

Housing and Planning Committee (HPC) Transcript – 11/10/2022

Title: ATXN-1 (24hr)

Channel: 1 - ATXN-1

Recorded On: 11/10/2022 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 11/10/2022

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

Please note that the following transcript is for reference purposes and does not constitute the official record of actions taken during the meeting. For the official record of actions of the meeting, please refer to the Approved Minutes.

[3:08:47 PM]

I am. Council members, Sabino "Pio" interior chair of the housing committee. I have my colleague. Here and on the dies and two on remote. So welcome here. We have a quorum. This year. Uh, some familiar faces out in the crowd. So I don't know what. What school program you're from. But welcome here, you know. We do the fun part. Five, making decisions on building as much affordable housing. As we can here in Austin. Okay, Carl, if. It may just I was just introducing them from the lbj school of public affairs. It's a housing policy class from is a professor Fulton. So alright, well, great.

[3:09:48 PM]

I am glad to see so many people, young people. Getting involved in that in this policies that are that you're working on the afternoon in dire need for people that are you can come and help us direct. The city on department. How and what would be best. Built. Alarm especially our future corridors that we're going to be building. It's going to be real crucial that we have as many support groups. Advising us on this project. So welcome. We're going to start our council meeting here. We do. I am going to ask for a motion to approve the minutes. We haven't attached to that made a motion to approve the minutes. Second by tovo hope Paige. Aren't you the same "Chito" villa? My colleague. All

[3:10:51 PM]

those in favor. Raise your hand. It's uh. The majority of the of the diocese. His voted positive . We were with one of our Collier in kitchen off the dies. Are there. We're going to start with our briefing today. Hmm. You have first one briefing is Ecuador transportation orientation development policy. We have the staff come up. Hello thank you. Council members for having us present equitable transit oriented

development to you this afternoon. My name is Warner cook. And I'm a principal planner with the housing and planning department. And I have other staff here today as well to help answer questions after the presentation is through. Um. So to set the stage, I first

[3:11:56 PM]

wanted a quick reminder of what the equitable transit oriented development policy plan is intended to do for the city of Austin. It's a comprehensive framework to help us imagine the future development around the project connect transit system, one that supports residents of all incomes social, especially those that have borne the burden of past and current inequities in transportation and land use. The policy plan is a plan for how to plan if you will. The document does not by itself, adopt or amend regulations or make specific investments at specific stations, but it will set the course for how we might make these changes in the years to come. So as another reminder council. Thank you for directing us to do this work in your June 2021 resolution. We've been partnering with cap metro based on the resolution that your body passed in order to prioritize equitable outcomes with transit oriented development. Um you asked us to look at roughly 30, different goals and strategies

[3:12:58 PM]

for our transit neighborhoods, thinking holistically about increasing access to jobs and services, preventing displacement, enabling walkable baikal neighborhoods and, most importantly, especially strategies to preserve and exist. Um affordable and attainable housing. So what exactly is E T O D or equitable transit oriented development? Where is the E come from? Well we know the traditional Todd brings lots of benefits to our communities, encouraging the transit system, giving the ridership that we need to support that transit system. However we also know that traditional transit oriented development has displaced people from their neighborhoods here locally and across the U. S so only you're doing and do no harm, approach and mitigating displacement still wouldn't be enough to actually increase the opportunities that our community has. To thrive. And grow. So the

[3:14:00 PM]

equitable transit oriented development comes from the equitable outcomes that we're searching for with this plan, um we're not only doing no harm, but we're actually trying to improve the economic mobility for people of all backgrounds, especially those that have been underserved by transit oriented development in the past. This effort is truly a partnership between three agencies as well as our community. We couldn't do it without them. Cap metro has led on much of the work on the study study over the last year with the city supporting and 80 P consulting. We've all ultimately the Austin transit partnership will design and build the new transit system while the city has land use authority and the

ability to implement policy through code, um to direct investments and new programs and can't metro will be the operator of the new transit system. The fourth crucial stakeholder and all of this is our community who we serve. Not only do we need to know from our community what they need and desire from the neighborhoods around transit, but we're also

[3:15:00 PM]

going to need them to champion. Some of these strategies themselves in order to get to the equitable outcomes that we deserve. The stage has been set well over the last several years for the mobility side of this work with the 2016, 18 and 2020 mobility bonds as well as the Austin strategic mobility plan and culminating with the proper a vote on project connect, where voters approved funding for the system and the anti displacement in 2020. After that approval, the city and cap metro both saw the need to plan around the transit system to benefit residents of all incomes. We've been partnering over the last year to understand the local conditions, search out national best practices and develop policy tools to get us there. Now we're here at the step of the E. T. O D draft policy plan, which will guide decision making around these stations in the future. After council will take action on the policy plan in December to approve it by resolution staff will move forward into implementing the

[3:16:01 PM]

recommendations in the plan focused on station area planning , regulatory changes and coordinating with our partners, and just a note. There's so much more engagement to keep doing in these years going forward. We'll have lots lots more opportunities to continue being involved. The study was funded, um, in part by the federal transit administration through a generous grant to cap metro. We're looking at roughly 100 stations. We're trying to do it in both quantitative and qualitative way. In order to take lessons learned from the study and apply them across the full system of project connect commuter, rail, light rail and bus rapid transit. On the quantitative side. We've got an existing conditions. Dashboard online that helps us understand the people and places along our transit system by looking at population and demographics, displacement, risk jobs and career opportunities, the urban fabric, real estate and housing costs as well as mobility infrastructure. On the

[3:17:04 PM]

qualitative side we've worked for the last year, conducting many different types of public engagement in order to hear what our community envisions for E T. O D. Especially those that have been underserved in the past large virtual meetings that we held last year did not reach all of the intended audience is that we had hoped so as we moved on, we added more strategies, like working with the community advisory committee working group members table, Ng paid focus groups as well as our paid community

connectors program. Um we had 12 ambassadors who had conducted their own outreach after a highly competitive selection process, and they reached over 200 people, 60% of whom were roughly by park and low income community members. I'm actually a little bit out of order here, so we're going to jump into what's in the plan document itself. We'll go through the six goals that have come from our community engagement. There's a snapshot

[3:18:04 PM]

of how T O D S in Austin have performed over the last 10 years. We've got stationary, a typology ease and planning priorities. The comprehensive policy toolkit and a work plan action plan next steps. So the sixth goals for E T O D that you'll see on the right hand side of your screen came from three different sources. First the city council resolution from last year. The goals outlined in that second we looked at the racial equity drivers in the nothing about us without us anti displacement, tool and report and then third, they came from the community engagement. The priorities that our community was expressing. So you'll see that it covers everything from safe, accessible transportation to closing the racial health and wealth gap again, preserving and increasing, affordable and attainable housing, expanding job and career opportunities. Supporting our neighborhoods with services that meet their daily needs like childcare, healthcare. And expanding our

[3:19:05 PM]

and preserving our diverse cultural heritage with our small and by park owned businesses. The next part of the plan is the typology ease of the station areas so these you can think of as categories classifications of the roughly 100 different stations across the project connects system. These are grouped according to shared characteristics in the table on the right. So the first column in the table on the right more or fewer relative residents today, um, is it relatively high vulnerability and experiencing displacement today or is it relatively low or historically exclusive today? And has it experienced more rapidly changing jobs and population growth or it has been a little slower than the rest of the system. So that those three factors help us get to the colorful boxes that are in the middle of the screen. And those words in those boxes. Those eight typology is give us the

[3:20:07 PM]

starting place of where we where we would start. Our strategies for are more focused, detailed planning going forward. Um just another note that these eight apologies. We don't see these as static at all. These are not prescriptive of a future that we envision their descriptive of what's there today, so we know that that's going to change over time, and therefore we know we're going to have to adapt and change. The typology is as well. There's also not won best or ideal typology. Every single station can do

more to give us the equitable outcomes across our city. So the goals and strategies are going to remain the same across the system, but how we use and apply those in different typology ease. That's going to be where the context sensitivity comes in here. Just yeah. Just right. Click on that. So the in other words like let's say, just starting on the top of the deep kind of purple first one that that applies across the

[3:21:09 PM]

side, basically, so that purple color is reflective of the more residents today and it's historically exclusionary. Okay and then those are reflected in the map that different typology that are in there. Correct yeah, you can read it all kind of. I tried to line them up across. Yes, thank you. So in addition to the typology is we also looked at planning priorities. This was another request from council knowing that we can't do detailed station area planning in 100 different stations that once we needed to figure out where the highest impact was going to be. First so we looked at areas that don't have very transit supportive zoning today, as well as areas that had a lot of capital, metro or city owned land or underutilized land, because that's where we thought we could have the highest impact the most quickly for possible future E T O D planning. Um we're also going to be looking at trying to make sure that we're in a variety of different lines of variety of

[3:22:10 PM]

different bus versus rail kind of stations and different typology ease, and we're also going to work to partner with ongoing processes. For instance, the northeast Austin district planning process has a lot of green line and metro rapid stations that will become part of an E T O D, um, looking stationary, a planning process. Um the last major component that we worked on with cap metro. Here is the policy toolkit. There's 46 different policy tools in our tool kit. You can think of this as the as the how if the last part that I was going through is the what? When where this is the how are we going to get to equitable T O D. Uh um. They cover topics of small business and workforce development, housing, affordability, mobility, land use and urban design and real estate and finance strategies for each one. We have a couple of pages. Just a brief description. Understanding who the partners are. What is the timeline for when we need to get

[3:23:10 PM]

started on this tool? And um what are some challenges or considerations? We're going to need to balance to make sure that it's being implemented equitably. And then finally, we have some success metrics to help us know that we're achieving the six goals. Uh finally, we have a short section of a work plan or next steps. These are some of the immediate steps that housing and planning plans to implement, starting in 2023 in order to implement E T O D, but like I said, we have partners that other

agencies we have nonprofits. We have the community that are also going to need to take up parts of this plan and be implementing that as well. So on the city side, we're looking at some focused station area planning. Um we're also looking at potential regulatory changes that would go through a big public process. If we did initiate that work and the development of an equity scorecard to try to evaluate the community benefits of private development projects. Lastly, where you have the draft plan and all of these elements online

[3:24:11 PM]

. There's a survey on speak up Austin dot org slash pto policy plan. We're also hosting an organizational summit for nonprofits and agency staff to try to build momentum and find those points of collaboration next Monday, and people can always reach us at E. T O D have Austin, Texas dot gov. And with that, we'll take any questions. Thank you. Is there any questions? Carly. Government passion. Thank you, Terry. I appreciate it. Yeah thank you for my presentation. I appreciate it. I do have a question like to know if there is a policy tool about, um, community land trust and about limited equity co operatives on page 108 and 109 of the print out. Yeah or talks about one. Um, they just want to eat in 109 of the printout. Yes one of our policy tools in the housing affordability section is on various types of shared equity

[3:25:11 PM]

models, including community land trusts, as one of those. Then there's a section about whether this policy tool existed. Austin however, there's no mention of any of the dozens of coop properties or any of the cooperative housing resources that we have in town. Sorry. I'm just trying to pull up the page that you're speaking about council member. Hmm. Okay so I haven't pulled up. So, yes, we talked about the community land trust program, but you're correct. We don't have a specific examples there of the limited equity you cooperatives co ops. Um but that's definitely something that we could add in there. Um in order to make sure our community

[3:26:12 PM]

knows about the resources that are available. Really appreciate that consideration. I'm concerned that those success metrics that focus 100% on community land trust, but don't mention any of the development of co ops as a contribution, or , you know, contributing factor to the success. Um so yeah, staff would could consider incorporating, um co operatives into those success metrics. I think that would be appropriate. Work. Questions Carly confirmed member villa. Are there any goals for. Number of housing units around each station or anything kind of solid like that for the E. T. O D S no council

member. We do have our strategic housing blueprint goals around districts as well as various metrics on how many housing units we'd like to see them around. Imagine Austin corridors

[3:27:12 PM]

and centers et de policy plan doesn't have a prescribed goal number of housing units in a station area. Um but we do have an understanding of what the housing mix is what the affordability mix is so that when we go and look at focus planning. We can see how we're going to be able to meet some of those citywide goals through this process. Great and I do appreciate council member harper-madison comments with regard to the cops as well. I know that that I mean, I lived in go ups and college and I know a lot of times associated with student housing. But you know again as prices start to rise, you know, I think a lot of things that we kind of thought of, as I mean, I think even of like boarding houses and stuff like that, I mean, there's a lot of kind of old tools that may be coming back in vogue and may be necessary to explore. And then finally with and I may be confusing a couple of things, but I know it's part of the anti

[3:28:13 PM]

displacement funding that we recently gave to a handful of organizations around town. I would assume that y'all are involved or coordinating with those nonprofits that received the grant funding. I was just checking to see if anybody else wants to answer. But of course, the answer is yes. Yeah, we, uh, displacement prevention team that's been leading that effort has been working really closely with the inclusive planning team and housing and planning on this one. And so we saw, you know, kind of that that displacement prevention is a little out in front of this planning work, so we tried to incorporate all the best practices that they're already learning through, like the community initiated solutions, and then some of the new things that they were hearing as well when they went out to do kind of some of the budget priorities and stuff with the C a. C, trying to make sure that we're aligned there. Okay, great. And to the extent that that you know, it's applicable. There's the. We just passed the right to organize with the goal of hopefully forming tenants unions in especially some of the

[3:29:14 PM]

low income apartments, a lot of them in my district and again, I would love to see kind of that formal structures in place. You know where tenants associations are able to kind of give us feedback and hopefully even be an intermediary. Potentially between like, you know, cold and so on and so forth. So anyway, I appreciate the information and you know and look forward to the results. And also if you can give us, uh, like a time schedule when you're going to bring this back to us. Yeah I know there's a lot of information that you're gonna be receiving so I might not be here, but my colleagues were definitely

would like to have that information that that time . Prepare for it. Yes so we were at planning commission this week , but we got postponed to next week on the 15th and we'll be at zoning and planning commission for a briefing and possible action on the sixth of December and then city council on December 8th your last meeting of the year. Thank you for that

[3:30:17 PM]

Kali there any more questions? Then when I want to thank you, and now we'll move on. Yes. Sorry. We actually had a speaker sign up last minute before that item was closed. So if before we move on if we could call Scott Johnson thank you. Mr Johnson, you have three minutes. Good afternoon council members. I was inspired on this topic that I'm gonna speak about when I was at the mobility committee meeting earlier today, and I certainly support affordable housing. I always like to try to frame things where we're thinking about all of the externalities when we're taking some action when we're building something or deconstructing something so something that should be known, and some of you are connected to air quality, I know is that this summer was unusually high ozone

[3:31:18 PM]

levels if we were value to right now by the EPA, which we're not going to be we would be right at the violation point for ground level. Ozone ground level ozone are. Car emissions that are volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides called Knox when they come together and form in a chemical reaction. That's what we call ground level ozone. Construction equipment, which is used for building homes, building roads, etcetera. That is a very large source of it there by now. I'm sure over 300,000 registered vehicles in Travis county. There may be much more than that. But when you look at the amount of construction equipment that's going on, including cranes and front loaders and all there's thousands, but but not hundreds of thousands, but that amount of construction equipment is approximately 10% of the inventory for nitrogen oxides, nox, which is the more important

[3:32:19 PM]

ozone precursor. That's a longing to irritant and a health hazard, so I just wanted to raise the awareness that we need to continue to work on our air quality, which influence and impacts climate as well and think about decisions. How we can contract for cleaner air or if we're part of a group and intergovernmental group asked the question. What are you all doing to reduce emissions from the construction work that this committee or this group or this governmental entity? Is doing. It's extremely important for the health of the citizens for the economic vitality of the region, because there can be penalties for that. We haven't had those penalties yet. We're actually nonattainment for a very short time in the late seventies, but ozone standard got changed, and so please think about that. Some of the

groups that work on this clean air coalition, which is a committee of the council of governments works on this. The clean air force, which is an air quality group. That's a nonprofit works on air quality. But this issue doesn't come up a

[3:33:20 PM]

lot. So I'd like to raise your awareness that when you see something being built, you might be happy it's being built. But it has cost it has ramifications externalities that impact our health negatively. And answer any questions. Thank you for your comments. College. Y'all have any questions? Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Scott. Colleague. Um what? The second item marine go through because it's gonna be setting the schedule for um next year's, uh, proposed meetings and. And just want to give you all the time to look it over. And as soon as we finished the briefing. We'll take comments and vote on approval for next year's really? Moving along. Do you want us to

[3:34:24 PM]

do the fourth briefing? Some compatibility and parking on corridors. Good afternoon. Council members. I'm Greg Dutton with the housing and planning department. I don't number four on your agenda is a code amendment. Compatibility on corridors. Um, what I'm gonna do is give you a brief presentation with some background. The council resolution proposed draft changes. Staff's recommendation and then the timeline. So just a little bit of background. This is not new,

[3:35:24 PM]

probably, but um in March, 2020 the L D. C revision was suspended. And, uh, more and then more recently in June, y'all past pmu two, so B M U two is the update to our existing being new regulations and allow 30 ft. In height above what you could previously do in return for a deeper affordability. And all. You also get a parking reduction. Um on, uh, on light rail lines. You get a reduction in compatibility. Uh 200 ft, meaning that at 100 ft compatibility ends. Um and. So when you pass that at your June 9th meeting. You then passed the resolution that is bringing forward the item that you have in front of you today. I'm not going to read through this verbatim. Um you all agree familiar with it? But basically that resolution on the ninth of June to initiate this code amendment said that we're having

[3:36:26 PM]

an affordability crisis in Austin. Um we have the new project connect project that was approved by voters. Um and let's put housing and transit together. We've talked a lot about, um, compatibility in Austin. For many decades. We have uh, a current standard in our code that's more restrictive compared to our peer cities. And then we also have the SNP, which was recently adopted plan that has a goal of 50 Mo. Chair split. Also changes to compatibility and parking regulations can help address the issues that we're currently having with market rate and affordable housing. Studies that the planning commission and zoning planning commission have been over the years have shown that um changes to compatibility and parking. Could help greatly. And then that just that you're committed to again making housing and transit come together and work with each

[3:37:26 PM]

other. So that was the resolution that initiated the amendment. Um uh, it went on. To kind of it was pretty specific. So it did say. Part of that was to end compatibility. 300 ft, so for residential and mixed use properties on certain corridors, compatibility would end at 300 ft. So today's code, it ends at 540 ft. This would be a change to 300 ft. In addition to that, sort of across the board, there would be a five ft bump in height. So today where you have a 60 ft building allowed. At 300 ft. That building would be allowed to go up to 65 ft, but that was really across the board. And again like vm, you too. Reduction in the parking the 25% of what's otherwise required for light rail M arch corridors and 50% of what otherwise required or medium corridors. It went a step further and it said that that's for all properties on corridors

[3:38:29 PM]

that are mixed use residential. But if you choose to participate in an affordable housing bonus program, you get a further reduction in compatibility. And it's specified by corridor so that on light rail corridors they would get the biggest breaking compatibility if they participated in this affordable housing program, it would compatibility will end at 100 ft. From triggering property. Uh for large corridors. It will end at 200 ft. But there's a bump up in height from 65 to 90 ft. At 1 to 200 ft in distance and then for medium corridors. It would end 250 ft. But there's above in height from 65 to 90 ft. At a distance of 150 to 200 ft. 250 ft from a triggering property. And this map is very small. I know it's um you can't see a lot of detail, but this is just to show you that the corridors specified again. Light rail, large and medium corridors are sort of throughout the city.

[3:39:31 PM]

Light rail, uh, shown there in the very middle. That's project connect the green. The green line is the green corridor is the Orange and the blue line. And then large quarters in blue medium corridor isn't

red. This is a visual just to show you how reduction compares to compatibility today. So that. That blue tent if you will. Is today's compatibility goes to 540 ft from triggering property. The standard reduction. That is, if you're not participating in the affordable bonus, the standard reduction and that compatibility at 300 ft. And then you can see that pink line is that five ft bump in height that that you know, everyone gets basically if your if your residential or mixed use project that's that's sort of like the tier one reduction in compatibility. Uh but if you do

[3:40:31 PM]

affordable housing again, you get a further reduction. So you do affordable housing and what you would be required to do is rental 10% at 60 for 40 years, ownership 10% and 80 for 99. That's our standard sort of requirement for affordable housing. Being blue is allowed that was specified in the resolution. And this graphic shows you that change. So if you're in a light rail corridor that that blue box there at the top, sort of that that's the new buildable area that you get. Because compatibility would end at 100 ft. So you can build into that blue area. So you it ends at 100 ft. And then you get that uh, it's effectively new buildable space. For a large corridor. It it ends completely at 200 ft. But you can see there from 1 to 200 ft. There's that

[3:41:31 PM]

that increase in height, so that's showing the proposed increase from 65 to 90 ft that you get. And then on medium corridors. It's very similar, but it's just it ends up 250 ft instead. But from 150 to 250 ft from a triggering property. You do get a bump in height from 65 to 90 ft. So again, that blue area is just the new buildable space. Okay, so staff's recommendation. Ah! We are bringing back to council what was requested in resolution, but we are not recommending it. We are recommending that the imb postponed um, for a number of reasons. It does add a lot of additional complexity to the code. Compatibility is already something that's very complicated. And it's not easy to understand that this would

[3:42:31 PM]

create new, different standards for different corridors. Um compared to our current compatibility. It would be a little bit confusing and unpredictable for staff, so you know? Predictability is really important to the code for everyone that uses it. The public developers and staff, so we think it would be um I would add to that unpredictability. We don't know if anyone's going to participate in the bonus. Um that's something that you know, we really never know until things are sort of uh, on the books for a little while. But in this case, um compared to other bonus programs instead of saying that you get height or

density. The bonus is really just the pullback compatibility. We really don't know if that's something that's that's gonna work. And then the five ft height. Increase uh, and the ending compatibility 300 ft.

[3:43:32 PM]

That's a positive thing. I think staff is very much supportive of moving in that direction, but that those things by themselves we don't think are going to do a whole lot. Five ft is obviously not enough to get an extra story. It might be enough on some projects, too. To result in an extra story, but by itself is not enough. And then ending compatibility at 300. Ft. Um you know that's a positive step, but current compatibility does the most suppression. Between zero and 300 ft. So ending it at 300 ft. Uh, just doesn't uh, we don't think it's going to do that much. And then we think that this will be better considered with, uh, other initiated code amendments that have been done recently initiated recently so that we can kind of consider them altogether. It this is a pretty meaty topic and it just probably deserves more time. To be

[3:44:33 PM]

analyzed and considered with those other things. We have had analysis in the past. So um we've been to other boards and commissions and had analysis about the impact. Um more specific impact on properties. We are rerunning that analysis currently because we found a better way to do it and so I don't have numbers to share with you today, but we're going to do our best to get as much of that done for planning commission next week. Tuesday um so no no numbers today are the impact on properties. But we're gonna do our best to have that done on Tuesday. Have as much as we can, by Tuesday. So timeline wise. We've been to the codes and ordinances joint committee. They did not make a recommendation. Either way on this planning commission. We were there on Tuesday, and they they heard from the public. They heard a staff recommendation with their they didn't take any action on this, so they're going to continue that discussion next

[3:45:33 PM]

week on Tuesday. Um and possibly make make a recommendation. Uh, we're obviously here today. And we are scheduled for a public hearing on the first of December. And I'm happy to take any questions that you might have. But you've done now. Council member Alfred. Did other people have questions? First I'm not on the committee. Thank you . I wanted to just clarify, um in the draft ordinance, one of things that we did in our proposal was make it so that you weren't triggering compatibility across the corridor. Can you confirm where you have that is that just it wasn't clear whether what you had in there was actually accomplishing that. Yes, it's uh we're certainly

[3:46:33 PM]

know that that's in the in the in the resolution. And the analysis being done is taking that into account. Okay, but so is that just being taken care of by B one on page forward where it says those apply, where the triggering property adjoins the corridor site. Sorry. Give me one seconds. Can you repeat the section? You're looking at houses member for under compatibility and setbacks. Section B. One. As I

[3:47:37 PM]

understand B is saying that those hi. Limitations and setbacks apply to a quarter site when a triggering property adjoins the corridor site. Um. But then it says, and then these are all yours. Then it says a structure is located within 300. Yeah so I just want to make sure that that's where you're taking care of that. Um I'll be so this section. Um. I want to be clear. We're actually the section that has some grammatical issues. We're going to revise this section. I don't know that it's being taken up in this section exactly. Um okay. Well, if you can get your question as to where you are, you are qualifying councils intent for compatibility to not just across the corridor. Sure. Absolutely helpful. Thank you. Thank you. So basically your recommendation is to postpone two. MM, quite

[3:48:43 PM]

exactly are going to be doing what? Through there in the postponement time. Can you say it again, please? What are you going to be doing? While it's being postponed, or you're going back to the planning commission, or you're waiting for some action from from the planning commission. Uh we're not necessarily waiting on the action from planning commission to planning commission, obviously, um oh, I don't know what they'll do, but they'll I was saying they'll take action of some kind. If planning commission did postpone this item into the future, say, and we would look at it, uh, more in the context of other amendments that are happening, particularly there is a suite of watershed amendments that you might be aware of um so that we can consider them together. I think also um. We would like to look at, um yeah. How to balance it with the watershed amendments or any other events that are

[3:49:44 PM]

happening. You have a number of other amendments that are in process. And I think. You know if it were postponed, we would also like to look at just how it could be changed to maybe have a or larger impact. Not just on corridors. That's something that um you know if we got any additional direction from commissioner council that would certainly be helpful, but, um yeah. More time for analysis. Okay cause I don't you know, because of where we're remembers are going to be coming on board and I just

don't want to see this. Get lost. And I really would right like to see you guys in here all the recommendations that were made. That this council can make a decision. Being the best route that we should follow. Yeah, it. It wouldn't certainly wouldn't get

[3:50:44 PM]

lost. I mean these amendments sort of live. Forever as long as they have been initiated. They're they're in process and being worked on. Um but that is why you know when you hear it on the first any action that you take obviously will be useful to staff. Okay, additional direction. Carly is there member, okay? I just want to say that's my expectation that planning commission is going to be moving this forward and that, um this was unanimously approved by council. It. Impacts a large number of properties in a lot of different ways, and the ways that we have all agreed on. Um and I don't intend to postpone this. Next year. I think we need to do something that we unanimously agree on and get that moving forward. Any next steps would take a long time. To happen in my view, but we're

[3:51:46 PM]

waiting to see you know what the planning commission recommends, and if they're tweaks that we need to make to improve it moving forward. Great. Remember? Paige. Thank you. Chair Mr Dutton. Could you let folks know where to find these documents online and how to provide their input to speak up Boston Paige. Council member. There is a speak up Austin Paige. Um I can uh, certainly read that. Address into the record if needed. Okay, okay. The website address is [www dot speak up Austin .org](http://www.dotspeakupAustin.org) and then people would search for ldc amendments, but it seems to pop up on the first page. Okay that's good to know. Um and I just had one question about the metro, the metro rapid lines. Um

[3:52:49 PM]

where did those stand? I know there was some discussion of medium or large corridors. Where did the match the metro rapid lines end up in this? The metro rapid lines are considered that they're classified as a large corridor. Okay? Okay I think there may be a discrepancy with south Lamar, so I may just double check on that and make sure it's classified correctly because I know there's also um some metro rapid lines that are not deployed yet, but are in the process of being deployed, and I want to make sure we don't miss the opportunity to classify those correctly right now. But thank you. Thank you. Remember Bella? Thank you for the presentation. I'm looking at the you're the ordinance amendment review sheet that y'all distributed specifically on page five, where y'all list the total properties impacted by compatibility under proposed standards. There's a bar graph.

[3:53:52 PM]

That would be total properties impacted by compatibility citywide. That council members so that bar graph. Yes, that's citywide. And it is breaking down the number. Ah that are impacted by this amendment, and then those that are impacted citywide that wouldn't be affected by the amendment at all. And, um and I'm sorry. We don't have the funder on the back up. But the. This also does not take account so the wrong number of properties impacted would be roughly 19,000. And then I'm looking at, for example , on the little green bar at the very top. It says that of the roughly 19,000 properties that are impacted by compatibility about says 580 would be properties on quarters were compatibility is removed. So in

[3:54:52 PM]

other words, 580 properties would under the new standards be completely free of compatibility restrictions. Is that am I reading that property? You are, but I do. I do want to just caveat this and say, well, the total number of properties is um accurate. We do have to we are crunching the numbers, basically so that number have to look at again, okay? And in terms of the numbers, and I don't know if you can do this, because it's subjective to a certain extent, but clearly some properties are not going to redevelop, you know, regardless, they maybe have something already built on there. There's tenants with long term leases, you know, in other words, is or any other factors in the possibility of a property being redeveloped included in this in that number. Or, like, you know, are they reduced by that number or anything like that? That's just a raw kind of bird's eye view. It's very much

[3:55:52 PM]

the latter that any analysis we do will be looking at properties solely on the basis of um, the spatial impact that is the degree to which compatibility penetrates into the property. So those other factors about turnover and property value and that that's what those who aren't really going to be considered got it so at most 580 properties are removed again of those 580, which are likely to actually be redeveloped in a certain timeframe unclear. Ah of the other properties. Then you know, then there's a number 2250 properties on quarters with compatibility is relaxed, again relaxed, meaning that. You know, let's say the compatibility instead of covering 50% of the property was down to like 40% in other words, relaxed with me any relaxation again, regardless of whether that would have a tangible impact in the real world. That that that's what that means? Yes. Okay. Got it. And then 1326 properties again.

[3:56:55 PM]

These are properties on the corridors where compatibility would still apply to all development. Uh and so you know , again. I mean, I guess I'm just looking at this. And so even for the corridors were really you know 580 would have it removed 1300 would be unaffected and 2250 would be somewhat affected. To what extent we don't know. I just want to make sure I'm understanding this and that I'm reading it correctly. Yeah your general understanding is correct. And again. I'm just going to keep saying that we're going to we are looking at these numbers again. So what happened? More clarity? Great and you all had a great map. The last time, I guess y'all gonna do another version of that of that kind of tool that that you put out and sorry. Which tool you're, like a little G. I S or you know something like that where you could kind of look at the at the properties from a you know, uh again a bird's eye view and see kind of where the competitor is that the deal have a similar to

[3:57:57 PM]

Lourdes in my remember remembering that wrong. I think you might be thinking we might have done that for vm. You too. Yes, yes. I don't know that we're going to do that for this or not, okay? Um no problem. And you talked about so currently. And honestly, I didn't realize this, but there's currently two compatibility categories for a small properties and for large properties is that correct? In our current code. There's yes. And what's the distinction? Like what? The small property with a large property uh, gosh, I don't know if the top of my head but it's just a size a lot size difference and maybe a frontage difference. And it ended, uh, primarily affects the setbacks. Mhm. Um. And then with regard to the changes that were planning like for example, the one that mayor pro tem alter mentioned with regard to not compatibility, not crossing the corridors. That only applies to

[3:58:58 PM]

the corridors that is not going to apply citywide. Right. I will. Certainly understanding from the resolution is that this is all the context is the corridors and so and so none of it would apply elsewhere. Got it . Ah and within the scope of the amendment, if we wanted to make the this maybe honestly more of a la question, but if we wanted to make, uh, something applicable citywide, could we do that with the item that in front of us? I don't know about the ability to you to do that, given the posting language or the that scope of the resolution. I think that would be a better question for law. Okay? And then one of the other changes that we mentioned, and I believe it's included in the ordinance. But where the right now compatibility is triggered by, uh, single family five or lower or civic. Uh again. I just want

[3:59:58 PM]

to make sure if right, yeah, it's a it's based on news, zoning and use different kinds. And the change would remove. Civic I believe another word. Civic users would no longer it would only be triggered by a

single family zoning. Is that correct? Right so when you if you make the shift from zoning and used to just zoning. Then. Zoning. Um you know, we're just looking at what the what that zoning is, and not has nothing to do with the use. So regardless of what the zoning what they use is we're just looking at zoning so that civic uses were not necessarily trigger but single family zoning that is not used for single family purposes would still trigger compatibility. Is that correct? That is correct, because you know if we're just looking at zoning again? We're not. We wouldn't be considering any uses. So I know like, for example, sometimes elementary schools and different and you

[4:00:59 PM]

know, getting stuff that you do not really consider or maybe they had a prior use before there was owned single family. Those would still trigger compatibility restrictions on surrounding properties, huh? Did we? I swear that we had asked for that change on it, but I'll keep that in mind for, you know. For our next meeting whenever this comes back to us. Um the. Can you elaborate on the. The complication of the proposal and the confusion. I know you know, you all mentioned that that is a very common concern. I think both from the general public and from you know the development community. Ah, what kind of problems do you all foresee with now we're going from to, you know, type of compatibility to five types of compatibility. Uh, predictability is probably the big one. I mean, um not knowing

[4:02:00 PM]

what kind of regulations will apply. Depending on how the property. Zone, but also like how the how the property on the corridor is used. So in this case you know, compatibility can shift based on how that corridor properties used so if you are. One of the questions that we've gotten a lot in the last week is how does this apply to my neighborhood, for instance? And it's very, very hard to answer because we don't know how the quarter properties is going to be used. Um so for a person who just kind of wants to have a general understanding. It's instead of having one compatibility standard where we can at least say this is what it is. If we're going to be saying it could be this, it could be that it could be something else. It's just it's going to vary wildly, depending on the development. Dance is gonna be a depends basically, huh? And I get that and it's I think in

[4:03:02 PM]

general, that's an ongoing problem with our code is that you know, it's just it's hard to decipher. Um you mentioned that so we're going from 540 ft for compatibility restrictions currently to a new 300 ft limit. But again, the 300 ft limit would only be for corridor. Uh properties, right? That's our understanding from the resolution. Yes. Now what about our peer cities? What are our peer city like? What are some examples of compatibility and in in similarly situated cities, peer cities, um, typically have compatibility

that ends at about 100 ft or less. Um I have never seen anything. That's greater than 540. Ft um, and the vast majority of cities that your dad are far far. Compatibility ends far far sooner and. Pulling back for a second, because you know,

[4:04:02 PM]

from from my perspective, I mean thinking about our land use I know. For example, mayor Burton brought the overlord. The commercial parkland dedication, you know, and we had our debate over those and you know again, there was always balancing like , you know what I mean? How much do we want to kind of demand versus kind of how much do we get? But for example, in the residential parkland dedication context in the commercial parkland, dedication context, regardless of what we think that you know, effects on housing, maybe from you know, imposing those costs on developers. We're getting a tangible result from that. You know, we are getting money that will go to parkland that will go to improve parks. And so I'm happy to have that discussion about. You know, what is? You know how much can we get ? And you know how much uh, how will that affect housing? But you know, on on the compatibility standards. Um to me. The results are soul kind of ephemeral and, you know, subjective that we're sacrificing all of this housing

[4:05:04 PM]

and my understanding is that the compatibility standards would be , you know, affect multi family housing the production of multi family housing in Austin. More than just about any other item is that is that staff for you? I mean that that, you know, compatibility standards are probably you know the biggest barrier to multi family housing. I don't know if it's quantifiable. Certainly. It has has noted in the resolution. Compatibility as an issue has come up. You know, it comes up a lot. And it has in the past, so it's certainly a factor that we hear a lot about and that's my sense to and again. Like I know , you know, we might lose 20 units on this project and 40 units in that project, you know , and when you add them all up again, I don't know if anybody has added them all up, but they sure seem to total like a lot of units, which we could absolutely used. But again going back to kind of the original theory of compatibility. Why do we have compatibility limits? Like you know why? Why why do most cities

[4:06:05 PM]

limit them at 100 like? Is there some goal I've heard like son, you know, angles to the sun, or, like you know what I mean? Some kind of what is the thinking behind you? What's the basis for having compatibility limits? Yeah. I mean, I think there's a. There's a hard to quantify element of it's like you're saying that maybe light and space and that kind of thing. Um, there is certainly uh, health and safety element to some of it like moving. It's a living in an industrial use farther away from residential um but.

Why we, you know why are standard is so different from other cities. And I don't know. Well thank you, man. I appreciate the information. Council member out there. Thank you, um. I just want to be clear

[4:07:06 PM]

that this is the single most important thing we can do to get more residential was residential and commercial, which is what the next item is when all through code next through everything else whenever they did the analysis. Um the thing that they said would get us the most units was allowing residential and commercial um, and so I'm pleased that we're bringing that one forward. I wanted to ask you. You said that there was a problem with your calculations. Can you explain what that is. I probably can't explain it particularly well, I'm not technically versed in it, but um. We? We basically found a better way to do the calculations. Um and a better way to find out how the impact on the quarter properties is gonna it will result. As a as a result of the resolution. Um. So we're doing a double check just

[4:08:06 PM]

to make sure that our calculations are accurate and then we're also doing sort of different sort of analysis. Um that gets at a little bit of the question of in what way? Or. Not not exactly the likelihood of redevelopment because we don't have that capacity. But it looks at whether there may be enough. Land on parcels that could reach approximately 60 ft in height. Um and what the difference is between sort of before the change in after the change, because there's generally sort of a minimum. Building square footage that is necessary for someone to be able to develop. Um multi family or mixed use building and so we're trying to see if we can get to that

[4:09:06 PM]

information because I think it will be more useful information. Okay when you did your calculations did you take into consideration the opportunity to do residential and commercial? Yes. Yes because we knew that that was likely coming. We basically included are all parcels that are currently zoned. Residential or commercial as as potential parcels where compatibility. Could be relaxed . Okay. Thank you, um so. You know, one of the things you know, you just mentioned that you know, parkland, dedication. Council member vela, you get something tangible. The way this is set up is that we are giving the relaxation when they provide the affordable housing at the 10% level, which is what we think is a reasonable level to be able to expect but we can't require but we can provide inducements to do that. And so

[4:10:08 PM]

instead of just giving away the compatibility were saying, you get this if you do the housing um and then in the accommodate in the partner resolution. We're allowing presidential to happen in more places. And so this is an option that's available in more places. Um, I have to beg to differ with the complications because we're basically, you know, saying if you do residential you get five ft extra. You get these sort of basic things. It doesn't trigger across which incentivizes the residential that we want and then we're you know, you can identify if you live on a medium or a large or real line. And if they do, um, the 10% then they get the relaxation and I've explained this at several neighborhood associations, and it's really not that complicated . It's different, but it is doing what we said, which is tying. Um the entitlements the additional entitlements to affordable housing. Um and it you know, is incentivizing the residential, which is what we've

[4:11:09 PM]

been saying that we want to do it, and it's allowing for differentiation across um, different corridors. Where we've been hearing from some folks is even just a little bit about triggering across the corridor is going to open up. Um, but in and of itself, so it's not just, uh compatibility, you know, numbers numbers there. As well. So I think it's kind of a package that that comes together . That has it, um, that I think that we should move forward with their a couple of things that you mentioned. We did ask them to look into. I don't know why they don't have proposals in there the part about that three etcetera. Um and there may be some things that we discovered along the way as we put this together that we want to go back and add in the code. I don't think you can do it in the context of this ordinance, but they certainly could be things. That we say hey, that that really works, and that would be an easy tweaks to do, um sooner. College I think we really need to move on to our next session. On the our next briefing. So we

[4:12:10 PM]

can move on to our next briefing. Residential and commercial bonus program. Can I ask one more question. Real quick chair is very secure. The for the affordable housing bonus to get the additional compatibility does the vm you qualify? It would as with the 10% requirement, right? Because the affordable requirement in B M U meets this standard, creating a new affordability program, just anything that has an affordability component would qualify for the compatibility right there would be they could they could get their using multiple uh, avenues. Got it. Thank you. Thank you. Now let's move on to our next briefing. Great. Um. I am Greg Dutton in the housing and planning department. Uh this item on your

[4:13:13 PM]

agenda residential and commercial is a code amendments. Similar to the last presentation will go through a little bit of background. The resolution from council proposed changes staff's recommendation and then the timeline. So. Residential and commercial is something that, uh , we don't have in our current code conceptually. It is something that was part of the draft land development code. Um. And that obviously was suspended a couple of years ago, so the basic concept is to allow residential and commercial his own properties. That is that don't have a residential entitlement today. Allow them to do residential, uh, in return for, um affordable housing. And so the council resolution from late last year said, um, currently we have a lot of Zones in Austin that are just straight commercial with no residential entitlement, but we know that we have a need for a market rate and affordable units. Uh again

[4:14:16 PM]

as a part of the land development code revision. This concept was in there. Um we need more housing supply. We need more housing. Um that. Uh we need we need warehousing of supplies. Excuse me, um and then as as, uh sorry. I can't remember someone mentioned up there on the diocese that this is this was recognized as a great way to add capacity housing capacity. Um, that's one of the reasons it was in the draft. Ldc and recognized as as a way to deliver more housing. So the resolution from council um said. To allow this new program in handful of specified Zones so. Commercial and office Zones. Csc is one G R L R G, O and L O and really, you wouldn't get to do this. Uh unless you provide some level of affordable

[4:15:17 PM]

housing, so that's that's the trade off. You provide affordable housing and in return, you're getting an entitlement. That you don't currently have on your property . Part of the resolution was to allow a right to return for creative spaces. So, um we're thinking that that will include this list that you've got here that museums, public art galleries. Venues theaters won't read through the whole list, but that's part of the resolution. So that if there's a creative space there now have the ability to return in the new in a new development. The affordable housing requirement is again sort of our standard 10 at 60 for 40 years, 10 and 80 for 99. We didn't see fee and Lou in the resolution, so that's not in the draft ordinance, so I just want to point that out that it's currently not allowed as drafted. This map. Shows you the distribution of all those zoning districts across the city. So this is effectively where where this new program would be allowed. And so the way that

[4:16:22 PM]

this is drafted, I do want to point this out because it is a somewhat of a departure from the resolution. So the resolution room council said look at B M U type standards for this program. The draft ordinance that you guys have in your backup. Is. More like an emu. So it's more like the addition of an emu, not a vm. You and what that means. Is that um there's no change to the site development standards. Height, impervious cover. Uh but or floor area ratio or parking so as it's drafted currently. It is like the addition of an emu two properties. Um and staff really did that we went in that direction because this is going to be allowed all throughout the city. And not just on transit corridors where you typically cbm you projects so we thought that that would be a better fit. For something that's going to be allowed everywhere. Um there's these two graphs breakdown. The

[4:17:22 PM]

distribution of those properties again that map that showed all the properties in red. How they fall into displacement, risk areas and higher opportunity areas. On the left. And then on the right hand side, it shows you how they fall within a half mile of project connect routes and a half mile current transit service. And so staff's recommendation on this item. We're very supportive of this item. We support it with a couple of recommended modifications. One of those modifications is to exclude properties that are within 500 ft of a level five highway, so that's your I 35 pack. And that's really because, um, research has shown that proximity to highways does have some health impacts. And that's why that that recommendation is in there and then the second recommendation is to modify this a bit so that you can't Cole

[4:18:22 PM]

locate residential uses with what are considered the more intense or noxious users that you typically get out of like a cs zone. And so this map here is showing you the distribution of all the properties where this would be allowed. Um but those commercial properties. Um. That are within 500, ft. Of the level five roadways are shown in red. So I do want to be clear that if you that that recommendation from staff about excluding the 500 ft buffer, excluding properties, it would take properties off the table. So you can see there that you know, maybe a little little less than a quarter of the properties would no longer be eligible. And then the graph at the bottom. There shows the breakdown of those properties. Um, how they break down into hi opportunity areas in displacement risk areas. And then just to follow on that the exclusion of the

[4:19:23 PM]

uses this list is from our colleagues and our zoning colleagues. This is sort of like the list of things that they typically see get CEO dude out of properties because they're considered too intense or not

appropriate to be close to our co locate with housing. And then timeline. This has been to the codes and ordinances joint committee. It was recommended there. It was at the planning commission on the 25th where they heard from staff. Um and then the environmental commission on the second it went back to planning commission on Tuesday of this week planning commission. Voted and they adopted the item with recommendations. Um planning commission had a working group and they also had a number of amendments from networking group that they adopted. And then we'll be. We are here today. Of course, and then we will be at council on the first of December for a public hearing. I'm happy to take any questions. I have

[4:20:24 PM]

one. No question. Why would you wanna exclude property within the 100 ft of the highway. So again council member. It's really based on, um research showing that properties that are residential developed your highways. That the tenants and of those properties and the people that live in those properties do suffer higher incidents of health issues because of that proximity is it because on them because of the building were in or they just being near the highway because I know that we have a lot of low income housing built along. 35 right now. It looks like. Council member harper-madison might want to speak on that, but I can as well I certainly don't wanna. Take up any more space than necessary, but yeah. Council member Renteria. This is one of

[4:21:25 PM]

those ones, right? You know, it comes up a lot in our discussions around appropriate places for people to live. It's come up in mobility came up and housing and it just kind of comes up and we talk about environmental justice and some of the other stuff and you know that the truth of the matter is people who live along highways have more incidents of asthma and other respiratory illness. And just generally speaking, it's not great for your health to live next to a highway. Um but then you know, that's where that whole chicken and egg situation comes in, though, because, like there are people who are willing to make the sacrifice with their health and whatever else to have a place to live, and you know, to some degree we have to think through what resources we have readily available and which ones are scarce and how to maximize access to, you know that kind of property that is frankly less expensive, and you can make more dense and taller. But it's not ideal to have people live there. So I was asking that question is because I know of a piece of land there next to here on

[4:22:25 PM]

airport in 35 felt was a tax credit house said housing that we built there. Just two years ago or 33 years ago. And that's the reason I was asking that question. And we shouldn't be a given tax credits. Future to

any of this kind of development for lower income housing. Along 35 500 piece. Because this one is right there on the furniture. And that was one of the reasons why I asked that question. And there was some discussion that planning commission as to whether there should be, um you know, some sort of city weapons citywide policy on whether housing should be near highways and council member Renteria. Um the main reason that it has health impacts is because of the pollutants associated especially with um. Ah like large trucks.

[4:23:26 PM]

Um. And of course in the future, you know, we hope that someday in the future, um much of our transportation will be electrified. And then it won't be an issue. But you know, that's not where we are present. Yeah I mean, if you look at, um, the east side, especially inside the javits area there a bit. We have a lot of single family house. Right on the press. And we have been issuing permits for them to continue building. Additional units and. I'm very interested in seeing him. What kind of policies going to be developed. Where we're not going to be allowing people to 500 ft. You know, that's that's a big concern for me. Also. Uh thank you. College. Nobody else has some councilor Ellis. Thank you.

[4:24:28 PM]

Chair. I just I have a last thought on that and I understand the implications of having more housing located right next to highways, but I think if we make that policy decision as a as a council body we should also balance it with. Well, then where is it best to have that and if we can move more towards a perspective of walkable bye, kable communities are good for denser housing. Then I think we're onto something. Um but it just seems a little difficult to say. You know, we have one map that says minimize compatibility along where all the metro rapid bus routes are and all the extra transportation and then we have another one that says don't put housing near where the transportation is. So I think there's a win here if we're talking about car traffic versus light rail and biking and walking, but I just think we need to hammer through that as a council body and be very deliberative about where we want to see that policy lie because I think there could be something

[4:25:29 PM]

here. But I'm just getting some mixed messages on what we're telling staff to do. And that may be why staff is coming back with. Hey, some of this may work. But some of it may not. So I just want to flag that for now. I don't think we're going to solve it in the next half hour, but I think it is a good conversation for us to have and I agree with you on that one. I think that is very interesting man. Policies that you know? And I mean, it makes sense for me because I'm more than 500. 1000 ft away from the highway, and he can still hear the noise and when 35. Slows down. If either smell the fumes from the electrics. So. But

still we're still allowing people to build and how they've along. 35 very we can't take their land away from anyway, any more questions.

[4:26:32 PM]

Continental really and just to be clear in a double check. We are reducing compatibility on those same highways that we are limiting. Residential one. That. Um. And I've I've have not dug into those studies. Ah! And. Our highways are also dynamic kind of place. I mean, I think about like Mo pack, for example, mkapa has a ton of housing surrounding it. I think about 35. I mean, not only did it have a ton of housing, but you're seeing a ton of housing, and this is not low income housing. You know what I mean? There's some really fancy apartment buildings going up in the downtown area right next to 35. I would be interested to know. How are. If we can solve for that, I mean, just in terms of like building our lead standards or

[4:27:33 PM]

environmental standards for our buildings. Where definitely in, you know, let's say, like, you know, the seventies eighties nineties. I know that you know, there's a lot more pollution cars produced more pollution and homes were not as well insulated as they are today. And I completely understand how that combination produced. Some very serious health effects. I just wonder, you know, is that still the case today given a very tight, you know environmental standards for buildings and you know, air filtration systems and all that kind of stuff like that open question that I'm you know, let's see what the data says. And then just the emu. What is a difference between a vm you designation and the M U R. I guess you know what is the emu? I mean for a property. Sure so the emu means that uh, as an example, let's say your cs so today and then you get this what

[4:28:35 PM]

is effectively an emu and let me stop you real quick, just so we don't go too deep into acronyms. Cs zoning would be, uh, it's our most intense commercial zone. It's one of the most intense that you typically see on a corridor. Um I was 60 ft in height. So, um if you see it, let's say your cs and you get this effective emu. It means that you're granted. Residential development. But that's it so no change to your site development standards of any kind. No change to the parking or the height or the impervious cover or the density. Um, it would just mean you get to do residential and compared to vm uvm. You, um you get to do residential, but there are a lot of other requirements like for vm. You do have to have ground floor commercial. You do get a parking reduction above and beyond what you might otherwise get in the central city. Um you don't get any more

[4:29:35 PM]

Haider impervious cover, but the big thing with vm here is that you get unlimited density. That's that's one of the biggest differences. Um so. That the site developed standards are are different for those two things, all right, and so, um, you it's not going to be I'm just getting trying to visualize it. This would be it would look more like not your again. Your typical pm you would be like a 90 ft tall building. That is basically not totally lot to like, you know, not me no corner to corner on the building but occupy the huge chunk of the property, whereas emu is going to be more like a traditional kind of garden style apartment complex type. Right, that that's fair. Yes, okay. That's the only question I had. Or anything else. Come from member harper-madison. Thank you chair. I actually don't have a question. I just wanted to see

[4:30:36 PM]

the council member vela if you want to continue to explore that topic that you brought up around some of the other opportunities for reconciliation, environmental reconciliation, but then subsequently think about how adjacent to that. Ms leaks, uh, point about electrification of our fleet and all and then you know, with a big fat overlay. It would council member Ellis said about you know where should more dense um, mobility outside of auto friendly neighborhoods exist. And what does that look like? And you know what is it that we're going to make a decision on it in 2023 that has you know, infrastructural implications in 2053. Did we make the right choice? I'd love to do something just brainstorming around that kind of subject matter as we move into the new year and new policy. I can't remember Alice.

[4:31:36 PM]

Thank you got one last question as far as the work that the planning commission did recently , could you daylight? What some of the topics are that they're making recommendations on for us. Certainly so that there they had a working group and the amendments that they passed on Tuesday did include uh, for instance. Taking this more of a B M U type direction versus an emu. Uh direction if that makes sense what we've just been talking about, so they're more in favor of the pmu type standards for this program. Um they. They did indicate that they thought that the 500 ft buffer and the noxious list of noxious uses those are important things but would like those considered as part of a larger discussion, I think again, sort of what you all have been talking about just now. Um, particularly for the. For the buffer on highways. Um uh,

[4:32:37 PM]

they're working group amendments will be included in the backup for obviously for council so you'll be able to see what they took action on from there working group. Um and adopted in conjunction with this amendment. That's helpful. Thank you. And I think that the vm you part of this conversation is interesting, not just because of affordability and height. Conversations but also because of that walk ability that that we've brought up a couple of times. I want to make sure that we're getting our best use out of, you know, walkable first floor and pedestrian oriented uses. So thanks for daylighting, those not look into them further. Income from Amarillo. Justin. I really appreciate that . Remember harper-madison and you know, with regard also to some of the conversations we're having around at 35. I was thinking I mean, we my staff has been working on, uh the Barry and cover 35 to a larger extent

[4:33:37 PM]

than just the current proposed just downtown cover. And if we do that we can control and direct the emissions. You have to invent it. Uh and you can do that in such a manner where you're basically kind of directing the noxious gasses up into the higher level where they really don't affect human health. So again, such a it's such a dynamic environment. I'd hate to kind of you know, put a hard and fast rule on something like that. Just when again, there's you know so much electrification of vehicles so much development already, you know, along the highways, building standards. I definitely appreciate it. I definitely appreciate the health concerns, but I feel like you know, I really need to be convinced that their overwhelming just because our housing crisis is so severe that I just I hate to turn down any spot that we can put housing in, especially in the central city, especially where it's so convenient and accessible for people. But thank you. Is there

[4:34:40 PM]

any more questions Kelly? Then we'll just move on. And I think that's the last briefing that we have scheduled day. Wanted really think the staff for the presentation. Uh we have one more item to work on. And that is the housing planning committee. 2023 proposed meeting dates. Since I'm not going to be here. I'm going to let you all decide and make the decisions. And so if I have a motion to approve this, and knowing that in the future. Any other members could get together and change the date, but I think this is what staff has been working on and I would take their recommendation. But it's up to your guys. Councilman harper-madison. Just like to

[4:35:41 PM]

gauge from my colleagues, um, something I've been thinking about within subsequently asked staff just in terms of protocol, is it you know? Do we have to select those meetings now? Or is it possible for us to postpone making that selection until we have an opportunity to acclimate to the new council and

everybody chooses their committees. Etcetera just seems the cadence seems off to me in this order. But do we do it this way? Because we have to. Staff. They're coming up. I'm not an expert on this. But my guess is that at least for other boards and commissions, they're trying to organize room reservations. Um so probably you need to check with this city clerk to confirm but that would be probably the biggest. I will also add as

[4:36:43 PM]

we've looked at committee schedules for other committees I've been on sometimes we get a whole big calendar year with all this color coding and you know if some of us are on Boston water and public safety and mobility, and we're all trying to manage the schedules, I think it just makes it easier to pick them early in the game, so that we're not trying to find the dates later on, because it gets really tricky to find time where the rooms available. 80 accents available at our schedules are clear to do that. So I think that's probably why staff suggest doing it this early in the game. And we have have the ability to change it later or something. Doesn't work. Mr chair if I might, um, the agenda office does ask us to work with the committees to try to get a calendar as quickly as we can. For just the reasons that council member Ellis is talking about to be able to ensure that we have room reservations, and we can mitigate as many conflicts as well as we possibly can. The new committee um and the new chair can certainly help us work to revise that. But if

[4:37:44 PM]

we can pin down any of the dates now I think that would be very appreciated by staff. Carly. Do I have over stone. I'm fine with with the dates as a proposal like said we can kind of juggle it around in the future as need be and as our future future colleagues join us. Do we have a second? One second. Motion has been made by council member vela, second by council member Ellis. All those in favor raise their hands. So inside unanimous on the diets with, uh and good. Ah! That's the final action except for identifying any items that wants to be discussed in future meeting. Question chair. Is this your last meeting as our chair of housing and planning, it is. Thank you so much for your service. We're really gonna

[4:38:44 PM]

miss you. This has been a lot of good conversations we've had over this time, so we wish you the best of luck, you great job have been a fun eight years. I think this is probably the best finance comedic committee that you can be on. It gives you so much gratification or in that we're doing. And working our hardest. To provide as many affordable units. Henry in our city. Housing that we desperately need. And it's been wonderful working. With our staff. When we first started it, whether even half as large as it is

now but they have done such wonderful work and. And the citizens of Aston has recognized that and have continued in our housing bonds. To make sure that and because they feel that. It's the young guys working in your

[4:39:46 PM]

housing department are doing an excellent job. And we wouldn't be here, if important you if it wasn't true. And I really want to thank y'all has been a wonderful eight years working with y'all. Uh some of y'all need our new but some have been here for other for a long time. Remember them? Remember you off and the community development commission that I served. 13 years. And I want to say thank you. Thank you, too. It's been a pleasure serving with you. Well Carly's alright but I got the impression that you were going to be at home watching these meetings, though. Didn't you tell me that? Mhm. Not here. Encouraging the y'all that bill tomorrow. With that I going into turn. This meeting. I don't have it on me. 4:40 P.M. This meeting

[4:40:49 PM]

is adjourned.