

# City Council and Planning Commission Special Called Joint Meeting Transcript – 4/11/2024

Title: ATXN-1 (24hr)

Channel: 1 - ATXN-1

Recorded On: 4/11/2024 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 4/11/2024

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.***

[8:59:24 AM]

We are a-t-x-n the City of Austin's Government Access Channel everybody. It's April 11th, 2024 and it's 9:00 am, we are meeting in the Austin city council chambers, located in the Austin city hall at 301 west second street in Austin, Texas, and a quorum of the Austin city council is present. This is a joint meeting of the Austin city

[9:00:25 AM]

joint meeting of the Austin city council and the Austin planning commission, and I'm pleased to, as to in welcome the planning commission to be with us, during this joint meeting, I will now call to order the meeting of the Austin city council at 9:00 am. And I'm pleased to recognize the vice chair of the Austin planning commission of ssr, to make comments and call to order the planning commission. Thank you. >> Mayor. With a quorum of planning commissioners present, I'm going to go ahead and call this meeting of the planning commission to order at 9:01 A.M. On Thursday, April 11th, 2024, at the Austin city council chambers at 301 west second street, Austin, Texas. Thank you, mayor. >> Thank you, Mr. Vice chair and again, I want to welcome everyone. As you know, this is a joint hearing and it's a joint hearing to consider the following land use amendments that that code amendments that will be considered by both the planning commission and the city

[9:01:26 AM]

planning commission and the city council. This is part of our effort to allow for robust public input and allow those recommending policy and those making the policy to have opportunities to hear comments at the very same time. The planning commission will meet again on April 23rd and April 30th. At those

times, there will be the chance for further public comment and input that the public may have if the planning commission is ready at that time, it will be able to vote on recommendations that it will make to the mayor and the city council. At that time, the city council. We're scheduled to meet on may 16th. Again, if we're ready, we'll be posted to vote at that time. Prior to that, we will have a work session on this item on Tuesday, may 14th. Not only will we have the chance to discuss and ask additional questions of staff, but but the recommendation is that we use that date like we have done in the past, to lay out proposed amendments so that different members of the council might propose at the may 16th council

[9:02:28 AM]

propose at the may 16th council meeting. It will be like we did, like I said, last December or in December of last year, the council members and the planning commissioners are able to ask questions and get answers from staff by contacting Katy powers via email. Responses will be shared with all of the council and all the planning commission. As soon as those responses are finalized, the public you're able to access submitted questions and the staff responses by going to the following website that's listed at the bottom. I'm told it's going to be listed at the bottom of the screen by atx, N and if that doesn't happen, I'll make sure that I announce it to everybody, maybe a couple of times during the course of the day this is to help us and help the public be aware of what's going on as we're going through this thought process and consideration today. The run of the show is going to be this way. First, we will call to

[9:03:28 AM]

way. First, we will call to order the hearings. The public hearings, we'll hear a presentation from city staff on the agenda item, if the commissioners or council members have brief clarifying questions, they'll ask them after after that presentation. But out of respect for the large number of people wishing to be heard and discuss, this item, and then they're just going to be asking clarifying questions, and we'll use the Q and a process that I just mentioned as a way to get, more detailed answers. We will hear from those wishing to speak. Each person will have two minutes. People may donate time to someone so that a single speaker can speak up to six minutes. If you're donating time , please see the city clerk so that you can complete a time donation form in advance and the donors must be physically present at the time. The person to whom they're donating time is

[9:04:31 AM]

to whom they're donating time is going to be speaking due to the number of speakers. We anticipate that during the course of the day, we may need an overflow room for those that are interested in that. At sun will be streaming from the boards and commissions room right across the atrium here, and

people can go there and be able to follow along as well. Speakers will be able to check the order of upcoming speakers at the kiosk outside the city council chambers, I'll ask you once again to be please be patient with the system, with the numbers that we have, but you'll be able to stay up to speed and know where you are in the rotation based upon those kiosks. I also ask that please try to stay within the two minutes, that you've been given out of respect for those who are wishing to speak, but they may be following you in order for us to remain efficient and respectful of time. We've set up two podiums and you can see the two podiums, in front of us here. Those are for the speakers to use, as your names are called, we'll ask you to come down toward the front so that

[9:05:31 AM]

down toward the front so that you'll be ready to speak. And please just alternate. Between the two podiums. When a speaker is finished, then the other speaker will be in a position to immediately begin, and like I say, there are seats down front that we hope that you'll utilize so that we'll be able to, move efficiently and, and respect your time. There will not be a vote, this is a public hearing only. So with that, members and without objection, I will now open the public hearing for this joint meeting of the Austin city council and the Austin planning commission. And I will turn it over to Veronica Briseno, assistant city manager, to begin the presentation. Councilmember Allison alter. >> Thank you, mayor, did I hear correctly that we won't be, taking this up for discussion as a council till may 14th and then be voting on may 16th? >> Well, that is the way the current schedule, as you know, was originally set out. We have opportunities to bring it up at other times, but that's the current schedule.

[9:06:32 AM]

current schedule. >> Okay. I just want to register that I do not believe that's enough time for something of this magnitude to air amendments and other things that people may be bringing forward for the community, or even for us as council, to be able to, to, digest the material so that, I think we really need to think seriously about having some time when we're talking about things, before may 14th so that things can be, daylighted. And, it is not always easy to see what the ramifications are of something that someone brings forward, that quickly. And, this is a series of large steps and there's, you know, nuances across all of them. And so I think that we need to build in some time for us to have discussion and to hear what, what may be amendments that people may be bringing great. >> Thank you. Council member. Yes. Council member. Kelly, thank you very much for the recognition. >> I'm curious to know if we might be able to have some dedicated time on a future council work session so that we

[9:07:35 AM]

council work session so that we can discuss this, prior to taking that vote, if that might be the right route to take. >> Well, hearing the request, we'll, we'll we'll look at how we make that happen because we want it to be a robust discussion. Any other comments before we begin? Thank you both, Mr. Pacino, I'll recognize you. >> Good morning. Mayor, mayor pro tem council members and planning commissioners. I'm assistant city manager Veronica Briseno, and I'm happy to be here with you today, we're holding a joint public hearing about a package of code amendments that support transit, housing capacity and the transition to electric vehicles. The proposed changes enable equitable, transit oriented development along the proposed project connect phase one light rail update compatibility. Compatibility standards citywide allow single family homes to be built on smaller lots and allow properties to be used exclusively for charging electric vehicles. Collectively, they will unlock opportunities for more housing, including affordable housing, throughout the city and along our busiest transit corridors. The regulations for electric vehicles charging sites will

[9:08:35 AM]

vehicles charging sites will help make this green mobility option more available to all austinians, but in a way that supports the council's other mobility and land use goals. These code amendments will also help us be more competitive when applying for federal funding for the project. Connect light rail transit program. Finally, these changes have been informed by years of community conversation and they were requested by the city council. After careful deliberation, staff has worked very hard to develop these proposed amendments over the past several months, and I thank them for that. We are proud to present them to you today, to you and to the community today. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Andrea bates, our assistant director of the planning department. Thank you. Andrea >> Good morning. Mayor, mayor pro tem, council members and planning commissioners. I am Andrea bates, assistant director with the planning department, and I am joined by four colleagues who will be providing an overview of the proposed amendments Eric Thomas, Laura Keating, Jonathan Lee and Warner cook. The four code amendments

[9:09:35 AM]

cook. The four code amendments will be describing today are electric vehicle charging use home phase two, which is smaller lot sizes for one unit, citywide compatibility changes, and an equitable transit oriented development, or TOD overlay. The goals for these amendments are to unlock opportunities for additional housing and to make our city more walkable, transit supportive and environmentally friendly for all residents. The timeline for these amendments includes. >> We can't hear you. Can we get the mic increase? Please thank you. >> The timeline for these code amendments includes today's joint public hearing and two scheduled open houses, one in person on April 17th and one virtual on April 20th for the public to learn more about the proposals, the planning commission will then consider the amendments at hearings on April 23rd and April 30th. Staff

[9:10:37 AM]

April 23rd and April 30th. Staff is currently working to schedule additional open houses that we anticipate in late April or early May, before council takes this item up again, and then finally, city council will consider the amendments on May 16th. As assistant city manager, Briseno mentioned, these changes have been informed by years of public discussion about the city's mobility, affordability and climate goals. These specific amendments were initiated by city council last summer and earlier this year. The proposal before you today was developed in response to the council direction provided in the resolutions that you see on the screen. And we will now begin with a description of electric vehicle charging. Use >> Good morning. Mayor, mayor, pro tem council and commissioners. I'm Eric Thomas, zoning division manager with the planning department. And it is my privilege this morning to

[9:11:37 AM]

my privilege this morning to speak about the proposed electric vehicle charging land use. I'd like to begin by talking a bit about why we're here. The city of Austin has established a number of ambitious, climate oriented goals and strategies, including reaching net zero community wide greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, the creation of a public EV charging network, the electrification of mobility fleets and services, and a target of 40% of total vehicle miles traveled in Austin being electrified by 2030. With the rapid transition to electric vehicle, or EV use, there is a need for a principal land use for electric vehicle charging that balances environmental environmental benefits with land use considerations. City council recognized the need for the new use and drafted resolution 2023 0608082. In June of 2023, council directed staff to create the new use while preventing it from becoming concentrated in active or residential areas, as well as allowing it through the conditional use permit process and limiting its placement to

[9:12:37 AM]

and limiting its placement to CSS and less restrictive zoning districts. The proposed electric vehicle charging use is defined as the use of a site for the charging of an electric vehicle or EV, including battery charging stations and rapid charging stations, each as defined by the United States department of energy. With the EV industry and its technology progressing and transforming at such a rapid rate, staff wanted to ensure that the use definition does not unintentionally prohibit a future charging technique by deferring to federal standards. The definitions may be updated to reflect contemporary technology, while aligning with other municipalities that elect to structure definitions. Similarly staff finds it necessary to prevent the proposed EV charging use from becoming concentrated in active residential, mixed use, or other pedestrian friendly areas to accomplish this, the use will not be broadly permitted in

a set of base zoning districts. Instead, the use will be permitted conditional or prohibited depending on the following factors. Existing and

[9:13:37 AM]

following factors. Existing and previous land use of the site. The zoning district of the site, the type of roadway that the site abuts, and the site's area and location. I'll speak in a bit more detail about how each factor may affect the ability of a site to utilize the ev charging use. First, we'll consider the existing or previous land use of a site. An ev charging use is permitted as the principal use when the existing or previous use of the site is service station. If the base zoning district is commercial or industrial, and the previous use was not already converted to a residential or restaurant. Use. Given the significant cost associated with site remediation for service stations, we view ev charging as an appropriate transition use, but the proposal would not permit the conversion of housing or restaurants under this provision. Additionally and this applies broadly to the use no matter where it is permitted, ev charging is prohibited underground, and this was a recommendation from the fire department. Next, we'll move on to the zoning district and roadway type factors, which

[9:14:37 AM]

roadway type factors, which determine where the use may also be permitted. An electric vehicle charging use will be permitted if the site is located in a chs or less restrictive zoning district, and abutting certain roads. For reference, chs and less restrictive zoning districts are chs, cs1, ch, ip, MILLI, and r&d. If the site is located in a chs or less restrictive zoning district and abutting a highway, hill country roadway, suburban roadway or internal circulation route, then electric vehicle charging is a permitted use. These requirements ensure that the use is mainly permitted in areas that are less likely to be pedestrian friendly or residential in nature. If the site is located in a chs or less restrictive zoning district, but abutting a core transit corridor, future core transit corridor or urban roadway, then additional requirements apply. The use is permitted if the site does not exceed 25,000ft S and is located at at least 1000ft from

[9:15:37 AM]

located at at least 1000ft from the nearest ev. Charging. Use if the site is greater than 25,000ft S, or less than 1000ft from the nearest ev, charging use, then the use is conditional, in which case a conditional use permit and land use commission recommendation would be required prior to site plan approval. As these roadway types are more likely to include transit rich and walkable areas, the additional requirements are intended to provide staff and the land use commission the opportunity to make a determination as to whether the specific location is appropriate for the proposed use. Staff is

recommending approval of the proposed electric vehicle charging use. While site plan applications have already been filed for ev charging and with an urgent need to address serious climate oriented city goals, the proposed new use will balance environmental benefits with land use considerations to allow responsible development in the most appropriate places around our great city. Thank you . Hello >> I'm meeting an officer at

[9:16:38 AM]

>> I'm meeting an officer at make. >> Please make sure that the microphones on. >> Hello. Council and planning commission. I'm Laura Keating with the project connect office, and I'll be presenting on this phase of the home amendments. The primary goal of the home amendments is to create more housing options that are attainable for more austinites. The proposed amendments under phase two expand on previous changes. This provides more housing, additional options for home ownership. In December, council adopted changes to allow up to three homes on a single family lot. The focus of phase two is to reduce the minimum lot size to 2000ft S, to facilitate fee simple ownership. Fee simple ownership means the homeowner owns the house and the land under it outright. The proposed changes for phase two will allow

[9:17:39 AM]

changes for phase two will allow similar types of development as phase one, 2 or 3 units on an existing lot, but goes the extra step of allowing these lots to subdivide Ed without these changes. If 2 or 3 units are built on a lot and sold separately, they are owned as condominiums. In line with phase one, the proposed changes only apply to sf one, two and three zoning, reducing the minimum lot size requires the adjustment of other standards to allow for feasible development. Phase one removed height restrictions for 2 to 3 unit developments imposed by mcmansion standards, allowing 35ft, which equates to three stories. Staff is recommending carrying this forward for small lots. A small lot is anything between the new minimum of 2000 and the existing minimum of 57 50ft S. Within the mcmansion boundary, which covers the

[9:18:42 AM]

boundary, which covers the central city, the size of one unit is restricted under current code phase one provided more allowable square footage on a lot if more units were built. Phase two proposes to mirror these entitlements for one unit on a small lot. These unit size maximums allow slightly more area in relation to the lot size for smaller lots, guaranteeing each lot 1400 and 50ft S homes, which provides for a comfortable three bedroom unit. In no case do the proposed standards allow larger houses than what is permitted in phase one and other parts of current code. Outside the mcmansion boundary, staff is

recommending a unit no unit size cap. This is aligned with current code and with phase one. This example shows three lots on a corner near the at the recommended unit size cap. For

[9:19:42 AM]

recommended unit size cap. For the smallest lot. Proposed setbacks are also reduced in certain situations to allow for units on separate lots to be attached. This will allow for duplexes and row homes to be built on small lots. The staff recommendation also includes decide standards. The goal of these are to provide open space along the street, reduce the impact of driveways, preserve curb space for street parking and trash collection, and to promote walkable building design, design standards include requiring a street facing entrance, limiting the amount of driveway or impervious cover in the front yard, and restricting the size of street facing garages or carports. Lot width minimums vary based on the type

[9:20:42 AM]

minimums vary based on the type of driveway access needed for each home. To ensure that there is adequate space along the street for driveways and utilities shown here on the left , the lot width minimum with a single dedicated driveway is 30ft. The minimum for other types of access is 20ft. On the right we see attached units with a shared driveway. Other types of access include alley access shown on the left and access from a side street on the right. We see row houses without parking, taking advantage of the minimum lot width of 20ft, while while it is expected at this time that most new housing will provide parking on site, Austin recently removed the requirement to do so, providing flexibility in the future for projects that are close to transit or do not need parking. Due to the existing reduction to due to the proposed reduction in lot and

[9:21:42 AM]

proposed reduction in lot and lot width and lot size, we expect that more flag lots will be created under this proposal. A flag lot is shaped like a flag. It has a narrow strip of land, which we call the flagpole, that extends to the street. And the purpose of the flagpole is to provide water utility access to each home. The proposed changes reduce. Reduce the width of the flagpole to allow for more lots to subdivide Eid while maintaining while maintaining enough space for utilities. The staff recommendation also includes a change to current code to ensure that all new impervious cover is accounted for. Previously, the flagpole did not count towards lot area and the impervious cover along it was unregulated. This meant it could exceed the maximum staff recommends including this area in the future, so that the overall site does not exceed the impervious cover limit. The changes to flag



[9:22:42 AM]

cover limit. The changes to flag lot requirements will allow more existing lots to subdivide into three small lots, as shown above. For lots that are interior to the block, meaning they are not a corner lot. The limited street frontage provides the main constraint for subdivision because each lot must have access to the street for utilities. The above. The above example above example shows how even though an existing lot is over 9000ft S and has enough lot area for four new small lots, the width only allows for three new lots. Additionally there is no proposed change to utility requirements exist. Conditions such as location of utilities or environmental features will reduce the existing lots ability to subdivide. For these reasons, staff's recommendation aims to provide as much flexibility to accommodate differing conditions in order to achieve the goals of the home resolution. In closing,

[9:23:43 AM]

the home resolution. In closing, we want to clarify what is not changing under this amendment. Staff is recommending no change to 45% impervious cover in sf two and sf three. Zoning for sf one. Under the proposed changes, impervious cover will increase from 40 to 45. This is in line with the increase in phase one for multi-unit developments. Regulations for one unit on a lot over 57 50ft S are not changing. Additional regulations from home. Phase one for two and three units remain the same, including the minimum lot size of 5750. >> I'm Jonathan Lee with the planning department, and I'll be presenting on proposed citywide compatibility changes. Compatibility is a zoning regulation created in the 1980s to preserve single family

[9:24:45 AM]

to preserve single family neighborhoods and protect them from taller buildings and potentially incompatible uses of land. Compatibility sets height limits for properties near single family homes. These height limits are more restrictive than the height limits that would otherwise apply. Compatibility also regulates screening, building design, and noise levels for buildings near single family homes. The proposed changes would reduce the impact of compatibility while maintaining a height transition between single family homes and larger buildings. The city is proposing to change compatibility to help achieve a few important goals. These include increasing the number of homes that can be built across the city, creating more walkable neighborhoods near public transit to support the city's climate and mobility goals, and simplifying complex regulations and bringing these regulations in line with peer cities at a high level, the proposed changes would do the following in compatibility. At 75ft in distance from single family homes, change the applicability so that only a site zoned single family with 1 to 3 homes triggers

[9:25:46 AM]

to 3 homes triggers compatibility requirements and multifamily building. Smaller multifamily buildings are exempt and Eid simplify current regulations that are difficult to understand and administer. Current compatibility. Height limits extend 540ft, or nearly two football fields from single family homes. The height limits gradually increase as the distance from a single family home increases. Within 25ft of a single family home, nothing is allowed to be built. The current compatibility height limits are far more restrictive than similar kinds of height limits in peer cities in Austin today, a building must be 300ft away from a single family home to reach 60ft in height, or five stories and 420ft away to reach 90ft in height, or 7 to 8 stories. On average. Peer cities allow 60ft of height at about 50ft in distance, and 90ft of height at about 75ft in distance . The proposed height limits are less restrictive than the

[9:26:48 AM]

less restrictive than the current limits, and are aligned with the average of similar limits in peer cities between 25 and 50ft of distance from a single family home, a 40 foot tall or three story building would be allowed, and between 50 and 75ft in distance, a 60 foot tall or five story building would be allowed within 25ft of a single family home. A compatibility buffer with vegetative screening would be required. This is how the proposed regulations would look on a hypothetical city block. The building on the property to the right would have to build within the height limits in pink and purple within 75ft of single family homes, which are labeled here as triggering properties beyond 75ft in distance. The height limits would be set by the base zoning district. In most cases, this height limit would be 60ft, as shown here, but in some cases there may be taller height limits. It is important to note that buildings are not always as tall as the height limits allowed by zoning. To reduce the visual impact of taller buildings and to provide

[9:27:48 AM]

taller buildings and to provide environmental benefits, there will be a new requirement for a compatibility buffer. The buffer will include trees and shrubs to maintain privacy, both for current residents and single family homes, as well as the occupants of new buildings. This is more of a buffer than what is required today. Currently, only a wall fence or hedge is required. The compatibility buffer will include trees that reach at least 20ft in height at maturity, as well as small trees and large shrubs. A 15 foot wide restricted zone will allow low intensity uses in the buffer, such as trails, driveways and fire lanes. The proposed restricted zone is more flexible than the current 25 foot no build setback. Neighborhood scale office and commercial uses will not have to build a compatibility buffer. Additional requirements will also help minimize the potential impacts of larger buildings. These include keeping existing screening requirements for vehicle lights, dumpsters, mechanical equipment, and

[9:28:49 AM]

mechanical equipment, and outdoor storage, and adding a requirement to screen outdoor common spaces. Existing noise limits for mechanical equipment and a requirement to shield outdoor lighting will also be maintained. The proposed changes would allow more homes to be built across the city. Current compatibility regulations limit housing capacity by around 82,000 units. Housing capacity is a projection of how many units could be built if every property were to develop or redevelop under existing zoning regulations. The proposed changes could unlock 76, or about 63,000 units of that lost capacity. These changes would help achieve the goal in the 2017 strategic housing blueprint of creating 135,000 homes in ten years. >> Hello, my name is Warner Cooke and I'm a principal planner with the city's planning department and the case manager for the equitable transit oriented development, or tod overlay code amendment and rezoning. In March of last year,

[9:29:51 AM]

rezoning. In March of last year, council accepted the tod policy plan, which provides a framework for how to implement this work throughout Austin in concert with project connect transit investments. The proposed tod overlay code amendment and rezoning helps implement our policy plan. The overlay aims to support our community's historic investment in public transportation by increasing housing and especially affordable housing opportunities near transit, ensuring that people of various backgrounds can all enjoy the benefits of our new light rail line. This proposal also provides protection for certain existing affordable housing and priority businesses and services. Lastly, the overlay restricts future expansion of land uses that are less compatible with high capacity transit. All of this helps maximize our investment of public dollars in transit and contributes to our future application to the federal transit administration for grant funding. The proposal includes the creation of two combining

[9:30:51 AM]

the creation of two combining districts that would apply in addition to a property's other zoning regulations. Today, the first of those two districts is the Ito date overlay combining district, which would restrict certain uses that are not transit supportive. The second is the density bonus district, or dbt tod. In this presentation, it would create a new density bonus program that would allow property owners additional entitlements in exchange for providing community benefits. The proposal also includes. In addition to the two new combining districts, a proposed rezoning council has recommended that staff apply or rezone certain non-single family properties within a half mile radius of the phase one Austin light rail and priority extensions. As it's important to note that a property would not be eligible for the

bonus program without also having the use restrictions applied, so the rezoning would include both combining districts into the zoning string. The items before you today include. The city

[9:31:54 AM]

you today include. The city initiated rezoning of approximately 1118 acres of land within that half mile radius. Properties proposed for rezoning and those within 500ft of those subject properties received a notice of the proposed rezoning. And there would be ways in the future that are listed on the slide that are not part of today's proposal. Should somebody want to apply for this zoning district. Based on council direction, staff recommended applying the overlay to non-single family parcels shown in blue on the map on the right of this slide. The two districts would not apply in certain places with existing regulating plans and overlays, which are shown in a medium gray on the map. It would not apply to single family zoned property, which is shown in light gray on the map, and other similar residential base Zones. It would not apply to unsold state owned land where the city does not have authority to rezone the property, and there are additional areas that staff recommended it would not apply

[9:32:54 AM]

recommended it would not apply based on analysis and that is detailed in the staff report. Those are the parcels that have no color on them other than the base map underneath, inside the buffer, but not shown in color. The map demonstrates that a substantial majority of land within a half mile of the corridor is either zoned today. Single family zoned already part of an existing overlay or regulating plan, or part of our tod rezoning proposal. I will now dive a little deeper into what each of these two new districts do, starting with the use restrictions of the overlay combining district. This district would restrict uses by either making them prohibited or making them conditional. Prohibited uses are those that would be prevented from locating on parcels in the future. Moving forward, conditional uses are uses that would require permission from the land use commission through the conditional use permit process, in order to locate on a site zoned tod. The tod overlay does not restrict any residential

[9:33:56 AM]

not restrict any residential uses, and it does not impact single family zoned properties. While commercial, industrial and agricultural uses would be restricted by this proposal, only future uses are impacted. Existing uses would not be required to discontinue under staff's proposal. All non-transit supportive uses have a history of using large amounts of land for parking and low density development, or creating uninteresting and unsafe environments that lack pedestrian activity. This slide provides a list of all of the uses in the proposal that the would be further restricted. Some uses, such as alternative financial services or pawnshops, might generate transit supportive levels of activity, and the people who

access those uses could benefit from them being conveniently located near transit service. However they have historically been restricted in many places throughout Austin, leading to an uneven distribution of them today, with concentrations in areas with more low income communities and communities of

[9:34:58 AM]

communities and communities of color. Because of these equity considerations, staff proposes these uses be conditional so there can be additional consideration through the land use commission permit process. One more reminder just because the overlay restricts the use, does not mean that an existing business or service with that use would have to discontinue. Austin's code. Would instead consider that to be a non-conforming use. Moving forward, nonconforming uses would generally be permitted from expanding beyond a certain size, but are allowed to repair, renovate, and continue operation as they see fit. Switching tracks I'll now talk about the density bonus program or db tod district to access this bonus program. A development would have to meet all of the requirements on the slide in front of you. That includes providing affordable housing units or fees towards affordable housing, which I'll go into more detail on the next slide. These projects that propose redeveloping a property with existing certain uses, such as affordable housing or specific non residential uses like childcare centers, creative

[9:36:00 AM]

childcare centers, creative spaces, grocery, etc. Would also need to provide notification, relocation assistance, replacement of that space and a right to return for the existing tenant. And finally db tod projects must comply with requirements for building and site design that are similar to the existing vertical mixed use or vmu two program standards. The affordability levels in staff's proposal for the db tod program are based on whether a residential unit is being offered for ownership or for lease ownership developments would have to provide 12% of their total units as income restricted to households at 80. Mfi median family income and below. They could also satisfy their requirement by paying a fee in lieu to the city's affordable housing trust fund. This ownership requirement is the same as what was recently adopted for the db 90 bonus program. In contrast, for rental developments, they would have

[9:37:00 AM]

developments, they would have two options for meeting their affordability requirement. They could choose to provide either 15% of their total units at 60% mfi, or 12% of their total units. At the deeper affordability level of 50. Mfi for rental developments. No fee in lieu option is available under this proposal. This requirement for rental is the same as the requirement for properties that were near light

rail in the now invalidated vmu two bonus program. If a property met all of the things that I've just detailed, they could choose to redevelop under the db tod bonus proposal. They could also choose to not use the bonus program if they. If they do choose to use it, a few things would apply. First, nonresidential properties. Those with commercial or industrial zoning today would be allowed to have residential uses. That means that a parcel like this could develop housing near transit where it couldn't. Today it's also important to note that the db tod bonus program is available to existing

[9:38:02 AM]

available to existing multifamily based Zones, which don't allow these nonresidential uses and they would not be granted any new nonresidential uses under the proposal. Second, a property would be allowed to build up to 60 additional feet in bonus height taller than their base zoning allows at a maximum total height of 120ft, third compliant. Combining complying projects would be allowed to develop with relaxed site development standards, including a version of compatibility standards that is less restrictive than the citywide changes. Jonathan just talked about. It's important to note that the existing impervious cover limits would still apply to a site zoned db tod, so nothing changes there. And lastly, complying projects that meet the requirements would be eligible to supersede a handful of more restrictive regulations that would otherwise apply to them, including some restrictions within conditional overlays. Neighborhood conservation combining districts known as ncc, and subchapter F, which is known as the mcmansion ordinance. These additional

[9:39:05 AM]

ordinance. These additional entitlements offered to projects that provide the required community benefits, will increase the flexibility of sites and allow our capacity for housing, employment and services near transit to grow. To help us visualize what this could look like in a few different examples, here is a possible existing site next to a possible project on a typical half block, 300ft by 150ft. Low stands for limited office and is a medium intensity office district. Low sites today are limited to either three stories tall or 40ft in height. Under the dbi tod proposal, the low site would be entitled to 60 additional feet, bringing the total to about 100ft or either or about eight stories tall, which would more than double the housing than if we just allowed them the residential uses, but no additional height. The same impervious cover limits would apply, meaning that some of the site would still be reserved without a structure on it, and the building would be allowed to

[9:40:06 AM]

the building would be allowed to be closer to property lines than it otherwise would, which helps with an active, pedestrian oriented public realm. Importantly, the new building also includes approximately

150 homes near transit with 20 or more of those being income restricted units. Looking at a different base zone, here's another example with CSS, which is general commercial services, one of our more intense commercial Zones today, CSS properties today are limited to 60ft in height, with the bonuses of the db tod combining district a new development could be twice as tall as it would be today, adding 60ft for a total of 120ft in height, which is about ten stories. This means an estimated 250 homes could be accommodated in the new building, with 30 or more of those designated as income restricted for lower income families. The last example is on a multifamily six site. Mf six is the densest multifamily base zone. Our current code has, and it allows for 90 foot tall buildings today because because of the

[9:41:08 AM]

because because of the restriction of 120ft in total height, only 30 bonus feet would be available to an mf six project under this proposal. This allows for more than an estimated 275 homes to be built close to transit, with 30 or 40 or more of those being income restricted. Of course, individual sites will continue to have unique character sticks that limit their development based on their existing environmental and topography features, drainage requirements, etc. But these examples help show theoretical projects that could be built under the bonus program and how the overlay meets the direction given to staff to equitably support our transit system and our community for years to come. >> As I mentioned at the beginning of the presentation, there will be multiple opportunities for the public to learn more and provide input on these proposed code amendments, and to provide comments directly to planning commission and city council. Staff will host open

[9:42:09 AM]

council. Staff will host open houses on April 17th and April 20th, with two more potentially in the works. The planning commission will hold hearings on all of the code amendments on two dates on April 23rd. Planning commission will consider home phase two compatibility and electric vehicle charging on April 30th, the commission will consider the itod overlay, so it's important for the community to know that the package of code amendments will go to planning commission on two days, and then finally, the entire package will return to city council on may 16th. Folks can learn more about all of the proposed code amendments and to read materials like the staff reports and the draft ordinances themselves on our website at speakup. Austin all-glvc updates community members can also submit comments or questions to staff via the email and phone numbers you can see on the screen. Staff will be

[9:43:10 AM]

see on the screen. Staff will be compiling these comments for the planning commission and council to review, and we will respond to all questions as soon as we can, usually within a few days. This concludes

our presentation. Thank you very much for the time . >> Thank you. >> Andrew, I want to recognize the assistant city manager. But could you go back to the next to last slide just real quickly? Because I want to call attention to that, because that was in my. The one just before that that thank you. And I apologize for interrupting, but but, when I was laying out what we were going to do and what was going to happen today, that website that speak up Austin. Org slash ldc updates was not yet up on the site. If you look at at sun, it is now up on the site so that people will be able to access that information. And I just want to call attention to that. That and the email address ldc updates. And Austin, Texas dot gov where people can submit

[9:44:13 AM]

dot gov where people can submit comments and we hope that you'll take advantage of that. And as you look at it, I hope you don't do what I do. When I first glance at it, I see cupcakes and so it's ldc updates, not ld cupcakes. So thank you for going back to that. So sister city manager, we're going to change the website to be cupcakes. >> Yeah, I was going to echo that we will have the website on the screen for the duration of the meeting. If anybody would like to learn more, we encourage you to do so. We are working on solidifying a work session date and working with staff to find a date between now and may 14th. And I wanted to echo what Andrea said. We are looking at scheduling two additional open houses so we will have more information available on those open houses as they get scheduled. Thank you, Andrea for your presentation for all our staff. >> Yes, thanks to all the staff. And thank you, assistant city manager. So so, we're getting ready to start the hearing from the public, two things I want to call out. One is remember that if you're it's two minutes, and

[9:45:14 AM]

if you're it's two minutes, and if you're donating time or if you're receiving donated time, please check with the city clerk's office so that we can make sure that we get, get that for you and do it the right way. And the second is, we've not had any requests for interpretation, but we do have an interpreter that is present. So if there's someone here that wishes to have, an interpreter, please, again, go to the city clerk and work with them, and we'll make sure that you're accommodated in that regard. Although we haven't had any requests for that, we just want to make sure that you're accommodated if you need it. And with that, I will, we've already opened the public hearing, and I'll turn to the. I'm sorry, council member Alison alter, yeah, I did have a couple questions for staff, if I might, to clarify. >> Please come up so she can ask the questions. >> So as as someone who received both notifications. Burns, I'd like you to clarify the

[9:46:16 AM]



like you to clarify the interaction. If you are in the itod area or the dp. Tod, you are not accessing the bonus. How do the other phases of or the other parts of this land development code impact your property? Because I think it is confusing because there are two different parts, and I think people who are in those itod areas, may not understand that the home phase two and compatibility changes impact them as well. So could you please explain that? >> Absolutely. So if we are speaking to properties within the tod overlay general area, which is the half a mile on either side of the proposed light rail corridor and planned expansions, a single family property in that area would have received the itod overlay notice, because multifamily commercial industrial properties in that area are proposed to be

[9:47:19 AM]

in that area are proposed to be rezoned with these new combining districts. So property near them could be rezoned and have access to new development standards. In addition to that, folks should have received a purple postcard with general information about the other amendments that we are talking about today. So the package of amendments that we are talking about had two types of notice a purple postcard that went to all properties in the city and in itod specific notice that went to a specific geographic area. So if you live in the itod area, you will have also received a purple postcard. And that means that sf1, psf2 and psf3 properties either person's own property or those properties near them are being proposed to have a new minimum lot size of 2000ft S for one unit and associated site development standards to enable that development. So they could be one of those properties that

[9:48:20 AM]

one of those properties that would be impacted by the home phase two proposal. Compatibility changes are also citywide. Those are related. Those relate to single family properties near multifamily or commercial or higher density properties. And so if you live on a single family property in the itod general area, you could also be impacted by the compatibility changes. The commercial or multifamily properties near you could be allowed to be taller, closer to a single family home, and then finally, electric vehicle charging is also a citywide proposal that is zone based and roadway based, and so you may have eligible, commercial or industrial properties that could accommodate electric vehicle charging in the future. As one of their allowed land uses. Did that cover your question? >> Yeah, I just I just think it's really important that, people be clear on that if they're not used to the jargon of zoning, it can be very it can

[9:49:21 AM]

of zoning, it can be very it can be very confusing to understand how these, these different proposals are interplaying. The other question that I wanted to ask is, with the introduction of the flag lots, it was

mentioned in the presentation that they were designed to be, you know, wide enough for utilities, how are they addressing fire concerns? >> I would like to ask Laura to come up as the case manager, who may have had direct interaction with the fire department in the code development. >> Yes. Thank you. Laura Keating, project connect office, at the time of subdivision, each lot has to prove that it meets utility, driveway access and fire access, requirements. So so every case will be a little different. But when they come in for a subdivision, that's when fire can review. >> Okay. >> But we are changing the subdivision vision rules will I mean I just been looking at the

[9:50:23 AM]

mean I just been looking at the diagram. It doesn't look like a fire truck can fit down those roads. We have high wildfire risk in the areas. And I just, you know, I'm assuming that the fire department reviewed this, but I but I am going to get questions on this and I want to make sure that we have some clarity on how this plays out, and that we are not unwittingly creating additional fire dangers, which I'm hoping has already been vetted. But but I would be more comfortable having some answers. >> Yeah, we will make sure that fire is represented at the next meetings to answer specific questions. >> Thank you. >> Thank you. Council member, with that, I'll turn to the city clerk's office to help us navigate the public hearing. >> Okay, mayor, we'll begin with remote speakers. Caroline English. >> Hello? Can you hear me? >> Yes. >> Hi. My name is Catalina. I'm

[9:51:25 AM]

>> Hi. My name is Catalina. I'm part of district nine, and I'm just calling today, to express my support of home phase two. With the edit of it being lowered from 2000ft S to 1900 square feet, I'm also calling to express my support for the changes in compatibility. Compatibility in the Escott, I personally managed to live my life in Austin without a car, and that saved me a massive amount of money and this is in large part due to living close to a transit stop, and having higher density along the light rail corridor would give me personally more housing opportunities, to continue to live car free. And I think it would provide more options for other people who are car free, either through need or want, however, I do think the city needs to make a larger effort to prevent displacement within this corridor, for example, I think additional bonus incentives and resources should be provided for units that house individuals and

[9:52:26 AM]

units that house individuals and families existing in homelessness and prevent incentives for the redevelopment of apartment buildings. Currently housing low income tenants. Additionally, I think other anti-displacement measures should be implemented by the city in addition to land use reform, such as a sustainable and ongoing rental relief programs that provide relief directly to tenants rather than to the

landlords. Burns for Austin homeowners at the risk of displacement, financial assistance for homeowners to build a housing unit on their homestead, like the one proposed by congressman Vasquez for home page one legal counsel in estate planning for homeowners at risk of displacement, affirmative marketing program and right of return policies for those who have been displaced and affirmed. City commitment to complete the qt development currently in the pipeline, as well as ensuring that the spending of anti-displacement money for projects is thoughtful and in keeping with Eid commitment made to voters, thank

[9:53:28 AM]

commitment made to voters, thank you for your time. And I just want to thank community groups like Austin. Thank you. >> Speaker. Your time has expired perspective on our changes from the changes. >> Thank you. Speaker >> Next speaker is Paul Robbins. >> Good morning, council, can you hear me? >> Yes, yes. Hello >> Okay. Council at previous hearings, there were speakers in their 20s and 30s who supported the home ordinance because they thought it was the best chance at affordability. The sentiment I heard was, well, where is my place in this new Austin? I have researched the history of Austin's development in some depth, written about it, and lived here for over 50 years. I can authoritatively tell you the largest reason for Austin's housing affordability crisis has

[9:54:30 AM]

housing affordability crisis has nothing to do with urban density. It is the Austin chamber of commerce and its regional affiliates who have worked single mindedly and obsessively to attract people to the region. The chamber began to industrialize Austin in 1954, when it was a sleepy college town. 70 years later, according to census, it is the 10th largest city in the country, and it is about what kind of jobs they attracted. Here. The chamber chose to make Austin a, quote, silicon city, unquote, in the image of silicon valley. One of the most important characteristics of high tech centers is their high housing costs, reflecting the high income of its workers. If you have highly paid professionals competing for a limited supply of homes, who's going to win the bid on a home sale? A Stanford software engineer or a carpenter apprentice? The obvious retort

[9:55:33 AM]

apprentice? The obvious retort is skeptics is, well, are we supposed to build a wall? No but we don't have to make things worse with amphetamine growth. Thank you. >> Romelke Ives. >> Good morning. My name is Roig. I am speaking on behalf of evgo, one of the nation's largest public fast charging providers. I just want to thank the council, commissioners and staff for the great work that they've done, putting together the ev charging, code amendment, we strongly support the thoughtful

recommendations that staff put forward in the draft ordinance, to incorporate, charging as a primary use within the Idc, while still protecting key transit corridors, these larger primary use charging hubs are going to be critical to meeting growing charging demand

[9:56:34 AM]

meeting growing charging demand in the city, especially in areas where residents don't have access to home charging, we want to offer two main suggestions to strengthen the ordinance, while we understand the rationale behind restricting the use to six or less intensive, there are some zoning districts that would allow for new fossil fuel gas station and not a surface, not ev charging. So we'd recommend using the criteria for proximity and area of projects, in lieu of, some of the base zoning restrictions and expanding the conversion pathway from gas stations to also include, parking and other auto uses. So, thank you again to staff for their thoughtful approach to this ordinance. And, want to offer our support. Thank you. >> Linda Godinez. >> Mayor and council members,

[9:57:35 AM]

>> Mayor and council members, I'm here to share the following comments from the board of Roger woods neighborhood association on significant land development. Code changes are best formulated by involving the community in a collaborative process that seeks a working consensus. We regret that this council has followed a different path, effectively excluding the community from a meaningful role and decision making. As a result, the city's proposed amendments are out of touch with community members lived experiences and will produce real life consequences that will adversely impact neighborhoods across the city. We believe that compatibility and land use is a virtue, not a vice. The drastic reduction distances between tall buildings and homes creates incompatibility, so significant that it will destabilize many neighborhoods. The unilateral across the board code changes to lot size will allow more than three units on some larger lots will incentivize redevelopment and promote increases in property taxes, displacing those who cannot afford them. The transit districts extend well

[9:58:36 AM]

transit districts extend well beyond walkable distances and will arbitrarily increase density, but not ridership. For these reasons and others, we must oppose the code changes as proposed. We ask that you postpone action on the home initiative and instead incorporate phase one and two elements into a new zoning district, so that proposed higher density development can be considered on a case by case basis. We suggest creating a balanced and inclusive citizen task force to consider and create compatibility standards that have broad support across the community. Finally, we ask that you limit the size of proposed itot on our eastern border to a distance of a quarter mile by foot to the Guadalupe and

38th street rail station. >> Thank you. >> Next speaker is Barbara Macarthur. >> Hi. My name is Barbara Macarthur. >> I am privileged to be able to speak to you during a work day. First, the 2000 square foot lots

[9:59:38 AM]

First, the 2000 square foot lots and home to Austin will be the only large city in the U.S. To effectively rezone most single family housing into tiny lots, with the exception of the city of Houston inner loop area, where it only impacted areas without deed restrictions on lot sizes. Since Houston enforces them. The Kinder institute writes documents large reductions of low income people in these neighborhoods 40, and says these neighborhoods also illustrate how gentrification is much more than what is being built or who is moving in. It is also about what is being torn down and where compatibility in the backup material, you have a chart in your memo showing that Dallas allows a 90 foot building at 50ft. However, the city of Dallas compatibility ordinance says that it allows a building of 90ft at 271ft of distance, not 50ft. Itod your bulk of zoning over 1000 properties that staff say are in or touched by their half mile radius. Our geo

[10:00:41 AM]

their half mile radius. Our geo mapped a half mile station radius on your map and found a discrepancy in the distance you have mapped is actually 0.58 miles on each side. Fda regulations actually talk about station areas, not distances along the whole transit line. Also, for your information, I did the math and only less than 20% of the properties you're proposing to upzone are within a quarter mile radius of the stations that are proposed. This is a rush job without adequate input from the public and riddled with factual errors. It is also not planning. It is free market deregulation. >> Next speaker is Bruce Graner. >> Thank you for this opportunity to address city council and planning commission regarding the latest home two proposal and my concerns with its adoption. While I hear the intent of this ordinance, I do not believe it will accomplish

[10:01:41 AM]

not believe it will accomplish the stated objectives. Like many other Texas property owners living in areas designated for single family, my wife and I made a decision to purchase our home in the spicewood estates subdivision because it offered houses with backyards and trees, provided a safe place to live and play, and access to excellent schools. As Austin has grown, so has our neighborhood. We are a diverse neighborhood and the values which spicewood estates offered when we bought our home are the same reasons why our new neighbors purchased here as well. If we wanted to live in a more densely populated area, we would have done so. There are many neighborhoods across Austin just like ours,

whether in north or south Austin. They were built for suburban living. They have similar character sticks. There are many miles from downtown with little or no access to public transit, no shopping within a walkable distance, and require a car for professional services to either or and a car to either get to work, go to houses of worship, or visit

[10:02:42 AM]

houses of worship, or visit friends in other parts of the city. It's fanciful to think that significantly increasing the density of outlying neighborhoods will eliminate the need for personal transportation before any further changes are made to allow smaller lots and taller structures and sf neighborhoods. There are several questions which need to be answered. How does more impervious cover and fewer trees impact the environment? What's the impact to schools? The capacity of our infrastructure and emergency services? What is the impact to subdivision streets which weren't designed for greater density? Now that on premise parking is no longer required, will these streets even be passable with vehicles parked on both sides of the street, resulting in less safe biking, walking and playing? If the goal is to provide higher density with access to public services and transit. >> Thank you. Speaker. Your time has expired. >> New neighborhoods. >> David Fouts. >> Hi, my name is David Fouts. I

[10:03:45 AM]

>> Hi, my name is David Fouts. I live in district two, which I have the honor of representing on the zoning and planning commission. I support Ed compatibility reform and home phase two because they will make Austin housing more abundant and affordable and mitigate the unsustainable urban sprawl we face now, and also contribute to a better quality of life. However, I do urge the council to adopt an amendment to change the minimum lot size from 2000ft S to 1900 square feet in home phase two. This will allow a 5750 square foot lot to be divided into three lots, as was the intention in home phase one. I also want to address the idea that home two is a giveaway to corporate developers. This is simply not true. According to KOBi Lefkowitz, an expert in development finance, large institutional development developers are uninterested in these small projects. They are really the purview of local, small and medium sized home

[10:04:46 AM]

small and medium sized home builders that have ties to the community. Thank you so much for your bold steps in affordability. >> Next speaker is Jessica Lehman. >> Good morning. This is Jessica Lemmon, senior associate state director of outreach and advocacy for aarp Texas. I'm speaking in support of home phase two in equitable transit oriented development. Aarp believes this will create a more livable Austin, enabling people to age independently in their community by allowing smaller lots. Home phase

two has the potential to both increase housing throughout the city and provide homeowners with options that allow them to remain in their neighborhoods, giving homeowners the option to sell a portion of their land. They can achieve the financial stability they need later in life without having to leave their community and lose the important connections they've created throughout their life. While this option will not make sense for everybody and they don't have to take it, it should be there for those who need it.

[10:05:47 AM]

there for those who need it. Also, allowing more than, not just more housing, but more affordable housing near the city's transit corridors means more people can access the transit who need it, reducing car dependency not only means fewer carbon emissions than it means those that cannot drive a car, due to a variety of factors can still access everything they need to remain independent in their community throughout their lifespan, and can participate fully in the civic, economic, and social life of Austin. We know that transit oriented development is often a victim of its own success, pricing out those who need it most, so ensuring housing options that are affordable to low and moderate income households, including older adults, is what makes it equity in Austin. Thank you. >> Nyika Arnold. Naika. Please unmute. Next speaker is Michael curry.

[10:06:48 AM]

speaker is Michael curry. >> My name is Michael curry. I questioned the timing purpose of this hearing. The staff prepared an impressive number of memos and ordinances, maps and supporting documents covering the three code changes before you today. But no one can honestly believe that the typical member of the public with a job, and possibly a family, has been given adequate time to review and process the written information to provide meaningful impact on these complicated ordinances is a mere ten days after the notice arrived in the mail, and ten days is the minimum time required for even the simplest zoning case. Each of these ordinances is make broad changes that will alter the fabric of neighborhoods across the city, upend families expectations, and ignored neighborhood planning compacts. The city has previously made. Yet this council is rushing them at a

[10:07:49 AM]

council is rushing them at a pace that ensures mistakes, misjudgments and misunderstandings. For example, one council member explained to her constituents in her April 3rd newsletter that with these amendments, the city is proposing, quote, adjustments to compatible standards on corridors. Close quote. Yet the compatibility reductions proposed by staff are not limited to corridors. This is a monumental disconnect along two dimensions. Obviously, it would be a mistake to extend extreme

compatibility reductions to properties not located on a corridor, and that mistake is compounded when applied to purely commercial zoning that has nothing to do with housing capacity, and was granted with the understanding that compatibility standards would apply. Again, this is but one example of an error in judgment or execution caused by time pressures and a lack of community engagement. Instead of rushing sweeping zoning changes to adoption, they should be vetted through community collaboration and consensus building and create new

[10:08:49 AM]

building and create new districts to allow consideration on a case by case basis. Thank you. >> Lucia aba. >> Hi, my name is Lucia aba. >> I'm a district five resident and I'm against the amendments to the Idc related to density bonuses along the light rail home phase two and changes to compatibility standards. I understand that a software program applied to half mile buffer around the rail system, but that just means the density program can apply to places not near a bus stop. As someone who does not own a car and relies on public transit, a half mile is a misleading benchmark for many people. It would take them more than a half mile to reach their stop, and for most people, a half mile walk is too far. Traffic, a lack of sidewalks, heat and other factors make it dangerous to navigate certain sections of Austin. When we envision what is equitable, we have to keep in mind the needs of many, allowing a density

[10:09:49 AM]

of many, allowing a density bonus among along the entire light rail is going to negatively impact people and businesses along that path who can't keep up. Once the value of land begins to increase, this means more displacement and increased housing costs. I understand that you opt into the density bonus, but it sounds like this would allow for someone to significantly redevelop their property, and that would greatly impact their neighbors who choose not to redevelop the density applied. The density bonus applied to the tod sounds like a precursor condition for gentrification. I urge you all to reconsider how such a blanket solution could be equitable. I urge you to postpone your vote. >> Nyika Arnold. >> Hello, my name is Nico Arnold . I am the executive director of the healing project and I am a born and raised austinite. And I am here to demand that you postpone the vote for public input and real solutions. And vote no on home. These plans

[10:10:49 AM]

vote no on home. These plans will only accelerate displacement of low income bipoc homeowners and renters by driving up property taxes, rent, and incentives for developers to take over our neighborhoods. By demolishing affordable housing. These plans will not improve affordability for Austin and low income homeowners and renters impacted by the housing affordability crisis, displacement,



and homelessness. These plans are systematically racist, low income bipoc neighborhoods will be targeted first by developers because land is cheaper in the eastern crescent, given higher profit margins, all of these policies will drive up housing costs, making the housing affordability crisis worse for everyone. These developers are trying to build a new city and make Austin their example and we will not be affected. We are demanding our postpone this vote and engage more with the community and stop making decisions for us, because we are the ones that are sleeping on the streets. We are the ones that are applying this band aid for surgery. We are the

[10:11:50 AM]

band aid for surgery. We are the ones that are getting rental assistance, which really is not sustainable. And the city of Austin may not be able to fund the rental assistance programs anymore. We're living on the streets. The city of Austin is not helping us, especially with these echo home coordinated assessments that six months to a year, even when you're living on the streets, we have mothers, children, fathers, families living in tents, sleeping on the benches, the shelters are overpopulated. There's lack of resources when it comes to housing. And I wonder why we have a housing crisis in the because there's no resources. We need more resources. We are demanding more resources. Postpone the vote until y'all can benefit Austin natives. I've been here for 31 years. My ears a whole community named after my ancestors. And I don't profit. I'm still struggling. I'm affected by the Dion. >> Thank you. Speaker. Your time has expired. I won't be able to UT anymore. >> What are y'all going to do for us? We are. >> Elizabeth Cifuentes. >> Hi. I'm a district ten. I'm a

[10:12:54 AM]

>> Hi. I'm a district ten. I'm a 65 year old native. Austinites I'm trying to build a tiny home in my son's backyard so that I can grow old in a new home. Initiative would make a difference with building my tiny home. After speaking and meeting with different individuals with the city of Austin and trying to fill out the application online, I was told there is no difference. Building a tiny home has the same requirements as a large home. The process has been very challenging and difficult for me. If I was wealthy or a developer, I could hire companies to do the process for me, but I am not. I would like to use the high quality storage shed, which would have hardiplank siding. I would like to hire a small business, small sms construction owned by Santiago. I've been using Santiago for other jobs in my home, but the requirements are very constricting. I was told I need a licensed architect and licensed engineer. Hiring a

[10:13:54 AM]

licensed engineer. Hiring a large contractor to do this would cost over \$125,000. How is this affordable housing doing it my way? By buying the storage shed and having Santiago assist me would be about

\$50,000. I heard that there may be some financial assistance coming soon. I hope this is the case and if it is based on income, I hope you consider this the cost of living in Austin has risen. I am now considered low income. Thank you for your time. >> Next speaker is James Janis. >> Hi, this is James, this isn't the meeting I wanted to speak into, but because it doesn't concern the planning commission, that's going on right now, it's a different issue that I'd like to address the city council with. So should I get back with

[10:14:56 AM]

with. So should I get back with the city clerk and find out what's going on? >> Yes. If this is not the, meeting that you intended to speak at, please get with the city clerk's office so that you can coordinate and be able to speak either to the planning commission or the council at the meeting that you, that would be more relevant. >> Yeah. I want to yeah, I want to speak directly to the city council about a city issue that has nothing to do with this meeting. Then please. Then then then please. >> Yeah. >> Okay. >> That'd be great. Thank you. Sir >> Dan keshet. >> Hello, this is Dan keshet from district six. I am speaking today in favor of this proposal in favor of all of the proposals, what I really want to talk about is that, first of all, our efforts at building new housing and seeing it make it more affordable have been

[10:15:57 AM]

more affordable have been working, we have seen statistics that a Austin is leading the nation in a the over the last year or so in bringing rents down where the rest of the nation has seen rents continue to climb. But we're also seeing that we're starting to hit against some limits. Projects that would have, that would have gone forward are starting to pull back or slow down a little bit because the projected rents are lower. And what that means is that we need to keep going and keep addressing the challenges that are preventing lower cost developments from going forward. So we need to do things like allowing smaller houses, allowing smaller lot houses, building a close to high amenity areas that will, that people will be able to pay more rent because maybe they can go without a car. And so I think that now, now, you know, we're

[10:16:59 AM]

that now, now, you know, we're seeing the effect. It's positive. But now is not the time to give up. We have to keep moving forward. Thank you. >> Next speaker is Hayden black walker. Hayden, please unmute . >> I apologize, I hit the wrong button. Good morning, mayor, council and commissioners. My name is Hayden black walker. My family's been in Austin for multiple generations. Thank you for considering these updates to our land development code. I've seen firsthand whether you're trying to find a place to live like my young adult children, or starting to think about how to age in place like David and I are, that we all need a variety of affordable housing choices for different stages of life. I'm excited

to see these moves toward more walkable, transit friendly communities with increased housing choices. So I'm here to support these

[10:18:00 AM]

I'm here to support these changes before you today. Thank you very much. >> Our June Chandrasekhar. Hi. Can everyone hear me? >> Yes, yes, yes, hello. >> Please go ahead. >> Hi, my name is Arjun Chandrasekhar, I live in district seven. I want to start by thanking everyone on the city council for all the hard work they do every single day. I'm calling to speak in favor of the proposed zoning changes. Not only do we need to encourage density to maximize the positive effects of our public transit improvements, but we need to encourage density to combat our unsustainable levels of urban sprawl. And furthermore, like a previous speaker said, every single study on the topic shows that building more housing will reduce the housing costs for everybody. Increasing supply is the best way out of our housing crisis, and this proposal will encourage denser housing. I also would like to take my time now to encourage the city council to take a look at what is happening

[10:19:01 AM]

take a look at what is happening in the city of Detroit, in Detroit, they are working to implement a split rate property tax in which the land value will be taxed at a higher rate and building improvements will be taxed at a lower rate. This will effectively shift the tax burden onto land speculators in a way from honest homeowners. Right now, land speculators can hoard vacant land and profit off of community growth while preventing us from making building improvements. And we need to tax those people. And going back to what another person said, I think this would address her concerns. I believe that if we implement a split rate property tax, it will naturally encourage denser housing around our urban core and synergize greatly with all the proposed amendment changes. Thank you for your time. >> Lydia zisman. >> Hi, my name is Lydia zisman. I live in district nine. I'm not going to speak too much on the home amendment today, because I think it was most most of this was covered last time. I did

[10:20:03 AM]

was covered last time. I did want to say that it's deplorable the way the city has shut out communities, shut out the neighborhood associations, shut out all the various organizations that want a voice at the table in favor of the developers in favor of the bigger interests. Why are we rushing this? Why is it so hard for the city to sit down and give a voice to the table? To those of us who have a different opinion, whether you go that way or not, in the long run, why is it being shoved down our throats? Why are we giving the minimum possible notice? I also did want to say that I do support the electronic vehicle amendment. Thank you for your time. >> Angel Maya varpu. >> Hi, my name is Neil, I would like to

speak in favor of the measure. Many of the arguments I'm hearing are reminiscent of the ones that were made against

[10:21:04 AM]

the ones that were made against development in San Francisco. And what I saw when I was there in the 90s was a very vibrant community that was filled with artists and people from many walks of life, getting displaced, I really love Austin, and I think that the only way out of the housing crisis and this is what study after study shows, is to enable building, the delays, against the measure are going to end up hurting, some of the people who are fighting against it, in my view, it's going to retard, growth. And I think it's not good for anybody, including, new efforts. I just heard from the Dean of the medical school. She's got amazing plans for developing the medical system here. And one of

[10:22:06 AM]

medical system here. And one of the main concerns in the crowd there was how they would attract the talent that they're hoping to, with, the increasing housing costs. So this is a concern for everybody. I think it's going to affect the entire community and building is our way out of it. Thank you very much for your time. >> Aiden Abraham. >> Hi. My name is Aiden Abraham. And I'm from district nine. I'm speaking in favor of home phase two and related policies. When I'm finished with college, I need to find a job. I'm not completely sure where I will live, but I would like to keep Austin as an option because I like this city. However, the only way this can happen is if housing is affordable in this city. The only way we can make housing affordable enough for people like me to live in Austin is if we build enough supply, as well as the type of housing

[10:23:07 AM]

well as the type of housing which is more affordable. Implementing the minimum lot size reduction and related policies will do just that. After Houston reduced its lot size to 1400 square feet, it sparked large amounts of townhome construction as well as small lot size construction, which substantially increased the supply of housing, putting downward pressure on rents and housing costs. The townhomes, which were built, also provided cheaper options than what was initially offered. Because of this, Houston has remained affordable despite adding so many new people to the city. It has also kept its current residents safe from being displaced. If we want people to experience the city of Austin and contribute to it without having to move out of it because of high housing costs, we must support phase two of the home initiative. Thank you. >> Duane reade. >> Oh, I beg you, vote no on

[10:24:12 AM]

>> Oh, I beg you, vote no on home two. The topic of urban density is often presented as a solution to housing affordability. Yet in reality, these initiatives often achieve the opposite. Exacerbating these very issues they aim to solve. Consider the irony that city initiatives designed to make cities more affordable are inflating place prices out of the reach of the average citizen. The construction of a triplex where a 500,000 house once stood when selling each of the units for 400,000, seems like a step towards affordability. But this is a mirage. The next sale sets a new benchmark, which offers exceeding 500,000 as developers anticipate hefty profits. This cycle dries up land values, taxes and cost, creating an upward spiral to unaffordability. It always has. And please pretend. Please don't pretend that you don't know this. The three densest U.S. Cities, new

[10:25:13 AM]

three densest U.S. Cities, new York, San Francisco, Boston are definitely not affordable. The average residents earn higher wages than the average American, yet pay at a minimum ten times their wages to afford a home. The average for the rest of the us is around 3 to 4. The quality of life is compromised. The cities become a homogenous landscape of similar housing types, devoid of character. The environment suffers under the strain of increased density, with green spaces giving way to concrete or other housing, this is geared towards yuppies who want to impose their ideals on everyone else, not everyone wants to live in a multi-story condo. Is a construction worker supposed to lug up their their paint up two flights of stairs? Are they supposed to ride their bike or get on a train with an eight foot two by four when they're going to their job? Economic divides widen as the city sells its souls to developers, sidelining the citizens it's meant to serve. A speaker just talks about this.

[10:26:14 AM]

speaker just talks about this. Thank you. >> Speaker. Your time has expired. Rob Snyder. >> Good morning, I'm rob Schneider, I'm a volunteer with aarp Texas and a member of the state executive council. I'm also a resident of district five, speaking in support of the home two proposal. When we ask people where they want to live as they age by wide margins, they indicate they want to remain in their communities and ideally in their homes. We also know that for most people, as they age, they will need some form of caregiving, whether that be assistance with getting groceries or managing their finances, or more substantial assistance. For some, their only option may be away from their homes in a facility, but for many people, a more affordable and preferred option is to remain in their homes and receive help, receive help from loved ones. When aarp spoke in

[10:27:15 AM]

loved ones. When aarp spoke in favor of the first home proposals, it was because they provided people with new options to stay in their homes or their communities as they age. By giving them the opportunity to move themselves, a family member or a caretaker into an Adu, or bring in resources to support themselves by renting out a unit that they built on their property. This new home two proposal offers another option for a person who still who owns their home to sell a portion of their property and still remain living in their home, providing them with resources they may need to support their own caregiving needs as they age and still remain in their homes. It's important for homeowners of all incomes to be able to take advantage of the provisions of the home proposals, for example, to have opportunities for lower cost financing to take advantage of the program, and to have protections against unscrupulous practices in the market if they develop. In that regard, we would urge you to request

[10:28:17 AM]

would urge you to request regular reporting from staff, including quickly identifying any problems that emerge among lower income and older homeowners. Thank you. >> Next speaker is Minami krems. >> Good morning. My name is Minami crumbs and I'm a resident of district nine. I'm a student at UT Austin and the campus director of the university Democrats. I would like to express my support for the Eckhardt overlay and the proposed changes to the compatibility standards, but would also like to thank the Austin city council for the efforts to address affordable housing affordability and transportation to issues that greatly impact students. The university only has a little over 8000 spaces in the dorms, which means that the vast majority of UT students have to find private housing in the west campus neighborhood. Because of the housing shortage, and west campus students must compete with each other, each other to find the best rates as soon as September for the school year that starts the next August,

[10:29:17 AM]

that starts the next August, developers and landlords know that students are desperate to find affordable housing and profit off students will found fears that they may not find affordable or livable accommodations. Poor property management is also rampant in west campus. It is not uncommon for landlords to kick out students in the middle of the semester for renovations and leave their apartment in an unlivable state. Pests mold, and breakages are also common in west campus, which all disrupt student lives and their ability to learn. The initiatives being considered today by the council will provide students with more options and hopefully improve living conditions in west campus . Because the current supply of housing is lower than the demand for it, students have to settle for paying high rents while also being neglected and mistreated by the same developers and landlords that they pay rent to. The amendments being considered will help expand the supply of housing, which will hopefully lower

the cost of living and ensure that developers must do the bare minimum of keeping the properties they own habitable. Thank you for giving me the

[10:30:17 AM]

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today, and I hope that you will support the proposed initiatives. >> Jenny Grayson. Jenny, please unmute. Neil. Isko. >> On my street. I'm west of camp Mabry and on many streets throughout older Austin. The water mains aren't able to provide the minimum flow required by the fire code. You wouldn't allow this in a new development. Would any of you vote to approve a new development whose water mains couldn't provide enough water to put out a single house fire? Of course you wouldn't. That would be crazy. And that's exactly what you'll be doing if you approve this. I'm all for affordable housing, and I am for density in areas that can support it. But throughout

[10:31:18 AM]

support it. But throughout Austin, you have a number of substandard fire hydrant flows that have not been addressed. Will not be addressed, and these areas do not support increased density, increasing density in areas that don't have the water, sewage, or electrical infrastructure in place would be a terrible mistake. It's delusional to think that that will lower prices because the ultimate. Ultimately, you've got to repair the infrastructure and you've got to increase the infrastructure in order to support houses. Simply decreeing that all of Austin can suddenly have density is fantasy. Critical thinking that I hope that you will address. This is not a one size fits all solution. The current proposal on the table, it just does not make any sense. It's not economic. It cannot work. Thank you. >> Jenny Grayson. Jenny, please unmute. We will try to reconnect

[10:32:24 AM]

unmute. We will try to reconnect with Jenny, but that concludes all of the, in I mean, remote speakers. So we will move to in-person Ann. >> Before you begin, let me remind everyone that if, your name is called, she'll probably call them in three at a time or something like that. And as your name is called, if you'll make your way to the front and take one of these seats, and then if there's an open microphone, just please come to the microphone state your name for the record so that we'll have that on the record. And then proceed. And then we have the two podiums there so that you can alternate between the podiums. >> The first speaker is bill mccamley. On deck is Kai Harkey with Valerie Maynard on deck. >> Thank you, Mr. Mayor. >> Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Mr.

[10:33:27 AM]

>> Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Mr. Chair, my name is bill mccamley. I'm with transit Ford. One. >> Well, that that was working. It's just I'm not sure it's turned up enough. So if, we can let let's experiment with it and make sure it's moderated. >> Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the city council. Okay, now we got. All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Mayor, bill mccamley with transit Ford. We're in Austin. 500 and 1c3 with a mission of education engagement regarding transit, with a specific focus on project connect and the. These types of changes are important for two reasons. The most direct reason is because the Austin transit partnership is going to be going very soon to the federal government and asking for billions of dollars to help complete light rail. The amount they're probably going to be asking for might be actually the biggest allocation by the federal government, dollar wise, in the history of Texas for infrastructure. And one of the things that they asked for in this competitive process is for land use reform. The federal the federal government knows that

[10:34:29 AM]

federal government knows that more transit near more bus or, excuse me, more transit, near more housing allows for more affordability, allows for a greener country because we're not greenhouse gases emissions down and allows for more safety. And so it's really important that along with the things you've already done, the home one, getting the density bonus things done, the parking requirements, these things will allow them to make a really good argument and put us in a very competitively advantageous place to help get this money from the feds to help us get a really needed light rail line. But the second reason is to kind of talk about some of the stuff that folks have already mentioned. You've got unions that are backing this because their workers need it. You've got students backing it because they want to have a chance to stay here in Austin, like generations before that came to UT and stuck around. You've got the aarp asking for this because, yeah, retirees want to live affordably here as well, making this work is a good thing for all of us, Mr. Chair. Mr. Mayor, last thing, thank you all very much for putting the time on this today. No, this is really,

[10:35:29 AM]

today. No, this is really, really tough, but we appreciate so much the effort, the amount of listening and the progress that's being shown here today. Thank you all very much for your time. Good luck with the rest of your day. >> Mayor. We have miss Grayson back online, so we will call Jenny Grayson and then we'll proceed with in person. >> Thank you. >> Jenny, please proceed. Okay. We're not able to connect. >> Please come. >> Go ahead and come forward. >> Good morning. Mayor. >> Good morning. >> Mayor. Council commissioners. >> My name is Kai Harkey. I spent the last 12 years working with the Texas parks and wildlife department, I today I own a small business where I help local, state and national park



service and the audubon society as we teach the next generation of conservationists to care about our natural places and to protect parks. I studied environmental resource

[10:36:31 AM]

environmental resource management right here at the university of Texas in Austin, and my path as an Austin native and a lifelong conservationist began as a tiny little boy scout growing up in the allendale neighborhood. Good. And they taught us the leave no trace principles. And bear with me for a second. Think about we go to a campsite and you're putting your tent up. They taught us not to put our tent on the outskirts of the campsite where we have native prairie. We have pollinator habitat, we have bluebonnets, but rather to put your tent in the area that's already been developed upon in the center of that campsite. As a conservationist and native austinite, I support the changes to the land development code today. They will allow for more compact and sustainable development in central Austin. Smaller lots, smaller units and transit oriented density is good for conservation and sustainability. I believe Austin's growth is inevitable and we have a choice of where that growth is going and the

[10:37:32 AM]

that growth is going and the existing land development code pushes that growth to the outskirts, where we have less than 1% of native prairie remaining in Texas. I want to keep wild places wild. We need to make changes to the land development code to do that. I can spend my time dreaming about the Austin that I grew up in, but I prefer to spend my time dreaming about the future of Austin, where my friends and my future children can afford to live still, and they still have green, open spaces in the outskirts of Austin to visit. Thank you for your time today. >> Valerie Menard on deck is Adrian Macias and Megan Ramos. >> Good afternoon, mayor, council members and planning commissioners, my name is Valerie Menard, and I'm the project director for Boulder's Colorado river conservancy. I'm a voter and a homeowner in district one. The presentation I'm going to give may look familiar to council. I believe

[10:38:34 AM]

familiar to council. I believe it bears repeating. Today I want to talk about gentrification, which is the antithesis of affordable housing and which both phases of home will escalate, forcing working class homeowners to become renters and unhoused. Ed, let's start with the 1928 master plan that segregated east and west Austin, placing communities of color next to polluting industries on the east side. Decades later, west Austin was designated as the watershed protection zone, while east Austin became the desired development zone. This led to a disinvest in east Austin into cheaper land that developers, investors, and investors now want to develop for massive profits homes, affordable housing, bonuses are weak and inadequate, so to claim that it will increase affordability is illogical and untrue. This is how

gentrification happens. You start with the history of disinvestment in the eastern crescent that creates low land costs that that equal higher profit margins for developers,

[10:39:34 AM]

profit margins for developers, followed by deregulation of the market, including upzoning policies like home and building market rate. Luxury housing in the eastern crescent destroys low income homes and drives up property taxes. When deregulation happens, there is an increased potential for profit margins and that an increased risk of displacing city councils passing a policy to let investors and developers build market rate luxury housing, displacing our black and brown communities, and policies like home accelerate gentrification. And we've seen it happen in east Austin, where affordable single family housing used to exist. Home will deny working class austinites a sense of security. The dream of home ownership and a chance for upward mobility for themselves and their children. Thank you. >> Adrian Macias, Megan Ramos and Carlos Carlos pinion sorry. >> Good morning, mayor and city council members. My name is Adrian Macias. I'm the youth

[10:40:35 AM]

Adrian Macias. I'm the youth coordinator for porta. With the passing of phase one of home, my city council representative and many other members have disappointed the Austin community. I'm more disappointed in the fact that a scheduled public hearing was set today, April the 11th. Given the community no time to share any meaningful thoughts or opinions on the matter, you are silently seeing us day by day and making the lives of the next generation of youth harder than it needs to. As a youth coordinator, and seeing the youth on a regular basis haunts me to know that the city they were born and raised in is no longer affordable. That they would have to move because our mayor and city council represent failed us and showed there is no future for Austin, for the generations to come. You have failed us and that is why you gave us no time to speak on this matter. You rushed us because none of y'all cared about the community of Austin, as I do believe you put profit over the people of Austin. So please, I am asking. The youth are asking and the people behind me are asking to not pass phase two or at least give us more time to show the community that

[10:41:36 AM]

time to show the community that you do care and that you show that we can trust you guys. Understand? Thank you mayor, and thank you city council. >> Megan Ramos, Carlos pinion. Good morning, council members, planning commission and mayor Kirk Watson. I'm Megan Ramos, a UT undergraduate student and resident of district nine. It's wonderful to be here again, to speak on this important issue and express my support towards the home initiative. As a young person in Austin, some

of y'all have already asked, what stake do I hold in this situation? Well, I live here and I vote here, so that and I am here, and I will keep coming here to emphasize the importance of having young voices heard in these conversations. I'll keep this short and sweet. I am one of many students in Austin who want to continue studying and living here, and financial barriers like unaffordable housing are continuing to drive us. Not just us, but current

[10:42:36 AM]

us. Not just us, but current residents as well. Out and further from the city. Our friends having to move further away from west campus, and friends who have to commute from their hometowns who aren't able to move closer to west campus because of the unaffordable rent. Considering what's on the table, all the reduction of the minimum lot size, the density bonus program, and the relaxation of zoning regulations for properties within phase one's project connect will benefit the present and future residents of Austin. This housing crisis is displacing longtime residents and pushing away future ones. Whether you like it or not, Austin is growing, so we must accommodate for this change. This impacts everyone's ability to own a home here one day, and I hope we can move in the right direction towards a more affordable and sustainable Austin. Thank you. >> Carlos finally on deck are alexia Leclerc and kymberley Levinson, good morning, commissioners and council members. My name is Carlos pinion, and I'm a renter in district five and work primarily in district three as a program coordinator at poder, an

[10:43:38 AM]

coordinator at poder, an organizing with poder community powered atx and the working class communities of color that home will inevitably force out of Austin. I've become familiar with the city's long standing history of systemic displacement of communities of color, specifically in the eastern crescent from the 1928 master plan and redlining to smart growth and codenext. The mechanisms that underlie these exclusionary planning policies have surfaced again through the home initiative. It is disheartening to watch the city not even attempt the bare minimum gesture of acknowledging its past, but to instead forgo history altogether and add to this, this disturbing legacy that you've passed home. Phase one. The question remains how will it create opportunities for low and middle income austinites? You've heard this over and over and will continue to hear it. Market rate housing only produces housing for wealthy buyers and investors, accelerating gentrification and displacement of low income homeowners and renters of color by driving up property taxes and rent, while creating incentives for developers to take over our neighborhoods. I'd really like to know why are you rushing these changes? It's only been four months since council voted on phase one, and one would think that such upheavals to the

[10:44:39 AM]

think that such upheavals to the entire city's land development code should take more time, more documentation, more community input. The fact that this is already up for another vote next month tells me that you aren't doing your due diligence to consider the implications that your decisions will have on Austin's communities, particularly residents in the eastern crescent, where, you know, profit margins are the highest, where, you know, developers will demolish existing affordable housing first to build ice or luxury apartments and townhomes. As you know well that three hearings and two open houses are insufficient under the scale of these code changes and won't reach those who will be most impacted. Are you interested in giving this community a say, or is this all just a performance for us to all play into? I'm definitely repeating myself from when I spoke at council last December, but it feels like nothing. Not the rallies, not the one on one meetings, not the hundreds of people who took time out of their workdays to speak against home and showed up in more numbers than those, for it has been instructive to you. I ask again, please reconsider your stance on home as we approach the hearings on phase two this month and next. You shouldn't be beholden to the developers who see. >> Alexia Leclerc on deck is kymberley Levinson and Isabel

[10:45:40 AM]

kymberley Levinson and Isabel Webb. Kerri. >> Hello, my name is alexia and I'm here to express my strong opposition to home phase two. The thing is, I'm not quite sure what to say anymore because everyone loves a good speech about equity or justice or Progressive change, but no one seems to actually listen to black and brown community members that are directly impacted by the issues. Last year, those residents took time off from work to come to city council to testify. They poured their souls out, telling very personal stories of how their homes were torn down to build airbnbs, or how luxury building and market rate apartments came into their neighborhoods and led to the displacement of black and brown residents. But y'all didn't listen. Professors and researchers from UT have proved time and time again that trickle down housing economics simply does not work. Building more luxury housing will not lead to affordability for middle and low income families. City council members from Raleigh has showed

[10:46:40 AM]

members from Raleigh has showed how similar policies displace black communities over there, and case studies from Minnesota and Berkeley also show our point. But y'all did not listen. Community experts have also shown up with the real solutions. We've asked for 50% 30% mi5 apartments to be built that are actually affordable. We've asked for community land trusts and all other things. The people's plan was never implemented, and our alternative proposal, which had an overlay to protect east Austin and to make it more affordable for low income and middle income folks to build ads, was also not considered. Y'all did not listen. Now, if there's an award for listening to developers, tech billionaires, or

yimbys, y'all could win. But listening to directly impacted black and brown community members that are from east Austin, I hope that y'all eventually gain that skill. Thank you. >> Kymberley Levinson on deck is Isabel Webb, Carrie and Miriam

[10:47:40 AM]

Isabel Webb, Carrie and Miriam Schoenfeld. >> Good afternoon. My name is kymberley Levinson. I'm a member of the downtown Austin neighborhood association. I live in district nine, and I'm here to speak in support of these, except with one caveat. I do think that we should consider in the lot sizes going down to 1900 square feet or less, because that would allow for three lots to be divided instead of just two. I think that the itod and the corridors and the compatibilities are some of the most important reforms that Austin could possibly take place right now. It will enable so many more people to ride transit. It will enable so much more urban infill, which will mitigate climate change, and it will mitigate traffic and pollution, asthma impacts so many people who live in densely trafficked cities. And the more people you can get out of their cars and onto busses and trains,

[10:48:41 AM]

cars and onto busses and trains, the better. So for the health of the community and for affordability, I urge you to apply all of these. But going down to 1900. >> Good morning y'all. How are y'all doing, my name is Isabel beccari and I am a senior at UT Austin. And first of all, just want to say thank you so much for being here today, so I'm graduating and I'm looking for a place to live. And on my laptop, I have two windows pulled up, I have zillow, and I have the Austin bus map, and I'm finding that the stops and the homes that I can afford are 45 minutes from a bus station. And the homes that I see near bus stations. Well, let's just say they're out of my budget as a graduating liberal law student. So I'm asking you on behalf of all graduates at UT who are graduating, maybe they want to be teachers. Maybe they want to be healthcare professionals. They want to serve their community. I'm asking you to give them options. And with

[10:49:42 AM]

give them options. And with options, that just means freedom. And it's something that, well, as the accent indicates, I'm not from here, but I've come to appreciate is a value held upheld in the united States, so I'm asking you for choices. And this plan isn't perfect, I'll say that. But but this is progress, and we can't make perfect the enemy of the good. And thank you so much for being here. >> Miriam Schoenfeld with Ty Bianchi and Miranda best campos on deck. >> Good morning, city council members. Good morning, commissioners. My name is Miriam Schoenfeld. I'm from district nine. Speaking on behalf of myself. Before I tell you why, I'm really enthusiastic about the proposals today, I just want to

add that I would love to see these policies coming alongside a list of proposals that were recently put forward by the Austin justice coalition, so that the community really sees a holistic housing package that also includes provisions for the

[10:50:43 AM]

also includes provisions for the people most directly and acutely impacted by the housing crisis, including our unhoused neighbors. So there are many reasons to be excited about these proposals, but I'm going to speak to the one that's impacted me the most personally, which is that we really need policies like this to make transit work, and we need transit to work so that every austinite has access to what they need, and every austinite can get to the places they need. So when I lived in Austin for a number of years after an injury which made it impossible for me to drive or ride a bike, so everywhere I needed to go, I had to get to by walking or public transit. And it was very, very difficult to live here, to name just one example, in order to get to my physical therapy appointments, I had to take the bulk of a day off of work because of how difficult it was to use transit, at a certain point, I left Austin for a number of years and lived in a place that was well served by transit and it was night and day. Suddenly, the world became accessible to me. Now my story

[10:51:44 AM]

accessible to me. Now my story is not idiosyncratic. There are many, many people who don't, for one reason or another, have access to a car. Kids can't drive. Many elderly people can't drive. As we heard from the aarp earlier today, blind people can't drive. People hard of hearing, can't drive people with certain cognitive disabilities, can't drive people that can't afford a car, can't drive. I could go on and on. It is so marvelous that we have so many provisions in place for people who are not able to walk, but can drive. We have handicapped parking everywhere so that those people can access what they need. It's time that we start building and supporting infrastructure that assures that people who can't drive can also have access. >> Thank you. Ty havank Miranda de campos, David Sullivan on deck. >> Hi, I'm Ty jovanka, a homeowner in district five, specifically in zilker. I'm fortunate enough to live in an old condo near south Lamar where I can take the bus into downtown like I did this morning. >> I love that it allows me to live a car lite lifestyle. Being

[10:52:46 AM]

live a car lite lifestyle. Being able to walk to nearby restaurants, coffee shops and stores gives me exercise and brings me joy. This is something I want more austinites to have access to, the ability to easily walk to the light rail or bus stop and access other parts of the city and the ability to walk to amenities just outside their door. Every trip that is made without a car is one less car in traffic, polluting

our air. It also means that people have the option to live a car free or car lite lifestyle, which saves them from the economic burden of car ownership, which can easily become a poverty trap. I've had one close friend sell her car because the maintenance costs kept piling up, leading to essentially a treadmill of credit card debt. It also saves them from the stress of driving and potentially people's lives. Most people in this room have complained about other drivers at some point. Imagine if the nervous drivers who didn't want to be on the road that are making frustrating or sometimes dangerous decisions were not on the road with you, but instead were riding on public transit or biking or walking. Unfortunately, our current low density sprawl makes it so that most people have to drive

[10:53:46 AM]

most people have to drive whether they want to or not. Thus, mixed use density gives people the choice in how they want to get around. If they need a large hole, a large load they can drive. If they want to grab a coffee, they can walk the right tool for the job. I support itod the compatibility changes in home tube because they each contribute to that vision in some way. On a larger scale, itod lays the groundwork for future investments in transit. More people living in more transit means more ridership, which means more political will for future investments in transit. And density can seem like a chicken and egg question. Some say that we can't have transit because we don't have density, others say that density without transit just leads to traffic, and then they use it as an excuse to do nothing and keep the status quo. Today, I'm grateful for our city council and our mayor for taking bold action to create momentum on one piece of the puzzle density. Thank you. >> Miranda campos is next with David Sullivan and Irene Picard on deck. >> Good morning. My name is Miranda campos. I am a master's candidate of social work and public affairs at UT Austin, and

[10:54:47 AM]

public affairs at UT Austin, and I am against the home initiative. And I will explain to you my reasoning why, with some data, I have been researching data regarding the accessory dwelling unit permits in the city of Austin and how it is impacting affordability for the longtime residents of east Austin. On November 19th, 2015, the city of Austin implemented an ordinance to amend requirements for Adu developments in response to affordability issues, and the ordinance took effect on November 30th, 2015. The changes aimed to make Adu construction more feasible by reducing restrictions. Since the 2015 ordinance took place, council districts one, two and three, which comprise east Austin, have been allotted 1407 Adu permits of those permits, 96% of them were obtained by lcs. The increase in Adu construction isn't propelled by homeowners themselves, but rather by developments or developers who have easier access to financing, financing remains a significant obstacle for the low and middle income homeowners interested in building an Adu. Given that the construction costs for an 850

[10:55:47 AM]

construction costs for an 850 square foot detached Adu are approximately \$150,000. Furthermore a comparison between the east side and west side of Austin demonstrates that more Adu permits are being sought after in the east side than the west side. Since the land is cheaper in the eastern crescent, there have been a total of 2660 Adu permits allotted since 2015. East side council district AIDs make up 53% of all adus in the city of Austin. The home initiative is a false solution that isn't helping our low and middle income communities, because there isn't an affordability mechanism in home, such as requiring at least one or of the 2 or 3 units on each lot to be income restricted. And most low income affordability programs require 10% of units in developments to be affordable, even by amending home, as is to require just one unit on each lot to be affordable would create a 33% rate of affordability. Among these, Adu developments, I urge you to listen to this data and recognize that these rezoning initiatives are false solutions. Thank you. >> David Sullivan is next with

[10:56:48 AM]

>> David Sullivan is next with Irene Picard on deck. >> Oh, council and planning commissioners. My name is Dave Sullivan. I'm in support of these provisions for four points I want to make. One is that I've talked about this before with home one, that higher density leads to lower greenhouse gas emissions. If you look at the university of California, Berkeley's cool climate website, there's proof of that. I did my own statistical analysis about our five county msa, and it shows the same thing here. Even when you take out the west campus, which is the lowest greenhouse gas emission area, and also the highest density, you still get a very significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions when you have higher density. Secondly, we can get more affordable housing. With this third point, I want to make is there are still some barriers in the provisions that you see before you, and you'll be hearing from some people in the housing bill, housing builders, about ways to make that easier. And then the last point that

[10:57:50 AM]

And then the last point that another other people have made is we need to make steps to prevent, involve displacement. And we also need to target high opportunity areas for adding in these new this new housing. It's very hard to do that in Texas. But still, I hope that you will look at that and thank you very much for holding this public hearing. >> Irene picot, good morning. >> I'm Irene Picard. At first I want to thank each and every one of you for your service. I really appreciate it. As a longtime employee of the state, I know that city council members are not making a huge amount of money. They are serving us and you. The planning commission members, are giving of your time. So thank you. I grew up in a two story modest home in a residential neighborhood. We had

[10:58:53 AM]



residential neighborhood. We had a lawn, trees, a vegetable garden in the back. Would it surprise you if I told you I grew up in New York City? My husband grew up in Cambridge, Massachusetts, right across the Charles river from Boston, right in a town or a city that had a great university in it. Harvard and we both met coming to Austin to go to great, a great university, the university of Texas at Austin. And we met and married and settled here in this city. And I want you to know that if we go back, my husband and I, to these cities that we grew up in, we still have what we our houses are still there. They are not encroached by large buildings. The gardens that we

[10:59:54 AM]

buildings. The gardens that we had. My father grew vegetables. His mother grew roses are still there because great cities protect and cherish their residents. All areas. I'm asking Austin. We chose this city. We love this city. Protect residential areas, keep. >> Next speaker is Wendy Mitchell and she has donated time by Mia Goldstein is Mia here? Yes. Okay, and then on deck is Al Allen. >> You'll have four minutes. >> Hi, I'm Wendy Mitchell, and I run the stuffed animal rescue foundation, which is not an actual foundation. I'm joined by some stuffed creatures over there who wanted to speak, but they actually can't. One day in school, my painting teacher at

[11:00:54 AM]

school, my painting teacher at the university, university of Georgia, told us in class, if you want to be a famous artist, you have to move to New York. But if you just want to be an artist, you can move to Austin now. I did not inherit a bunch of houses like my landlord did, nor did I inherit money like my painting teacher did. And so I moved to Austin in 2001. And that December, when I first saw the 37th street lights, I understood what he had meant. This was a place where people like me were appreciated. In 2009, I saw an ad for a sublease on 37th street and I sprinted there. It was 300ft S with graffiti on the walls, holes in the closet, broken windows and wood floors that still give me splinters. And I said, I want to live here for the rest of my life. That affordable apartment is part of a four plex, and it has been my home for 15 years. And every year I make a stuffed animal petting zoo during the 37th street lights, I get

[11:01:55 AM]

37th street lights, I get stuffed animals that were destined for landfills, and I Wright stories about them. Those stories create value to out of nothing. And then thousands of people come and they apply to adopt these things that nobody had wanted. I've done 400 of these free adoptions to all sorts of people, making beautiful experiences out of things that other people think are trash is specifically the specialty

of 37th street, and it has been for decades. Artists like us who live in these multi-family homes that some people think are trash, put in months of work for free because we love to create joy and art for the whole community, not just people with money. We were not notified of the itod overlay because we don't own anything. This proposed rezoning of 37th street only targets our homes and not just the insides, but

[11:02:59 AM]

and not just the insides, but the outsides where we together make pvc pipe igloos and ten foot volcanoes and giant godzillas. The single family homes are not being targeted, but we, the people who actually create this thing are not them. These days. We have to beg these people to put just a few lights on their lawn, yet they talk about the lights community and how great it is on their real estate fliers like this one. For a \$1.65 million, 2200 square foot house on the street that could fit seven of my apartments inside of it, I read, I don't know this is true. You guys can tell me. Apparently, it's determined that repair if repairing and affordable multifamily structure would cost more than 50% of its value, then the owner can destroy it, I am obviously a crazy writer and artist who owns nothing, so I

[11:03:59 AM]

artist who owns nothing, so I have a very different definition of value. When we stand back and watch thousands of happy people enjoy what we create every year, that is real, meaningful value and I hope you all value it like we do. And like all of Austin has for decades. And that you consider it before you let a privileged owner tear down this irreplaceable bit of history that Austin created. Thanks >> Next speaker is elle Allen with Scott turner and whit Irwin on deck. If your name has been called, please make your way to the podium. Ryan Pasinski. Maddy. Brett. Adam. Powell. Please state your name.

[11:05:06 AM]

Please state your name. >> I'm Maddy Bratt, and I've lived on 37th street for seven years. I have been in district nine for more than a decade, and I love density, I love transportation, I want you all to get this funding for this train. I want to take the light rail here. I want it to happen, but I don't want it to happen at the expense of old Austin culture. And I don't want it to happen at the expense of people who have lived here and who have built these neighborhoods, so I'm mostly confused why our multifamily properties on 37th street are the ones being rezoned, and none of the single family houses the \$1.6 million house that's currently for sale on 37th street could fit six of Wendy's houses on it. I also think we have different, definitions of affordability from what I understand, an affordable one bedroom unit to y'all is about 1350, a affordable one bedroom unit on 37th street is 4 to \$800. If you

[11:06:07 AM]

37th street is 4 to \$800. If you think 1350 is affordable, you are not a low income person like myself, and sorry I've never done this before, I do want you all to get the federal funding. I want to take the train, but we are sacrificing old Austin culture. If these properties on 37th street were me and Wendy and Mia live are rezoned, 37 street lights will not survive. We do everything ourselves for months and we have to live there to make it happen. We have to be able to afford to live there to make it happen. And the plan, as it stands now, it would guarantee that I have the same amount of bedrooms, but it wouldn't guarantee that I have two sheds for thousands of Christmas lights. It wouldn't guarantee that the community garden that Wendy and I have been working on for years will live. We won't have any. It won't guarantee that I won't have to pay extra for my cat to live with me too. I probably won't be able to have a chicken

[11:07:08 AM]

won't be able to have a chicken in the backyard, and all of these protections are not there. I implore you, if your name has been called, please make your way to the podium and state your name. >> If there's an open podium, just please step forward. State your name for the record. Good morning. My name is whit Ewing, mayor, council, planning commissioners, thanks for the opportunity to speak. I'm an enthusiastic supporter of home2 itod and compatibility reform. And I live in the Clarksville neighborhood. And I think that a lot of us here know and have spoken about this, that Austin is a welcoming place. It I remember on this smokestack that historically was over here like just a block away, that it was it said Austin, the friendly city and so in order to be a friendly city, in order to be a city that welcomes all, we need to be a city that offers choice. Choice to what type of place we live in. If I think back on all the years that I've lived here,

[11:08:09 AM]

the years that I've lived here, I was born here and lived here for decades. I've lived in all kinds of different housing, apartments, triple-a offices, triplexes roommates, you name it, and so this is the kind of choice that you're enabling by passing these reforms and other reforms. And I just encourage you to proceed with that. And I'll just end with this example. And my family, I would love for the opportunity for family to live near us or on our property, not in our house, but near our house. And so just having the opportunity to do that on our on our plot or just nearby and not having to say, yeah, and it's going to cost you \$800,000 or something like that is just very meaningful. I mean, the last quote, I'll end with is grandparents hold our hands for just a little while, but our hearts forever. And I would love for my daughter to be able to have her grandparents nearby, so

[11:09:10 AM]

have her grandparents nearby, so thank you very much. >> Hi all. My name is Adam Powell. >> I'm a resident of district seven, and I want to start off by talking about the obvious, which is that we are already in a dire housing affordability crisis every day, austinites struggle to afford rent and face the very real possibility of becoming unhoused every day. People who want to live in Austin see living, and instead the suburbs outside of our city as their only realistic option. Every day, we, the artists and musicians who have made this city the cultural force that it is, are no longer finding it welcoming here. And so when I face that, I ask myself, will equitable, transit oriented development compatible reform, minimum lot sizes, fix all of this? And the answer is no. The problem is too massive. But as someone who was born in this city, who was raised in the suburbs of Leander because of the exact same affordability

[11:10:10 AM]

the exact same affordability crisis we're talking about, just the earlier stages of it. >> I refuse to accept our current status quo. So to me, the proposed policies are a meaningful step that we have to take to address our housing affordability crisis. And it's also a step that I believe will not encourage more displacement of current residents. And we don't have to guess at what policies have led to the displacement that we've seen. It's the policies that have been in place for decades now. So in conclusion, I urge our city council to pass these proposed policies and to continue to pursue proactive solutions to address this absolute housing crisis that we're in. And I'm so grateful for y'all's time. Thank you. >> L Ellen Scott turner, Ryan pazsitzky. >> Please state your name. Good morning, mayor, council and commissioners. >> My name is Ryan Purzycki, and I'm a single family homeowner in district one. And I strongly support these reforms as the reductions in compatibility restrictions are particularly

[11:11:10 AM]

restrictions are particularly welcome. Our land development code has already covered most of our city in single family zoning, limiting housing opportunities to an increasingly select lucky few. Compact compatible city grants those lucky few the additional power to salt the Earth around their properties, so that some 80,000 housing units cannot grow. Talk about rubbing salt in the wounds of those already hurt by our housing affordability crisis. With the proposed reduction to 75ft, it looks like we'll get 75% of the way towards reviving some of those tens of thousands of housing units killed by compatibility. I strongly encourage you to go the remaining 25% of the way and free the 20,000 additional units that would still remain restricted by compatibility. In short, compatibility is not compatible with the goals of our city and the demands of the present moment. Thank you for your consideration. Support of a more

affordable, more welcoming Austin. Thanks Mike Wainwright on deck. >> Are Sherrod middle, Felix de Porto and Logan Shugart. Thank you, council mayor and planning

[11:12:13 AM]

you, council mayor and planning commission for your time today. My name is Mike Wainwright. My friends call me dub. I have been an austinite my entire adult life since the year 2000. I live in district one in the rosewood neighborhood. For most of that time, I am a homeowner in an itod zone. I serve on the board of Austin liberals, and I've been a working musician here for two decades. Come see my band Clyde and clem at the hole in the wall 50th anniversary this June, sadly, most of the artists that we are performing with are having reunions, and for the most part, these bands split not because of careers or kids. It was because of housing, most of my musician friends are moving to other Texas cities. Lockhart Houston San Marcos Austin is Texas's most expensive city, and musicians are not high earners. But what these articles about how expensive this city, has gotten never mentioned, is that if you want to buy or rent here, you have to get a much, much larger piece of land to go with your home, 57 50ft S is a rambling country estate. I do not want it or need it, but my wife and I, a UT associate

[11:13:15 AM]

wife and I, a UT associate professor, were forced to buy it to make a permanent home here. For people who aren't in a position to buy, they're forced to rent all that empty land. Why? Musicians and college professors in all austinities of every background don't need giant lawns. They need bedrooms and bathrooms, kitchens and employed girlfriends, look, just look at this chart, guys. This is a no brainer. We are so far out of line with our peer cities . Look how linear this relationship is. Do you think San Antonio is a bad place for communities of color? Come on, this is a no brainer. Guys. Let's get these reforms done. Let's bring our lot size down to the middle of the road for Texas. So normal people who fall in love with this place can make a life here, contribute to our amazing culture, breathe new life into our neighborhoods, in music venues, land costs money. Stop forcing people to buy or rent more than they need. Being forced to continue purchasing or renting empty land to have a home is nonsense, and only the most ideological individuals could possibly consider that to be compatible with

[11:14:17 AM]

be compatible with affordability. And America's 11th largest city. Thank you. >> Good morning council. My name is Felix de Bordeaux and I'm proud to call district four my home. Today we stand at the tipping point of an extraordinary transformation for this great city, I'm here to support a future where Austin is celebrated as a truly sustainable, walkable place that everyone, regardless of race, income, age, or ability, can call home. I can see us achieving our ambitious climate goals. We can mitigate destructive

sprawl. We can save our farmland from overdevelopment. We can reduce our water and energy consumption, and we can address our housing crisis. But in order to do so, we must dream beyond the confines of car dependency and embrace the vast potential of our transit corridors. While these proposals represent significant progress for Austin, let's not shy away from acknowledging that they could indeed be stronger. It is crucial that the principles of equity being discussed today

[11:15:18 AM]

equity being discussed today truly form the bedrock of our future endeavors. Our aim should be to enrich the fabric of our communities by making them more resilient, more vibrant, and more inclusive than ever before. You must do more to curb land speculation. You must restrict short term rentals, increase funding for rental assistance, strengthen right to return policies, and take bold action by leveraging city owned land. Do not wait for the market to solve this affordability crisis on its own. This moment offers an unparalleled opportunity to make your mark on Austin's history. May you rise to this occasion with an unwavering commitment to the ideals that we all hold dear, and may you create a legacy of which we can all be proud. Thank you. >> Next is Sherrod Mudd with Logan Shugart on deck. David Williamson, Magatte Wade. If your name has been called, please make your way to the podium. Marion Sanchez, Zach Abnett, Christopher Paige,

[11:16:19 AM]

Abnett, Christopher Paige, Martha Quintero, who has time donated by Brad Massengill. We are Martha and Brad here. Thank you. Yes please state your name, hello, my name is Zach Abnett. >> I am a resident of district nine, currently renting out of the Travis Heights East neighborhood. >> I'm here to testify in favor of, in favor of, and urge the city council to vote in favor of Home Two. I currently work to advocate for environmental policy on a local and state level, particularly environmental policy that I believe is good for people and about the environment. I do this as state director for a national environmental nonprofit called the American Conservation Coalition. I believe Home Two puts us in a good path towards leadership on a more sustainable, carbon neutral future, and not just in our state, but nationally. That

[11:17:21 AM]

state, but nationally. That particular leadership for Austin to do good, to help people in the environment. Home Two is the right policy for the environment. According to the Turner Center study, one of the best things the city can do to help the environment is build infill housing near city centers. This prevents people from driving long distance and creating more and creating less carbon emissions. Additionally, lowering minimum lot size requirements encourages the development of smaller, more energy efficient homes. While the environmental outcomes are wonderful and the need for them, the

need for this home two goes beyond justice. I believe my own situation as a resident of Austin can testify this. While I currently rent, I am working to own my own home in this community. Having it close enough to a lot of the wonderful amenities that this community offers. But due to the shortage of housing currently and the cost of owning the home within the vicinity of a lot of the things I enjoy about Austin is currently out of cost for both. For myself and a lot of the working class people here in the

[11:18:21 AM]

working class people here in the city of Austin. The city council can take the right steps towards addressing this through passing home. Two we can further do more to help, this crisis by revisiting compatible requirements like height building placement and other regulations that drive up the cost of building and constructing homes in the city of Austin. These reforms would go a long way in helping people like myself. >> Thank you. >> Thank you, councilman David Williamson. >> Maggot weighed Marion Sanchez. If your name has been called, please make your way to the podium. >> Miss cotera, if you please come forward, you'll have four minutes. My name is Martha Rivera. With Monica Sanchez and many, many organizations that are asking for a course in home place changes until a public hearings are held in all parts of town hours when all residents are able to attend.

[11:19:24 AM]

are able to attend. >> We also ask that you please adopt the planning commission recommendations regarding low income austinites, communities of color and the elderly, Monica made me tell this story, which I told her before when our daughter accepted a teaching position at UT, she wouldn't pay millions of dollars to live near us. So we agreed to multinational multi generational living with minor changes to our home. I took this opportunity to check out finances, as would anybody, you know, trying to benefit from the proposed code changes for a home equity loan of \$35,000. The university credit union required approximately \$2 million of collateral. Our lender told us they didn't care what our home was worth or about other properties we owned. We were old, and when we died, it was not worth their trouble trying to collect on our home. Although our home's taxable value was

[11:20:25 AM]

our home's taxable value was then about \$900,000, the lender did everything possible to discourage us, but my husband knew nothing about this, by the way, so I want to say that. But I had to prove a point after providing titles to seven properties, seven insurance policies, seven tax records, and years of irs returns at three hellish months later, we had a \$35,000 home equity loan, but not after I threatened to pull out of the whole deal and bring them down with me when they required a costly appraisal, I was

not about to spend a nickel on that. This is how the land code changes will benefit regular austinites and I don't even want to talk about two years of permitting process like that wonderful lady spoke about her mini little house. I'm sorry, the opportunity to benefit from the proposed

[11:21:28 AM]

benefit from the proposed changes is available only to very wealthy austinites and investors. The rest of us get the downsides monstrosities next door and losing our property because our heirs, you know, can't possibly keep them. At a minimum, let's get input from all parts of town and for once, let's incorporate policies and practices that benefit everybody, especially, I am saying affordable financing mechanisms. I mean, we spend millions and millions and millions of dollars on homelessness after after we make that happen and then we're like, okay, let's do this. Let's put in mechanisms in place so that people, regular residents can modify, add to their homes and keep their homes. And also, of course, fix the permitting process so that regular homeowners don't have to spend two years trying to navigate the

[11:22:31 AM]

two years trying to navigate the process just to add a balcony or open up some windows like we had to do, I really, really appreciate your considering, again, especially having public hearings and all parts of town because believe me, everybody wants to have a say in these momentous changes. And I do support your policies regarding transportation. As long as the housing nearby is truly affordable. The last time we had an affordable housing project in program in Austin, publicly funded teachers could not afford it because they did not make enough money to afford the loans. >> Thank you, miss cotera. Appreciate you being here. >> Christopher Paige Gatica on deck with shiv Mistry. >> If your name has been called,

[11:23:33 AM]

>> If your name has been called, please come forward. >> Betsy Greenberg has donated time from John good. Is John good here? Thank you. Please make your way to the podium. >> Please state your name for the record. >> Geetika Yamaguchi. >> Can I go, please? Go ahead. Yes >> Hello. My name is geetika Yamaguchi. I reside in district nine and I am in favor of item one. For the past year, I have volunteered with the UT Austin chapter of miracle messages. Our mission is to help homeless folks in Austin find and reconnect with the loved ones that they've lost touch with. Having worked with the homeless population, I have heard many stories of displacement, stories of people being kicked out of their homes, and stories of people who have been told that they do not belong. High housing costs drive up homelessness from 2017 to 2022, a 29% increase in the median rent in Austin was associated with a 46% increase



[11:24:33 AM]

associated with a 46% increase in our city's rate of homelessness. There has been and continues to be, an urgent need for a higher volume of housing and addressing Austin's incredibly restrictive zoning policies is an important step. No council member can, in good faith, claim that they are working to resolve homelessness without supporting reforms that address Austin's restrictive zoning laws. These laws enable displacement and homelessness, limiting the availability of housing options for the members of our community. It is easy to express compassion for those without homes, but your words are empty unless they are followed by the right actions. >> Go ahead. Please state your name. >> Good morning. My name is Chad Mistry and I am a UT student and resident of district nine, and I am here in favor of item one. I skipped both of my classes to be here today because I really do, you know, believe in these proposed changes, our current minimum lot size of 5750ft S was

[11:25:33 AM]

minimum lot size of 5750ft S was set 78 years ago, in 1946. This was raised from 3000ft S. And the same local officials who raised that minimum lot size also chose to segregate Austin's first public housing projects. Just a few years before that, so I have to ask, is that the legacy this city wants to uphold? And, you know, I certainly hope not, and so I think in a few weeks, each commissioner and council member will show us with your vote, where your values truly lie. In 1946, Austin's population was just above 100,000. Today, it's nearly ten times that. I know it's easy to hold on to the Austin of the past, but we need to realize times have changed when you live in such an amazing place like Austin, people find out about it and decide to move here for decades, past members of this council have refused to accommodate and responsibly manage Austin's growth, insisting that if we just ignore it and hold on to our antiquated zoning laws, it will just go away. And because of this many of the individuals who made Austin the fun and weird place it is got kicked out of their

[11:26:35 AM]

it is got kicked out of their own city because they can no longer afford the cost of housing here. I know many will be quick to dismiss me because I am just a student. I'm not a real austinite, but I think I can speak for all of my fellow students. When I say we work jobs here, we pay taxes here, we support businesses here, we vote here. So we sure as hell deserve a future where we can afford to live here, so today I call on this council and this planning commission to move Austin forward and just simply do the right thing. Thank you. Thank you. >> Next is Betsy Greenberg with donated time. She gets four minutes. On deck is Sophia snap. >> My name is Betsy Greenberg. >> I live in the heritage neighborhood in district nine, and I took the bus to get here today. >> I am speaking today about the so-called equitable transit

oriented overlay, which is proposed for every property in my neighborhood that doesn't have single family or P zoning. Traditional transit oriented developments cause gentrification and displacement of both existing residents and businesses. When transit dependent riders are replaced with more affluent residents,

[11:27:35 AM]

with more affluent residents, ridership has even been seen to decrease. Equitable transit oriented development is intended to avoid these unintended consequences. Fences. Cap metro was awarded \$3.15 million from the fta to produce an itod study, but the proposal today does not use the 46 tools in the equity based toolkit. There is no station area planning and no attempt to avoid displacement of people or businesses, not even for people in section eight housing, merely including the letter E in front of tod is unfortunate, useless, and will not achieve the desired equity. The proposed itod overlay uses only one tool drastically increase entitlements in exchange for an affordability requirement that can even be satisfied with a fee

[11:28:36 AM]

can even be satisfied with a fee in lieu. The excuse is that we need to make the fta grant application more competitive. The study report claims that this objective is premised on the contract with the voters, but looking back at the contract with the voters, it says nothing about competitive Ness or land use changes. My neighbor, John Goode, donated his time to me. He also lives in the heritage neighborhood in a 12 unit condo property. In other words, missing middle. This property has mf2 zoning, which allows up to 40ft in height with the dbt tod zoning that requires no on site affordable housing. The property could be redeveloped up to 100ft tall, more than double the current entitlement. This is deliberately designed to displace the current residents. Many of whom have lived in the property for 25 years or more. He told me that his daughters recently visited from Toronto,

[11:29:38 AM]

recently visited from Toronto, where similar zoning laws have been implemented. This has resulted in housing that is more expensive with no hope of homeownership. Instead of supporting transit. These zoning changes only support investor tirs who end up owning the property and not caring about the community or quality of life. Please redo the tod overlay to allow for the use of tools that ensure that the most needing transit will benefit from the investments, and provide safeguards for current residents and businesses. Thank you for your time and congrats to the council members and commissioners who have acquired homes in the Mueller pod where your home and surrounding properties aren't affected

by these proposed changes. >> Next is Sophia snap on deck is Jeff Dickerson. >> Hello city council members

[11:30:45 AM]

>> Hello city council members and my fellow speakers. My name is Sophia snap, and I'm grateful for the opportunity to both be heard and to listen to you others speak. Today, I'm a third year undergraduate environmental and humanitarian engineering student at UT Austin. I'm also a resident of district nine and work as a civil engineering intern at a local consulting firm, where I've been able to learn more about land and site development. I'm here today to testify in support of agenda item one. Please bear with me as I share my perspective by combining my limited working knowledge and personal experience, I first want to say that I hear the concerns and frustrations of my fellow citizens. I want to start out by saying I am absolutely against gentrification and displacement in my view, these amendments will diversify housing options, especially in downtown areas where many people work in transportation. Improvements are underway across various affordability levels, thereby helping to curb urban sprawl and minimize displacement and gentrification. I'm personally for these amendments because I would really like to stay in Austin. I love my job and I love the city, and I would love to

[11:31:46 AM]

the city, and I would love to stay here. I will not be able to stay here. However, if there are not more affordable housing options, it's really hard to find somewhere that's close to my work and in my price range. I know a lot of my peers who are here today share the same concerns. I'm an engineering representative in the student body of uts legislative assembly, and I also know that affordable housing is a frequent topic of significant interest to students around the university. Also just last night, 41 of my friends said they care about affordable housing through a quick poll on my social media. I want this to be able to be in Austin, where everyone can live safely, comfortably and happily. Thank you for your time. Thank you. >> Next is Jeff Dickerson. On deck is Susana Almanza, who has time donated from Pedro Hernandez and Susan Lippman are Pedro and Susan here? Okay. Thank you. >> Council member. Mayor. >> My name is Jeff Dickerson of district five. I'm here before you to say I oppose all three

[11:32:47 AM]

you to say I oppose all three amendments. Let's talk about the charging amendment. You heard from everybody here. Can't pay rent, can't afford a house, can't do this, can't do that. How the hell are they going to afford an ev with those charging stations? Let's put on our party hats table. The measure. Because we can't afford to put those in place. No, the home amendment two. My jaw just dropped to the floor when I listened to city council staff and their presentation on one thing, she said, more

housing, more housing. Nowhere was mentioned about stability for the smaller lots and houses. It was not mentioned anywhere, nowhere was mentioned. Budgeting restricts budgeting or infrastructure. Budgeting for traffic because you guys eliminated the on site

[11:33:49 AM]

you guys eliminated the on site off site traffic, you want to increase density, but you don't want to pay for the infrastructure to go along with the density. I would like to push back against a couple of speakers, first off, everybody that says smaller lots equate to affordability. That's not a true statement. You have to pay more per square foot for newer building and newer lots. And for the nice young lady that spoke before me, I'm deaf, my daughter's deaf, my brother's deaf. We can drive perfectly fine. And if you have. Is what public transportation and the busses that do not support the deaf population. Thank you. >> Susana Almanza is next. And she gets six minutes on deck. Is Noah Elias and Adam Greenfield.

[11:34:50 AM]

Noah Elias and Adam Greenfield. >> Good afternoon or good morning? I'm Susan Almanza with poder, and I'm an indigenous person of this continent. So that's why I show this is really what it's about. >> The manifest destiny. >> You see the guy on the right, he says, this is mine. This is our land, our country. And as indigenous person, I have a lot of history behind me. I have to talk about the 1928 master plan, bringing it to now the what? We're here today, but not forgetting the manifest destiny. And the colonization that is bringing into Austin, when we look at the manifest destiny and what happened to the indigenous people, we were put on reservations and then when those reservations held sacred minerals, then we had to be moved. So the master plan in 1928 put us on the reservation of east Austin. And now east Austin is full with green land. It's gold, and everybody wants that land, and we're constantly

[11:35:51 AM]

that land, and we're constantly being displaced. When we looked at your neighborhood plan process, that another part of the colonization of our communities and indigenous people in east Austin, we saw what happened with the new zoning, commercial service, mixed use mall amnesty, etc. Vertical mixed use. According to U. UT study from 1998 to 2004, it saw that our land in the east Chavez neighborhood plan area that you see there, the land went up 400,000% increase in land value. Our taxes went up 123, right now, in that Cesar Chavez neighborhood plan is only probably about 10, people of color, Latinos left. That's what happened with the new zoning. It's the continuation of the gentrification that is happening at this present time. When we look at what you what you have built so far is discrimination and inequity in housing. You

[11:36:52 AM]

and inequity in housing. You can't count on this council and you're planning to face equity because you've never done it. Look at what you've built. You've built from this is your data from 2018 to 2022. You built 35,742 units for the upper class income from 61 to 121% mfi. And you look at that, the amount, it's 146,750 for a family of four. That's at 120, mfi. At 80% mfi, you're looking at 93,000 \$450,000. But look at that when you see what you built for people from 30 to 60, mfi 30 being 23,350, 60 being 35,000, I mean, 60, \$70,080 for 60. You've only built 6847 units in that range. But look at 30% mfi below

[11:37:52 AM]

range. But look at 30% mfi below 363 units only. And you talk about equity. You talk about this home bringing more affordable housing. You're lying to yourself. You. This is a false solution with a false narrative you're providing. You are pushing forward and saying that this is about equity. You need to take you use home because that's a pleasant word. When we know it's codenext, we know that this is codenext, but you try to give it, you try to sugarcoat it with such a nice thing, but you look at your own stats, you're not helping and you're not making anything affordable at all. What you're doing is making sure that you're continuing on that manifestation, manifest destiny, that colonization that will move people of color and low income people out of the urban core. And I feel I feel that the people at the universities,

[11:38:53 AM]

people at the universities, those those that testified in favor of this high density, are not being well educated. They don't know the history of what's happening to our communities because even though you push this citywide, who is the most vulnerable populations and you know where those pockets are, and that's where you target it. And so if you don't put those safeguards in places will be continued to be displaced. First, we had the urban renewal from the 1960s to the 70s, and we know what happened to there. The African American population was the one that was really moved. And also the Latino, but more heavily the African American population. You then came with the neighborhood zoning, conquer and divide the same strategies during the manifest destiny, dividing the city into 54 neighborhood planning and then going after and saying, what do you want in your community? Only to come to city council and find out the only thing that was legally binding was zoning. Everything else that we had said. We would like to see our neighborhoods.

[11:39:53 AM]

like to see our neighborhoods. No funding was put to it and it was not legally binding. And now we come to the neighborhood zone home. Now we come to this particular place where people are saying this only way we can keep people here and we can stay here is by bringing is promoting home and bringing more affordable housing. But the question is affordable to who you seeing the own stats of the city council and the type of housing they built. This is all about, again, the developers. What is it that the developers want? And they're making the profits. It's about somebody. She just brought up the LLCs who's really bringing who's building these ads. And when we brought the eight, when you talked about the Adu, we said, if you don't put any money, if you don't put any forgivable loans for us to build that second unit, it's not going to happen for us. We're not going to be able to sustain ourselves. If you don't put the safeguards in there, it will not happen. This is what happened in our communities. If we're being

[11:40:53 AM]

communities. If we're being constantly displaced. Thank you very much. Next is Noah Elliott with Adam Greenfield, Taylor Winberg. >> Peter Britton Hannah Thomas. If your name has been called, please come forward. >> Zoe, call Jason Haskins. >> Please state your name. >> Hi, I'm Peter Breton. I'm a resident of district eight. Mayor Watson, council members and planning commissioners, thank you for being here today. I want to talk today about values, everything we do and say, every ordinance we pass and every event we attend expresses our values. 40 years ago, Austin

[11:41:54 AM]

our values. 40 years ago, Austin city council passed a restrictive land development code that made it harder for our most vulnerable neighbors to live here through mandating large, expensive lots with high setbacks relegating most new multifamily housing to be built on the choked, dirty, dangerous, major streets in our city. The code that was passed is largely the code that we have today. It's no surprise that our black and brown neighbors are being displaced because 40 years ago, we decided that it was more important that single family homes across Austin should be saved from development. It was the moment that we mandated that those homes and the homes that are being built today are only accessible to the rich and powerful. The new luxury house or apartment of today is the

[11:42:57 AM]

or apartment of today is the naturally occurring affordable housing of 40 years from now. I urge you to pass the reforms here today because they are one more step forward, not in righting the injustice being

done today, but righting the injustice being done tomorrow to my kids, to our kids, to your kids. Nothing is perfect. We have far to go, but we must be biased towards action leaders are the people who go big. Thank you. >> Hello, my name is Jason John-Paul Haskins. >> I am the chair of AIA Austin housing advocacy committee and an economically displaced former Austin resident currently suffering my way through my nightmare of someone else's American dream in the suburbs. >> It is so encouraging to see progress on these items, and I'm excited to support these efforts and to work to improve, improve them, to increase the potential benefits for housing affordability, the draconian so-called compatibility regulations have long been a

[11:43:59 AM]

regulations have long been a shameful codification of injustice, enshrining the idea that single family homeowners are somehow superior to those who rent or own in multi-unit buildings from the perspective of solidarity, the idea that the city needs to protect the already more privileged citizens at the expense of the less fortunate is patently unjust. From the perspective of subsidiarity, the idea that a property owner should have rights that extend over another property is similarly ingest, that that imposition might extend 540ft away with no public benefit is frankly insane. The this notion comes up every time we try to build affordable housing. We hear that those people don't belong here and they aren't compatible with our neighborhood. I know they prefer to frame it as they are the victims of the evil developers, and we certainly need to hold developers and landlords accountable for their crimes. But we should be using our relative privilege to help those who are daily the direct victims of these economic sins. The city should not be codifying segregation or ghettoization, nor enshrining socioeconomic homogeneity in its ordinances. So it was incredibly encouraging

[11:44:59 AM]

So it was incredibly encouraging to see that the resolution initiating this current reform stated the principle that the restrictions imposed should be equal to or less restrictive than those applied to single family structures. If compatibility is supposed to be about formal compatibility of buildings, then this would actually improve that rather than a force artificial inconsistent gaps in the urban fabric. Unfortunately, the draft ordinance under consideration does not follow your instructions and in its current form does not implement this principle. Building, buffering and screening should be based on the actual health and safety concerns of specific uses and equipment. Under no circumstances should you continue to require buffering and screening between neighbors to protect you. >> Sir. Thank you. Good morning, mayor, council and commissioners. >> Adam Greenfield here from district three. I'm here to speak strongly in support of home phase two and the ITOD measure. And I really want to speak to something that I think is very overlooked in these

[11:46:01 AM]

is very overlooked in these conversations, which is the importance of community fabric, of social fabric among us, my wife and I are huge community people. We knock on the doors of our neighbors when they move in, and I'm very excited at the chance to have more neighbors around us, to have more vibrant, active communities. It is a form of wealth. Community is a form of wealth, not just the affordability of the house you live in, but the connections you have with your neighbors is something you're able to leverage many times over. And my neighbors and I have done that to, to a life changing degree for so many of us, I also want to talk about another really overlooked aspect of this, which is porches. Austin has a wonderful porch culture here. That's how people meet their neighbors. That's how they get to know their community, it is very important that we get the front, minimum setback requirements right, in home phase two to make it so that porches can come close enough to the street so that people on

[11:47:02 AM]

the street so that people on their porches can have the option to have a social interaction with passers by. Currently, the proposed minimum is 15ft, actually, studies have shown that ten feet is a is kind of that sweet spot to give people the option to interact with passers by, but also they don't have to if they don't want to. So let's let's try and shave that that number down a little bit. And it will make a big difference to the social fabric here in Austin. So thank you very much. I'm personally very excited about this. This is absolutely the way to go. And thank you for all the work that you do. Thank you. >> Taylor Winberg Hanna Thomas Zoe, call. Okay hello. >> My name is Hannah Thomas, and I am a student at the university of Texas at Austin, wmps or west campus, to those who are not

[11:48:02 AM]

campus, to those who are not familiar, is the epitome of what comes to mind when imagining a predominantly college based city parties, bad drivers, noisiness, but most prevalent of all is extremely high rent prices. So high to the extent that people are are forced to either commute a longer distance from campus, work 30 hours a week on top of school, or simply not attend colleges in Austin. This I assure you, is not what someone who is looking at prospective colleges and or house hunting would want to hear. >> The overwhelming, overwhelming housing expenses deter a lot of people from wanting to live in Austin, which is extremely disappointing because a beautiful city like Austin should not be defined by the cost of living, but the sad reality is that it is. >> I think the question we need to ask ourselves is how do we want Austin to be perceived? Weird and unique, or stagnant and obsolete? Hi there, my name is Zoe Cole and I am a current resident of district nine as a student. Currently studying government at the university of Texas, I am so thankful to be



[11:49:03 AM]

Texas, I am so thankful to be located right here in the capital of Texas. However, as an individual that would like to advance a career in government and politics in this lovely and opportune city, I feel disheartened at the fact that I will be priced out of this location after graduation. The city of Austin is becoming increasingly unaffordable, and if current zoning and compatibility requirements persist, my options for continued residence in the city will be pushed further away from the heart of the city. And unfortunately for me, from the heart of governmental affairs, I currently do not have a car. The means to acquire a car, nor the desire to own a car. I walk and utilize public transit almost everywhere I go in the city, which is only currently possible because of how centrally I am located. Knowing that I come from a place of privilege in comparison to so many others makes me even more disheartened at Austin's current situation. People of color have been disproportionately displaced from the central city as a result of current zoning conditions. If others are able to recognize the injustices that are occurring under current conditions, then they should recognize that a change must occur to address these outdated conditions. The gifts that the city has to offer should not be

[11:50:03 AM]

city has to offer should not be reserved solely for high income earners. Home is crucial to increase availability and accessibility of units available to individuals like myself, who want to utilize Austin for their personal and professional goals, but lack the means to do so under current zoning conditions. Thank you. Thank you. >> Chris Gannon has time donated for Michael Hsu. Our Chris and Michael here. Okay. Thank you. On deck are Lucy Begg and Michael Nahas. >> You'll have four minutes. >> Excellent. Thank you. Hi, my name is Chris Gannon. I'm an architect. I'm the co-chair of aya's housing advocacy committee . I'm a longtime austinite. I'm a husband and father to three young austinites. I support this land reform and applaud the council and the mayor for spearheading these resolutions. I love Austin and am excited to see how the city grows. When I was just graduating college, none of my peers wanted to stick around, and then eventually they

[11:51:05 AM]

around, and then eventually they all came back. Well, a lot of them did. I want more people to come back. I want it to be possible for folks who are working in the city to also be able to live in the city. I believe that these resolutions will help build density around our corridors and enable more people in our high opportunity Zones, while still protecting our vulnerable neighbors. I believe we can do this. One goal does not have to be at the expense of the other home. Phase two proposes to lower the minimum lot size down to 2000ft S. Maybe it could even go smaller. We know that land is a driving factor in the cost of a home. This will allow for more people to live on smaller parcels if they wish, and existing homeowners can be more creative with how they use their land. I'm looking forward to a more dense,

livable Austin. Where did our current minimum lot size come from anyways? In 1931, Austin created its first minimum lot size of 3000ft S. Then in 1946, in reaction to Shelley versus Kramer, which

[11:52:07 AM]

Shelley versus Kramer, which made racially restrictive covenants unenforceable, the city increased the minimum size to 5750. This had the effect of continuing segregation, albeit through economic means, rather than explicitly racist means. I'm excited that we are at the point in our history when we can acknowledge and correct this terrible policy. We know that reducing the minimum lot size is not going to fix the effects of segregation or redlining or Jim crow. But let's start by getting this large lot policy off the books, just an aside in my research, I found that the, the sweet point for making money off of land was about 8000ft S. This is what they discovered in the late 40s, so all of these, developers would set their lot size at exactly 8000ft S. This was the best return on on on the money. What is Austin's average lot size? It's 7950ft S, so when we're talking about the greedy

[11:53:10 AM]

we're talking about the greedy developers, I think that the 8000 square foot is a good spot to look at, and what else was going on in 1946, this is just some research that I found the city was arguing about having, recon milk in the school rooms and fighting to obstruct the university from building 140 hutments, which were quick four bed units for our incoming vets, that's just an interesting tidbit that I found. We know that reducing the minimum lot size helps with housing affordability. Studies show that it may even be the most important factor. Houston, well known for its affordability compared to its size, cut their minimum lot size from 5000 to 1400. In 1998. Houston has many other problems, including pollution, but let's look at what they're getting right, we also need to congratulate the city for taking steps to simplify the subdivision process and making flag lots better. There's still work to be done on these fronts, but it feels good knowing that the process has started. I also want to speak about compatibility. Our current

[11:54:10 AM]

about compatibility. Our current policy is the most drastic in the nation, reducing the impact of compatibility will do such good for our corridors like Lamar and burnet. These could be thriving, walkable districts, but they are limited to two stories because of their proximity to single family homes . This regulation, as it stands, has robbed Austin of 82,000 dwelling units. I'm excited to see how this city grows. I'm also very supportive of itod. All right. Thank you. >> Lucy beg Mikel nos. On deck are Ryan knell and Mona wakim. >> Good morning. >> My name is Lucy beg. >> I'm an architect, small business owner, and aisd parent and member of aia Austin's housing advocacy committee. I'm here today to

express my support for the home phase two ordinance, as well as advocate for a companion resolution approved last year, which will

[11:55:11 AM]

approved last year, which will be essential to realize the full potential of these policy changes in 2011. My husband and I were fortunate to purchase the least expensive residential property at the time in our neighborhood of Cesar Chavez, a 700 square foot home on a 2500 square foot corner lot. We had recently started a small business together, and securing this modest spot on Austin's housing ladder has been instrumental in providing the financial security to allow us to build our business while growing our family to include our two kids, now ten and seven, six years ago, thanks to small lot amnesty, we were able to add a second story to our home. We live very comfortably as a family of four with a small yard parking on the street and easy access to the many wonderful amenities of our neighborhood. I'm delighted that this opportunity to live on lots of similar sizes to us is going to be extended to more families of Austin, and that the flexibility

[11:56:12 AM]

Austin, and that the flexibility is going to be restored, that homeowners of our neighborhood once enjoyed to parcel off a portion of their lots to sell to someone else, which resulted in over quarter of the lots in the Cesar Chavez neighborhood being below the current minimum lot size. Today however, unlike in the 70s when our lot was likely subdivided, splitting a standard residential lot into 2 or 3 smaller lots, today will currently involve a costly and lengthy subdivision process, with at least \$50,000 of civil surveyor and city fees. Fiscal surety requirements exceeding that cumbersome drainage and water quality infrastructure, and a timeline of over a year, a process that will eradicate any financial benefit. >> Thank you for your time. Appreciate your being here. My name's Ryan knell, Moana, joaquim and Fernando arista. >> Mayor, city council, my

[11:57:12 AM]

>> Mayor, city council, my fellow commissioners. My name is Michael Nahas. I'm an economist with a master's from UT Austin. I'm vice chair of the city's economic prosperity commission. I'm here speaking for myself, Austin. So I'm going to talk about the minimum lot size here in Austin. Austin has about 200,000 single family lots total. We have more than 1 million families in the metro area, which gives about one single family lot for every five families in the metro area. If we look at the income distribution, the top fifth of the income distribution earns more than \$150,000 per year. Those are the people able to afford lots inside Austin. We have lots only for the wealthy in Austin. We need to create

more. The lots closest to the center of the city are zoned sf3. More than 80% of those lots cannot be split because of the minimum lot size. We need a smaller minimum lot size. Almost

[11:58:13 AM]

smaller minimum lot size. Almost all the lots within four miles of city hall cost more than \$2 million per acre. At 2000ft S per lot, which is the proposed amount that is 20 lots per acre. That would mean the cost of the land is going to exceed \$100,000 for these small lots that's too high for middle class incomes. The minimum lot size should be less than 2000ft S. Any minimum lot size will set an income limit on who can afford those lots near city hall. The best minimum lot size is zero, period. That means everybody who can buy a lot can afford it. I've been working on this issue for seven years. This is I think, the way I can do the best change to the world is to make Austin more affordable. Please lower the minimum lot size to zero. The other issue is itod any maximum limit on the height of buildings on the number of units means less housing. There

[11:59:15 AM]

units means less housing. There please. >> Thank you sir. Appreciate you . >> If your name has been called, please make your way to the podium and state your name. >> Hello, my name is Ryan knell. >> I'm a district four homeowner and have spent the last 15 years trying to start housing cooperatives. I've worked on projects to fund by lease and operate co-ops, but throughout my career, building new co-ops has seemed like an insurmountable wall. >> Organizing all the members, convincing people to fund a relatively unknown housing type, getting past the resistance of a land development code that doesn't acknowledge community based housing, once you get past all that, you actually have to build a building, all of this is really difficult. It's really risky, and it's something that I've been kind of afraid to do. I was always scared that I would be the dog that caught the car. Developing housing is like any other skill that you develop. It

[12:00:15 PM]

other skill that you develop. It takes time. You need to do do it multiple times, and you need to do it in an environment that feels safe. And land development in Austin doesn't allow you to do those things. So community based developers like myself, we need small project projects to cut our teeth on things like adus, converting single family homes to duplexes, subdivision and adding small homes. Converting oversize homes to co-ops. One of my favorites. I would have loved to have started a co-op that I could have raised my son in, but that was far too difficult for me to do at that point in my life. The much safer option for me and my family was to buy a home with a dilapidated Adu and then renovate that Adu with the changes that home brings. Maybe we can add another house or two to the property and start to

begin to develop that community around my household that I wished I could have started several years ago, but didn't have the opportunity to.

[12:01:15 PM]

didn't have the opportunity to. I think allowing communities and families the flexibility to meet their needs is the only alternative that we have to institutional based investors creating housing and I think home will support those goals. >> Thank you. Thank you. >> Up next is Mona wakim on deck is Fernando arista and no Elias. >> Hi, my name is Mona wakim. I grew up in Austin, right on south congress. We actually own high tech automotive. >> It's across from torchy's next to the Chase Bank, we're a family of four, and my dad founded high tech automotive in 1987, professor juergen Shryock of UT actually wrote a book that was ten years in the making about my dad called self making man. And, we are a big part of this community, and we support our community in Travis heights, and they support us, and we hope that you all will consider us and make sure that, whatever

[12:02:17 PM]

and make sure that, whatever happens to us matters because this letter says that we may lose the right for our current use as automotive repair. >> Excuse me. >> Obviously, I really care. You guys are gonna prohibit automotive sales and repairs, and I just think that you you know, you all this letter says that we may lose the opportunity, but you all are saying no, it's nonconforming and so it's just really wishy washy. >> And I think that you all need to be more transparent and clear about what's actually going to happen. And the reason why I'm so emotional is because it feels like we're on a merry go round, and every day we deal with something different. >> We're constantly being ticketed and our customers. >> Excuse me? Our customers are

[12:03:17 PM]

>> Excuse me? Our customers are constantly getting tickets because they pull into our shop. And I've talked to engineers, I've talked to traffic control, I've talked to everybody that I need to talk to, and I still get harassed even last week. Every single week, a customer pulls into my shop and we have a limited space. And I just hope that you guys do your job and make sure that we are actually being listened to. >> Thank you for your comments and we have some. >> We have a staff member right there who can answer some questions for you about the conforming and non conforming regulations to make sure that they're clear for you. Thank you . Yes, city clerk thank you. >> Next is Fernando arista and Noah Elias with pinaki Ghosh on deck, hello. My name is Fernando arista. I've been working here for about seven years as an

[12:04:19 PM]

for about seven years as an electrician. >> Ann I'm a union member, part of the international brotherhood of electrical workers. >> So for seven years I've helped build, some of the high rises around here, including Google and Facebook. >> I've also helped build the Tesla, Amazon, and, houses and, hospitals and schools. And I have been haven't been able to afford a home here in Austin, in the seven years that I've helped built it, I think this, home and, itod initiative will help, with housing. I think it will help make it more affordable. I don't think it addresses everything. I think, we also need to increase, minimum wage, and lower rent, and make a rent cap. But I do believe it'll help, it'll also help, construction workers such as myself, build new publicly funded projects, and it'll help provide, longer time jobs for people who will manage the train stations. I do believe it'll

[12:05:20 PM]

stations. I do believe it'll also help homeowners. Get a passive income by by building a second home and renting it out, or maybe, renting it out to a family member. Maybe it could even build a tiny homes where they could, it could fix the, unhoused problem and, stop the unhoused from being harassed with these city sweeps. I think the people who are talking about gentrification, like, are right. And that should be addressed, I'm glad that this, proposal has , equitable language, anti-displacement language. And, and I'm glad it also takes into consideration the pollution that can come, from this sort of plan . And I'm glad it has steps to mitigate that. So as a person who's built this city for seven years, I support home and the tod initiative. Thank you. >> Noah Elias on deck is pinaki Ghosh. David Carol, and Judah

[12:06:23 PM]

Ghosh. David Carol, and Judah rice. Please make your way up to the podium. >> Hello, I'm Noah Elias. I am a resident of district three. I live in the metropolis neighborhood. I am an elementary school teacher, which is taught half day today so I can be here. So so I'm here to tell you about. Well, first of all, let me tell you my story. I am an immigrant. We got here when I was eight years old. We settled in the montopolis neighborhood because we were able to find a house to rent, not only to my family, but other families, with similar backgrounds have settled in the montopolis neighborhood. And since then, I have seen my neighborhood completely decimated with displacement, gentrification, a lot of my neighbors, the people I grew up with, no longer live in my neighborhood, no longer can afford to live in the neighborhood, they are in the outskirts. They're but kayo. They moved everywhere, and I'm

[12:07:23 PM]

They moved everywhere, and I'm here to ask you to vote. No or to at least postpone this vote on home and the itod, and all the plans that you're considering, because these plans are actually just for investors. They're market driven plans. So there's no affordability requirement in any of these, which means that families like my family, a family of teachers, my the families that I serve, my students, the families of my custodians, our cafeteria workers are not taken into consideration when you're thinking about these plans, and what does that mean is that they're going to be displaced, because when you give entitlements to developers and you don't give them an affordability affordability requirement, then you displace people like me, people like my community. So I'm here to tell you that these plans are only going to accelerate the displacement of low income

[12:08:24 PM]

displacement of low income people of color, homeowners and renters. It's going to drive up property taxes, it's going to drive up rent, and it's going to give incentive. >> Next speaker is pinaki Ghosh. David Carol Judah rice. If your names have been called, please make your way to the podium. Rita Thompson, Lisa Wimberley. Xiao Paul Conley. If your name has been called, please make your way to one of the podiums and state your name. Thank you. >> Go ahead. All right. >> It's a little confusing. Good morning, mayor and council members and commissioners. My name is Lisa Wimberley. I live in district seven. I serve on the board of the Austin infill coalition. I'm here in support

[12:09:25 PM]

coalition. I'm here in support of the compatibility reform itod and home two initiative. I want to thank you all for your hard work and to tell you that I am grateful to you on behalf of Austin's future generations. As you probably know, there are still a lot of work to do and many improvements to make to our outdated code. And since this is a joint session with the planning commission, I would like to take the opportunity to illustrate one instance that would definitely benefit from further changes, and that is extending the home regulate home initiative regulations to all single family zoning. My company owns an sf six lot where we would like to build three modestly sized and priced units. However, because our sf6 lot is smaller than the 14,000ft S required for three units, we cannot do that. As a result, we find ourselves in an absurd situation of having to spend money and time to down zone our sf6 lot to sf three zoning in

[12:10:25 PM]

sf6 lot to sf three zoning in order to take advantage of the new regulations. This obviously causes unnecessary delays and additional costs. I hope you will take into the consideration as a deliberate further improvements to the current code. And thank you for your time. >> Thank you. Next speaker. >> Hello, I'm Rita Thompson. >> I've been here since 77. >> I worked Asa social worker and had the privilege to work in numerous communities, including including much of east Austin, I hope to consider myself a friend or an ally to east Austin, but I would never propose to know what is best for that community. >> And I am. I am heart sick to hear people speak on their behalf and call them those people. I used to be on the planning commission, I do appreciate your service. I just

[12:11:27 PM]

appreciate your service. I just remind you that to have humility and continue to show respect, to the people who come up here who are going to be most impacted. And I think we know who those people are because historically, we know who those people are, so there's a house, there's a home, there's a neighborhood, there's a community, and that's more than a plot of land. And when you move one piece of it, you just have no idea what you are disrupting, because it is not just a plot of land and the lack of respect that comes when you use such a broad brush is immeasurable. Well, each community is different and unique and has its own challenges, desires and wants that should be honored when that's not done, there's results in displacement, gentrification, Ann. And I just want to say density is not affordability. Everybody's for affordability. I

[12:12:28 PM]

Everybody's for affordability. I don't know anybody who's anti affordability. But I'm going to ask you this. And because I may be wrong about this but I've been watching the planning commission which my husband's eyes glaze over because I do that and I keep hearing when cases come up around zoning, not to take into account affordability. So some thank you for being here. >> David Carroll, Judah rice jalpa Conley, Tina Barrett, and Christian Shope. If your name has been called, please approach a podium and state your name. In no particular order. >> My gosh. >> Good afternoon, mayor, council members and commissioners. My name is Tina Barrett. I live in district seven and I'm a member of the Austin infill coalition. I'm here in support of the home two

[12:13:28 PM]

here in support of the home two initiative, and I want to thank you for everything you've done so far to help Austin be more affordable and inclusive. >> I want to address something I've been hearing today. Many speakers have mentioned that east Austin is somehow being horribly impacted by code. Next home and home two. What I wish they would recognize that none of these things are in place yet to



make any impact. What is making an impact is the status quo, the historic, exclusionary zoning that has kept the rich, mostly white west Austin neighborhoods, prohibitively expensive due to huge minimum lot sizes and limiting of diverse housing types, is what's having an impact. These policies have put enormous pressure on the east Austin neighborhoods, by making it nearly impossible for lower income neighbors to be able to afford these giant homes on giant lots. Home and home two will force the expensive west Austin neighborhoods to finally allow more diverse, diverse housing types and start to mitigate affordability. So much has been done, but still some left to do in order to remove the barriers from developers to building homes that are more

[12:14:29 PM]

building homes that are more affordable and diverse, there needs to be more done with the encumbrances to the development process. Please consider making significant and impactful changes to compatibility and site plan light and the lot subdivision process. These are still contributing heavily to the cost of building, which simply gets passed on to the end buyer and contributes to our affordability problem. Finally, please consider extending home Ann home two to all single family zoning so we don't have a large number of edge cases that end up costing more in the development process. Thank you. >> Shaw Paul Conley, Chris Chen Shope, Lauren Maher. >> Hello, mayor and planning commission. >> Mayor, council and planning commission. >> Last time we did this, I was on your end. And I'm not going to lie, I kind of like being on this side of things, but I am here to share ajc's position and response to the three updates proposed to the land code. Change as Austin's council is preparing for another round of updates to the city's land code,

[12:15:30 PM]

updates to the city's land code, it's important that we remember this is definitely not the first, and it certainly will not be the last conversation of this sort in Austin. Land use belongs to the political. It is not the sacred, untouchable territory of those who own property in this city. It belongs to tenants. It belongs to transit users. It belongs to every person that lives in Austin. And everyone should have a say. I'm convinced that austinites want to live in a compassionate city that affirms everyone's right to have a place to be. Here at ajc, we had the opportunity to carefully review these changes, and while we believe that reforms can provide necessary changes, and while we believe that we should not be held hostage to a land code from the 80s, we also do not believe that this reform alone is or ever will be enough. Our concern about the itod specifically is that in some ways, it's still an uneven incentive that provides too much incentive towards the redevelopment and potential redevelopment of existing multifamily and potential displacement of tenants, while at the same time too little incentive to densely develop other areas near transit that could provide more affordable

[12:16:32 PM]

could provide more affordable and accessible housing for transit users. But on the whole, we are supportive primarily of the aims of home two, which we believe will be positive and a and a positive tool for preventing displacement. A tool in the toolbox of lower income homeowners. At the same time, we think it won't be enough to address the needs of low income homeowners and low income austinians, and ajc is proposing seven practical policy positions that we believe this council should prioritize with the same level of priority. It has given to home. We believe there should be a sustainable and ongoing rental relief program. We believe the city can should explore developing loans for low . >> Thank you sir. >> Christian Shupe, Lauren Maher , Craig Naser if your name has been called, please approach the podium and state your name. >> Please come forward. >> Chris Paige on deck. Roy Whaley. No need to go in any

[12:17:32 PM]

Whaley. No need to go in any order or the order that I called. Just approach the podium . >> Howdy, y'all. >> My name is Roy Whaley. >> I'm the conservation chair for the Austin regional group of the Sierra club, established in 1892, making us the oldest environmental organization in America. Start out saying 37.5. Say it with me 37.5. That is the capacity of lake Travis right now. That is our water source, and we're not the only ones with a straw. And that water source. So let all of your decisions be guided by that. We can't count on disasters for other areas of the state to fill up our Lakes.

[12:18:35 PM]

the state to fill up our Lakes. And so please, with every decision you make, think about that. And and I hope everyone had a chance to enjoy the eclipse the other day. What I'm hoping because I loved it. I had a great time, I'm hoping that home will not eclipse environmental protection. We have to think about our environment first. It doesn't matter. From one generation to another, the environment is what we have to protect. And that's what I'm here to speak for. For Sierra club. I'm happy that so many people are here to speak, especially young people. Whether I agree with someone or not, I'm glad they're here. From an environmental point of view, we have to look at what we need to preserve, what we have to protect, the trees. We have to deal with flood waters. We need to have to deal with water reuse

[12:19:37 PM]

to have to deal with water reuse and purple pipe. We have to deal with enhanced Leed certifications, parks and our, our actual working trans systems. Wow thank you, Mr. Whaley. Wow yeah. >> It's good

to see you. Thank you. >> Thank you very much, Mr. Whaley. >> Thank you. When I see you drawing that deep breath, I know you're not finished it. Thank you. We appreciate you . >> Yeah. Please go ahead. Harris Paige can go first. >> Two minutes. Chris. Paige. >> Good morning. We're now

[12:20:46 PM]

>> Good morning. We're now afternoon. My name is mark Deutsch, and I'm a d10 resident and candidate opposing these policies. Council, this is not a victimless policy. This is going to supercharge displacement in Austin unless it's a thoughtful plan in place to address this, I struggle to understand how my diversity minded city can rally behind this policy in Houston and this specific area and specific time frame. And I've shared some of this data with council. They experienced a massive loss of brown, black and poor folks and experienced an equally massive spike in anglo Asian and wealthier residents. Second point housing policy is economics. One reason I'm running is because I fear the one person with a background in economics and the diocese will soon be gone. So I offer economist doctor Cameron Murray's work. Murray's one of the few to correctly predict the housing market during covid. Murray's book is. His new book is a chapter for everybody the politicians, the wonks, the yimbys, the people who live and breathe supply and demand and zoning, and who believe that home will somehow let them live in Austin. And two major takeaways from Murray. Can you

[12:21:46 PM]

takeaways from Murray. Can you advance the slides? One political cycle lags behind the housing cycle. So are we solving for 2019 or are we solving for 2023, which has a dramatically different economic situation? Two the only way for homeownership to increase is for landlords to sell their property to renters. That's it. It sounds simple. This policy does little to change this. All the missing middle they may build may be for rent. It's market rate not affordable. A huge reason nine hundreds of my neighbors have homes in this economic is because the economic condition that allowed them in the aughts has Eid different cap rates. And that's what's guiding homeownership. It's not going to be home phase two or phase one. What can we do better? Let's comply with the spirit of notification. Uninformative purple postcards that invite people to testify during workday is not the answer to let's have an authentic public input process. Houston and San Antonio have entire days for public input. Three let's not have pre-arranged votes. We don't need a kangaroo council. It's not too late to make this a

[12:22:46 PM]

not too late to make this a place where ideas of merit are debated and compromises are struck. Thank you for your time. Thank you. >> Chris Paige is next on deck is Blair McKay. Robbie Robert Levinsky, if your name has been called, please make your way to the podium, so, before I get started, there's a lot of

slides, so I'll. >> Just click the next button. >> Okay, so the question here is revenue at any cost. And I invite every lawyer in the room to try to argue how this doesn't violate fair housing through disparate impact. Right, this is at emb town is how they recruit students, which many of many of whom I'm sure you heard from today. >> This is how they teach them to talk. >> This is how they tell them to

[12:23:49 PM]

>> This is how they tell them to come out here or bust them out. Little history lesson for them. Here's the 1928 master plan and where racial demographics are in the city today. Here's where development goes. This is where development doesn't go, where it doesn't go, where it doesn't go, and where we are. The desired development zone. This is where they incentivize redevelopment in east Austin, put heavy polluting industrial uses into our neighborhoods. This is what they did in my neighborhood. Carcinogens led, ask mic. >> This is what they did through urban removal, as we like to call it in east Austin. >> This is when they decided they wanted to upzone east Austin through transit. This is what they call something that's equivalent to I-35 five. It's a two lane residential street. This is how they've been dismantling our neighborhood plans through, private lobbyists that they hire. You can see

[12:24:50 PM]

that they hire. You can see where they all are. East of 35. And then. >> That's envy town. That's a venture capitalist. This is what strs have been doing in the city. You can see a little drop off on the pandemic started, but it's exploding. 24 is just getting started. This is build to rent, single family rental. >> Thank you. Sir >> Affordability is not poison. Greg thank you. Robert Levinsky. >> Sorry. Something is wrong with my speaker list. Okay.

[12:25:50 PM]

with my speaker list. Okay. Robert Levinsky, Blair Mckay, Celine curry, Lauren curry, srikar nalluri. If your name, please. >> If your name has been called, please come forward and be prepared. >> Thank you sir. >> Feel free to take the microphone, thank you. Council members, staffers and planning commissioners for your time. We truly appreciate your service, I also wanted to support the policy makers that are as they work hard to put together these pro housing pro density amendments and continue to show that they are all support and more affordable. Austin, my name is Blair Mckay. I'm an architect, and a resident of district four. I've spent the better part of the last eight years volunteering and advocating in Austin, that aligns more closely with the imagine Austin plan. This plan

[12:26:52 PM]

imagine Austin plan. This plan strives for a more livable, sustainable, and prosperous city with better mobility and connectivity for all, I'm also the current, commissioner of advocacy at the aia. Austin, I'm here to support equitable transit oriented districts and developments, we appreciate the mayor and the council's approach for focusing on housing policy to ensure that we all are building density around our project, connect alignments, without this prioritization, that project will not be successful, I'm also here to advocate for compatibility reform, Austin has long had one of the most stringent compatibility standards in the nation. The staff's recommendation of 75ft would be a tremendous improvement and align better with our city's other cities by aligning our standards with those of our peer cities, we can significantly increase our unit capacity, as confirmed by the staff's analysis, this change is not in line with almost half of our

[12:27:55 PM]

line with almost half of our strategy. Sorry. This is not only in line with half. Almost half of our strategy strategic housing blueprint goals, but also community priority, and it's time that we act on it, Austin's latest designation as the 10th largest city only further highlights the need for us to shift into density, or we face paying for sprawling infrastructure as more people move. Thank you, thank you. Thank you, mayor and council members. My name is Bobby levinski. >> I'm an attorney with the save our springs alliance. I want to start by saying that I really appreciated the Austin justice coalition's comments, because I think that so much of the debate is so much more in the nuance and the details, save our springs alliance is against the proposal, and it's largely because of while this is tailored towards increasing transit, supportive density, which is which is important. >> So much of this proposal is lacking in the details of what's what's missing. >> And the important community

[12:28:56 PM]

>> And the important community values that Austin represents, including the I think what while this does increase the ability to develop each lot, what really needs to be understood is also the increased economic pressure will have on removal of trees, the increase of impervious cover, which affects water quality and stormwater flows, and the displacement of existing residents, this happens a lot in the environmental world. So when you have smaller lots, there's one of the analysis that you have an environmental variance is whether your design will dictate the environmental variance. When you have a smaller lot, it gets sold off to a new homeowner. It's going to necessarily, lead to the result that there are more environmental variances. There will be more just, tree removals. And Austin's tree ordinance is already very difficult to enforce. I'm going to raise an example of something that recently happened, a oak tree that was in south Austin just got removed. It was denied three times for removal because

[12:29:58 PM]

three times for removal because it didn't meet the qualifications. And then the applicant came back with a, kind of some made up facts and an excuse and ended up getting removed. And that was for a swimming pool that was not for housing. And so while a lot of this is designed for housing, we have to understand that there's a lot of people that can be described by that, don't represent the values that you're trying to, that you're trying to bring to the table and that there will be abuses of the language. So we have to be careful in what gets written. That's the time. It's not enough time for the Craig Natasha century. >> Lauren curry srikar nalluri and Tommy vineyard, please state your name. >> Hello. >> My name is Craig Naser, president of Austin environmental Democrats and resident of the Gracie woods neighborhood of north Austin. Home two has some good things in it, but we still have concerns.

[12:30:59 PM]

it, but we still have concerns. While density generally is good along transportation corridors, increased density displaces natural ecosystems wherever it occurs. Austin has significant unmet flooding needs. Local flooding needs due to the fact that soils and topography vary greatly in their water absorption abilities, while keeping impervious cover limits to 45% is good. This number is an approximation. These code changes will incentivize maximizing impervious cover limits. Combining this with climate change and localized flooding will likely be increased. I emailed you an article worth reading my observations inform me that we have for years, despite our best intentions, have been running nature out of Austin. Higher density without a mechanism for acquiring more nearby parkland will continue to do this, resulting in increased inequity as density near parkland or any green space becomes more unaffordable. Here is a quote. The old lakota Luther standing bear was wise. He knew that a

[12:32:00 PM]

bear was wise. He knew that a man's heart away from nature becomes hard. He knew that a lack of respect for growing living things soon leads to a lack of respect for humans to. So he kept his children close to nature's softening influence, access to nature at this late date needs to come first. If you truly do that home will work. If not, we will continue down the same old unsustainable road to a future no one wants. Thank you. Good morning, mayor and city council. My name is srikar nalluri, I've been living in Austin here for about eight years, and I live in district nine now, I wanted to speak in support of the proposals on the table today because, I was able to come to America.

[12:33:00 PM]

to come to America. >> My family was able to come to America, come to Texas, come to Austin, all three of those steps because of the availability of townhouses and apartments, I think it's important that we that we are able to build those for the next generation that might be able to come in. And I appreciate that. Compatibility is on the reform is on. Reform of compatibility is on the table here because, a lot of people where I grew up have asthma because they put the apartments next to oil refineries and next to the freeways. And I think an apartment building is more compatible as housing with other housing than it is being pushed out of all the central neighborhoods. So thank you for taking up these reforms. Holding this public input hearing, I learned of some issues, like what the 37th street neighbors were saying. Obviously, no proposal is perfect, but I think it will help, and thanks for having these hearings. You're the first council in my lifetime to treat this with a sense of urgency that it needs. And

[12:34:01 PM]

urgency that it needs. And hopefully you will continue to improve and take in the feedback from today. Thanks. Thank you. >> Tommy vineyard on deck are Michelle Anderson, Kendall Kessinger, Ryan Pollack. Mike kennerty. And Andrew Nelson. If your name has been called, please approach a podium and state your name. >> Feel free to begin. >> Okay. >> Thank you. Good afternoon, mayor, mayor pro tem and city council. I'm Michelle Anderson, CEO of Austin habitat for humanity. We work tirelessly with clients every day in the workforce, in the missing middle, from diverse backgrounds , ages and abilities, all striving to secure home ownership. We provide housing,

[12:35:02 PM]

ownership. We provide housing, counseling, financial counseling, vital services like foreclosure prevention, and I am truly impressed by the strides this council has made and simplifying housing creations, expanding affordable housing options for a wide range of income earners. Your dedication to addressing home ownership also builds generations wealth, and is one of the reasons I'm able to stand here today. Each week you face tough decisions, yet your unwavering commitment to our community shines through. I want to express my heartfelt gratitude for your services on behalf of all of our families. Your efforts have a profound impact on the lives of hundreds of individuals and families in Austin and future home ownership investment for generations to come. Austin habitat for humanity stands ready to collaborate with you on

[12:36:03 PM]

collaborate with you on initiatives that further our shared goals to ensure affordable home ownership for all who desire it. Thank you again for your tireless dedication, and I look forward to continuing our work together to build a stronger Austin for everyone. Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Good morning

mayor, council and commissioners. My name is Ryan Pollack. I'm here today as a 17 year austinite currently of district nine, a representative of the international brotherhood of electrical workers local 520 and the central Texas building trades council. Our members, who are deeply involved in shaping Austin's infrastructure, have been facing the challenging reality of being priced out of the city. They serve at this point for well over a decade, if not two decades. >> This underscores the urgency of the reforms you're considering, and illustrates why we ask you to support these changes. >> The updates to the land development code, including the itod compatible and the second phase of home, are badly needed. >> Steps in the right direction, steps that show you appreciate

[12:37:03 PM]

steps that show you appreciate the efforts of all the workers who build and maintain everything that we all recognize as a tangible essence of Austin our physical capital, our wealth . >> By striving to ensure that they can afford to live where they work, we often hear from those in opposition that this will change the character of their neighborhoods. Which is weird because during due to the gigantic, minimum lot sizes, home builders have commonly been building new hulking mansions that no local can reasonably afford in order to turn a profit on those lots mansions in place of the previously existing bungalows and ranch houses. I don't understand why that doesn't count as change of character in our neighborhoods. Gentrification, displacement has already been happening here for a very long time now at shocking speed under the existing code. If you haven't already been displaced, your community broken up, just wait. A significant point to highlight in the proposed amendments as the as the adjustment to our city's compatibility standards. For decades, Austin has adhered to what are currently some of the nation's strictest standards. The proposed changes aimed to

[12:38:03 PM]

The proposed changes aimed to bring our city in line with its peers, which, based on staff analysis, could enhance our our housing unit capacity by 63,000 units. A substantial move towards meeting our housing blueprint goals goals that this council passed itself, reflecting a community and council aligned priority. Also significant is how critical this is for us in qualifying for potential billions and federal grants for transit, potentially a once in a lifetime opportunity that would help solidify Austin not as an overhyped, superficial fourth. >> Thank you. >> Appreciate you being here. >> Kendall Kessinger, Mike kennerty, Andrew Nelson. >> Hello, my name is Andrew Nelson. >> I represent the Austin ems association. I also live in district two, the rest of the board would like to be here today, but we are in our own meeting at this time. So you have me, the Austin association unequivocally supports this measure. Membership has a vested interest, but mainly lives outside of the city and outside of the county. Because we've been priced out, many of them would like to be here but feel alienated from the process because they're not. City of



[12:39:04 PM]

because they're not. City of Austin residents. These changes could effectively reduce pricing enough to allow our membership to finally be able to comfortably afford starter homes. For those members that don't or can't buy right now, it- could also allow other austinites to purchase starter homes, freeing up rental space and reducing rent prices for our membership. I don't want to overstate the massive impact this could have for our membership and for our public safety partners across the city. Thank you. Thank you. >> Amidah, ameera Streeter, Chris alfinito, Sharon Blythe. Isabella. Sanchez. >> Feel free to begin. >> Good day, mayor Watson. >> Council members and planning commissioners, thank you so much for taking the time to hear these important amendments today . I am speaking today in favor of the amendments related to

[12:40:04 PM]

of the amendments related to electric vehicle charging. My name is amirah Streeter and I am a senior government affairs and community engagement manager for volterra, which is a company that builds, operates and operates electric vehicle charging facilities for all types of vehicles. We provide ev charging stations across the nation for businesses and organizations who need to power their electric vehicles, volterra greatly appreciates all the work that city staff have put into drafting this ordinance. For this new use. We believe this ordinance allows for the reasonable development of land into charging stations, but we do have feedback and want the council and the commission to consider our recommendations. When you usually think of electric vehicle, you might think of a Tesla, a Chevy bolt or a Nissan leaf, maybe even a prius. You may even own one of these cars. In addition to light duty vehicles, volterra provides infrastructure for all types of

[12:41:05 PM]

infrastructure for all types of evs, including medium and heavy duty vehicles. This this can look like a van, a truck, or even a bus. Even a school bus. We build for companies who want to transition from gas to electric, and we have concerns about the distance requirements and the square footage restrictions that are currently being imposed. We would ask that instead of the 1000ft limit between sites, consider either removing that restriction or decreasing that limit significantly. This change would allow for flexibility while siting ev stations and offer reasonable access to charging while preserving density. Instead of having the 25,000 square footage limit, we recommend increasing that to 50,000ft S. Again, this allows for flexibility to find land that would allow for sufficient development of ev stations. >> Thank you for your input. Thank you. >> I'm Sharon Blythe. I don't

[12:42:07 PM]

>> I'm Sharon Blythe. I don't have any prepared statements, but listening to this testimony this morning reaffirms my position that I have no representation on any of these councils, commissions or anything.

>> I live in far west, north northwest Austin. Yeah I live in a single family home. But you're going to reduce my lot size to 2000ft S, which will decimate my neighborhood, decimate my house, and decimate my house. I built shortly after my husband died, raised my two children there. I still live in that house and now I find out recently that watershed protection is going to tear up the valley behind my house. And take out 13 heritage trees, plus many, many other trees, and put a lot of cement down there because somebody wants to build a development in south, spicewood springs road. Shame on you all. Shame on

[12:43:07 PM]

Shame on you all. Shame on watershed. Shame on you for even considering this home initiative. It is a citywide disaster that's beginning to happen, and you all should be ashamed of yourselves. Thank you very much. >> Thank you Chris alfinito Isabella Sanchez, sonny Shukla, Katelyn Kalb, and Jean Wilkins. >> If your name has been called, please approach the podium and state your name. Okay. >> Hi everyone, I'm Soni Shukla, I'm a sophomore law, government and sociology student at UT Austin and I'm here to support the home initiative in the urban density program, but also say that we need to be doing more to make housing accessible, and we need more government regulation when it comes to housing. >> And I think this is a great step toward making that housing more accessible. >> But, you know, like what everyone here said, all the environmental justice people and everyone who has been displaced, they all have very valid

[12:44:08 PM]

they all have very valid concerns. >> And, you know, historically looking if you look at the urban policy research and if you look at the history of housing, housing development has historically, you know, been able to reduce urban sprawl and actually save green space as well as lower the cost of housing. >> So I'm hoping with the home initiative, this will continue to happen. >> But, there does need to be more government regulation when it comes to the cost of housing as well. >> And I hope that we can start prioritizing people over profit when it comes to housing, because as many of you know, gentrification and, displacement of people from urban centers is a very real concern. And yeah, thank you for your time. >> Hello, my name is Jean Wilkins, and I oppose the home initiative as it is proposed. I live in Barton view neighborhood , which is a pretty dangerous area in terms of wildfire. If you're familiar with that area,

[12:45:09 PM]

you're familiar with that area, we have a fire wise group that have met in the past with, with, the fire, representatives from the city who've already warned us of how dangerous it's going to be for us to exit the area and the infill with the congested development that's proposed is going to make it even more dangerous in case of a fire to get out of the area. I hope that there's plans being put in place that will address this and give us a way to safely exit the area with the congestion that is proposed to be increased. We also share this concern with Barton, hills, which is just across 360 from us. There are no sidewalks in my neighborhood, and, it seems like smaller lots with no parking is being incentivized, children

[12:46:11 PM]

being incentivized, children will have to walk in the streets with cars on both sides of the road. Families who are trying to walk in the evening, which occurs frequently in my neighborhood, will have to walk in the middle of the road. People walking with strollers will be walking in the middle of the road again. There's no sidewalks. Taxation is a major concern to me, since a lot can be subdivided and be more valuable. How is this going to impact the value of the land and therefore the tax bill? I've asked this to Brian alter in meetings that we have had. I will ask it again. This Friday in our next meeting. I've gotten no answer on that. I'd like for somebody to crunch numbers. Thank you. >> Caitlin Caleb Ingrid Morton, D.A. Kumar. Edgar Handel. If your name has been called,

[12:47:13 PM]

your name has been called, please approach the podium and state your name. >> Good evening. My name is Dia Kumar and I am a student of the university of Texas and a fellow resident from Austin from district nine. I came here before you today to express my support for phase two of the home initiative, because I believe it is a pivotal step towards addressing the housing challenges that we face in our city. I have only lived in Austin for two years, but have really grown to love the city and its community. As I continue through my academic pursuits, I hope to remain in Austin. However, throughout my education, I have been facing struggles with affording rent with the limited spaces of west campus and fear that I might have to cut my education short. I believe with the promises of phase two to alleviate these burdens by providing more affordable housing through the lot size and height reforms, students like me can continue their education without the conflicting stressors of affordability that conflict with my academic goals. I also hope

[12:48:14 PM]

my academic goals. I also hope to continue living in Austin when I graduate and find a job in the city which can which could provide possibilities of which could be possible with phase two with the home initiative represents not just a policy change, but a beacon of hope for students striving for academic success amidst the pressures of finding a home in Austin, I urge you to consider the positive impact this initiative will have on the student community and future for the city. Thank you. Thank you. >> Ingrid Morton followed by Edgar Handel and Zachary Faddis. >> Hi. Good afternoon, mayor, city council commissioners. >> My name is Ingrid Morton, and I'm a resident of, district five. And I'm here today to ask for the postponement of the home two initiative. We need to answer more questions when it comes to the concerns that

[12:49:18 PM]

comes to the concerns that people have brought up about our infrastructure being in place. And I really think we need more time to really do that, most of all, we need to give ourselves more time so we can educate the community. The residents of Austin. Most people don't really know what's going on, and we just need to let them know what, because it's going to affect everyone. Thank you for your time. Thank you. >> Zachary Faddis, Luis Austin, Igo. Next is Janice Rankin, with time donated for Mary Engel and Tanya Payne. Are Mary and Tanya here? Thank you. So Janice will get six minutes. After Janice, Omar Vasquez. If your name has been called, please come down. >> So we know that you're you're here. Thank you. >> Please begin.

[12:50:23 PM]

>> Please begin. >> Good afternoon. Mayor, council members and commissioners, thank you for your time. I am Janice Rankin. I'm a retired attorney, and I've lived in Austin since 1988. I oppose home one, home two compatibility reductions and itod proposals. This is pursuing a fool's gold. I became a homeowner in council district seven and 92. I've been paying property taxes ever since, including the tax increase that supports a part of the project connect cost prior to the project connect election, the voters were not told that home two, home one or itod super density policies would be needed in order to build or afford project connect speculative data based on potential density will hardly support federal capital grant applications. There is far

[12:51:24 PM]

grant applications. There is far too much competition for that money. This is a high stakes experiment. A failure to plan is a plan to fail. Austin homeowners and residents are being subjected to an untried, untested proposal. This experiment would come at a huge financial and personal cost without considering the long term detriment to them, and their families. We don't want to be your Guinea pigs.

A public vote is needed on these proposals in public governance. A sweeping change like this calls for transparency, with broad and extensive public participation in not just meet and greets. Most people in Austin have not even heard about this proposal, and when they learn about the changes, they are shocked to learn they will not be a public vote on this measure. The public does not understand that this has much more to do with allowing 120 foot tall buildings outside of downtown, and not necessarily

[12:52:25 PM]

downtown, and not necessarily near corridors, than it does with actual transit changes. This is a tool for private commercial developers and not for transit and housing. Housing that austinites actually need. These purple cards are vague, misleading, and defective as official notice to owners, the card says coming changes could affect your property or that code changes may affect how it could be developed or used. There's not much to go on here. Nowhere does the card state the affected address and the record owner. Nowhere does it state how or when the owner's property will be impacted. Nowhere does the card mention home, two lot divisions or subdivisions, or the impact of itod high density transit districts. Only those who have a digital device to use a qr code can learn about the itod density areas measured from rail and bus stations, as the purple card merely describes

[12:53:26 PM]

purple card merely describes home lot two divisions, home two lot divisions, or the impact of itod high density transit districts, with the purple card merely describes home to without identifying it by name. It says revised regulations that apply to lots with one housing unit and regulations that apply to flag lots. The purple card does refer to compatibility standards, and it lists potential action as revised height, building placement and other related regulations that are in addition to a properties based zoning regulations. The fact is, these proposals will not keep Austin weird and wonderful. They will make it ugly and undesirable for families. It may actually increase urban sprawl when the single income no kids workers decide to opt for a family life, making the surrounding towns more attractive than living in a compact cram in densified

[12:54:26 PM]

compact cram in densified Austin. So instead of cramming more people into Austin, it would work a lot better to provide clean, effective, flexible, and timely bus service in Austin and the surrounding areas to alleviate traffic. This is a better way to manage this housing shortage in Austin by helping area workers commute into Austin without needing their vehicles. We're not addressing that at all. It never has been. This is a threat to neighborhood communities. This unwelcome, forced density displaces family neighborhoods and local businesses. It impacts homeowners and residents living on lots all over Austin

and cuts across all economic levels. It's an equal opportunity threat that jeopardizes all of these austinians, their communities of interest and their families. This calls for a public vote. Thank you for your time. >> Thank you. >> Luz Austin Iugo. Omar Vasquez

[12:55:27 PM]

>> Luz Austin Iugo. Omar Vasquez is on deck. >> Sorry about that, pal, this is on. >> Yes. Well, good afternoon, folks. I'm, Luis Rosie. Iugo district resident, and, or a board member, and I wanted to say that I'm in full support of these policies, and I want to more specifically take the planning, thank the planning commission. Council and mayor Watson specifically for focusing on not what you may necessarily be defaulted to, but what is really going to get something done that we can pass, and that's going to be good for the residents of Austin both now and into the future. I have been hearing the most what to me feels like nonsense, circular reasoning, trying to guilt, treat, bully or otherwise coerce people into doing what they would already want to do, which is control the future of Austin for themselves and themselves alone. It's very, very simple. Eid sort of policies are right. Where do you want working class people living near the train or near a highway, compatibility is very simple, right? How much do

[12:56:27 PM]

very simple, right? How much do you want to push out the people who can't afford a single family home in Austin? You want to live in central north, central, maybe far or south? Or do you want to live in Taylor or Kyle or Buda? Right. It's quite straightforward. Obviously it's not perfect. You know, I think that there's a place to revisit and we can improve upon, you know, I don't believe in minimum lot size or compatibility at all, but I appreciate that the mayor and council and planning commission has taken a sort of a uniting and sort of yes, and approach to like, okay, we all have disagreements, we all see things differently, but how can we get something that moves forward and that's so radically different from how we've done things for the last ten years. The status quo has led to the displacement of black and brown folks. The displacement of working class and young people outside of the city. And it's something that I think we should never go back to because that there is no future in that lifestyle. So thank you. Thank you. >> After Omar Vasquez, we have sol praxis with time donated from Iliana Medrano and Fran

[12:57:29 PM]

from Iliana Medrano and Fran tattoo. Are Iliana and Fran here ? We okay. We'll call them when they return. Go ahead, Mr. Vasquez. >> Actually, I'm Edgar Handel. >> I live in district three with my wife and two kids. I'm here to speak in support of equitable transit oriented development, compatibility reform, and home phase two. My dad, a Honduran Palestinian immigrant, makes a living buying salvaged cars, repairing them and selling them through my dad and his work, I've come to understand the financial

dangers of cars. >> When I consider buying a new car. >> It's his voice I hear in my head reminding me how much money I'd be losing to depreciation, interest, insurance and more. >> I've seen him give tithe and labor for family who are in dire need of a car. >> I've seen how emergency costs associated with cars are right up there with medical emergencies, as quick routes to financial ruin. >> Indeed, traffic collisions are one of the most common causes of serious injuries and all of the costs that entails. >> I say all this because it's important to understand the profound impact, not needing a

[12:58:29 PM]

profound impact, not needing a car can have on financial stability and the ability to make rent. >> Giving up a car can save households hundreds or even \$1,000 a month. >> If we consider two homes with the same rent, one in an itod and one car dependent home, the itod home would be much more affordable. >> So I'm not only hoping that we can advance these proposals, but strengthen them. >> That could mean allowing more density even in single family Zones, lowering minimum lot sizes more, adjusting site development regulations like setbacks even more to make homes more home options feasible. >> I believe these policies will help with affordability and keeping residents in their homes. But it won't solve it entirely. We also need to work on other policies, including but not limited to, rental assistance, permanent supportive housing, financial assistance to low income homeowners who want to build more homes in their property, and spending our anti-displacement funds wisely to help vulnerable populations so let's take all the meaningful steps we can towards addressing Austin's housing crisis, and let's also work on these important land use changes, improve them and pass them. >> Thank you.

[12:59:30 PM]

>> Thank you. >> Good afternoon, city council. Planning commission, thank you for your time. My name is Omar Vasquez Alpizar. I was born and raised in the city of Austin, and I'm here to voice my support for home initiative. Before I begin, I just want to take a moment and keep Austin weird by saying I love each and every one of you. Thank you so much for all you do and all the hard work you put in, back to the main point though, as I said, I was born and raised here and it's becoming difficult every day to stay in Austin. I've lived in the downtown area, but was forced out due to pricing. I now live in west Austin and out of district with a lot of friends of mine. In one house, and it is a very common story that I hear often, and I truly believe that the home initiative will help alleviate this burden and help me reach my goals of actually owning a house in Austin at one point. And hopefully I can share

[1:00:31 PM]

point. And hopefully I can share the same dreams that my parents shared, which is to raise a family and a beautiful neighborhood with love and support. All around me. Thank you. >> Good afternoon council

and commission. I'm sorry. Praxis d3 Austin renter one second please. >> Yes, our Ileana and Fran here, here. Okay. And okay. So six minutes, you get six minutes. Thank you, thank you. >> Who is here today? Very few black and brown Austin residents who are most impacted by the housing affordability crisis. And the extreme harm these zoning changes will accelerate. As a housing organizer and service provider here on behalf of community powered atx, a coalition of over 30 organizations across the eastern crescent with members who actually work with and are renters at risk of homelessness, unhoused neighbors, and low income homeowners. I can tell you that we have real solutions to the housing affordability

[1:01:31 PM]

to the housing affordability crisis, and that if you want to meet black and brown, longtime east austinites, just go to the streets because the majority of unhoused residents were pushed to the streets by rising rents in Austin. This here is the opposite of how planning should be done. This is what structural racism and classism looks like. As a former planning commissioner, I know that this is normalized for you all. As I witnessed many hearings where working class bipoc residents voices were drowned out and gaslit, where commissioners literally said, we need to turn the knobs to lower the cost for developers. That would then trickle down to result in lower housing costs for renters and homeowners, while at the very same time passing gentrification projects demolished existing affordable housing that residents were begging you all to stop. What a joke and what a disgrace we need real, community driven planning and solutions to the housing affordability crisis. City staff we've spoken to have agreed and admitted that home phase one was rushed. A majority of speakers at the December 7th, 2023 hearing registered against the home

[1:02:32 PM]

registered against the home initiative, and they showed up despite barriers and were directly impacted, telling council to vote no and to postpone. Not only was public engagement severely limited during the holidays, but since this year has begun, there's been no robust process or genuine community outreach. Community powered atx calls on council to postpone the votes on all ldc amendments for a community based input process. Abundant housing what you mean by that is abundant for the rich and nonexistent for low and middle income people, Austin is growing. We just need to build more. We are building more, more luxury housing, but we don't have a luxury housing shortage. We have a deeply affordable housing shortage, and we need to build deeply affordable density. You aren't pro housing. You're pro developer, pro profit, pro displacement. Whereas those of us in our coalition coalition, we are pro preserving and producing affordable housing. We should only be expediting truly affordable housing density. During phase one, we pushed for

[1:03:33 PM]



During phase one, we pushed for financing opportunities for low and middle income homeowners to build deeply affordable units on their lots, and we were ignored. We still want to see forgivable loans and creative financing for units at 50 and 30. Mfi we were ignored because again, this isn't really about affordability. It's about developer profits, market driven, driven upzoning plans only worsen the profiteering that has caused this crisis. The only way to stabilize rent for middle and low income homeowners is through the production of truly affordable housing, which requires approaches that are not market based. For etudes, any density bonus should require a much higher percentage of units, and they should be between 30 and 50. Mfi because that's the income level of households being displaced based on the 2020 census and deeply affordable as well. Below 30% for residents most at risk of homelessness. If you say that's not workable for developers, I can recall one project when I was on planning commission where residents who were being displaced by a vmu two project and could not afford even the quote unquote affordable units included, were

[1:04:34 PM]

affordable units included, were told that there was no way the developer could provide any deeper levels of affordability. When vmu two was put at risk by the court case, the developer had to scramble, had to change plans. They accessed late funding, and now the property is 100% affordable. We need to hold developers to a higher standard, they say. They can't build deeper levels of affordability only because y'all let them get away with that. It is disgraceful that almost 100 years since the notorious 1928 master plan, systemic racism is still alive and well in Austin city planning. Back then, it was about disinvestment. It now exploitative redevelopment, home one and two. The tod overlay compatibility changes all of these inaccessible urban planning policies with language meant to confuse regular folks, excludes those of us most impacted by the housing affordability crisis. From the conversation, and makes those most privileged with an urban planning background think that they're the only ones who truly understand. But we understand. We understand the interests behind all of these zoning

[1:05:36 PM]

behind all of these zoning changes and the impacts because we see them every day in our communities. All of these resolutions are about giving developers more entitlements to build more luxury and market rate units for more profits, as they all drive up housing costs and accelerate the housing affordability crisis for everyone but the wealthiest of residents with middle and low income residents impacted the worst by displacement and homelessness. The mechanism for this, you should be familiar with at this point is increased market value due to the higher potential profits with greater entitlements to developers, which then causes an increase in property taxes and rent, and incentivizes the demolition of existing affordable housing to produce market rate luxury units. On the current itod map, there's multiple currently affordable properties that accept section eight vouchers and will likely see increased

rents or be demolished for luxury housing with minimal affordability. At minimum, you need to include language preventing demolition and closing loopholes for developers. Next, we also called for a protective overlay during home phase one, but it was so rushed.

[1:06:38 PM]

phase one, but it was so rushed. And of course we were ignored. We need to protect and preserve existing affordable housing through an anti-displacement equity protective overlay that protects neighborhoods vulnerable to displacement by not applying any of the up zoning in home lots, the citywide compatibility changes, and future LDC amendments within that area. Due to a history of disinvestment in low income BIPOC neighborhoods, the profit margin is highest in the eastern crescent and investors target our communities for exploitative redevelopment. >> Thank you. >> Next speaker is Chris Alfinito, followed by Caitlin Kell on deck is Leland Murphy and Ali Zavala. >> If your name has been called, please step up to a microphone. >> Chris Alfinito Caitlin Kalb. >> Is your name been called? >> If your name has been called, please approach the podium and begin your testament testimony. >> Good afternoon. Mayor,

[1:07:41 PM]

>> Good afternoon. Mayor, council members, commissioners, my name is Chris Alfinito. I'm a workforce housing developer with Heartwood Real Estate Group and a resident of District Nine. >> In 2017, we recognized the need for a lot more housing, both affordable and market rate. >> So we created a plan, a big plan for ten years, 135,000 new units. >> Halfway through, we're 92,000 units short. >> We produced less than one third of our goal by the way, we did this during a five year period in which market fundamentals and interest rates were as low as they're ever going to be, and as good as they're ever going to be, there was not a better time to produce more housing than the past five years, and we kind of squandered it, didn't we? >> How do we get back? How do we catch up? We need to we need to work on our development code, which is putting a chokehold on the supply. We know that the demand is there, but we can't create it. >> So I'm here to support these resolutions and I'm here to support the relaxation of compatibility standards, which are some of the strictest in the nation.

[1:08:43 PM]

nation. >> I support splitting our lots into smaller lots so that we don't have to build \$2 million houses everywhere. Here. It's only a start. We still have way, way too much work to do to get to this goal, but we can try. And if we don't, if we waste any more time, we're just going to get to the end of the ten year period and be very, very badly behind. >> Thank you. Thank you. Leland Murphy. >> Hello and good afternoon, everyone. It's great to see y'all. My name is Leland Murphy. I'm a master's of public affairs

student here at the lbj school at UT, and I'm testifying today in favor of item one. Throughout my now five years at UT, I have been able to live on campus with four of those years having served as a resident assistant. Being an RA thankfully secures my housing and covers my housing costs while I have been blessed with my housing paid for, I know there are so many students and community members in Austin who can't afford housing. I have countless friends who work two

[1:09:43 PM]

countless friends who work two or more jobs just to make rent and be able to live here in the 2022 2023 school year, I served as the president of UT student body and repeatedly so many students raised their concerns to me about the issue of housing and affordable housing. A recent Gallup poll found that a record low of 21% of Americans have confidence in the current housing market, but I believe by passing these reforms, we can start to turn these numbers around here in Austin. These reforms allow for creating more housing options and, most importantly, driving housing costs down for all residents. Additionally, the plans to have housing next to transit is super important to me as I am a frequenter of capmetro and I don't own a car and so with that all being said, I hope you all pass these reforms so we can have a more affordable and more connected Austin. Thank you all so much, Ali gavalala Raul Shaw, Joan Saldana.

[1:10:45 PM]

Joan Saldana. >> Hi. >> Good afternoon. My name is Ali Zavala and I'm a junior at UT Austin studying psychology, and I live in district nine. I'm testifying in favor of this amendment, for equitable transit oriented development that would reduce minimum lot size relaxing zoning near phase one of project connect and creating a density bonus program. I also want to hold space to consider the points brought up about environmental concerns, as well as infrastructure, as well as segregationist city planning that has been in Austin for decades. We need to address all of these in tandem with increasing, with increasing density. Increasing density is important because it allows for movement between commercial and residential areas. For those of us who do not and cannot drive.

[1:11:46 PM]

us who do not and cannot drive. This is especially important to me as someone with a peripheral vision impairment. My field of vision is only 90 degrees, meaning I will never be able to drive at least until self-driving cars improve in the next 20 years. I'm coming from Dallas. This disability made it difficult and costly for me to visit friends and loved ones, or make daily commutes to school and work. Moving to a city more walkable than my hometown meant more freedom to be involved in my community and go about my daily life independently. On top of this, density means or should mean more affordable

housing. As a second generation longhorn, I grew up hearing about the cultural vibrance of Austin, how the city is full of life and new ideas. Some of my parents friends from their days at UT stayed in Austin and remained

[1:12:46 PM]

stayed in Austin and remained part of its growth and success to this day. The reality is that it was far more feasible. >> Thank you very much. Appreciate your being here. >> Caitlin Caleb. >> All right. Good afternoon, city council members. My name is rahul and I'm a sophomore at UT Austin. I moved to UT. I moved to Austin two years ago with my family when the housing market was insane, and it's hardly cooled off since then, I currently live in west campus and my parents live up in spicewood springs, which are parts of districts nine and six, and I'm here to testify in support of city council city code title 25 to support the housing reform and promote project connect. I was first exposed to Austin housing when I moved here. And it was pretty much insane. And following that was the nightmare of finding a lease in west campus after my freshman year. And I was fortunate enough that my parents decided to invest in a condo. So I now live in west campus there. But after working to help some political refugees from the Middle East find housing in

[1:13:47 PM]

Middle East find housing in Austin, it's only made it more clear that how dismal the state of housing in Austin is, title 25 is a step in the right direction to bring more affordable housing. The problem is that there isn't enough, and this is the step in the right direction. And additionally, project connect will make Austin more accessible, not just for the tens of thousands of students at UT, but it's going to also make it more accessible for the quickly growing regions around the proposed light rail. Title 25 is a step in the right direction to make the city more affordable and accessible for a quickly growing city. Thank you for your time and I hope you'll prioritize increasing housing affordability and public transportation for Austin residents. Thank you. >> Thank you. Hi. My name is Caitlin Cobb, and I'm a student at the university of Texas at Austin, I'm a sophomore. I'm also a university Democrat. >> So. >> Yeah, so basically, I'm here to say thank you, council, for

[1:14:48 PM]

to say thank you, council, for your hard work and collaboration with students to make housing affordable for people like me who are paying, you know, 1500 a month for rent, completely on student loans, stuff like that makes it really difficult for people who do not come from privileged backgrounds to afford to go to the university of Texas. And we all know that the housing, problem that's going on in Austin is making it very difficult for students to find housing, but legislation like this and reforms like this

will make it more affordable for students and more affordable for people who want to live here in this great city, so, yeah, thank you so much. And, please consult with students in the future to make sure that you're passing legislation that includes us because we care. >> We live here, we want to live here, and we want to be a part of Austin's future. >> So thank you so much. And thank you. >> Joanne Saldana, Monica

[1:15:50 PM]

>> Joanne Saldana, Monica Guzman, Robert crump, if your name is called, you don't have to speak in this particular order. Just make your way to the podium and state your name. Please Aleem Virani . >> Good afternoon. >> I'm Monica Guzman, policy director at go Austin. >> Vamos, Austin. >> However, this afternoon I'm speaking as a d4 resident with no reflection on Garza council members. Your staff and your appointed commissioners must stop with your collective litany about affordability and opportunities for middle income families during phase one. Mayor pro tem Powell's chief of staff was telling d1 residents home is for middle income folks. For people earning 50 to \$90,000.

[1:16:50 PM]

people earning 50 to \$90,000. However, less than two weeks ago, Katy reported that the millionaire population in Austin jumped 110% 110% in the past ten years. This skewed the Austin mfi, resulting in an even greater number of austinities in the low income brackets. Last week, while at a north loop neighborhood association meeting , council member vela stated, either explicitly or implicitly, that rent going down was going to make it more affordable. I countered with yes, it's going down for higher income earners, who will now have pocket change for going out to eat and trips to Starbucks while low income and working class families continue to struggle, sometimes working more than one job, he said more apartments going up will free up affordable units, less expensive units does not equate affordability. In 2018, city demographer Ryan Robinson addressed council about codenext, stating trickle down economics is not applicable to housing. When I lived in larkspur crossing apartments, paying just below a thousand for a large two two, a neighbor was paying far more for a11. Why?

[1:17:52 PM]

paying far more for a11. Why? Because as tenants moved out, management said that they must upgrade the units, so rents continued to increase to cover the cost. Finally, that home must be approved because there are no other solutions. That's wrong. Over the past several years, community solutions were presented to council 2018 people's plan. There were six resolutions in the overview of the six resolutions. Only the right to stay, right to return. Move forward when council approved in March 2018. 2022 del valle community coalition submitted a joint vmu two recommendation. >> Thank thank you,

thank you, miss Guzman 2024 statement about the. >> Good afternoon. >> My name is Alan Virani. I'm a resident of district nine and I'm an aura board member. So you might be wondering why I'm wearing eclipse glasses right

[1:18:52 PM]

wearing eclipse glasses right now. Well, on Monday, as you all know, we saw a spectacular, awe inspiring event. But it's not as awe inspiring as substantial land use reform. Okay, but the real talk the downside of wearing these glasses. I can't see anything right now, but that doesn't mean I'm blind to our housing crisis, but seriously, on Monday I was watching the eclipse from auditorium shores, and it did remind me how great this city is. It was great. It was with other austinites. >> We were watching the eclipse together. It was a great event, but I also was reminded that not everyone can share in how great this city is, because it's not affordable to everyone. So I'm asking council and the commissioner and the mayor. Thank you so much for your leadership here. We really do appreciate it, because let's not make the high cost of living and the high cost of housing eclipse. What makes Austin so great? Thank you. Robert crump, Jeff Bowen, robin rather. >> Megan miesenböck. I'm going

[1:19:56 PM]

>> Megan miesenböck. I'm going to try to do this with all the heart that I can bring it. I understand what's happening here. We have a collision of two important things I respect every single speaker, including the ones I disagree with very significantly. >> What's happening here is we have the realm of values, aspirations, hopes, and fervent prayers. We're all on the same page in terms of what we want and what we know we need. >> And what that is, is we need affordable housing in a way that doesn't intensify our climate problem. And that doesn't increase our already horrible displacement. Gentrification problem. That's we are all on the same page where it's completely falling apart. And why this is so divisive is

[1:20:57 PM]

why this is so divisive is because the aspirations I'm listening to these UT students, these grandparents, these ems folks, I'm listening to aura. We all understand what we need, but some of us are not buying that what is in front of you is actually going to do the job. Some of us are worried sick that it's going to make the climate problem worse. I really listen, I learned in the 90s to listen to Susana Almanza, to listen to poder, to listen to the Austin neighborhoods council, to listen to the lived experience and the people that that have lived experience under. And this is going to be horrible for more displacement and so what I'd like to do is, is beg you, I know you're good people. Tim McGraw is playing at the moody center

tonight. I love his song be humble and kind in our first job together is to be really good to each other. And those of us are that that are really concerned about this need to get

[1:21:59 PM]

concerned about this need to get with you all that are all excited about it, and find that sweet spot that we can move on together. Mayor Watson, this used to be your strength to help us find the sweet spot again. Thank you guys so much. >> Thank you, Jeffrey Bowen meg miesenböck, David Glenn. Ben lie . If your name has been called, please approach the podium. And zeeshan Malik. >> Hi. Good afternoon. My name is David Glenn. I'm the senior director of government relations for the home builders association. And proud district five resident. Thank you so much for taking the time today. This is an exciting time for housing in Austin. There's a lot of really great work to be done, we support all of the items on today's agenda, but we're focusing a lot more on the home initiative, we would encourage the group to, to take a look at the lot sizes and try to go as small as possible so that we can

[1:23:00 PM]

small as possible so that we can get the density we need. Ideally if we could maybe subdivide a typical lot into four units instead of just three, that would be great, we also want to talk about setbacks. When you provide more flexibility with design standards, you allow for more room to accommodate things like trees and other, topographical elements that, that we all love, we, we want to make sure that the, the resolution makes sense, there are going to be some technical tweaks that we're going to recommend, things that will make sure that there aren't conflicts within the code and also make sure the projects actually pencil and, the developers will actually go out and build these projects. So we're working on those recommendations this week. We've already spoke with some of you all about setting up some meetings, so stay tuned for that, and hopefully we can answer any questions you may have along the way. Thank you. Thank you. >> Ben Lee zeeshan Malik, Sylvia Sypniewski has donated time by Ernest Wilson are either of you here? No Eric Paulus, Katrina Miller. Please state your name.

[1:24:05 PM]

Miller. Please state your name. >> Thank you. >> Hi. My name is Sylvia zaniwski, and I was born and raised in Chicago to Polish immigrants. And I lived in Travis. >> Please. Is Ernest Wilson here? Okay. You get two minutes. >> Okay. I'm gonna cut this in half. I've lived in Travis heights district nine for three years, the following has been pulled from the 2024 rental housing report just published by Harvard center of housing studies. A record number of people are experiencing homelessness, local regulations and zoning laws constrain multifamily construction in many neighborhoods, and estimated 75% of the land in major cities is zoned exclusively for single family homes. Increase the supply of market rate units

will help to address the affordability crisis, but cannot wholly resolve it. Expanding assistance to lowest income renters will be crucial. Crucial everything that I've stated is in quotes. I've

[1:25:07 PM]

I've stated is in quotes. I've had handfuls of friends and neighbors relocate to San Antonio from Travis heights, where the San antonians have a saying keep San Antonio lame as a direct response to the migration of austinites, whose increasing presence and larger budgets, as compared to San antonians, have put pressure on their housing market. If this initiative doesn't pass, the socioeconomic imbalance of San Francisco and L.A. Will be mirrored by Austin and San Antonio will mirror what Austin will become, and so on. Imagine Austin as a cake home, seeks to cut the desired existing cake into more pieces, or by adding layers in an effort to make housing to satisfy the demands in amenities and opportunity. Rich areas like Travis heights and east Austin recall your favorite cities from your global travels and envision in Austin with townhomes, walk ups, and low rise apartments nestled in these amenity and opportunity rich areas, the lot size of my childhood home in Chicago was

[1:26:09 PM]

childhood home in Chicago was 1600 square feet. My parents, I'm a family of nine, denounced their citizenship to their communist at the time homeland of Poland, in exchange for the opportunity to live here, access to affordable housing is fundamental to one's success. I would not be standing here today speaking in favor of this initiative if similar zoning wasn't available in Chicago. >> Thank you very much. Appreciate your comments. >> Please state your name. >> Hi, my name is Katrina Miller . >> I'm a district eight resident and an employee of farm and city. >> There's really nothing I could say right now that you don't already know, so I'm really just here to say thank you so much for all of the work that you're doing in support of walkability, cycle ability and transit accessibility in the city of Austin, and making it more available to more people, thank you all so much for all the work that you're doing, and we really appreciate it. Thanks. Thank you. >> Eric Paulus, Philip Wiley, Andrea freiburger, Heather Hubbs

[1:27:11 PM]

Andrea freiburger, Heather Hubbs . Cedar Stephens, if your name has been called, please make your way to the podium. >> Hello, I'm Heather Hubbs, and I'm a district nine resident and a UT student, and I'm here to say that young people don't want to hear no young people don't want to hear. >> Yes, but we want to hear the city wants to hear. We want our city council members to change our city's outdated policies. So we are not forced to move out of Austin due to unreasonable rent costs. UT students are thankful that we have such a great council and mayor that are willing to hear us out. Finals are coming



up and it's the most nerve wracking time of a student's life, and I'm happy that students can come out and express our support of this, we want to see change so we don't have to watch people struggle and struggle ourselves. You'll hear that building more won't work economically, which is historically incorrect, and you'll hear those who oppose this item claim that they're doing this because home won't

[1:28:13 PM]

doing this because home won't actually facilitate affordability, and that they're doing this for students. But then you have people from their party who are potential mayoral candidates bullying college students in the library or not library lobby. Sorry, but please think about where their interests really lie. Again, thank you for your efforts. >> Thank you, Philip Wiley. >> Andrea is on deck. >> Good afternoon everybody, my name is Philip Wiley. I'm a resident and homeowner in district nine, and by profession was a supply demand planning manager and apex fellow, which is the professional society that looks after that particular discipline, I'm here in support of everything that's being proposed. I'm here to support tremendous gratitude for the planning community that works so hard for so long to get us to this point, that includes our

[1:29:16 PM]

this point, that includes our city staff, that includes our volunteer planning commission hours. It includes, all the advocates in the community who have been working at least 15 years hoping that someday something like this would happen. And it's a start. It's a really good start. I think everybody in this room that's worked on it should take pride on what you've brought to us today, I'm sorry that everybody isn't happy with it. I think there's still some education that needs to take place on why this is such a good thing and such an important thing, I walked here this morning, found out that I was 105 on the list, right, and hadn't had breakfast and didn't want to pass out at

[1:30:17 PM]

and didn't want to pass out at the podium. So I walked home, made a smoothie, and came back. So the first trick question is Google says it's 32 minutes each way. Is my walk shed 32 minutes or 96. For downtown residents, there is no walk shed. We can get anywhere. You can't put enough people here, but please try. Thank you very much. >> Andrea freiburger Richard Hayman, cedar Stephens. Chris flores. Michael Rhodes, please make your way. If your name has been called and state your name, or I'm going to keep going. Michael Rhodes. >> Hello everyone. I'm Chris

[1:31:18 PM]

>> Hello everyone. I'm Chris flores, I live in district ten. I registered as oh, sorry, I wear night guard stress, I registered as neutral because I support a far smaller lot size, in all city areas with no carve outs or exceptions. >> That's only fair, I support increased housing density, but I ask that you make amendments that provide some guardrails. And by guardrails I mean, number one, laws that allow older little apartment complexes to be incentivized to stay in place with upgrades for energy efficiency. The small complexes already offer density and are somewhat affordable and have shade, two to take human health into consideration for the people who will inhabit smaller, denser homes, we need laws that mandate orientation that creates passive air cooling and energy efficiency, as well as impervious cover and tree shade

[1:32:19 PM]

impervious cover and tree shade to offset the urban heat island effect three please look at south Lamar or burnet road as what not to build vehicle pollution in minimal shade, heat islands, constant noise and stacking people on top of each other like sardines. These buildings are rent expensive and not fully occupied. This is ugly, unhealthy, unhealthy and costly density. I'll close with this, working people in Austin want to own and care for our families in affordable tiny homes without swimming pools nestled under trees. Please help us make that happen. Thank you. >> Michael Rhodes, Matthew low. Amy Deluna. Hi, gray. Oh, I'm sorry, can I go? >> Okay. >> Please go ahead. >> Hi. I'm Matthew Loucks, a lot of people already made the

[1:33:19 PM]

of people already made the points that I was going to make, but, I feel like delivering these ordinances is a step in finally delivering the transit oriented development that we've repeatedly failed to create, I remember voting for the light rail proposal in 2014, when I had first moved here as a new UT student, and I'm sure some people felt the same way then about the proposal from 2000, this time is different. Not only did we pass project connect, we seem so much more prepared to take the small step of densifying our urban core and corridors, and we're even leaving single family homes alone for now. So this seems like something that, like the most number of people could possibly agree on, I live in a block of north university that would be affected by these changes, and a lot of my neighbors agree that a lot of the restrictions on height and compatibility are onerous and outdated, making these changes will decrease car dependance for essential trips, lower housing

[1:34:21 PM]

essential trips, lower housing costs by eventually driving up supply if property owners want to use their land for denser housing and get us federal funding for project connect, thanks. >> Your name has been called. Please come to the microphone. Just state your name for the record for us. >> My name is Kyle gray. >> I'm the president of the Austin infill coalition. And, I think I've been coming to these meetings for like 15 years. So I'd like to talk about why I think this stuff is important. And also, I'd like to thank you for all your hard work. >> I know this is, an incredible amount of work for everyone on planning commission on city council to go through this stuff. >> This is not an easy job, the reason I care about this is I think about a long time ago, we had an idea that if we don't build it, they won't come. Which? Which maybe could have worked, so we tried that. >> We made zoning very difficult, and we made the process very difficult to build housing. >> And that just didn't happen, people just still came anyway. And so what we started seeing is housing got more and more

[1:35:21 PM]

housing got more and more expensive because there was more people and there was not enough housing. And so what that kind of game of musical chairs, the people with the most money are able to get the housing it. A lot of people think this is about developers, and I want to say you shouldn't make these decision based on developers, and that process. While the city got worse, developers actually did fine, this might sound surprising, but building a \$3 million house and selling it to someone is actually profitable. I know that's weird, but that actually it works. The reason I think we should have more housing is because people need housing, and this is another thing we saw is, is housing got more expensive, people had to move farther and farther away. So they had to move more and more to the outskirts of the city. I think what gets lost in the economics of that is the human element. So when people have to live farther and farther away, but they still live in central Austin, that means they spend less time with their kids, less time with their families. They spend eight hours working, but then they have to spend an hour or two commuting. That's time that they could be spending with their five year old daughter or their significant other. And that's why I hope we can have more housing in central

[1:36:21 PM]

can have more housing in central Austin and allow things like missing middle housing so more people can live in our city, I am concerned about displacement as well, but the current thing we've been doing for the last ten years, which is limited amount of housing with you, can only build a house on a large lot, and you can only build one house, we've seen the results of that and the result is not positive, thank you for your time. >> Thank you. >> Amy Deluna. Genesis Britz, jazz gill. Brian Pena. Parker. Welch. Janice. Bookout. Riley. Patterson. If your name has been called, please make your way to the podium and state your name. Thank you. >> Hi, my name is Riley

[1:37:24 PM]

>> Hi, my name is Riley Patterson. I'm a resident of tarrytown in district ten, I support all the housing reforms we're discussing today, but I want to speak in particular to the merits of the proposed decrease in minimum lot sizes, my wife and daughter and I live on a 2700 square foot lot that was split in 1980 before the current zoning code made such splits illegal. Our immediate area has a denser, more walkable feel than our neighborhood at large, largely because of other lots with similar arrangements and some apartment buildings that were built before current zoning as well, this enables a tight community where I see my neighbors frequently, where we're much less car dependent than your average neighborhood in Austin, we walk to the H-E-B, to the trail, to several local restaurants, and we see our neighbors, doing the same. We're able to bike and take the bus to downtown. If we as a city are to meet our sustainability goals, we need to enable this lifestyle throughout more of Austin, decreasing minimum lot sizes is an important step towards that.

[1:38:26 PM]

an important step towards that. Additionally and even more importantly, the reforms we're discussing are critical tools to combat the housing affordability crisis that we're experiencing here in Austin, even my own home on its small 2700 square foot lot has the majority of its value in the land, rather than the structure requiring the purchase of over twice that much land for the vast majority of homes in Austin sets an absurdly high floor for the price of a home. Here my wife and I are were fortunate to find the rare lot that didn't require that, and it made homeownership more realistic for us. If we allow these sorts of lots to be split all over town, we can substantially bring down median home prices in our city. Thank you. Commission, mayor and council, for all your hard work passing home phase one and towards phase two so far, I urge you to support phase two to continue the progress towards alleviating the housing crisis and improving and enabling more sustainable lifestyles here in Austin. Thank you. >> Thank you. Hello, my name is rich Richard Harmon.

[1:39:27 PM]

rich Richard Harmon. >> I live in cherrywood in district nine, I teach urban studies at UT. I've been there for 18 years, and my phd is in urban geography. >> I recently I've been conducting research for the equity office of the city on housing affordability. And I've reviewed the latest academic research on up zoning on, lot size reform, on new supply and new construction and on filtering. And the evidence does not support claims, that proponents of the home initiative make about affordability the basic premises of the home initiative are flawed and are not supported by the academic research. >> The latest research suggests that up zoning and new construction will increase property values, especially in low income neighborhoods and contribute to gentrification and displacement of residents of color. >> Unfortunately, the research does not support claims that you may have heard on social media, and I'm happy to share with you

[1:40:29 PM]

and I'm happy to share with you or your staff, a review that I wrote of the current research that is out there. >> Thank you. >> Janice Bookout I'm wearing my eclipse shirt today because I believe in miracles, but it does seem that it'll take a miracle to shift the direction here, so I'm asking, who are you serving with these changes? The word affordability has been used to justify many of these changes, but deeply affordable housing is not being addressed. They say rents are down, but rents are down at the top end and the working poor are getting evicted from affordable housing, just likely because tech incomes have driven up the median family income, \$22,000 in just three years. Yes, having ev charging ordinance is important, but the way it's written could restrict some local small businesses in east Austin from applying for Navy funds that could cover 80% of installation, that could bring them foot traffic, and place the benefits of charging infrastructure in the hands of folks historically left out of

[1:41:29 PM]

folks historically left out of investment opportunities. You said home one and two will help families by creating passive income while adding to the housing supply. But many of the working poor, how many of the working poor have the time, money, financial credit or desire to take out huge loans and reduce their living space? The wealthy and financially trusted will get the benefit, while property taxes will go up for everyone else in the neighborhood, and those that can get a loan will charge market rate for those properties. You've said housing supply will trickle down to the working poor, but how do you think that will happen? Local data does not support that. But even if it did, who wants to move into a smaller, cheaper housing? Those of us who have experienced low income know that when you can't, that you can. That when you cannot buy peace and joy, you find it in the place you live. Who wants to move? I want to stay. The unhoused community has been used to argue for supply, but the affordable housing data shows the last 30 years of supply side policies have produced 39,000 displacement driving homes that are unaffordable to the neighborhood

[1:42:29 PM]

unaffordable to the neighborhood they're placed in, and only 4000 deeply affordable units. Meanwhile over 75% of our unhoused neighbors were displaced from homes here in Austin. The majority of people who spoke last time opposed home one, but you voted for it this time you thank you. Howdy. >> My name is Zach Faddis. >> I'm a resident of district nine and president of local nonprofit called aura. I didn't have much time to prepare. I don't have anything fancy, all I mainly have to give you all is. Thanks thank you for, trying to create room for myself and for future generations of austinites, I like homes. I think trains are pretty cool. And I think we should be building a lot of homes near trains, it is critically

important, both for our region's affordability crisis and the planet's climate crisis. Thank you all so much. And good luck for the rest of this. >> Genesis. Brits, jazz gill, Brian Pena, parker. Welch Curtis

[1:43:30 PM]

Brian Pena, parker. Welch Curtis Rogers, Eric bird. If your name has been called, please approach the podium. Mario Perez, Andrew o'brien. Gina. Andre if your name has been called, please make your way to the podium. Carmen Yanez, Michael Ramos, mark Vaughn, berg. >> Please begin. Either one of you both at the same time. Yeah >> Hi, everyone, good afternoon,

[1:44:30 PM]

>> Hi, everyone, good afternoon, mayor, council members and commissioners. My name is Andrew o'brien. I'm a resident of district one, where I rent a small home. I'm eager to continue living here in Austin, assuming that housing remains affordable today. I advocate for the adoption of home phase two, representing both my current status as a renter and my aspirations to one day buy a home. Since the data and projections related to this bill have been thoroughly discussed by previous speakers, I'd like to highlight an unaddressed potential effect, which would be the bill's positive impact on our city's esthetics and architecture. Having experienced life in cities with significantly smaller or nonexistent minimum sizing requirements, I can confidently challenge any notion that home phase two could lead to a homogenization of the housing stock in Austin. Rather, this legislation promises to enhance architectural diversity in Austin by easing restrictions on property development, encouraging a burst of creative architectural expressions that reflect the unique character of our neighborhoods. Home phase two will unleash the potential of Austin's architects, who thrive in environments that

[1:45:31 PM]

thrive in environments that champion housing innovation, property rights and diversity and design through flexible zoning. So I urge you on behalf of all current renters, aspiring home owners, and the creative minds in Austin's architectural community to support the passage of home phase two. Thank you. Thank you. >> Starting now, council members, let me paint you a picture. >> My name is Mario Dan Perez, the third of district nine. >> When I got into UT Austin, that was one of the happiest days of my life. >> As he grew up in the small border town of del Rio, Texas, I couldn't stop dreaming bigger. >> I couldn't stop dreaming of Austin, a place for anyone and everyone I've been having the time of my life in this beautiful city, making friends, building my future, and working to make a difference in this world. Whether it's beekeeping through both beekeepers. Here's some honey right here, campaigning with university Democrats and tailoring my legal journey through the Texas youth justice alliance, all to get

into UT law school. That's my dream. But unfortunately, my time here may be cut short. As of now, housing takes all of my income as a college student, and as I look into numbers as a

[1:46:33 PM]

as I look into numbers as a lawyer, this city may not be financially feasible to live in. I have a goal, an objective I will achieve to provide quality legal defense to those who can't afford it in Travis county. But housing? Let's be real guys, housing makes this challenging as people are strangled out of their homes, pushed out of the city, straight from their dreams here because of housing costs alone, this city is slowly, not rapidly changing from a city of the people to a city of the privileged. >> The heart of Austin is in jeopardy. >> Some of the smartest people I know have had to give up their dreams at UT because of the housing costs alone, and I know people who had to give up their own homes drowned by these changes. However, I have hope. I have hope that people like you, council members, if you can appreciate my funny sense of humor that you guys can make these dreams a little easier to achieve. Because when did living become unaffordable? >> In times like this, I'm reminded of my wonderful honeybees, how they strive to work together as a colony. >> Therefore, we together should work to protect the great big hive of Austin that everyone loves. That's why I'm here in a

[1:47:34 PM]

loves. That's why I'm here in a suit and a tie to show you guys that college students like me. We mean business, wait. No, no, we mean business. Right? Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, a little levity. Come on, come on. We love politics. It's fun, have a good one, guys. Enjoy the rest of your day. I hope I made it much better. >> You. Sorry, Gina. Andre. >> Be safe. >> Carmen Yanez. Missile. Ramos mark. Sorry, mayor. You made me laugh. Mark Thornburg, mark Whalen. James. Lagai. Matthew. Atkinson. Dalia. Becker. Jacob. Dove. Not Matthew Mccoy. Bethany. Epstein. And, bill

[1:48:37 PM]

Bethany. Epstein. And, bill bunch, if your name has been called, please make your way to the podium and state your name. >> Feel free to begin. >> How are you? My name is Matthew Mccoy, and I'm a proud resident of the wonderful district nine, and I'm also the president of the university Democrats here at UT Austin, so today I'm speaking in favor of home phase two, and I just want to give a big few thank yous to our council members, chito vela, Jose Velasquez, Ryan alter, and tosh harper-madison, mayor Watson, Vanessa Fuentes and, Paige Ellis and zo qadri. Our wonderful council members want to say thank you all for everything you're doing here, I just want to say that housing is one of the most important issues the city is facing, especially as students, because of decades of a land code that restricts what can be built and where. This is artificially increased housing prices and makes homes in

Austin deeply unaffordable for most residents. This is also a very important to students who want to stay in Austin after they graduate, and make sure

[1:49:38 PM]

they graduate, and make sure they can find affordable accommodations in a city that they love. A west campus has been a widely successful in creating a dense, vibrant community. Under uno, the university neighborhood overlay and rent under uno have also grown at a slower rate than the rest of the city. This is done by good policy design, and while it's not perfect, it's making the neighborhoods around campus more affordable and place where people want to live. The reforms mentioned today are also good city policy to undo the damages of the 1984 land code, that has had Austin for decades and are necessary necessary to keep up with the growth of central Texas, experiencing. We're greatly looking forward to project connect and the itod overlay is a great policy to ensure ridership and mobility around the city. Thank you again, council members and mayor for the changes that are happening today, and we look forward to what you all do in the future. Thank you. >> Thank you. Hello mayor Watson, city council, planning commissioners, and good afternoon.

[1:50:40 PM]

and good afternoon. >> I am Bethany Epstein. I am a proud resident of district nine, Hyde park, and I have come to speak in favor of the, the proposed changes to our zoning and transit code. I am, before I lived in district nine, I was a resident of pleasant valley over in district three, in south Austin. When I first came here, to attend graduate school at UT Austin in physics, I, I, was I was unable to find a place close to campus, and I was basically relegated to, you know, living much further away from campus in an area that while absolutely beautiful and amazing, is unfortunately fairly lacking in transit options.

[1:51:43 PM]

transit options. >> And I, you know, was without a car as I could not own one on a student salary, so I, eventually I got a car. I, I ended up moving, and now I actually live in a district that has significant Hensley, you know, much more proximity to campus and more opportunity for transit, at the same time, I recognize that there are a lot of limitations as, you know, even like to the area, the areas that I have, that I've been living in and I would like for more thank you for your time. >> Appreciate you being here. >> Mark vorenberg. Go ahead. Please state your name. >> Hello. Name for the record,

[1:52:46 PM]



>> Hello. Name for the record, good afternoon, mayor, council members and commissioners. >> My name is Gina Andre. >> I'm a senior architect with Cass design build and the chair elect of aia Austin's residential advocacy committee. >> I am happily residing in an Adu of my own design that I built in the Robertson hill neighborhood in district one. Since 2017, and it's on a transit route, and I've been a member of, resident of Austin since 1992. I'm excited to support the items on the agenda today, and I thank you for your hard work in bringing these efforts forward. I specifically want to highlight the reduction of minimum lots for single family residences, a lot has been said today about them, so I don't think I could say anything new other than even if the home two amendment goes through with reducing smaller lots, I urge you to take care to make the

[1:53:48 PM]

you to take care to make the process efficient and easy for homeowners to manage. >> Try to eliminate as many hurdles as you can to make the process more successful. And, as a personal point of view from this advocacy thing, the more that can be spelled out specifically of items that will come before the commissioners as we submit, permits for this to implement, the easier it will go, like if there's you're splitting a property that already has two homes on it, shared utilities. >> How does that sort out? >> If you're creating a new property that doesn't get the part where the driveway is and there are no parking requirements, is a new driveway going to be required? >> All of those things? It would be great if you could slow down just a little bit. If it's going to get passed to make, our interaction with these lovely people easier. Thanks. Thank you

[1:54:48 PM]

people easier. Thanks. Thank you . >> Mark vorenberg mark wailing James la guy, Matthew Atkinson, Delia Becker. Jacob thevenot and bill bunch. >> Mister bunch, it looks like you. Maybe you. >> Good morning. >> Good afternoon bill bunch. >> Save our springs alliance. >> We support the comments earlier from Barbara Macarthur, Michael curry, Suzanne Almanza, robin rather and others who are so knowledgeable on these issues , we oppose this hostile cram it down. >> Your throat process that kicked off with, inadequate and misleading notice and is on a rocket docket that excludes the vast majority of the public, if you if you really care about reducing sprawl, where is the

[1:55:49 PM]

reducing sprawl, where is the sprawl impact analysis? >> And more importantly, why does the proposal do nothing? >> Literally nothing to prohibit standard issue sprawl subdivisions on our suburban

greenfields. This absence makes it clear that this is about developer profits and developer deregulation. Standard issue reaganomics supply side discredited economics. If you care about walkability, where is the proposal to immediately repeal the sidewalk fee and lieu provision so that we get actual sidewalks? Wouldn't that be amazing if you care about climate, where's the climate impact analysis is where is the tree and tree canopy impact analysis. This this proposal is tree destruction on steroids. >> Where is the urban heat island impact analysis? >> If you repeat more affordable housing 10,000 times, it won't

[1:56:50 PM]

housing 10,000 times, it won't make it so what you'll get is housing that's a little less expensive. And that's a dishonest proposal. Please step back, put this on hold, and let's find some common ground that actually, truly advances the policies you claim that you support. >> Thank you. >> Sir. >> Is your name called sir? >> Yes. Ben. Lie. Go ahead. >> Good afternoon, city council members. My name is Ben lie, and I'm a second year UT student. >> And as a resident of district nine and full time student, I'm here to testify in support of item one of city code title 25. >> That would encourage the development of dense, multimodal communities close to public transit. >> While Austin is famously known for its live music,

[1:57:51 PM]

known for its live music, massive food truck scene and general weirdness keep Austin weird on the other side of the same coin. Austin has long been known as the epicenter of Texas's housing affordability crisis, according to a recent report done by the Austin board of realtors, over half of four person households in Travis county have a median family income of 80% of the mfi or less. However, only 5% of homes sold in Travis county were considered affordable to them, resulting to a shortage of about 250,000 affordable homes. And as a student graduate this fall, I, like countless others, would like to live in Austin and enjoy the many things that city that the city offers without the fear of affordability. However, I fear as the cost of living increases in Austin, that won't be a reality established, dense, multimodal, connected communities that are walkable, bikeable, and in proximity to public transit can address these major issues. Diversifying and expanding affordable housing options all alike. While the

[1:58:51 PM]

options all alike. While the proposal is not perfect, if we continue to maintain these antiquated zoning regulations, how do we expect to keep up with the growing housing demand and ensure that the residents who have known Austin as their home for their entire lives are not forced out of their communities due to skyrocketing costs of living as a result, it is imperative that the city council supports this item as these proposals will increase housing options and in turn hopefully lower the cost of living in Austin and make the city and many great things. It provides more accessible for all people. >> So let's

keep continuing making Austin weird and also try to make it more affordable. >> Thank you. Thank you mayor. >> All the speakers have been called. >> Thank you, members of the planning commission, members of the council, those are all the speakers that, signed up to speak at this public hearing. Without objection, we will close the public hearing on behalf of the city council and the planning commission, for the public, there's not going to be

[1:59:51 PM]

public, there's not going to be a vote today before the public. Let me remind everyone what I said at the beginning of this meeting. The planning commission will meet again on April 23rd and 30th. And at that time, there will be a chance for further public comment and input, and if the planning commission is ready, it will be posted so that it will be in a position to vote. Any recommendations to the mayor and city council at that time? Currently scheduled? The city council is scheduled to meet on May 16th, and if we're ready again, it will be posted for a vote at that time. And prior to that time, we will have at least one work session. One work session where this item will be on it, and that would be Tuesday, May 14th. There has been a request that we look at and staff, is looking at how we might have additional opportunity for a work session. In addition to that, there has, staff is working on two community events, and I think they're scheduled and or soon to

[2:00:55 PM]

they're scheduled and or soon to be scheduled and being scheduled. And they're also looking at two additional. So that we would have a total of four, please, go to the website, where information will be provided with regard to those questions that the council, planning commission has can be sent to, Katy Powers via email. And as I've pointed out and has been on the screen throughout the day, the public can look at those questions and the answers as those are put up. If you go to speak up [austin.org](http://austin.org) that speak. Up [austin.org/ldc](http://austin.org/ldc) C updates L ldc updates. Yes council member Fuentes thank you mayor. >> Just wanted to share with our community that I am working with

[2:01:55 PM]

community that I am working with councilmember Velasquez, councilmember Bella, and councilmember Harper-Madison on an eastern crescent focus style of town hall slash open house in which our city staff will be participating. >> And I'm really grateful for our manager and working in ensuring that we have staff participation. >> That is going to be key for us as we engage on this issue, is to be able to have an in-person conversation with our east side communities. >> So, yeah, thank you for bringing that up. All right. There's no further business to come before us, and the public hearing has been closed. I do want to say on behalf of the city council and the planning commissioners, how much

we appreciate the public input and the level of public involvement, including the passion that is brought, to these sorts of, public hearings. We really do appreciate that, Mr. Vice chair, would you like to adjourn the planning commission? >> Thank you, mayor. And echoing the mayor's words, we really appreciate the community's input and feedback. And, of course, we'll be taking that into account, without further, you

[2:02:56 PM]

account, without further, you know, any other words? I'm going to go ahead and adjourn this meeting of the planning commission at 2:03 P.M. >> Thank you. And thank you to all the planning commissioners. And without objection, the city council of Austin, Texas, is adjourned at 2:03 P.M. Thanks, everybody .