

Housing and Planning Committee (HPC) meeting

Transcript – 1/23/2024

Title: ATXN-1 (24hr)

Channel: 1 - ATXN-1

Recorded On: 1/23/2024 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 1/23/2024

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.

[2:32:57 PM]

We are a-t-x-n the City of Austin's Government Access Channel soon, everybody, welcome to city soon, everybody, welcome to city hall. On this fine, fine day. It is the 23rd of January, and we're getting started a little late, but I think a lot of y'all know that we were here. Most of us were participating in a press conference, a couple doors down. That was really important. So thank you for your patience and us getting started a little late. I am city council member Natasha harper-madison. I get the fine opportunity to chair this committee of the housing and planning committee, and we are at city hall council. City council chambers. Today, January 23rd, 2024. And it is now 2:33 P.M. As we call this meeting to order. If I understand correctly, we have a couple speakers today. We've received some packets. Oh, actually, only some of us have received some packets from one of our speakers. Mister Crossley. And then I believe we have one other speaker. Would you mind announcing our speakers for us? Thank you. >> Jay Crossley and then Ruben brooks. You have the price is right would be so much better.

[2:34:06 PM]

right would be so much better. >> Sorry, I wasn't sure if we meant right now. Hi. My name is Jay blaze at Crossley. And, thank you so much for your time and your service to all the people of Boston. I think it's a very exciting discussion to be talking about. How to plan for the most people to benefit from an awesome light rail line. And so we I'm executive director of a nonprofit called farm and city, and we do a lot of work at the intersection of transportation and housing. And we've done some analysis, working with Ruben brooks, looking at how how many people council, let's live near light rail impacts. How many people will ride our light rail. And we think this is very important. And we we basically are recommending to try to think about how you can remove the limits on the number of people allowed to benefit from this thing and then figure out how we can do it in an equitable manner and grow and plan these communities. We, wanted to point out just a couple things. Just

[2:35:06 PM]

out just a couple things. Just that the uno, the university of neighborhood overlay in a way, is the pilot program of how to do actual transit oriented development has resulted in a lot more people living in a space at being a much better, walkable place. People drive a lot less. They're now, and have services. But it's also more affordable. And if you look at median monthly housing costs in uno, they have not gone up in the last ten years, whereas almost everywhere else we know housing costs have skyrocketed. And so this kind of densifying in a walkable place helps people stay in spite of what many, the many concerns to the contrary. And so I think with these 15 stations, we should have policies that let people live there. And so we outlined this report and we did do Ruben has done what may be in terms of a volunteer transit advocate. He may be one of the only ones in the nation who is running the federal stops model to estimate ridership. And so it's kind of

[2:36:07 PM]

ridership. And so it's kind of fun that we have this independent tool to help you guys and help atp think through this. But we ran a couple models where we said if council were to remove zoning, limitations and allow people to live there, if you had 25% more people than the campo projections, what would the impact be on ridership? And then if you had 92, which was to equal the least dense part of west campus, but to make all of these stations at least as dense as the least dense part of west campus. And the ridership gains would be very big. And the big takeaway is that if you have 25% more people, you'd have 35% more ridership. And if you have 92% more people, you have 162% more ridership. So the more people you have living in walkable places, the more and more of them actually get to use the transit. And that's why we think it's so important that there are a lot of good people here that know about zoning regulations in 120ft versus 150, but I'm here to petition you to please try to

[2:37:09 PM]

to petition you to please try to raise the capacity. And however we can do that as a community, to let more people in. So thank you very much. >> Thank you, Mr. Crossley. Can you remind me how long do our speakers have? >> Three minutes. >> Three minutes. Thank you, I appreciate it. Thank you for your testimony. We appreciate it. And just for reference, Mr. Crossley was speaking to a briefing that will receive this afternoon about project connect and its urban rail phase one. Specifically federal funding and land use implications. That's going to be item two on today's agenda. I believe we have a second speaker. >> Yes, Reuben Brooks, and our last speaker will be Chioma Okoro. >> Thank you. >> Welcome. >> Good afternoon, Mr. Brooks. >> Afternoon. I want to give you some a tiny bit of background into,

particular software we've used and the results we've obtained. And in 1990, the fda received a very distressing report, the Pickrell report, which showed that on average,

[2:38:11 PM]

which showed that on average, applicants overestimated ridership by about 40. And that upset people at the fda. And so in 2015, they did two things. They passed a rule that all applications must contain ridership forecasts. And gave developed from very specific approaches. And they released the first version of their own package for forecasting ridership. The so-called stops software. Austin transit partners. It must use the stops model to forecast ridership. There's they have one other I think they have one other choice which doesn't fit the Austin area. And they must use it in a very specific way. So the ridership forecasts that we've been hearing from atp have a very good engineering background

[2:39:12 PM]

very good engineering background . We've played Jay and I have played a bit with that same software. Thanks to a, to Jennifer Pyne who's sitting there who responded to our public interest request to provide us with the models that they were using at atp and we were able to ensure that what we were doing matched, gave the same results as the atp models, and then we went on ahead and looked at what would happen when to ridership, when density was increased in a half mile around station. That number was chosen because as it's pretty much the default number that the fda uses for estimating ridership, we think our claims are about increasing ridership, about increasing density and increasing ridership we think are based on the best available engineering. Thank you very

[2:40:15 PM]

engineering. Thank you very much. >> We appreciate it. Our final speaker. I'm sorry, can you pronounce her first name for me again? >> Chioma. >> Chioma, thank you for joining us. This afternoon. You have three minutes. >> Happy new year to the council members. You are not many today, but but the land issue we are talking about is a commonwealth. It's a posterity. It's economic value. When we start doing things that are not right, it doesn't help everybody. I brought a case here 4 or 5 years ago about gentrification that I wanted the city to budget for back land for black people on the east side. I was proposing 2 million, \$2 billion for them to build a complex because economic value on black people is declining. So much, they can barely get a job with the population. We have now. And

[2:41:16 PM]

population. We have now. And when they get the job, they are promised an income. But the housing that we are budgeting here, affordable housing, have only very few, two, units for people that are poor. And when we pay up to \$2,000 for one bedroom with paying less tax for the neighbors that are around very soon, the black man don't get a job, the black woman don't get a job. They are thrown out. There are things in their reign. No place to go. So I see so stain that claim that the gentrification 1015 years ago on black people on east side was inappropriate. There is a law on gentrification, but it applies if the government wants to use the land, what they call right of way. It does not apply where investors convey with the authority of the city to defraud the black community. So please bring back the black to their habitats where they have the elementary schools and things

[2:42:17 PM]

elementary schools and things like that. It could be part of affordable housing because we lost people like me, lost up to seven properties. Okay but on the other side also mental health. We are not doing enough. We are pushing it on county court. She is not listening. I propose mental health academy where 200 people can be taken off for four years and redid them. You got my research on homeless. Solution where I had economic and non economical to put in in, in view. But we are not letting the non economical to make the transition into the economic value. I did that research on purpose. You are never even paid me. Okay. But we, I am tired of seeing the city inadequate and we have new administrators now. The new manager, the new mayor. We need something different. Done we don't need people stacking houses from other countries. And

[2:43:17 PM]

houses from other countries. And Americans are asked to pay so much money. Things are being thrown away. They can't even have visitors. And those people are not paying commensurate taxes for those things. And they are building houses, taking away the value of other people's property that don't have that much complex. So when are we going to look into that? >> Thank you very much for visiting us this afternoon. And we're only a few today because this is the housing and planning committee, as opposed to the full body of the council. But that's one of the beautiful things that we get to do with these committees is that when people bring us information, when you come to the podium and you present your information, even if it's just a couple of us that you see today, the full body will be able to hear what it is that we receive here today. So thank you. We appreciate you coming out. Is that the last of our speakers? Thank you very much. And I think that offers us the opportunity, unity to move on to our first item today, which is the approval of minutes, in which case, colleagues, we have

[2:44:18 PM]

case, colleagues, we have several items on our agenda, including an important briefing from the Austin transit partnership and a discussion and possible action related to several important land development code amendments. My recommendation is that we take up the shortest items first today. That would be item number one, which is approving our minutes from November 2023, 2023. It's the following year. Council member qadri. Oh, yes. And then number two would be item number five, approving our calendar for the year. And then we can take up items number two. And for item number two is the briefing from. Oh, I'm sorry. Item number two is briefing from adp. And then three and four are the presentation from our city staff, which I see everybody's here. The proposed prioritization of land development code amendments and our feedback on those prior items that are presented to us today. And then finally, we'll close out with a discussion on future items we'd like to

[2:45:20 PM]

future items we'd like to explore, explore as a body. So on item number one, we got a very enthusiastic motion from council member qadri. To approve the meeting minutes from our November 14th, 2023 meeting. And with that motion, is there a second I and we have a second with vice chair alter and it looks like, council member vela has joined us as well. So we it was moved by council member qadri, seconded by council member alter. All in favor, please say I. I it looks like we have a unanimous vote of the body. Plus our de facto body member. Council member vela and passes unanimously. Item number two on our agenda to give me just a moment, is the beginning of our briefing on project connect. And funding and land use implications. Hi there. Come on up. Actually, you know, I'm sorry I said we were gonna do

[2:46:26 PM]

sorry I said we were gonna do one and then five, so the calendar. I might have called you up prematurely. You're welcome to stay. If you like, but I think we'll run through the calendar next. And so, item number five, that's us approving the 2024 housing and planning committee calendar. So thank you, staff. So we've worked with, the various department leaders and the agenda office and committee members offices to identify dates attached to in this backup for today's meeting, for this item and after having had that conversation, I think it's up on the screen for you guys to view after having had those conversations with city staff, we are able to determine that the preferred meeting dates in March and April are. Look, I might need to look to March 26th and April 23rd and then then, screen by committee members and staff, the agenda office. So it looks like these are our dates.

[2:47:26 PM]

looks like these are our dates. The clerk's office also approved. So with the preference of the March and April dates, I've stated I'll entertain a motion to approve those dates and times. It looks like the motion is made by council member qadri and again seconded by vice chair alter. And so all in favor, please say aye. And are there any questions about the calendar? All right. Looks like we're set to go. Item number five passes unanimously. So then we move on to item number two, which is our briefing on Austin light rail. Item number two should be a familiar topic. Oh, hi there, council member Ellis, thank you for joining us. Should be a familiar topic to everyone in the room. It is a briefing by Austin transit partnership on the Austin light rail. And project Austin light rail and project connect. It is my understanding that that we will be sharing, that they will be sharing rather with us details on how our collective decisions on land use and housing policy will help make light rail

[2:48:27 PM]

will help make light rail proposal even better. And we've heard from a couple of speakers on the light rail item today, but I know that a lot of folks are really excited about it here in this briefing, myself included. And we have the chair of the mobility committee joining us today as well. So thank you, staff, and we look forward to, to receiving the briefing. >> All right. Thank you so much, council member and committee members, my name is Jennifer pine. I'm with Austin transit partnership, and I just have a brief briefing. I'll start with an update on where we are with Austin light rail. As you, I'm sure, recall, last June, the city council, the atp board and cap metro board all approved the light rail implementation plan, which identified a phase one project to be advanced for light rail as well as a couple of priority extensions. Since that time, we've been advancing the design work and also the environmental review. We'll need to conduct environmental review in compliance with the national environmental policy act, which is just one of the required acts that will need to meet in order to pursue the federal grant

[2:49:29 PM]

to pursue the federal grant funding that we would like to obtain. So we are looking for federal funding from the new starts program, from fta. And that would account for or ask is about 50% of the capital costs of the project. So to receive that funding, you go through a multi-year multi step process. That includes a number of different stages and factors. But I'm going to focus today on the intersection excuse me, of the light rail light rail project and the land use policy work that we're talking about today. So among the steps to kind of receive this competitive grant funding is that our light rail project will be evaluated. Since we compete with projects across the country for those grant dollars. You know, this is an important part of our grant application package. So the evaluation of the project is, is what's represented on the screen here today. And some of the main factors was about half of the

[2:50:30 PM]

factors was about half of the project evaluation has to do with the financial plan. And then the other half are six factors. Associate with the project itself. Four of those related to mobility improvements, environmental benefits, cost effectiveness and congestion relief are fairly prescribed. And by that I mean that there are certain data sets that you need to use and certain ways that you calculate those benefits. As part of your grant application, then the land use and the economic pick factors are a little bit different. The land use, component of the evaluation is looking at population, employment, parking, affordable housing and the economic development piece is a little more forward looking. It's looking at the plans and policies that are in place that would support transit development, transit compatible development within the light rail corridor. It's advantageous to have those policies in place that really demonstrate, our intentionality to manage the

[2:51:31 PM]

intentionality to manage the growth that's happening in a way that makes sure that we are directing that growth, where we are also investing in mobility while also protecting affordability. And options for where people can live. Another important point here I think, is, ridership. And some of our earlier speakers did refer to this, the extent to which land use is managed around stations to promote people's access to the light rail will have a direct positive benefit on the ridership that we'll see on the system. So to this end, you know, atp and the city, we've been coordinating on, land use policy that's already underway to make sure that we're coordinated. As far as the timing of that work, we will be submitting a package this summer to fta that is our preliminary ratings evaluation package. So that will address all those factors from the last slide. And what we've been talking about is

[2:52:34 PM]

what we've been talking about is that we would like to sort of take credit for all the policy work that is included up until that time. So essentially through the first half of the year, to make sure that we can include it in that package and it will be factored into the evaluation of our light rail project. So what happens after that? So this submittal occurs in August. The fta will evaluate that for some months. And in the spring, an annual report will be issued that will provide a rating and other information. And that is just one of the early and very important steps in our federal funding process to set us up for future federal appropriations. So that concludes the briefing I was going to make, but certainly happy to take any questions. >> Thank you. I appreciate it. >> Colleagues. >> Are there any questions from the dais? I did have one. Brief question. Did you say you had a question? Please, no. Go ahead. >> Miss bond, great to see you. The proposed, itod draft is, is on the agenda for February 1st.

[2:53:38 PM]

on the agenda for February 1st. I believe in one of the things that I was so happy to see in the draft was that the overlay area we're looking at about a half mile, around the stations in terms of where we want to do our overlay to allow the, the supportive to allow housing, basically, in future riders. Where is the federal government in terms of does that align with , with their, evaluate action and scoring of the, of our future grant applications? Ann. >> Yes. Excuse me. That would be typical to look at a half mile along the corridor. >> All right. And would that be a half mile along the corridor or just a half mile? Around the stations? >> It depends on which analysis you're doing. So we're looking at ridership. For example, you might be looking at a half mile or so around a station, which is an estimate for what a reasonable walking or biking distance would be. But for other things like development impacts,

[2:54:38 PM]

things like development impacts, you might look along the entire corridor and do you have any sense of in terms of the scoring, any other items that, that, that jump out at you in terms of changes that, that, that we, you know, need to make to, to maximize our scoring for the federal grant? I think some things that are advantageous and that would be directly considered in the application would include, efforts to promote density and compatible land uses, especially within the light rail corridor, to provide some tools to plan for appropriate land uses in the years it will take to get from now to the time when it's actually operating. And also taking a good look at parking, especially downtown, because that's an area that they specifically look at. >> Thank you very much. >> Thank. You very much I appreciate it. I think that was at least a part of my question around the potential potential

[2:55:39 PM]

around the potential potential considerations for future funding mechanisms. But you said , the way you closed out your presentation, you said for future funding considerations. And I think my question is very similar to that of council member Vella and that I'd like to know what it is that preemptively we could be doing to set ourselves up for success. And I think ultimately what you said was, you know, you're talking about offering a suite of options which includes which includes, you said more density and compatible uses. I wonder if you could expand on the compatible uses component I think would be the last part of my question. >> So especially around stations to look at the type of uses that especially residential commercial destinations where you would want people to have easy access to the transit system, you know, as opposed to something that might be, just a more I don't know, I guess I'll say a more car oriented use or something where you're not, gathering people, to support, you know, a pedestrian friendly

[2:56:40 PM]

you know, a pedestrian friendly transit friendly environment. >> Thank you, I appreciate that. >> Any other questions, colleagues? All right. >> Thank you. Thank you so much. >> Thank you, miss palmer. Appreciate your presentation. It looks like we are up to item number three. Do two, three and four, which are both very similar. Item number three is a discussion regarding proposed land development code amendments that are related to project connect. Increasing density, minimum lot sizes for property zoned single family and council initiated code amendments, and then item number four is a discussion on the status and timeline of amendment to the land development code. So I was going to say a staff approaches, but you beat me to that. So modify my speech as I go. Approaches the podium. I'll remind the public that our committee was entrusted with the very important objective of, last year of ensuring that our

[2:57:40 PM]

last year of ensuring that our prioritization of land development code amendments and housing policy put very specific emphasis on affordable housing and equity. In development. It is my hope that after staff's presentation that we are able to provide feedback and any additional direction that the full council can consider at our next council meeting, as we have done from time to time on this committee. So colleagues, I'd like to recommend that we provide some recommendations on the prioritization of these, land development code amendments, especially in light of this afternoon's briefing from staff. When it's all said and done. So. Miss Middleton, Pratt, are you the only one presenting for us today? No, ma'am. Okay so take it away. And I suppose you, conduct the order afterwards. Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Thank you. And good afternoon, chair and council members of the housing and planning committee. >> Lauren Middleton Pratt, director of planning. And on

[2:58:41 PM]

director of planning. And on behalf of staff, I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to brief council on our code amendment work program for the spring. Over the next four months, staff will bring forward code amendments that have been previously initiated by council, as well as new amendments that staff have recommended in support of advancing housing capacity and transit, supportive land use for council's consideration. Ann will be code amendments that establish bonus programs intended to promote density, including income restricted affordable housing and amendments that empower more people living near transit. These efforts are all vital to supporting atp and project connects. Phase one light rail funding application Ann. Additionally this spring, staff will advance its work on the home resolution option with an amendment allowing one housing unit on a smaller lot to enable

[2:59:41 PM]

unit on a smaller lot to enable more affordable fee. Simple home ownership in the next few months will be very productive as planning staff works. Interdepartmentally as well as with council to achieve a balance between meeting citywide goals and deadlines, as well as creating long term access to transit and affordability in Austin at this time, Andrea bates, assistant director of planning, will walk you through the impending code amendment work program for this spring. Thank you. >> Good afternoon. As director Middleton Pratt described, staff is prioritizing two sets of code amendments from now through the end of may. There are five that we're categorizing as specifically transit supportive amendments. They include a new

[3:00:41 PM]

amendments. They include a new density bonus zoning district, which would replace the vertical mixed use two or vm2 provisions that were invalidated by the courts citywide modifications to compatibility standards, regulations, and a new density bonus program for the south central waterfront district. Modifications to downtown parking requirements, and the creation of an equitable, transit oriented development overlay, or tod overlay, which would apply along the phase one light rail and priority extensions in addition to this bundle of transit, supportive amendments, staff is prioritizing amendments to change the minimum lot size for one residential unit. A council called for this change as part of the home initiative. I'll now provide a quick overview of these priority amendments. First, the proposal to create a new density bonus zoning district would create a combining district that would allow up to 90ft of height on

[3:01:42 PM]

allow up to 90ft of height on commercial zoned properties. When affordable housing is provided as is vm2 used to do. This district would allow property owners to access the entitlements previously provided through vmu two, in exchange for providing the affordable housing units that were also part of the program. The amendments to create the zoning district are on the fastest timeline of the priority amendments that I'll talk about today. We're planning to bring the code amendment to create the district planning commission and to council by the end of February. Once the district is adopted into the land development code, property owners could then apply to add the combining district to their property through the rezoning process. The proposal to modify compatibility standards was initiated in a June 2023 council resolution, and it responds to findings from a study on the impacts of compatibility that was released in September of

[3:02:43 PM]

was released in September of 2023. The current compatible city regulations limit the height of commercial and multi-family development within 540ft of trigger properties or single family properties, the proposal would apply compatibility standards to properties that are within 75ft of the triggering property, and it would also simplify the height limitations that apply within that 75ft. In addition, it would add a requirement for a landscape buffer. These changes would increase housing capacity citywide. Many properties would be able to develop additional units, including additional income restricted affordable units. If compatibility standards were changed. Since the proposed changes would benefit commercial and multifamily properties, all over the city, they really allow more transit supportive development across the entire transit system. The light rail lines, the commercial rail line, the

[3:03:43 PM]

the commercial rail line, the rapid bus lines, local bus lines, all the entire transit system could benefit from the citywide change. The proposal to create and apply new regulations specific to the south central waterfront area was previously initiated. In September 2022 and has been under development for quite a while. These regulations would implement some of the goals of the south central waterfront vision framework plan , and they would enable trans supportive development in this very important area, which includes the waterfront station area of the phase one light rail. The proposal would require new development to create a walkable street grid and streetscapes to encourage a good pedestrian environment and it would also create a density bonus program that would allow for additional density for properties that provide community benefits, including things like affordable housing, public open space, cultural uses, enhanced environmental

[3:04:44 PM]

uses, enhanced environmental protections, etc. The proposals to modify compatibility and the south central waterfront regulations have been underway for a while and were on the schedule of proposed code amendments when we presented to this committee in the fall. For this proposal to modify downtown parking requirements is new. These changes would be initiated through a resolution that is posted for consideration on the February 1st council agenda. The proposal is intended to implement some of the recommendations from a recent urban land institute downtown parking technical advisory panel recommendations that were released in October. The proposal could include things like including a portion of above ground structured parking within a project's floor area ratio calculation, reducing the existing maximum number of parking spaces that are currently allowed downtown require Singh. The decoupling of

[3:05:44 PM]

require Singh. The decoupling of parking as a new gatekeeper requirement for the downtown density bonus program. That means developments would need to treat the cost of parking separately from the cost of a unit in the development site, and then potentially other changes necessary to help reduce the overall number of new parking spaces that would be built within downtown. >> These changes would allow us to better manage parking downtown, which in turn supports transit and creates a better pedestrian environment. >> Another new addition to the schedule and to the spring 2024 work program, is the creation of an equitable transit oriented development overlay. The itod policy plan called for the creation of a system wide itod overlay, and that is underway. However it is a much larger project with a large scope and is not scheduled to come to council for review until early 2025. So in the interim, staff

[3:06:45 PM]

2025. So in the interim, staff from the planning department, the project connect office and Austin transit partnership have developed a proposal for an interim overlay that would apply to the phase one light rail corridor and priority extensions . With the exception of some areas that already have transit supportive overlays in place. So, for example, the overlay is not envisioned to apply to the east Riverside corridor, which has its own regulating plan. So staff is envisioning changes to the east Riverside regulating plan in support of project connect. And those would actually be initiated as part of the February 1st resolution. But they are now anticipated to be part of a later phase and would not be coming back this spring. >> The tod overlay would prohibit commercial and industrial uses that are not transit supportive of things that cater to cars or do the not

[3:07:45 PM]

that cater to cars or do the not create a good pedestrian environment, or bring people together near the transit stations. >> It would also create a new bonus program that would allow up to 120ft in height, depending on the base zone. For commercial and potentially multifamily zoned properties within the overlay. To access this additional height, development would be providing income restricted affordable units. The itod overlay may potentially supersede regulations that apply to commercial and multifamily zoned properties, with within specific regulating areas called neighborhood conservation combining districts. However it's not intended to supersede any nqd regulations that apply to these single family properties. In those areas, it would be focused on the multifamily and commercial properties as the benefits of the overlay would be delivering increased housing and transit,

[3:08:46 PM]

increased housing and transit, supportive development along this first phase of the light rail and the priority extensions . So in addition to that bundle of transit, supportive amendments, staff is prioritizing amendments to change the minimum lot size for one unit residential development . As I mentioned before, this was initiated by the home resolution adopted by council in July 2023. The proposal would modify the base zoning regulations to allow a smaller minimum lot size that's below the current standard of. 5750ft S. The starting point for the staff recommendation is to maintain current impervious cover limitations, which are 45% pending watershed protection department review to see if any changes from that impervious cover percentage are appropriate , we would be modeling and recommending other modifications to site development standards as needed to accommodate development on a smaller lot.

[3:09:47 PM]

development on a smaller lot. These changes are not intended to supersede regulations that apply to single family zoned properties with in ncfs and would not supersede private restrictions like deed restrictions or hoa requirements . This this proposal. Advances one of council's key housing policy priorities. The price of land is one of the major determiner of the cost of housing in Austin, and allowing seif fee simple ownership of smaller lot sizes could incrementally support more affordable home ownership options. So this presentation has covered the priority code amendments that we're focusing on for this spring. Now through may, we are also providing an updated schedule of active code amendments to the committee, as is our custom for your meetings, this. Schedule includes all of the code amendments that are

[3:10:50 PM]

the code amendments that are currently on track to come before council in the first half of the year. You can see there are many that I have not spoken to that are previously underway. Key and on track to also be complete during this time frame. This is the top portion of the schedule of active code amendments, which is included in your backup and will also be posted to the ldc amendments public input website Wright. So most of the amendments that we talked about today are anticipated to go to planning commission and council in April, and may, with the exception of the creation of the new density bonus zoning district, which is on a faster track for review, potentially by the end of February. This is the bottom portion of the schedule of active code amendments, which shows those amendments that are anticipated to be ready for council review after may and everything that has been initiated. But where a timeline has not yet been determined. For additional information about any

[3:11:52 PM]

additional information about any of the code amendments that we've discussed or that have been initiated, the community can visit our website, which is public input. .Com scolds, see updates in the community can also email or call staff at the email address and phone number on the screen with any questions about code amendments. Thank you very much. That concludes our presentation. >> Thank you very much for the presentation. I know. We have some questions, and I think we're going to start with the mayor. Mr. Mayor, our new addition to the committee. >> Yeah. Welcome aboard. Appreciate being here on the vmu two slide. Actually instead of going back to it would you just walk me through the process of what it is we're doing? And it's in response to a lawsuit and now we're trying to come up with a way so that we can put vmu two in place. So would you walk me through the process, as it and I

[3:12:53 PM]

through the process, as it and I wouldn't mind you walking me through that process from the point of view of someone that wants to build, so that we would know how that would actually work. >> Okay, so the vmu program is associated with a combining district, which is the dash V to utilize vmu, a property owner needs to apply to have their property rezoned. >> With that V and can then access the parameters of the program. There were new parameters associated with the V combining district that were recently invalidated by the court. The way that we had put them into an existing combining district was found to be invalid , and so to reestablish those parameters, the ability for a property owner to access the additional 30ft in height and the other entitlements in exchange for providing an income

[3:13:54 PM]

exchange for providing an income restricted, affordable housing. We are proposing to create a new combined district with the parameters that used to be associated with vmu two. The action that we're anticipating to bring to council by the end of February puts that combining district in the code it creates the combining district and the parameters that it would provide and the requirements that it has and puts it into the code for property owners to be able to use if they rezone their properties to have the new district, just like they would have needed to do to rezone a property with the V. And so the envisioned February action would put the code into place, and then anybody wanting to use those parameters of the code would file an application for rezoning to add that new combining district to their property. It would go through the standard rezoning application process with staff review and recommendation Ann planning commission review. And recommendation to council and

[3:14:55 PM]

recommendation to council and fundamentally, a council review and potential action with all of the up, protest rights and certification associated with a typical zoning case. >> Okay, so you anticipated where I

was headed, with my next question. But let me back up just a little bit. Because this is one of the tools that focuses on affordability. I think it's a very, very important tool for us to get right. And so I want to make sure that we're taking all the steps we need to do to do that. With that being said, led by putting it into the code, first of all, what notice are we going to need to provide? And secondly, once it's in code and somebody comes in and applies to be a part of that, what what sort of notice is going to be when you mention protest rights and that kind of thing? I want to make sure that we're walking through those as well, that that question. Make sense to you? Absolutely.

[3:15:57 PM]

Absolutely. >> And I would like to invite miss link with the law department for additional certainty in the response. >> Trish link with the law department. The first step would be to create the district and put it into the code. In order to do that, we would give published notice and, and then it would go to the planning commission for recommendation and then to council for approval. That is the only notice that needs to happen because it's not touching anyone's existing regulations. It is just going to exist, as we say on paper in our city. >> Code creates a position in code, correct? >> So after if council approves that the creation of that district, someone will come into the city and ask to be rezoned into that combining district. When they do that, staff will review when it goes to the land use commission's, they will get individual notice. The 500ft out on the coat based on the city code and. The 200ft out would have the protest rights, but the actual notice goes 500 under our code, right. So it would they

[3:16:58 PM]

code, right. So it would they would get their recommendation from the land use commission, then come to council if there is a valid petition, council will need to pass it by nine votes. Otherwise they can pass it as a regular zoning case. >> Okay. Thank you. I've got some additional questions, if that's okay, madam chair. >> Absolutely. >> I think that answered my question with regard to the notice. As you're coming back. Go with me to minimum lot size and with minimum lot size, you indicate that you would need to focus on, making reforms to site development standards. Would you walk through what you're referring to there? >> I'm thinking of things like setbacks, building coverage, limitations, minimum lot width, the other regulations that are

[3:17:59 PM]

the other regulations that are associated with the base zoning district that today are calibrated for our current lot sizes. As the lot sizes shrink, something like a setback may also need to be adjusted in order to accommodate development in the smaller area. >> Okay, I ask that primarily so that there's clarity about if we if we're if we as a committee and we as a council are going to also be looking at the

reforming of site development standards as part of that, what what people can have in their minds that will be looking at at the time we're doing that. I, I would also like for us to talk about what sort of notes we will be providing in that regard. >> So for that particular set of changes, we would recommend a joint meeting between the council and the planning commission and then have the council decide the notice. Generally speaking, because that

[3:19:00 PM]

Generally speaking, because that will touch so many lots throughout the city. It would be a city wide notice, that would go to all of the property owners and to the utility account holders. >> Well, I don't want to speak for everybody, but I think this council has been pretty clear that it wants to follow this where people get lots of notice, including if it requires citywide notice. So as you think through the, that that would certainly be my recommendation as we make sure that everybody has the has as complete a notice as we can. And the joint meeting with then a follow up meeting with the planning commission, follow up meeting with the council as well. >> And just as we recommended to council previously, we would also have social media posts and on our city website so that folks can find that there. >> Great. Thank you. I've dominated. I'm sorry for that. Thank you. >> I appreciate those questions. I think they're very important. And I you know, I think some of the questions that you asked, as opposed to it establishing something new, it's just getting clarification of, you know,

[3:20:01 PM]

clarification of, you know, things that we've discussed in the past. And to your point, this is very important information. I know our vice chair has questions. It looks like council member Ellis has questions as well. And then, council member qadri, I'd like to piggyback on on the vmu question means that the mayor was asking, is there. For >> I'm concerned that we're going to create a really long, expensive process for someone to do something that today they're achieving administratively. And I understand that there is a challenge, Paige, as it relates to, our ability to do things administratively. And so, I'm not asking us. To violate that, but what I'm trying to understand is, is there a way in terms of that process to move it along quicker so that it's not a year long zoning case when someone who has the V today and could, you know, is engaged in trying to do a 90 foot project

[3:21:02 PM]

trying to do a 90 foot project for 15% affordable, can we design a process, I guess is the question, so that they can. Move through much quicker than a standard full blown, you know, zoning review case? Is there a kind of a skinny version or a way to, to expedite that? >> No, what we've proposed is the fastest route and the cleanest and frankly, the most, the safest route for the development community by

adopting the paper district at the end of February and then council cases can start rolling in. One of the things that we would recommend as part of adopting that district act in February would be direction to the manager to essentially initiate cases for folks who may already be in the process so that those cases can move forward and get resolved quickly.

[3:22:03 PM]

quickly. >> Okay. I some other questions I think we're gonna have an executive session that will be more appropriate for that setting. As it relates to the south central waterfront, are you all envisioning the bonus, including fee and Lou or is it going to be an on site requirement. >> Burt of my notes to make sure I can give you the accurate answer to that. And I'll have to look to the audience, phone a friend to see if the affordable housing will be on site or fee in lieu. >> Good afternoon, Erica leek, planning department. It could be a bit of a combination of both,

[3:23:06 PM]

a bit of a combination of both, depending on what the proposal is. So it's still being finalized, but, we know that there are challenges with maintaining affordable Katy of ownership units. And so we want to make sure that we're sensitive to those issues. Okay. Thank you. >> Thank you, thank you. >> Councilmember Ellis is please thank you. >> So I had a question about the V designation. I mean, right now it is mostly built for height requirements and walkable. First floor is that still going to continue as we look at what a v2 designation looks like to make sure that we're actually getting the same results that we were aiming for as far as walkable first floor. >> That is our intent to ensure that we are bringing forward the parameters of the vmu two program that we're working, knowing that this would be a

[3:24:06 PM]

knowing that this would be a separate combining district. But, but that we would be aiming for the same outcomes that that were that the vmu two was designed to achieve. Okay >> And legal doesn't have anything to add. Okay. Good I just want to make sure we take a little bit of a step back, especially for some of the newer colleagues or people that are joining the conversation now. When this first came across the dais, we had the discussion about whether the V two designation should operate as a bonus program, meaning you come and get your zoning V and that is approved by council. But then if you have a V and you want to use v2 two, you just have to go by the criteria that we had set, which included affordability standards. So now it seems like if we're put in a position where someone has to come to us for the V designation to be added and they have to come to us again for av2 to be added, and,

[3:25:07 PM]

again for av2 to be added, and, tell me how that works. Do you see anyone coming for just the V and then changing their mind in 5 or 10 years and having to come back through a rezoning case or, or what's your feel of how many people have applied for a V designation and how that's going to function with a different V option? >> So the V that's on the books, that existed prior to June of 2022, that program still exists. It's what we did in 2022. The court invalidated. So everything that was there still remains Wright this is a separate will be a separate combining district that gives additional height in exchange for additional affordability. And so if someone does want to reach the 90, foot standard for their building, they would need to come in and be rezoned and. Okay >> So anyone that let's say

[3:26:08 PM]

>> So anyone that let's say someone came and they just think they're going to build a 60ft, they come and get a V designation from us in the next year or two, and then they end up not building the project for five years or whatnot. They have to come back through again to get the 90ft. So maybe more people are going to be applying for the v2 just to say, I don't want to come back twice, or even if I think I need 60, I may just go for v2. Whether or not I think I need the height. >> We envision people choosing between the options, but okay, you are correct. If their needs change, then they may need to rezone again to whichever program is more appropriate. As their plans have changed. >> Okay. And so then that leaves my last question is, generally we could have two tracks of land adjacent to each other where our, someone comes and says, I want v2 and council says, yes. And then the next person comes and says, I want v2 and I want to build the same project next

[3:27:09 PM]

to build the same project next door and a same council. Different council says no for some reason. So now we're kind of in this point of it's just up to the Dyess to say yes or no. And you know, I think what I'm trying to explain is I just think the bonus program was a good tool in the toolbox to say, yes, yes, but you're going to have to build affordable housing in here. And now we've got the ability for people to just say, hey, I just for some reason, I'm going to say no today, and you've got two adjacent tracks of lands with similar neighbors on similar corridors, and you don't have any predictability into to what type of height might be allowed in that situation. Is I mean, I guess that's rhetorical. I'm not putting you on the spot. Unless you want to add something. >> The only thing I would say is we still have affordability unlocked, right? Which is purely administrative, which is very successful. >> So we basically no longer have an admin iterative blessing for on site affordability without it being an affordable

[3:28:10 PM]

without it being an affordable unlocked project. >> You would need to be rezoned unless you were utilizing affordability unlocked, correct? >> Okay. >> All right. Well, I'll I'll leave it there. Thank you. >> Thank you. I appreciate it, councilmember qadri. >> Thank you, chair. And I just want to touch on what everyone has kind of said already. I really appreciate councilmember Velasquez's work on the on the committee and excited to have the mayor, on board. I saw him sharing some tic tac, I think. So, I think next time I'll be sure to sit next to you, because I. I want some tic tac. I have a I have a I have a few questions, and I really and not tick tock not tick tock. Correct. Yeah. God knows I couldn't do that if I tried rushing out. >> Yeah. >> I just have a few questions, and I do appreciate the, the presentation and the answers to the many questions that have already been asked. My first question is just the reasoning behind, having limiting, limited density adjacent to state lines.

[3:29:11 PM]

density adjacent to state lines. You know, something we heard from stakeholders, during the uli tap process on parking reform, was the need for unlimited F.A.R throughout downtown with stronger gatekeeping requirements. I think we can all agree that downtown is a regional center, and we don't want to limit density. And I'd imagine the benefit to ridership would be great if we didn't limit density near, near light rail stations. So in terms of the phase, this is preliminary phase of the itod overlay, some of the things that are driving the proposed parameters are, are the amount of time that we have to develop it, and the knowledge that we will be doing a system wide overlay with a more comprehensive analysis and community engagement. >> Coming back next year and so the balance between those is doing what we can now, where it may not max out the desired

[3:30:12 PM]

may not max out the desired entitlements, but we feel confident in what we are able to offer, will be useful to start providing that transit supportive density will be useful from the property owner perspective will be able to encourage community benefit. That's kind of a simple set of community benefits. While while the analysis for the fully tod overlay and any station area planning that may further refine the regulations in specific areas is under development. So it's a first step, but certainly not the only look. And it will just be done. You know, as one step early out, in support of, you know, with the eye on the grant application and some quick wins. >> Great. Thank you. I got four more questions and then I'll be done. The planning commission recently initiated removing height restrictions in the inner west campus portion of uno. I just want to know, could it could it be possible that that

[3:31:14 PM]

could it be possible that that could be added to the package we were working toward for project connect by may? >> Excellent question. We'll have to, review that and discuss it with the staff and consider the steps that it would take to make those changes and how it impacts the internal and community and council and commission capacity. If that were to be added on. You know, we're I identifying the priority set and very quickly after that things will start in motion to put, you know, identify the subsequent meeting dates and to start preparing all, you know, the proposal and the materials. So we could certainly look into it and see what it would entail and if it's feasible on the timeline with everything else that's before you got it. >> Thank you. Question number three. What is the timeline on other efforts to create or preserve affordable housing within a half a mile? Of the phase one light rail quarter example itot policy plan as an acquisition plan, recommendation . Mainly to invite up interim director Demayo with the housing

[3:32:17 PM]

director Demayo with the housing department for the non-regulated answer. >> Eid Demayo, interim director of the housing department. >> We do currently have a land acquisition and preservation strategy, operating under ahc, Austin housing finance corporation. It's part of our strategic housing blueprint implementation plan. We have been and will continue to look for opportunities along, particularly phase one, of the light rail implementation. I will say along phase one, we have acquired two different properties, thus far, to small multifamily, naturally occurring affordable housing developments. One called midtown flats in d4 and one called soco. 121 and that's on south congress, I believe it's in d5. So those have been acquired using the 2018, affordable housing bonds. We continue to look for opportunities. We also have some

[3:33:18 PM]

opportunities. We also have some vacant land along phase one light rail. And we prioritize, the alignment of high capacity, high frequency transit. The location of affordable housing. When we do our rental housing and ownership housing development assistance awards the next of which will be coming to you all on February 29th as the hfc board. Great does that answer? >> Yes. That answers and then another question is staff looking at any policies around multifamily redevelopment currently we. >> We're thinking about the potential for redevelopment in the design of the itod overlay. We're very cognizant of potential, negative impacts on existing market rate, affordable multifamily. So we can see benefits of additional units in an area. But we want to avoid any unanticipated impact from redevelopment of existing

[3:34:20 PM]

redevelopment of existing multifamily. And so that's one of the ways that it redevelopment of multifamily is currently being considered. If you have more another example that could help me, if there's anything else. >> No, no, no, I was gonna I was gonna ask my last question. Do we have any templates on how to address impervious cover? For single family? From from previous land development code effects. >> There are many different, places to look for. Examples for site development standards for smaller units, and certainly the ldc revision effort, had different Zones with different impervious cover limits. There were some property specific, there were some proposed ways to mitigate the potential drainage impacts of additional impervious cover on missing middle scale properties. There are other,

[3:35:21 PM]

properties. There are other, small lot Zones that examples from the Mueller development and from neighborhood infill tools. So there are lots of different places to look for site and other cities, of course, for site development standards for smaller lots, it will be challenging to find examples that hold a 45% impervious cover steady for a small lot, but we could certainly thought in the past about lot scale drainage interventions and can be considering that in the conversations about whether increasing impervious cover for this proposal would be feasible from the watershed protection department's perspective, thank you. >> Thank you very much. >> Those were actually really good questions because they answered a lot of my questions as well. Were there any other questions? Sure, absolutely. Councilmember Vella, just, a couple of I appreciate, especially the focus, at least

[3:36:22 PM]

especially the focus, at least for the time being, thinking about the small lots, the setbacks. >> You can build a small home on a small lot with 45% impervious cover. Again, there's. I think there's an open question as to whether we should or shouldn't allow. I know that small lot amnesty right now, would allow up to, I think, 60% impervious cover. If you're doing a small lot amnesty. But again, what? But if you don't change the setbacks, then you really can't build much of anything on a 2500 square foot lot. You would have kind of some almost like doll's house or, you know, it very, very awkward looking house. So I really appreciate the, the, the, the need Eid really to look at, setback X in particular. And, and, you know, as was discussed during the whole phase two, I'm sorry, the home phase one, you know, the front setback in particular, the closer to the front setback is to the street, the less driveway that you have

[3:37:24 PM]

the less driveway that you have to pave, to get. So, you know, I'd rather use less pavement on, you know, the driveway access and more pavement on the actual livable space. So again, I really I think we

have to, as a practical matter, look at setbacks. As a priority, in terms of, again, I don't want to take impervious cover, especially for small lots off the table, but I just wanted to mention that that, the setbacks and the size is on the overlays and whether they're going to touch or how they're going to touch multifamily properties. I do really appreciate the concern over, naturally occurring marketrate, affordable housing, which again, these are older units that, you know, again, have been remodeled, haven't been updated in a long time that are just you know, the kind of cheap and easy, my concern is that that if we don't do anything, if we say we're not

[3:38:26 PM]

do anything, if we say we're not going to mess with those properties at all, or we're going to disallow, let's say the use of overlay for these, you know, older marketrate, that does not mean they're going to stay affordable. The landlord, the owner has can move everybody out, remodel, do the lipstick job on the property and boost rates. So I just want to be very careful where we, you know, we our intentions are good. But the result may not be the result that we intended because that owner has every right and once the line and the station is there, every incentive for financially to make it not a market rate affordable property to do everything they can to raise, you know, the cost of those apartments and the fact that the, you know, the station is going to be let's say, you know what I mean? A quarter mile away

[3:39:26 PM]

what I mean? A quarter mile away is in and of itself, going to raise the rents of those. So I just want to be really careful and thoughtful about what we do there. You know, and especially to the extent that that, that these are small properties, like, I, we had a really good debate over or one property in district four. It was about 30 units. But it was going to be replaced by about, a 300 units with, you know, 10% of them being affordable. You know, we can be in a situation where almost on a one by one basis, if the new developments and if we got something structure everything right, where we're incorporating, folks potentially into the new developments, again, giving them maybe first right of refusal or, you know, doing something like that to where we don't want to displace people. We want to incorporate them in you know, a low cost way into the new development. So anyway, I don't have any solutions right now, but I just wanted to. So even, you know, I think about mcmansion also where, where, you know, the goal was to the goal was different than the outcome that we got

[3:40:27 PM]

than the outcome that we got with mcmansions past, you know, way back in the day. And I just want to be very careful about our unintended consequences. Moving forward. So thank you. >> Thank you very much. Did it sound you took a deep breath? Did you have another question? I just took a deep breath,

breathing in the happiness. Fantastic. I think council member qadri I do think your questions answered my questions and thank you. Mr. Bayoh, for, answering the question with the specific 229, date that was very helpful. And the information about acquisitions, etc. That was really helpful as well. So thank you for contributing that. I think I will eventually have some questions about you made reference to the small lot drainage, options. And so I'd like to, get more information about that, maybe in a future meeting or, prior to were there any other questions for staff on this item? I think you're off the hook. Thank you very much.

[3:41:29 PM]

the hook. Thank you very much. We really appreciate the presentation. I think it was very helpful information. >> Thank you all. >> Okay. So I do have actually, you guys should have all received one by now. I have a clean copy now to I'd like to recommend that we do provide some recommendation on the prioritization of the land, development code amendments, especially in light of the presentation and with some of the questions that have been asked. My staff has distributed, on the dais, a motion that I'd like to bring forward that really lays out a recommendation to the full council. And I ask that, staff, please share the motion. Oh, it looks like. Oh, good luck with that, guys. Yeah I don't know about anybody else, but mazzini optical is not that good. Handed out. Fortunately, I think we all have a copy. Council member Vella, do you have a copy as well? >> I don't, but I'll. I'll scroll through it.

[3:42:29 PM]

scroll through it. >> And, Ellis, I actually think I have some, may I believe it was emailed out okay to us as well at least. Awesome. >> Sorry for the folks at home that might be squinting. >> And oh, the tiny. The teeny tiny. Yeah, good luck with that. So I'm just going to lay out the motion, with the whereas is and if there are any questions about the intent behind the motion or any specific questions around the motion, that's fantastic. So whereas as the city council has previously directed, the city manager to work with the housing and planning committee, to prioritize current and future land development code amendments for the greatest impact on housing. And whereas, as since the council has provided direction to the manager, the committee has consistently provided feedback and recommendations related to the organization and priority of the land development code amendment. And whereas city council has initiated several land development code amendments and directions to staff related to equitable transit oriented

[3:43:31 PM]

equitable transit oriented development, otherwise known as tod citywide compatibility standards, density bonuses, and other programs that support more access to housing, jobs, and transit. Throughout

the city of Austin and whereas, the city initiated and the city council initiated land development code amendments in 2023 as a part of the home initiative that will adjust to your point. Council member setbacks, height and impervious cover for single family. For single family zoning to allow more units on smaller lots. Therefore, be it resolved, the committee recommends to the full council support for the tod package of the land development code amendments as presented by city staff to the committee on January 23rd, and that includes, two bullets prioritizing completion of the previously initiated citywide compatibility reforms and bullet two is initiate initiation of an itot overlay, which we heard about

[3:44:34 PM]

overlay, which we heard about earlier today. Corridor for the urban rail phase one alignment and priority extensions that will address any existing zoning overlays, districts or plans. And then lastly, be it further resolved, the committee recommends to the full council that reforming site development standards are prioritized in conjunction with the city manager's proposed timeline for a reduction of minimum lot size requirements. So that the council may consider both the reduction in minimum lot size requirement butts, along with revised site development standards that are ready for council review in mid 2024 for and with that, that is my motion and I will look for a second and then if we have any thank you. It looks like so the motion is made by me. Council member harper-madison Ann, chair of the housing and planning committee and seconded by council member qadri. Any discussion on, vice chair alter? >> Thank you very much. I just want to highlight Wright that I

[3:45:36 PM]

want to highlight Wright that I think. As we look at site development standards, I do believe that impervious cover is something that is, unique and kind of has a higher standard than, let's say, just addressing a setback. And so as staff works through the complexity of what we need to do or what recommendations burns they're going to make from the watershed department as it relates to impervious cover. You know, those might take more time. And we need to get this right, because it's so important and complex and so I appreciate the chair, including the language about you know, those standards that are ready because it is very possible that those are not ready. And like I said, I think we need to get it right rather than get it fast. So I just want to make that comment. >> I couldn't agree more. Thank you for your contribution. Councilmember Ellis. >> And I've got a point of clarification on two. I just wanted to make sure, it was understood that any other ordinances, like save our

[3:46:37 PM]

ordinances, like save our springs that have very specific maps tied to recharge features and things like that, that those would not be brought up in this discussion on necessarily. These would be about other

watershed beds that are outside of the Barton springs zone. Is that correct? I'll just take a nod. Yes, I'm getting a nod. So we will count that. And I too think this is a very interesting conversation. I'm reminded of back in 2019. It was actually councilmember pool that had asked very specifically for staff to take a look at how we can look watershed by watershed and make sure that as we allow for gentle density in some areas, that we are still mindful of impervious cover limitations. And in the rewrite of 2019, which we know is, sitting right now and not moving forward, because of other issues that have come up, staff had come up with a way to account for more gentle density, more ways of doing infill development that allowed people to be, trans riders, less car dependent. So

[3:47:39 PM]

riders, less car dependent. So this is a conversation I'm very much interested in. We need to be mindful of where our sensitive features are and making sure that we're not prioritizing some neighborhoods over others, because we need to make sure that no neighborhood is flooding and everybody has access to be able to use the land that they need and make sure that they're doing it in a responsible way. And so I'm glad these conversations are coming back up. I think we'll have a robust conversation on the dais about these moving forward. But I'm glad that staff is looking into it. >> Thank you very much. I appreciate that. And you got the nod you needed? Yes awesome. Thank you. And mayor, thank you. >> I want to piggyback on councilmember Vella and councilmember Ryan alters and make sure I understand when we talk about the final, whereas there that we're talking about setbacks, heights and impervious cover for the single family zoning so that we can allow smaller lots. And then in the second resolution, we talk about site development standards being prioritized. And again, that's with regard to what we're talking about with these minimum lot sizes and reducing minimum lot sizes. Correct correct, sir.

[3:48:39 PM]

lot sizes. Correct correct, sir. Got it. >> Thank you. You're welcome. >> Staff, did you have anything to add that I may have missed? With clarifying on his question, all right. So we're all squared away. So I made the motion. It was seconded all in favor of us bringing the motion before council as an entire body looks like we are unanimous on the dais. And councilmember Vella, I see you looking in my direction. >> No, no, I'm I guess since I'm not officially a committee member, I you know, don't vote. I think that's what I was told to do by the clerk. So you know, just, it I tell you what, why don't we wait until the item comes before the body as a whole? >> And then at the very least, we don't waste your vote. We make it official and with that, colleagues, I think we're going to move to what I personally think is going to be one of the most exciting parts of this meeting. We get to talk about what we get to do in the future. Us as a brand new body and this brand new year with so many

[3:49:40 PM]

brand new year with so many exciting things for us to look forward to. So for 2024, are there items that, colleagues would like to bring forward for consideration? During the course of this conversation, you're always welcome to bring them later. Councilmember Ellis, I don't have a specific topic, but I just wanted to daylight. >> We've had a couple of meetings where there were either formally posted as joint meetings of mobility and housing and planning, or they were just Burt unofficial joint meetings. Since a number of us overlap in those conversations. And so I look forward to us having more conversations that that center around transit planning and housing development and how we can partner with other entities like the county and school districts and things of that nature. And so I hope that we have more collaboration like this in the future, and I'm looking forward to these conversations in 2024. >> Thank you very much. I appreciate that. I think you articulated it better than I did. Because what I've been encouraging staff and folks that were taking meetings with, it's like if I see any overlap whatsoever. So if you see your

[3:50:41 PM]

whatsoever. So if you see your name with five other people on the invitation, it's because I've decided that we take too many meetings and it would be very helpful if we could consolidate the commodity that we all have the least of. And that's our time. So moving forward, I'd like very much for us to whenever possible to have our discussions be condensed. So with that, it looks like we are about to be adjourned on this fine day. 123 2024 at 3:51 P.M.