitchen: So is this one we need to set aside?

>> Mayor Aer: Yes, I think we need to set aside Thi the question is substantialero.

>> Tovo: And I think at some point either now in the future, I'd like you to explain what you mean by design professionals didn't want to participate because the public would be involved.

>> That's our understanding. We had aard time getti folks to participate in that third round of testing.

>> Tovo: I guess I would wonder if it was just because we weredoing a third time, but anyway I look forward to hearing more about that -- about that, and I hope we can fd design professionwho view the public as a resource, since they're living in the areas that are going to be impacted.

>> Mayor Adler: I think part of it, as I recall, back at that time, wast the -- kind of the emotional environment surrounding that. Okay. So we're going to flag that one. Anything else? Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: C, we've dealt with. D, identifying, I would suggest identifying and complimenting opportunities throughout the code to encoura tgehe preservation of existing housing, especially market affordable housing.

[10:49:51 PM]

>> Mayor adlanyb: Y have any objection to that? None? Sleut that in. That's D, goe in, as an add.

>> Tovo: And then 3 would be added somewhere along the way to the zonin map. Additional direction to staff. Additional direction to staff to develop specific contact-sensitive areas where the distance between corridors is less than a half mile.

>> Mayor a: This is with respect to housingitac cy? Okay. Does anybodyav he any objection to that? Hearing none, that's I okay.

>> Tovo: Back to site development standards on question 3,y only change there would be to add in at the point where we're talking about reduced site development strds as appropriate.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to saying as appropriate?

>> T O: Question 3, code text 1 C, but that section has been changed, I have no idea -- no, I was working out the base motion so let me see --

>> Mayor Adler: This is O page 4. Page 4.

>> Kitchen: We didn't change that.

>> Tovo: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: We didn't change it. It's pag 4, down at the Botto in the code text section, C. Reduced standards as appropriate. Any objection? Hearing none, that's I N. Anything els E?

>> Tovo: So, this section is also somewhat changed.

[10:51:54 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Uh-huh.

>> Tovo: So I'll have to think Abou where it goes. It was talking about transition Zones, and indicating that the mapping --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, this is --

>> Tovo: That one of the considerations of the mapping would be instances where market affordable and/or missing middle housing -- so-called missing middle housing is adjacent to a property along the corridor. So it may be putting it --

>> Mayor Adler: We're gog ton have to flag this one. This one is flagged.

>> Tovo: That's like a gong.

>> Mayor Adler: I have people reaching out.

>> Tovo: I think that is it.

>> May Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: For my amendments, except for those as I mentioned that I have to other people's.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. Councilmember kitchen, you want to take us to yours? Do you have anything left?

>> Kitchen: Okay. I have a few. I want to start with my addition to the affordable housing.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: That's motion sheet amendment to base document number 2, it's the list of affordable housing a through -- a through P, and so do you need me to walk through each of them or have people have a chance -- this is one I've had out there for a while, so -- and I made some -- some people had raised some concerns, so I made changes to reflect them. So councilmember harper-madison, you had wanted to make sure that I didn't say prioritize areas close to high performing schools, so I too that out .and.

>> Harper-madison: I think that one was a two-parter. It wet minimum bedroom requirements.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Harper-madison: The word requirements.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Harper-madison: And then propose mechanisms to prioritize areas close to -- oh, you took out high-performing schools. But if I recall correctly during work Sones, the word that triggered me was requirements.

>> Mayor Adler: I have the same ncercon.

[10:53:55 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay. Do you want to hold a for more conversation or --

mayor Adler: Just that line. I'm fine with everything else in this document, other than -- tie any increase in development capacity to affordability requirement.

>> Kitchen: Wait, we're on increased supply in multi-bedroom housing.

>> Casar: So, wait, did you alre Y resolve the issue? Because I only he two issues that I think are eily fixed.

>> Harper-madison: I think it could be easily resolved. I was just wring could we do a thinghe WRE we offered a bonus for multiple bedrooms, as opposed to -- requirements iso of a punitive thing.

>> Mayor Adler: Greg, what were you going say?

>> Casar: Yes, T- I -as just going to say that where you were mentioning, mayor, the tying any increase in development capacity to affordability requirements, we've debated that pretty heavily today, so I

thought we could just have that say tie increase in development capacity to affordability requirements, as stated in this document, just because we'-

>> Kitchen: Oh, yeah, we're not on the same one.

>> Casar: But on bedroom requirements, I grew he that should --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So let's hold -- bedroom requirements we're going to --

>> Kitchen: So we're going to hold a. We're going to hold a. Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: And we're going to hold C.

>> Kitchen: Oh, C -- I see where you're talking about C.

>> Mayor Adler: Are you okay with his change? Read it again, Greg.

>> Casar: Tie increases in development capacity to affordability requirements as stated in the rest of this document.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, that's okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that? Hearing none, that change is made. Tie increases in as provided in this document. Okay. So it's just the issue of bedroom requirements.

>> Kitchen: Yes, the rest of it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else?

>> Kitchen: Okay -- go ahead .

[10:56:03 PM]

>> We could revisit D --

>> Kitchen: Which one?

>> Harper-madison: We could revisit D. That would be helpful for me.

>> Mayor Adler: Options for implementing a density bonus program from missing middle?

>> Harper-madison: Uh-huh. Yeah. I have some options. And then --

>> Kitchen: So you want to hold D.

>> Harper-madison: Yes, please.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Harper-madison: And then J.

>> Kitchen: The puds? You want to hold that one too?

>> Harper-madison: Yes, please.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Harper-madison: And then N.

>> Mayor Adler: B, D, J, and N.

>> Harper-madison: Uh-huh.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else?

>> Harper-madison: Nope.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else, Ann?

>> Kitchen: So the rest of these are --

>> Mayor Adler: The rest of those are in, except a, D, J, and N.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So now I'll go back to the amendment to the base document er 1, updated, so there's just a few of these left. Everybody got it? It's the longer document. Okay. Tell me when you're ready .

>> Mayor adler:got it.

>> Kitchen: Okay on the first page, under communication, I have ine a transparent and educational public policy under which stakeholders are informed on how their input has been received and is being evaluated.

>> Mayor Adler: Informed on how.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, it should be on.

>> Mayor Adler: It's not incompetent, to which stakeholders are informed on how their input has been received.

[10:58:10 PM]

>> Kitchen: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm okay with that. Any objection to that being included? Hearing none that's included.

>> Kitchen: Next page, at the top the creative spaces. Propose options to support creative space including zoning categories specific to cultural spaces and incentives to create dedicated below market rate creative spaces in developments along corridors and centers.

>> Mayor adler:any objection to this? This is to promote options to preserve. So we're on kitchen, page 2of 8. At the top. It's subsection. Bis that what do aware --

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Subsection B. Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: I'm generally in support of this, I think. The proposed objections including but not limited to.

>> Kitchen: Okay, that's not fine.

>> Flannigan: Because I don't know that we would want specific creative zoning.

>> Kitchen: Yeah.

>> Flannigan: But, yeah including but not limb to.

>> Kitchen: Thane.fi

>> Mayor Adler: Including but not limited to zoning categories.

>> Flannigan: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to this going in? Hearing none it's in.

>> Kitchen: Next one is E and ink chincilmember Casar may have an amendment to that. It's fine with me.

>> Casar: That's right. If we could move E, except replace -- here, I'm handing it out. This language got the okay from clean water action and --

>> Kitchen: I think it's two and four.

>> C: Save Barton creek and sos didn't have a problem, it replaces 2ii and E little IV.

[11:00:14 PM]

Essentially it's asking for -- it's setting mor the goal and the direction we want things to go in as opposed to trying to write the policy and the code right here.

>> Mayor Adler: To say this differently, I don't know where this would go but I'm not sure we have to decide that. We can ask staff to figure out where this goes but kitchen and Casar are offering that the direction the T manager include these two provisions.

>> Kitchen: Well, andin in here.

>> Casar: It's these two provisions. It's all of the provisions written by councilmember kitchen. Itt J replaces her requirement of 5,000 square feet.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Casar: And her exemptions on impervious cover limits with --

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. It replaces II. So this beginnings with -- where does this begin.

>> Kitchen: Begins E.

>> Mayor Adler: Begins with E, okay. Begins with E. And but I as I deleted. What else -- II --

>> Kitchen: II replaced with councilmember Casar's.

>> Casar: My II.

>> Mayor adleray.ok

>> Kitchen: Ifive is replaced with councilmember car's.

>> Casar: And then I think it should be without objection because I think then it becomes very -- that is just aetti S of environmental goals.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. Anybjec oon to that? Hearing none, E is included with T twoheanges to II and V.

>> Kitchen: Oka next page is under objective on the next page, it's just the language that adds -- well, you know, let me double-check that you don't have this already. I don't think you do but it's language that adds preservation of 10,000 affordable housing units, production of sufficient numbers of permanent supportive housing units each year suffici to address needs. So let's see.

>> Mayor Adler: It did.

[11:02:14 PM]

It's on page 2.

>> Kitchen: Didn't, right.

>> Mayor Adler: It did not.

>> Kitchen: That's what I'm proposing.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to [indiscernible]30% missing middle housing, which I don't see that you have here.

>> Kitchen: Oh, yeah, well, I'm happy to include that.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's include that. So ASN a addition to a, without any deletions, you're adding --

>> Kitchen: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: The 10,000 -- preservation of 10,000 housing units,

[indiscernible] Permanent and supportive housing each year to address needs. Here you have it, you have it before --

>> Kitchen: Oh, I do. You already had the 30 percent missing middle.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that being added to a?

>> Flannigan: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Flannigan: My only concern is that I don't think permanent supportive housing accomplished what I think it has to be subsidized.

>> Kitchen: But it is, I had the conversation with our housing folks about that. It could be because some of those units are undercongregate zoning so there may be a land development code next to us.

>> Flannigan: I'm fine then.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: We're adding from kitchen the language in red on page 3 of 8, where on page 2 of amendment A it has 60,000 formal housing units, we're going to add her language just as she has added it before and to 30%.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? So that -- those two lines of red come in.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay?

>> Kitchen: Next page.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: D at the top of the page. The city manager Sha provide estimates for the potential impacts of the new map on transit ridership as well as affordable housing goals.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody have objection to that? Hearing none that's included. Okay.

[11:04:14 PM]

>> Kitchen: Under testing, which is B, S is additional with whatever else has been added to this. It should provide accurate and careful modeling of corridor and transition area regulations so that council and community discussions can focus on achieving policy results and include proposed non-zoning regulations as previously directed by council resolution, and then there's a number. Before final adoption. So basically this is just saying that the accurate and careful modeling would be done before final adoption and it's information that's available to us and the public.

>> Mayor Adler: So it's adding the red language.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, just the red language.

>> Mayor Adler: It should provide an ending with as previously directed.

>> Kitchen: It ends with before final adoption.

>> Mayor Adler: So that council communities can focus --

>> Kitchen you're looking at the updated one, right?

>> Mayor Adler: No, I'm not.

>> Kitchen: The updated one added "Before final adoption."

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry.

>> Kitchen: That's all it add, "Before final adoption."

>> Mayor Adler: Page 4 of 8, I'm sorry. "Be final adoption," okay.any objection to that.

>> Flannigan: Mayor, I think we have staff.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Ericaek acting as assistant director of neighborhood housing. Super quick on T permanent supportive housing issue, I think you could say, you know, more congregate housing, but permanent supportive housing is not a housing type, per se.

>> Kitchen: I know. We're not sgin that it is. We're just -- we just decided to include the goals because the goals may impact the land devnt code. That's all we're doing. We're not saying anything about the zoning category that goesith W it.

>> Mayor Adler: To the degree you could help facilitate that that would be good. To the degree you say we don't have the tools available to do that, report that back.

[11:06:14 PM]

>> Okay. We will come back with that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. All right. So we have the red language. It should provide accurate D carl modeling all T way down to "Before final adoption." Any issues with including that? Hearing none --

>> Flannigan: Oops.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: Head srt. I'm just -- can't we put a pin in this to talk aboutbo later? I want to go back and read the resolution and understand how much of the corridors we're asking toe modeled.

>> Alter: I think it's more of a question about how the testing is done. I had copies of the resolution for everyone.

>> Kitchen: We could put it on hold. I think other people have this section to talk to too.

>> Aer: I have copies of that resolution which I'll pass out.

>> Kitchen: .Ok so we holding that one? Is that what we're doing.

>> Mayorer: We're going to hold that one and if Jimmy reads that resolution he'll tell us and we'll let that go. Right now we're putting a pin in 4ab.

>> Kitchen: Next page, under 1b, where it's where appropriate allowing now housingtypes to qualify as ads. I added -- I don't think this was picked up yet. I added "Including existin homes being preservednd a mobile and manufactured homes" to that list. I'm on B.

>> Mayor Adler: It's on B, page 4 of the amendment a. This is capital a, B, C, this is additions to capital B.

>> Kchen: It's on page 5 of mine.

>> Mayor Adler: It's on five of eight of kitchen and page 4 of amendment a.

>> Kitchen: Yes okay., yes. Mm-hmm.

>> Harper-madison: In which case if we could go back a teeny tiny bit. We left off at B on page 4 of 8 for kitchen under code text we left off at B.

[11:08:16 PM]

Did we cover C or did we just --

>> Mayor Adler: She didn't offer C.

>> Kitchen: I didn't offer C.

>> Harper-madison: Got you.

>> Mayor Adler: It was already added.

>> Kitchen: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: C was already added.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: B has a pin in it.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay?

>> Kitchen: Are we over on page 5?

>> Mayor Adler: Now we're on page 5 of 8 of kitchen, which is page 4 of amendment a.

>> Kitchen: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: And it's B down at the bottom, capital B, what's being added is "Existing homes being preserved and also mobile and unimproved homes."

>> Kitchen: Yeah.

>> Harper-Madison: Got it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? All right. A has allowing such as -- okay. All right. Any objection to those words? Hearing none, that's added.

>> Kitchen: The next one is C. This is the reduced site development standards for missing middle housing. I'm adding a sentence so it says "Reduce site development standards for missing middle housing options such as duplexes, townhomes and cottage courts in order to facilitate development of additional units, based on code revisions. I included council will need to determine the appropriate criteria to achieve more affordable housing while protecting environment and public safety, transportation, utility and right-of-way needs. So it's just suggesting that we want to reduce site development standards, we just have to consider how we do that in line with these other requirements."

>> Casar: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

S. >> Casar: I would be fine with this as long as I understand when you say council need to determine you don't mean we need to take another vote between here and the staff bringing something, you mean when it eventually gets to us we'll deal with it.

[11:10:18 PM]

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> Casar: That's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to T language being included? Hearing none it's included.

>> [F mic]

>> Kitchen: That was -- it was on page 5 --

>> Mayor Adler: Five of eight of kitchen. It's question 31c.

>> [Off mic]

>> Mayor Adler: Sorry? We okay? Got you, okay.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So the next one, which is the last, I think --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, good.

[Laughter]

>> Kitchen: On page 6 of 8, and that's under code tex

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Because I don't think we -- yeah we didn't do this one before. So this one says "Maintain draft 3 no bld and vegetative buffer, wch I think is the language that you all have, and then I just said "Include standards related to noise, uses, utility, screening, trash, lowering and pickup zons well as shielded lightin" then I added include green infrastructure from draft 3 and continue tree preservation policy as well as ireasing tree canopy along corrido and centers to enhance walkability and curb heat island effect.

>> Flannigan: Mayor I wanted to talk about this maintain draft 3 maintain vegetative buffers thing. I do think this is a topic of discussion, this area.

>> Kitchen: What about I? Are you okay with I, the rst one.

>> Flannigan: I is fine, I think staff noted it's already kind arrive thing. And then, two, ii2, green infrastructure wast very well defined in draft 3 so I think there's conversation about how much definition we

need to be providing. >> Kitchen: So two is a hold then?

>> Mayor Adler: So I is in and II has a pin on it.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

[11:12:19 PM]

Flannigan: And the maine

-- paragraph on two because I want to talkbout the no build vegetative buffers from draft 3.

>> Casar: Sorry,ittle I under code text?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Harper-madison: Actually we're not. Councilmember Flannigan and I were both in primary text under code text, the maintain draft 3 no Bui and vegetative buffers.

>> Casar: Right now is councilmember kitchen moving ii1 a ii2.

>> Kitchen: Two was hold and little I.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, weary and II.

>> Casar: I'd like to just pin both.

>> Mayor Adler: Pin both, okay, let's pin both.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Harper-madison: Mayor, if I may, I think what we're saying we're ping this whole thing, both councilmember Flannigan and I are saying pin the no build and vegetative buffer and councilmember Casar is saying both I and II.

>> Mayor Adler: Both I and II.

>> Harper-madison: And primary language.

>> Mayor Adler: There's some primary language that's already been adopted.

>> Kitchen: In amendment a.

>> Flannigan: When we were on this item adopting amendment a I was told I couldn't remove it during that process and we would come back T it so I'm ping all of two codenext.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's pin all of number 2 codenext -- code text.

>> Flannigan: D say that, did you? Okay.

[Laughter]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. That's pinned.

>> Flannigan: Great.

>> Mayor Adler: So that's all kitchen --

>> Kitchen: Wait. I think that's all. Let me doublecheck here. Yes, that's all.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Wait, wait. Yes, that's all unless I fi something else.

[Laughter]

[11:14:19 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Harper-madison we've already put in.

>> Kitchen: Seems like there wasanother one somewhere.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool

>> Pool: Yep.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's look at yours.

>> Pool: All righty. Let's start with the two to four combined.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Pool: Sure. It's the one that's stapled.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. Leslie, what?

>> Pool: I'm wtingaior everybody to find it. It'she two to four combined, oneheith the staple in it.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it.

>> Pool: Nothing on the first page, obviously. The second page, I'm not gonna urge that because I think we've already kind of dealt with that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Pool: On page 3 where I have modify non-zoning regulations colliding utilities I believe that was add. I think that was --

>> Mayor Adler: We did add that.

>> Pool: Yep so that is done it's about the non-zoning regulations --

>> Mayor Adler: It was added specifically called out Austin energy and Austin water departments.

>> Pool: That's right. And she gave anexample of -- somebody gave -- maybe it was you.

>> Tovo: I was going to say are we talking on mine.

>> Pool: It was the example of the cost for the addionalti

>> Tovo: That was mine, yeah, so we' not doing that. Okay, got it. Thank you. I wanted to make sure we weren't modifying --

>> Pool: No, no.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool has offered anything yet. She's going tgh her stuff.

>> Pool: Then page 4, here's where I wanted to ask staff a question about cooperatives. I don't know. How are you gs doing?

[Laughter] Out there? Oh, good. Brent, you're awesome. I wanted to ask question about whether cooperatives are considered a particular type of housing or if it is, like, a financing scheme? In other words, is it appropriate for theord "Cooperatives" to be included in a description of missing middle housing options?

[11:16:22 PM]

If so I'd like to keep it in there because it is a descriptor but inderstan at some point staff may have advised -- I don't know which of the commissions that cooperatives was really a funding extreme.

>> I would answer that. Yes, it is a funding scheme rather than an actual use.

>> Pool: Okay. Is it --oes it work okay, though, in this document with this -- which is direction to the city manager and toou all to continue to include it in there to -- as an exhibit of our intention that we would like to find ways to incentivize cooperatives?

>> Yes.

>> Pool: All right. Then I would like to add the word "Cooperatives" to this list if that was okay with everything. >>Ayor Adler: Greg.

>> Casar: My suggestion to get that very clear is to just have it be housing typologies that may be appropriate for cooperatives.

>> Mayor Adler: That makes sense. Housing typology.

>> Pool: I think it's different.

>> C: Itar not important enough. I was trying to catch your direction with words. Wel>> It is in a list of typologists.

>> Casar: We can leave it in there, that's fine.

>> Pool: Okay,reat G

>> Mayor Adler: Are we okay with that language? Adding the word "Cooratives"? Any objection? It's added. Cooperatives is added.

>> Pool: Great. Right below that you'll see zoning map the goal ofpr riding additional missing middle housing should inform the mapping of missing middle Zones consistent with the direction provided throughout this document. I'd like to have that in there as additional direction.

>> Mayor Adler: By missing middle Zones is that the same thing we've been calling transition areas.

>> Pool: I think so. I think there was a point staff recommended we change the naming.

[11:18:27 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to adding that language?

>> Flannigan: Mayor, am reading this right that substantively the change is the phrase inform the mapping of transition Zones as being changed to

[indiscernible] Missing middle Zones?

>> Pool: Yes. I think it thes opposite of what the mayor just said. It's more specific. It's to the type of housing, not its location.

>> Flannig:ant's probably fine, yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: So we're going to keep it missing middle Zones . >> Pool: Thank you.

>> Mayor: Oker. It's in.

>> Pool: Okay. And that's -- let's see. Page 6. Now I don't remember if we included this. About the in general consider revision -- this is underonin Z map question four, zoning map item, which is number 3a. In general consider revision that's minimize the act of compatibility standards on properties facing transportation corridors particularly in relation to shallow lots.

>> [Off mic]

>> Pool: Is that something that somebody else has already put in there? I really am tired.

>> Kitchen: I think we did put --

>> Pool: Okay. Maybe it wouldn't B remiss to go ahead and include it just in case. I mean, if it's duplicative then staff C tell us we've already said this twice. B is map lots adjacent to rcelpa fronting an active corridor with a zone on m1 and Bo. That does not trigger compatibility standards and is in scale with any adjant residential house scale zone and I'm thinking --

[11:20:33 PM]

>> Kitchen:this is in conflict.

>> Pool: We've already addressed this.

>> Mayor Adler: Wve already addressed it.

>> Pool: Just a.

Or Aayer: Just a. Anybody have any disagreement with a? So not intended to take anything out but as an addition, a is in.

>> Pes. Y and I think C on that page was als discussed.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Pool: And the very last page that was also discussed. So we're done wh that. The last one is my motion sheet one, and this is the additional direction at the end of the document.

>> Mayor Adler: About planning. Does anybody have any issues with this pnninla document pool motion sheet 1?is pool motion sheet number 1.

>> Pool: Just remind everybody this tracks with the resolution we passed in 2017. That was the kitchen resolution.

>> Fnnigla: Mayor, I'm not ready to move on the additional planning direction yet. >>is:I don't think we fully covered it in work se so N just want to make sure --

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to put a P in this. Pin.

>> Pool: If I could then ask if you want to talk about in work session weed N have --

>> Mayor Adler: She jussa it hadn't been covered in work session

>> Pool: Okay. Mean, I think we did talk

about it in work session. >> Mayor Adler: In any event, Mr. Flannigan wants it --

>> Pool: That's fine. We'll talk about when we're fresher. Fine. That's it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. That gets to --

>> Kitchen: I did find one re, but you can do other people first.

>> M or Adler: Okay. I'll come back to you. Harper-madison's is already in. Alter. I think we --

[11:22:34 PM]

>> [Off mic]

>> Mayor Adler: Hmm? We've already voted on 3 and, right, we've already voted on 3. And queion St we already included, I think. So I think your two amendments a already dealt with. Okay. All right. That gets us then to councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: So I have a version two of the motion sheet that I had handed out this morning. It is red-lined for clarity onxact E what is updated so if you still have the originalotion sheet you can discard that one. We worked with staff to make surehat T it did what we thought it was going to do so they had a little bit of updated verbiage to add in here, but there are some portions O our transit priority network that are not necesrily in imagine Austin activity expenditures this is intended to allow for staff to be able to utilize those areas because 're increasing transit capacity to be in line with how we're handling our increase in housing and increase in transportation goals so I wanted to daylight there are spots ere that I'm willing to kind of spell out more directly that I think those are okay to include in this as well even if they're not on imagine Austin corridors or centers right now.

>> Kitchen: I want to think about this one.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Pin in this one. >>Eah.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And, Ann, I think tt gets us up to --

>> Kitchen: Yeah, this is my motion sheet number 5. I'm just going to take thela one on there that says the code revision -- and this goes INT question one overall scope. And it's the It bullet.

[11:24:34 PM]

The code revision process shou proldde consideration of the need to upgrade infrastructure, capacity and areas proposed for increased density along corridors and imagine Austin centers. Additional

considerations and means may be needed in older areas that may not currently have adequate infrastructure in place. Such as sidewalks. We talked about those earlier, stormwater management, water pressure supply and sewage line capacity. It says should provide consideration so that just means, to my mind, that that's something that the -- as part of the code revision process would be identified and would come back to us.

>> Pool: That sounds good.

>> Tovo: Sounds good to me.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's put a pin in this one.

>> Alter: Maker are -- just curious on the ones we're ping, because I had an -- pinning, I had an amendment I was going to propose depending on what was done but at this point I'm not sure if the other stuff is in there and I can throw it out there we're coming back to the pins.

>> Mayor Adler: Why don't you throw it out.

>> Alter: Okay. I don't know if I was next.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, what?

>> Alter: I can pass it and go when it's my turn.

>> Mayor Adler: It's your turn.

>> Alter: It's my turn, great.

>> Mayor Adler: We've done everything. It's in your hands.

>> Alter: Great. This one is easy it shouldn't surprise you, intended to maintain our parceled dedication and heritage tree protection requirements O O corridors but allows that if the staff determine that they significantly constrain our housing goals they can return with option that's allow us to achieve our housing goals while still ensuring the parceled efficiency and council can make decisions based on the options presented.

[11:26:38 PM]

That's the explanation and the amendment I'll read it since I'm passing it out now for parcels within activity centers and activity corridors the application of non-zoning regulation should not waive heritage tree requirements or the parkland dedication ordinance, should [indiscernible] Significantly constrains our housing capacity goals in these areas staff should return to council with options for achieving housing capacity goals while still ensuring we reduce our parkland efficiencies.

>> Mayor Adler: Put a pin in this. Thank you for daylighting it. >>: Maarr.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Casar: As I mentioned at the very beginning of the meeting I did hand out councilmember Garza and my amendments from week ago because they largely were obviated by the rent-flannigan-harper-madison amendments and the ellis-adler amendments, there were only two or three ones that weren't covered in all the work we did this morning and I think the likely won't get pins in them. Nobody has brought them up as objection inequitable the last week and has to do with maximizing potential for employment and residential units within downtown. Sounds like they will have a pin.

>> Tovo: I just didn't understand what they meant or what they did or how that was going to be achieved so that will take a little conversation.

>> Casar: Okay, cool.

>> Mayor Adler: Pin in that.

>> Tovo: I don't know that I have objections to them. I just don't understand them.

>> Casar: Great. >> Mayor Adler: All right. So best as I can tell we have about 15 pins. I think that's pretty good work. If the -- I think it's best probably if the clerk -- start polling offices and see when we can get together for a special next week. And I staff could go ahead and try to put all this together and hand it out to us everybody can get a copy of that that would be real helpful too.

[11:28:47 PM]

If we could get out a list of what's been pinned, I don't know if you could do that or --

>> Kitchen: If we can -- we can share ours with you guys. So --

>> Mayor Adler: If we can get that up on the message board or something out for us quickly so we all have that. Does that sound good with everybody.

>> Harper-madison: One quick question. I thought the overall goal was to create the base document this evening. Is that what happened? Then the pins all come back to?

>> Mayor Adler: We're really close. We'll resolve the pins probably next week and then we have a document we can give to staff and say go forth.

>> Kitchen: We have to vote on it first, but --

>> Mayor Adler: No, no. That's what I'm saying. The goal is to meet next week, consider the pinned items.

>> Harper-madison: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Once we do those then we vote on the direction.

>> Kitchen: Gotcha.

>> Mayor Adler: The goal is to be able to next week after we've gone through the pins to be able to do the document and then give it to staff.

>> Harper-madison: Ongoing. Not to prolong this, but I am concerned that aside frometh 15 pins between now and next week somebody might have a hankering to go back and ditle with something we ready covered is that a possibility?

>> Mayor Adl: I think we've opened it up if someone wants to try to do that they certainly can.

>> Harpemadir-n: Hmm.

[Laughter]

>> Mayor Adler that doesn't mean people have to vote for it, but it doesn't stop anybody from asking. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I do think is possible when we look at it all together we'll find things that look add together.

>> Mayor Adler: I think tshiwas incredibly good work. Tonight. So I thank everybody. I think we can thank each other R that. A lot of work went into this. All right, anybody else haveanything before we adjourn? Then here at 11:30 we're adjourned.

[11:30:48 PM]