

Housing and Planning Committee (HPC) meeting Transcript – 4/23/2024

Title: ATXN-1 (24hr)

Channel: 1 - ATXN-1

Recorded On: 4/23/2024 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 4/23/2024

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

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

This

[1:00:24 PM]

thanks for joining us. This gloomy but gorgeous Tuesday afternoon in Austin, Texas. Good afternoon. I am Austin city council member Natasha harper-madison. I get the privilege and the honor of chairing the housing and planning committee. We are joined here by chair Ellis of the mobility committee, committee. And today we are going to have ourselves quite the hootenanny. We're going to do a joint meeting of the housing and planning and mobility committees, so it is now 1:00 pm, and I called to order the housing and planning committee, and I'd like to toss it over to my colleague, chair Ellis, to, to start off the mobility committee meeting.

>> Good afternoon, everyone. I am Paige Ellis. I chair the mobility committee of the Austin city council. It is 1:01 P.M, and I call our meeting to order. We are here in city council chambers.

>> All righty, and with that, I do believe we have ourselves a speaker. So I'd like to first

[1:01:26 PM]

speaker. So I'd like to first ask that staff call up general comment speakers for the purposes of today's agenda, we will limit our speakers to ten today. We have a tight, tight schedule today, so if you wouldn't mind calling up speakers. Thank you, bill bunch. Good morning, mister bunch or afternoon, thank you for your service to our community. Bill bunch will save our springs alliance, mostly addressing housing and planning, today. And want to start off. And this does overlap with your south central waterfront discussion, somewhat. But as you know, we won the lawsuit against the city to invalidate the south

central waterfront tax increment reinvestment zone, and my request to you is that you not support any sort of appeal of

[1:02:26 PM]

support any sort of appeal of that decision. It was clearly correct. One under the law, but also the correct one for our community, y'all just heard about a big budget shortfall that we're looking at, you have no business siphoning off, millions of dollars each year, totaling, projected 354 million to subsidize the most luxurious, wealthy development that our city will ever see on the south shore of the lake, probably the most valuable land in the whole state of Texas, and it's totally inappropriate to be subsidizing that kind of development, high intensity, high profit development, and doing it in the name of supporting economic distressed areas, which is what that, tool is clearly intended for, for, there's no way any place in the central city could be considered either blighted or economically distressed. So, asking you not to appeal their

[1:03:28 PM]

asking you not to appeal their asking you not to consider this tool as mayor Watson spoke about on November 30th meeting of a potential tirz on the north shore of the lake between Lamar and mopac, completely inappropriate there, as you do your 78702 planning, there's no, no need or even should be remotely considered for the lake, north shore of the lake east of 35 as well, and then I want to draw attention to a big issue of tax increment Zones that's been overlooked. And that is buried in that statute. It says you can dodge Paige, our charter provisions that control, excuse me, distribution of public land. So basically it allows you to circumvent if it's upheld, there's reasons to challenge it. But the statute says you can dodge a charter provision that says you have to get voter approval to alienate

[1:04:28 PM]

get voter approval to alienate public parkland. You should not go anywhere near that, and that's especially why tirz are wholly inappropriate for being anywhere near any part of our lake, front parking, lake front land surrounding lady bird lake on the south central tirz, you have your backup says. Oh, we're holding on to the overlay ordinance, but we're changing it. So those are contradictory statements. You need to pin that down. I haven't seen anything. I think they're trying to gut the overlay and pretending like it's just massaging it. So let's see the details. Thank you.

>> Thank you for joining us this afternoon. I appreciate it, so, colleagues, after consulting with the chair, Ellis, and recognizing we have a lot of important items to try to squeeze in today, I think in order to do

so in a timely fashion, what we're recommending is that we take up our home and itod briefings, take those items up first, and then we'll

[1:05:28 PM]

up first, and then we'll conclude the joint meeting and move on to our housing and planning agenda, which includes housing and planning. Item number two, which is our standing ldc amendment prioritization, then, housing and planning committee meeting item number three. I don't have to tell you all how excited I am about the agrihood conversation. And then we'll close out with item number seven, which is to discuss future items. So again, the order of the housing and planning committee meeting will be, housing and planning committee and mobility committee . Item number one, where we approve minutes from both of the committees independently from last month. And then our joint briefings from staff, then item number four of housing and planning committee, which is item number two for mobility committee. That's regarding the proposed land development code amendments, including home phase two ev charging, the tod overlay and compatibility standards, and then housing and planning item

[1:06:30 PM]

then housing and planning item number five, which is mobility committee. Item number three regarding the proposed amendments for development around the south central waterfront, and then lastly, the housing and planning committee, item number six, which is mobility committee item number four regarding proposed amendments that would change, the parking requirements in the downtown area. So we'll let chair Ellis close and adjourn the mobility committee, then we'll resume with the remaining discussion on items for housing and planning agenda, which again include that item number two, discussion of the timeline of ldc amendments. Item number three, we'll hear from experts on the innovative form of sustainable development called agrihood. And then lastly item number seven which is future items. So with that said, item number one, our minutes, our first item is to approve the minutes of the housing and planning committee meeting of March 26, 2024. It looks like we have a motion by council member

[1:07:31 PM]

have a motion by council member qadri and seconded by vice chair alter. So moved and seconded. All in favor say I unanimous there. I'll pass the baton to chair Ellis for mobility committee, and I will move item number one on the mobility committee agenda, which is our minutes from March 28th, 2024.

>> Do I have a motion by vice chair qadri and a second, by me, it's going to be Natasha harper-madison. All in favor, say aye. Aye. All all three of us in attendance, support that approval.

>> Awesome, in which case we will move on to item number four, which is our briefing from staff on ldc amendments. And as you make your way up, as we go ahead through moving forward through the joint committee items, we're going to just sort of have everybody queued up to, to come up next. The next one will be item number five with the south central waterfront

[1:08:33 PM]

the south central waterfront briefing. Are there introduce yourself and we're ready when you are.

>> Good afternoon. I am Andrea bates, assistant director with the planning department here to give a short overview of the four amendments that council and planning commission reviewed at the joint meeting on April 11th. Those amendments include electric vehicle charging use home phase two, which is a smaller lot size for one unit citywide changes to the compatible standards and the equitable transit oriented development or itod overlay. So I'll start with an overview of where we are in the review process for these amendments. We had the joint council and planning commission meeting on April 11th. Staff then hosted two open houses, an in-person open house on the 17th and a virtual open house on the 20th. Today is the 23rd, so we are having a briefing here with you,

[1:09:33 PM]

having a briefing here with you, and then there's a planning commission meeting tonight to review three of the four in the package of amendments. There is also a follow up planning commission hearing on April 30th. Then there will be two additional in-person open houses on may 6th, which is a location in west Austin, and may 8th, which is a location in east Austin. And then finally, city council will take up the item at their meeting on may 16th. So we've done quite a bit to get the word out about these code amendments as they move forward. This spring, we have mailed notices including what we refer to as the purple postcard for three of the items on the joint meeting, and in itod specific notice that went to a certain geography. There has also been news coverage. The city has done social media posts and also posted advertisements in several local publications. We have a website with extensive information about all the code

[1:10:34 PM]

information about all the code amendments and an email address and phone where people can leave comments and questions for staff to answer. And then of course, we also have the open houses that I mentioned previously. So in terms of the numbers as of yesterday, we mailed out over 670,000 purple

postcards and over 39,000 itod specific notices at the beginning of the month, there have been almost 5000 visitors, 404,990 plus visitors to the portion of the speak up page that is specific to this group of amendments staff has received over 200 emails and phone calls with questions or comments about the amendments, and with an additional 150 comments left directly on speak up Austin, there were 181 speakers at the April 11th meeting. 88 attendees at the first open house and about 75 at the second, and these are the details on the two

[1:11:36 PM]

these are the details on the two additional open houses that have been planned on may 6th, from 6 to 8 P.M, there will be an open house at Anderson high school, and on may 8th, also from 6 to 8 P.M, there will be an open house at the George Washington carver museum and cultural center. So that brings us to the Conway point of this presentation. Since we gave council and planning commission an overview of the four proposed code amendments on the 11th, today, we'll be focused on some clarifications that answer questions we have been receiving since then. We will start with the electric vehicle charging use.

>> Good afternoon. I'm Eric Thomas with the planning department, and I'll be providing a couple clarifications to the proposed new electric vehicle charging principal land use. Part of the staff recommendation for ev charging is to prohibit the use underground. This is part of this. Excuse me. This

[1:12:37 PM]

this. Excuse me. This prohibition was included on recommendation by the fire marshal's office and this is because when evs catch fire, they burn incredibly hot and generate a great amount of smoke underground smoke remediation can take several days, during which time access to the entire parking garage would be prohibited. In the time since the staff recommendation was finalized, we have continued to coordinate with the fire department and have come to an understanding that ev charging could be acceptable. One level below grade with certain design criteria and restrictions on placement. Given the timing, staff is deferring the option to amend the proposal to the planning commission and city council. Additionally, after reviewing public engagement conversations, staff feels the need to clarify that the proposed principal land use will not change or restrict how ev charging is already permitted as part of an accessory parking use. The proposed regulations only apply to ev charging as the principal or only use of a site accessory. Parking will still be permitted for other principal uses. Staff does not and will

[1:13:38 PM]

uses. Staff does not and will not restrict the number of spaces that may be electrified, so long as accessory parking requirements are met. Thank you.

>> Hello, council. I'm Laura Keating of the project connect office and case manager of home phase two. And we just wanted to clarify a few items that we've received questions about. So first, home phase two recommends a 45% impervious cover limit for all developments. Impervious cover limits help ensure there is space for rainwater to be absorbed into the ground or directed towards the storm drainage system. Residential subdivisions are designed with the assumption of 40, with a 45% impervious cover. Additionally, we've gotten some questions about emergency access and fire code. All new development is reviewed to ensure that it meets

[1:14:38 PM]

reviewed to ensure that it meets current fire code structures out of reach from the fire hose from the street must have a sprinkler system, or a fire lane is required, and in general, the median lot depth does not exceed the fire hose length.

>> I'm Jonathan Lee, case manager for compatibility. I first want to emphasize that the compatibility buffer is much more flexible than the current no build setback, though they both have the same width, the compatibility buffer allows a number of low impact uses, and this additional flexibility translates to more buildable area on sites and for residential projects, this means more housing units. The compatibility buffer was adopted as part of db 90 in February, and the requirements for the buffer are located not in the zoning code, but in another section of the land development

[1:15:39 PM]

section of the land development code. Chapter 20 5-8 and I also wanted to share another statistic about compatible Katy. It's that the proposed compatibility changes would reduce the overall area, subject to compatibility, by nearly 94. This is in large part due to reducing the distance that compatibility applies from 540ft to 75ft, but also due to the revised applicability fee, including an exemption for a lower density multifamily districts.

>> Good evening, council members. My name is Warner Cooke and I'm with the planning department and the case manager for the equitable tod overlay. And similarly we have a few clarifications based on some feedback that we've received so far. The first being that there is no requirement if a property is rezoned into this overlay to redevelop, the property can continue existing as it is today, the they would just also have the ability to

[1:16:40 PM]

just also have the ability to take advantage of the new density bonus program if they comply with the requirements. The proposal also does include redevelopment requirements that help protect certain

existing affordable housing tenants and commercial tenants, and that would actually make it harder in those cases for those properties to redevelop without providing those additional protections. Additionally, while new uses identified on the prohibited uses list for the proposal would not be able to be established in the future, you couldn't have a new one of the prohibited uses. The existing uses existing businesses would be able to continue to operate. They do not have to discontinue operation and shouldn't see any impact. They just become legal, nonconforming uses, we've also heard questions about compatibility and what Jonathan was just presenting on and how that relates to the dbt bonus program. And it is slightly relaxed in the staff proposal for the dbt bonus program as compared to the citywide compatibility standards

[1:17:41 PM]

citywide compatibility standards being proposed. The same compatibility buffer, the 25ft, would still apply for dbt projects in the same ways, but the height limitations would be relaxed after that. So between 25ft and 50ft from the triggering property, a dbt building could reach up to 90ft in height, which is about 7 or 8 stories, and then after 50ft in distance, compatibility. Height limitations would not apply. So the property, would be able to reach its full height, which in this case would not be able to exceed ten stories or 120ft tall. And this relaxation helps, reduce compatibility's impact on our housing near transit, as well as aligning with the approach recommended in the staff recommendations published last year on compatibility that we should look at. Relax ING compatibility for projects that provide community benefits, such as those in density bonus

[1:18:41 PM]

as those in density bonus programs, the last, last few clarifications. It's important to emphasize that this is this really is an early out first phase of the tod overlay, there will be future phases of work staff plans to engage both the general public as well as, you know, interested stakeholders, the development community, etc. On a larger effort to calibrate a density bonus program that can apply in additional geographies such as along the metro rapid and metro rail lines, as well as looking at increased entitlements and additional types of community benefits beyond just the affordable housing benefit and we anticipate developing that and bringing it back in spring 2025. And then finally, it's worth noting that once these provisions are adopted, should council approve the ordinances in may and Ed, they're on the books, additional property owners within a half mile, which is about a ten minute walk or roll, half mile, of the phase one light rail, could request application of the new combining

[1:19:42 PM]

application of the new combining districts through the property specific rezoning process. So if they're not part of the rezoning proposal today, the planning commission or the appropriate land use commission would hear that through an individual rezoning in the future, should a property want to take advantage of this program.

>> That brings us back to our schedule moving forward. As I mentioned before, tonight, the planning commission will be holding a hearing and taking potential action on home phase two compatibility and electric vehicle charging next Tuesday. On April 30th, there will be a council work session with a briefing on these items and a planning commission meeting in the evening, where the planning commission will be reviewing the itod overlay proposal on may 6th. There is the first additional open house in west Austin at Anderson high school, and on may 8th, the additional open house in east Austin at the carver museum. On may 14th,

[1:20:43 PM]

carver museum. On may 14th, there will be another council work session and then finally on may 16th, this returns to council for consideration. As always, we encourage folks to visit our project website. Speak up Austin all-glvc updates and email comments or questions to staff at ldc updates at Austin, texas.gov or give a call and leave a voicemail for staff. At

(512) 974-7220. And that concludes our presentation for today. But we welcome questions.

>> Thank you very much for the presentation. I know that I saw a couple of ears perk up, so I'll start with you, council member qadri. But Mr. Mayor, did you have questions also, I have one after. After council member qadri. I have one question on compatibility I share.

>> I see that the one, two, three.

>> Great. Thank you. Chair I have two questions on on home and then two questions on ev

[1:21:46 PM]

and then two questions on ev regulations. All right, I'll start with inviting the home case manager, miss Keating, up.

>> Great.

>> Hey.

>> Well, I appreciated the presentation as a whole, just two quick questions on home staff recommendation is 2000ft S, is there any reason not to consider something lower to meet the intent of home, you know, in the in the Mueller neighborhood or Miller, I still am terrified on what to call it or not

to call it, the, the square feet is, I think, 600ft S. Is there a reason not to go all the way to what Mueller has or Miller.

>> Yeah. So staff's recommendation, is calibrated to one if you have 45% impervious cover, 2000ft S gives you about 900ft S of impervious cover, which allows for a reasonable building footprint, along with, you know, a parking space or a short driveway, staff also calibrated the size based on

[1:22:46 PM]

calibrated the size based on existing lot sizes, and so the median lot, can divide into three under 2000ft S, that median lot size might be larger than 6000ft S. Typically it's 8500ft S citywide, but with the existing lot width, you'll only be able to get three, three lots out of that. And the flag lots in the back tend to be larger than that minimum because of the lot area to get back to them.

>> Got it, and then one more question on home. You know, when it comes to the preservation incentive, you know, a lot of folks have called for fixing it. What does the fix look like?

>> The exit, the preservation incentive that was passed under home phase one.

>> Correct? Yeah so we're not able to make any changes to 2 or 3 units on a lot, because the notice that was sent out only

[1:23:47 PM]

notice that was sent out only referred to one unit on one lot. So, we cannot make any changes to the existing preservation an incentive at this time. Okay.

>> Great. Thank you. And then, and then I just want to confirm there's going to be individual briefings, chair harper-madison on, like, are we going to go back to home and ev we are. Okay. Well then I will save my ev questions for when we go back.

>> Got it Mr. Mayor.

>> Thank you. On compatibility. And this may be a dumb question and I apologize in advance if it is, the second bullet that you had, you remember the bullet about 90 allowing for 94, 94% less, I think is the way it was phrased. First of all, if you can restate that. But but I'm not sure I understand how you get to that number.

>> So, just to restate it, the proposed changes would reduce the overall land area, subject to compatibility by 94% compared to current regulations.

[1:24:49 PM]

to current regulations.

>> So the current compatibility goes out to a distance of 540ft. We're cutting that to 75ft. That's a big part of it. We're also changing what triggers compatibility.

>> I now understand okay. Unless you go ahead and finish. But it was a dumb question, just I'll declare it for you, just to say what triggers compatibility so everyone's aware, so that's a property zoned single family that has one, 2 or 3 housing units. That's that's part of the change. Previously, it was zoning without a single family use. Could trigger or vice versa. We've fixed that.

>> I understand now. Thank you for answering the dumb question.

>> No dumb questions. Mr. Mayor.

>> I like your attitude.

>> Vice chair.

>> Alter, I have a home question. You touched on the fire code, safety issues. When I, I represent a number of

[1:25:49 PM]

I, I represent a number of neighborhoods who have very limited ingress and egress into their neighborhood. And I know when we look at a larger development that we look comprehensively and say, for this number of units, you have to have a certain ingress egress so people can get in and out. Do we have anything of that nature as it relates to a neighborhood? So saying that, you know, this area, it's only safe for 200 homes, and if we exceed that, then we need better ingress egress.

>> Yeah. I would have to, defer to the fire department, but they do, review at the time of subdivision. So especially for phase two, I would have to see if that's a part of the review, if it's site specific or if they look at the neighborhood as a whole. But we can follow up on that. Yeah.

[1:26:50 PM]

that. Yeah.

>> Would that be a question that is reviewed if you're not subdividing, if you're just putting three units on a lot without subdividing?

>> Yeah, I don't know if that would be reviewed at that time because that's just a building permit. Right, well, I'd really be interested to know because, you know, we've obviously recognized that it's important at a certain level. And so I know neighborhood development has is different than a, one one

development. But I do have that concern so that people can get in and out if we are creating a certain level of density within a neighborhood, my second question, it may be a question for you. Back when we did home phase one, the mayor had put on an amendment about data reporting that is really comprehensive and will help us see kind of how this is actually unfolding, when I think six months would be sometime in may. So are we is there an expectation of when we might see that first data report? >> Yeah, I know that, dsd is

[1:27:51 PM]

>> Yeah, I know that, dsd is collecting that information so I can follow up with them. Okay.

>> Well, I appreciate that. And then I didn't this one question until councilmember qadri brought it up as it relates to the preservation bonus, I know there were some interpretation, questions. And I don't know if this is maybe a trick question or, but how how the resolution was interpreted by law. But and as it related to the notice, essentially I want to get clarification on if you're preserving what needs to be preserved with taking the subdivision question out. You are allowed under this proposal, the preserved units plus a maximum of two more. Is that correct?

>> For a total of three. You're correct. Trish link with the law department okay.

>> And I think that was part of the question of did did that unit count in the three total. And it it does. And I just want

[1:28:51 PM]

And it it does. And I just want to make sure that is clarified here.

>> That is correct.

>> Okay.

>> Very good. Well that is my questions for now. Oh

>> Councilmember Ellis, I did have a question about the community engagement efforts that have been planned.

>> I know there was some interest in doing one that was, south, south, central, southwest, is there still an opportunity to schedule one of those? I know we're doing a community fair tomorrow night, but I know there's just a different method and plan to making sure we hit all parts of the community. Is there going to be one south of the river, and can we get in line?

>> Council Veronica Briseno, assistant city manager, we try to be as broad as possible in our in our outreach and would love the opportunity to have more time to do outreach. But because of the

compressed timeline, it's just really difficult to plan an additional event at this at this point, we did add the two on. We

[1:29:52 PM]

did add the two on. We struggled. We try to find something central west, and it was tough finding a location, west where we could host it. So, we made our best attempt and wish that we could have opportunities to have more outreach events, but just don't with this compressed timeline. Okay?

>> And so are there other events on the list that are maybe like central library or something that's just city wide that folks south of the river could put on their calendars?

>> There was one south central at the central library that I believe it was this past weekend. I'm going to ask the team to correct me if I'm wrong, there was also a virtual event that was held, and I believe that was recorded and should be available on our website, but I'll confirm that that's the case as well.

>> That would be very helpful. If we can't get an event south of the river. I'd really love for folks to be able to watch along and have a chance to ask questions through a different format, just to make sure that people have a chance to understand better what what the changes propose.

>> Absolutely. Okay. Thanks. Thank you. >> Thank you I appreciate that.

[1:30:52 PM]

>> Thank you I appreciate that. And, that's that is something that I considered when I looked at the locations. You know, how do we figure out how to thread that needle? And that's something to consider moving forward. So if there are no other questions, I think we're prepared to move forward, into our next briefing, so next up is , is, housing and planning item number five, mobility committee, item number three. This is our south central waterfront. Item we're going to hear from staff on proposed amendments for development around the south central waterfront and then ask some questions. Hi there. Please introduce yourself.

>> Hi, good afternoon. My name is April Giarrusso. I'm with the planning department. My team and many colleagues across city departments have been working on the south central waterfront code. This includes team members from planning, housing, watershed Pritchard, project connect, economic development and development services, to name a few. But the list certainly goes on and we're glad to be presenting to you the

[1:31:53 PM]

to be presenting to you the draft code as it stands today, as a reminder for how we got here in 2016, when council adopted the south central waterfront vision framework plan, and as a part of that vision, it was recommended that a regulating plan for the district be written into the city's code to fulfill the vision plan. The code was initially started with both versions of the full land development code updates, both of which were unsuccessful. However, what was set into place from the vision plan was the street network that you see in front of you here, this is already established within the Austin strategic mobility plan. Additionally project connect was initiated and the south central waterfront was identified as part of phase one of build out the proposed path alignment and stop in the district selected last year is also shown on this map in front of you. Then in 2022, city council put forward a resolution to reignite the development of code pertaining

[1:32:55 PM]

development of code pertaining to this area. The resolution, in part, called for developing a code that accomplished many different things, some of which are shown in front of you, and I'll highlight some of the resolution, where council asked for the code to maximize affordable housing units within and nearby the district, maximize infrastructure investments such as for new streets, parks and bicycles, infrastructure and trails. Maximize other community benefits. Ensure enhanced environmental standards and protections. Support project connect transit investment in the community, and notably create a connected pedestrian oriented, mixed use district where thousands more austinians can live, work, and play. So as staff got to work on this code, we had to make some adjustments. It's, including we've modified the code from a regulating plan to a combining district paired with a density bonus program. I can go into details as to why, if you're curious, the zoning regulations in the south central waterfront will therefore be

[1:33:58 PM]

waterfront will therefore be implemented by the hopeful council. Adoption of these optional set of regulations and bonus program if successful. The first step would make this area a paper district in the same way, the north burnet gateway is also, a paper district went through that process. Then we would ask for a city initiated rezoning of the properties in the district, but I want to quickly call out that our intent is staff is to ask for rezoning of all of the existing, parcels in the district with some exceptions that you see in front of you on the map, those include existing puds, pdas, and the plan development agreement in the area. We would not ask for those to be automatically rezoned. They would still have the ability to be rezoned, but that would be through special and typical. Excuse me, typical rezoning processes that would go through council separately. Additionally, council had asked

[1:34:58 PM]

Additionally, council had asked in 2022 for this regulating plan to be this code to be reevaluated at least every five years. We are recommending the first reevaluation to be within 1 to 2 years, to understand better economic trends that we're sort of currently going through. One additional adjustment adjustment we've made since the adoption of the vision plan is the addition of several parcels, extending the southern and western boundaries of the area, as shown on the map on the screen, to the south. This is to support the project connect and transit oriented development alignment. And then to the west. It's based on some public feedback. We received and staff believes allows for a cohesive urban approach along both south congress and south first streets. With this addition. As for the code itself, here's how it's organized. The elements of the combining district you see here on the left, and the density bonus elements are on the right. And I'll dive in

[1:35:59 PM]

the right. And I'll dive in further. Now about those things. The south central waterfront is broken down into four different subdistricts. The subdistricts are distinguished from one another in terms of both height limits and floor area ratio, essentially an approximation of density and intensity of development. The subdistricts are designed to reduce in density from the most dense subdistricts closest to downtown and adjacent to the proposed project connect station. Reduce Singh down from their. The critical water quality Zones or the Zones that reflect the floodplain in Austin, as shown here on the screen, will remain in the district and will be updated as is regularly done with the city. The waterfront overlay containing the auditorium shores, south shore and Travis heights subdistricts will remain. However various elements such as building height and impervious cover will be superseded by regulations. In this code. The land uses that

[1:36:59 PM]

this code. The land uses that are included in the district support transit oriented activities. Pedestrian oriented activities a mix of uses for day and nighttime activity. The creative enterprise and recreation and entertainment activity. As for the parks and open space in the area, the team has worked hard to establish what we can in terms of a structure to realize the open space. As we identified in the vision plan. Items on the screen are some of the important aspects of how we're hoping to achieve this. As for those that walk around the space or the pedestrian experience, we've developed standards such that internal walkways and streets have requirements. We can. We consider pedestrian walkways for an important reason. The goal of breaking up the building site to be more friendly at the human scale. So the concept that you see in front of you, the density distribution areas, require tirz. Each area may not exceed 90,000ft S, so roughly 300ft by

[1:38:01 PM]

90,000ft², so roughly 300ft by 300ft, which is approximate the same size as a downtown block. The first of its kind in Austin, these are put forward in the code in an effort to get to the intent of the vision and the pedestrian and transit oriented development we're seeking as a community. So before I go into the density bonus program in some amount of detail, I'll mention we had two different economic consulting firms support us in analyzing and stress testing the program, and Hyatt Brown Eps supported us in calibrating the bonus area of the various on site community benefits. Hyatt Brown analyzed how we might successfully structure the program so we could get a myriad of community benefits as desired by council and community, and that's still in their assessment, but at least marginally pencil in today's economic conditions. We also had them look at an improved economy, because we understand that today's conditions for development are challenging nationwide,

[1:39:01 PM]

challenging nationwide, including here in Austin, members from Hyatt Brown are joining us remotely. If you have any questions for them on their analysis. Okay, so as for the bonus program, our gatekeeper requirements are, or those requirements that gain parcels, some amount of density include enhanced environmental standards, streetscape and built environment standards, and 5% of rental housing on site must be affordable within a 3 to 1 floor area ratio, and as you see on the screen, we did some rough calculations on the number of onsite affordable housing units. We're looking at if full build out occurs, and this gets us pretty close to what was anticipated in the vision plan. Additional affordable housing could be maximized in other ways through publicly owned land and leveraging additional resources. So to explain the remainder of the density bonus program, we've created this image for how it fits together. What's a parcel opt in to building within the south central waterfront

[1:40:02 PM]

south central waterfront combining district, there's a base floor area ratio, which they are permitted to build, and then in order to enter into the opportunity to build beyond that base to a density shown in the subdistrict map, a site must adhere to the gatekeeper requirements within the first 3 to 1 they're seeking in the district. Then, to achieve the maximum density as described in the subdistrict map, a site must contribute fees in lieu and other on site community benefits, so this is structured in the following way 70% of the in lieu fees and 70% of that density bonus could be gained through in-lieu fees and dedication, and those fees would be dedicated in the following way. Affordable housing. This would be spent within a boundary that the city is describing as south central Austin, parks fees. And this would be spent within a distance from the property from which it's obtained. This is how it's typically done with parks fees. And then the infrastructure and community impact benefit fee would be spent to support the south central waterfront district itself. And then the other 30% of density bonus could be earned

[1:41:04 PM]

of density bonus could be earned by achieved by achieving additional on site community benefits that are described there on the screen. So the image that's shown here is an artist's rendering of what could be expected in the district. As you see, density is the largest towards downtown and by the proposed light rail stop and moves down as you get further away from that portion of the city. To further get an idea of what it might look like within a single project, here's an example. In the district and that has recently submitted their development assessment application to the planning department. You can see that through the program, the development is able to achieve roughly 6 to 1 fa. And then community would in receive and return 21 on site affordable units. \$7.1 million in fees and low for housing, parks and infrastructure. Based on the site size, it's broken into three density distribution areas

[1:42:05 PM]

three density distribution areas and additional density is gained through various provided on site community benefits. This includes certain types of commercial and music space, public art, and then of course, open space. So on April 9th, planning commission heard from the south central waterfront team on the draft code with a vote of ten one one. PC recommended to with 13 amendments and recommendations, move the draft code forward to council, I have outlined all 313 recommendations in the next few slides and the staff's responses to them per recommendation. Generally speaking, of the 13 recommendations made, staff is not recommending four of them, not including three since they're out of scope of this zoning code amendment. So not sort of technically within our scope of work. And then we're in support of and we're relevant to the code are including six, I'm not going to go into detail on each one that you see in front

[1:43:08 PM]

each one that you see in front of you, but I'll highlight a few for you here. First, related to number one on the screen, the draft presented to planning commission outlined an even split amongst fees in lieu. Planning commission recommended modifying the fee in lieu distribution, with 60% going to affordable housing and the remaining 40 split amongst parks and infrastructure. And our staff recommendation is to maintain the even split among all three categories community input put a high importance on parks, open space and the pedestrian experience in the area. In addition to affordable housing. And since this is a financial tool to support the realization of all of the community benefits, we as staff feel that an even split still makes sense. Excuse me. Next, related to, numbers four and five, planning commission asked to modify the fa map and internal circulation routes. This was to further support the density in the

area to support project connect, reduce density further on the new western parcels and then enhance the

[1:44:09 PM]

parcels and then enhance the pedestrian experience through the adjustment of internal circulation. Route options staff is making these adjustments in support of the planning commission, council and just generally the community's goal of transit and pedestrian, friendly environment. And then as for item number seven, this was definitely the most dramatic of the recommendations of the night. And was not universally passed. In short, the recommendation Ann asked staff to change this code by rewriting it to align with the downtown density bonus program. Part one specifically so explicitly not Rainey street, in the name of simplicity and on site affordable housing. Ultimately, the downtown density bonus program simply does not meet the needs of the central waterfront, and believe me, if it were as simple as such, we would have definitely proposed it versus working tirelessly to try and get something with the myriad of community benefits we've been

[1:45:10 PM]

community benefits we've been able to achieve with the draft we've got in front of us today, but we were asked to accomplish on site affordable housing in the area, infrastructure for pedestrian, transit and transportation, and incentivize open space and parks and the downtown density bonus program just doesn't work to do this, in front of you are a few reasons why, and I'll dive into them, and it's not first on the table, but I am going to start with affordable housing. Part one of the downtown density bonus program does not require on site affordable housing. It's completely optional, and we've seen over time developers most often opt for fees in lieu downtown as staff. We were asked by council and community to have affordable housing in the south central waterfront district. Beyond that explicit ask, it's the city's goal. Through the council approved strategic housing blueprint to create access to opportunity in the city. South central waterfront is specifically identified as an

[1:46:11 PM]

is specifically identified as an area of opportunity in the blueprint. Not only does the draft south central waterfront code require on site affordable housing for rental units, the affordability levels for rental and for sale are deeper than what is prescribed for any units that make it into downtown, providing optionality in on site, affordable housing in Austin has proven over time that affordable housing will be put elsewhere, this is against the stated goals of council staff and community for the south central waterfront. So beyond affordable housing, the downtown program does not accommodate the varied nature of lot sizes and configurations that the south central waterfront has. As the south central

waterfront code. Does, occur? Update this the south central waterfront needs to provide incentives that are beneficial to small lot sizes. So 30,000ft S all the way up to multiple acres in size, and create a pedestrian and transit oriented environment while doing so. We do this with the

[1:47:13 PM]

so. We do this with the introduction of the density distribution areas to create a pedestrian oriented environment. The pedestrian scale is a community benefit that could otherwise be ignored in development without the parameter tirz. Our draft code establishes. Additionally, it needs to accommodate that the fact that there's insufficient existing infrastructure in the south central waterfront, especially at a pedestrian scale . So in south central waterfront, this code requires tirz a gatekeeper, a standard for enhanced streetscapes, including what elements we can from the great streets program. We require internal circulation routes within the das that have minimum standards at pedestrian and multimodal scale. Finally, downtown also does not accomplish much when it comes to parks and open space. The south central waterfront vision plan underscored parks, open space and trails as a hallmark of how the plan should be realized successfully, and there are

[1:48:15 PM]

successfully, and there are minimal tools available to the city to be able to accomplish this. But we've tried our best, in requiring 5, open space for development, providing density bonuses for additional open space provided, requiring public access easements for all provided open space encouraging, adjoining extending and enlarging existing parks, trails. Open space in and near the district, providing density bonuses for parkland buildout and additional fees and low will be directly supported. Park buildout in this area, the downtown density bonus program requires nothing related to parks and open space. The optional aspects within the bonus program downtown include additional density for optional, publicly accessible onsite plaza , and then also fees in lieu for off site open space. So in sum, again, downtown does not get us where we as a collective, both

[1:49:16 PM]

where we as a collective, both council and community have identified where we want to go within the south central waterfront. And we don't believe as staff a simple fix of expanding the area to CBD zoning and applying the downtown density bonus program will work. The final group of recommendations from PC are, seen on the screen here in front of you. Many of them are suggestions that go beyond the scope of this code, including the suggestion for extending the bridge option for project connect in this area, and a transportation management district. Where they are directly interfacing this code. Staffer in support of some, but not all recommendations specifically, staff support affordable housing suggestions,

particularly items number 11 and 12, which will either be directly incorporated into the code like number 12 or already in place like number 11, and staff do not recommend the last recommendation from planning commission, as we've historically identified barriers with such requirements so

[1:50:19 PM]

with such requirements so substantially staff is in general support of more than half of the items planning commission put forward for those items. We aren't directly including in the code, but are in support of or await further public feedback on. We look forward to working with staff, community commissioners and council in the future. In terms of the big picture, here are some of the highlights on how the draft code has evolved from public and planning commission feedback. This year we expanded the boundaries in the district. As I mentioned, modified the subdistricts, and we adjusted the affordable housing investment area for the fees in lieu to ensure proximity to transit and to prioritize spending, in part to preserve affordable housing in that area. And we added multimodal circulation options and enhanced all internal circulation routes to further encourage an area where people are walking, biking and being outdoors. Finally, there are a number of things that we as staff have on our

[1:51:23 PM]

that we as staff have on our immediate to do list for next steps in the code that you see in front of you here. These are important for consideration, but to support the fta grant application process and its timeline, we feel like these items can be completed soon, instead of now with limited impact to the realization in this area. As for the timeline, here's where we've been with the public comment aspect. There was a one month public review of the first draft during it, we held three public meetings, two virtual, one in person, and we received hundreds of, responses via online survey. We've spoken to nine boards and commissions, including presenting before the planning commission a couple of weeks ago and have been incorporating relevant feedback along the way, we're also participating in the joint code amendment, open houses. We participated in the one last week and will be in the upcoming ones. We're speaking to this body today, and then we intend to go before council before the end of may. So as we continue to

[1:52:23 PM]

end of may. So as we continue to move forward, our hope is that council approves this draft code in may. And that concludes my presentation. But I do look forward to your questions. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much for the presentation. Colleagues, do we have any questions? I'm going to start with vice chair alter and then move over to council member qadri. And just to, to kick it off, I

misunderstood your question earlier about whether or not the briefings would be separated. They are in fact separated, but the one that you were making reference to, around electric vehicle charging. But that would not be an additional briefing. So, just so you guys know, after this round of questions, before we move on to the next briefing, I'd like to bring folks back up to, respond to your question about electric vehicle charging. So just to give a heads up.

>> Thank you. Thank you, vice chair, just so I am clear in terms of the fee in lieu option, what what, if anything, can someone pay fee in lieu for because they.

[1:53:26 PM]

because they.

>> There are a couple of aspects. So, 70% of the density earned could be obtained through payment of fee in lieu.

>> Okay. So and that would be an even distribution of those three areas.

>> And then additionally, sorry, you were about to ask a question. But then additionally you can pay a fee in lieu, in part for if you are building, for sale units, instead of rental units in the property, instead of providing on site affordable units at a for sale. So a condo market, you can pay a fee in lieu instead.

>> And since the bonus is in terms of your fa, you're not going to be able to pay a fee in lieu as it relates to, let's say, like parkland, because your square footage is your square footage, it's really as it relates to gained square feet of vertical entitlements that. Correct.

>> That's that's correct. >> Okay. I lost you a little bit

[1:54:27 PM]

>> Okay. I lost you a little bit on the density distribution areas.

>> Okay.

>> Those are 90 up to 90,000ft S within a specific zone that we're drawing. Is that correct? So parcels if you can bring up the slide that has a map we can look at the wonky parcel size.

>> Well this is a fine example. So the parcel size is like I mentioned some of the parcel sizes are as small as 30,000ft S and some of them are acres large. And so what we're trying to do is accommodate and create a space where pedestrians and, and, and all sorts of people want to be on a regular basis and feel comfortable sort of walking around and sort of getting to places where they want to hang out and stay and be. And so what this density distribution area concept does is it allows within one parcel to not, necessary subdivide, but it is similar to the breaking up

[1:55:28 PM]

it is similar to the breaking up of the building land, like the building mass in a particular place, so that a pedestrian won't go more than roughly 300ft, to before they sort of get to another place to turn a corner or, you know, have, a break with an internal walkway or that sort of thing before the next building site.

>> But that will only apply to certain pieces, I guess I'm trying to reconcile it with, like your example that you gave that had, looks like 750,000 square foot building, but you say these other are 90,000 square foot maximum. Those don't seem compatible in my mind. What? I know I'm missing something here. I'm just trying to figure out what.

>> Yeah, I don't know if, Tyler or Chad. You want to come up?

>> Yeah.

>> Happy to forgive me for just not getting it. Hey, Chad Sherrod here. >> So the maximum. So, for

[1:56:28 PM]

>> So the maximum. So, for example, you have your parcel and the example you're referring to. There's multiple density distribution areas within that parcel. And so for example, I believe there's three I believe it was the 500 south congress example, so you would have multiple chunks so you can have more than one dda per parcel. Got it. Okay.

>> That makes sense.

>> That makes sense.

>> Thank you. I thought we were talking about the whole lot that really, you know, can I say it back and see if I understood what he.

>> Yes, by all means, what he seems to understand now, because I was with him on that. What you're saying is it, it may have 750,000ft² of building on it, but within that it will have to be divided up so that you have what she said, not more than a certain amount, where there's a walkway or something. So it's not a 750,000 square foot structure. It is a number of

[1:57:30 PM]

structure. It is a number of structures, in this case, probably three, that add up to 750,000. So that you get the walkability and movement.

>> Yes, it's to reinforce that permeability for people because yeah. Good, good. Thank you. Thank you.

>> My last question as it relates to the yeah. Thank you for that clarification that it just wasn't adding up, but the on site versus off site question that, y'all have clearly analyzed and you say, so the slide you had that at full build out. We're looking at potentially 481 on site units. Did y'all do any kind of comparison of what that would potentially yield if you did allow for any kind of fee in lieu and restricted that to a certain geography? So like let's say you could do fee in lieu, but you have to spend it within a mile that might yield, you know, 600 units or I, you know, making numbers up.

>> But I don't believe we did any analysis on the affordable

[1:58:31 PM]

any analysis on the affordable housing investment area itself.

>> What we wanted to understand is knowing that on site affordable housing was a priority stated to us. We wanted to understand what the threshold that we could get and would, as I said, marginally pencil in today's conditions. What we would be able to, we believe ask for in this density bonus program. And so as a result of that analysis, we looked strictly within the district area to understand, you know, what does that mean? How does that equate to what was asked for in the vision plan? So we only looked within within the district.

>> Got it. And you know, I just think about the statesman site and the fee there that is going to support Mary Lee, which is about a mile away and is going to yield hundreds of units and some of many of them permanent supportive housing units. Based on that, that one fee in lieu.

[1:59:32 PM]

on that, that one fee in lieu. And so that policy question of, you know, it is very close. It's not right there, but it's within a mile of downtown. And the yield we're getting off of that just from a single site is almost this entire south central waterfront. And I just I think that's a question that we need to know what we're what the trade off is because we're potentially leaving a lot on the table that could be done nearby. But I see Mandy's at the edge of her seat, so I might I might have some numbers misquoted. And she. But Mandy Demayo with the housing department, the statesman pod, was, I think, a unique scenario in that it was, of course, an extremely large parcel which had the potential to effectuate a large fee in lieu. I do want to clarify that while we had a lot of discussions about Mary Lee, which is a development on a redevelopment that's being undertaken currently by

[2:00:32 PM]

undertaken currently by foundation communities, the fee in lieu was not, in fact, dedicated to Mary Lee. It was dedicated to the housing trust fund to be spent within a certain prescribed geographic area, we do not anticipate that, other large or of the scale of the statesman pud, development, and so we have worked closely with April and her team, on making sure, as April mentioned, that we prioritize size, a reasonable amount of on site affordability given today's market conditions. So we're fully supportive of those recommendations.

>> And I think that's incredibly important. You know, I think about the presentation we got a couple weeks ago from related about their quite substantial development. And I know I've heard other people talk about ideas that aren't necessarily, you know, on paper yet happening, but that are huge, and so it just seems like there's potential there. But

[2:01:34 PM]

there's potential there. But anyways, I won't take any more time. I appreciate it very much.

>> Any other questions?

>> Regarding the street grid, what opportunities lie ahead of us to make sure that we have a functioning street grid through the south central waterfront? Overlay

>> Well, I think the days are one element of it, but certainly this is one financial tool in the toolbox. And and in, in terms of and I, hopefully I'm getting to your question, but if not feel free to clarify, what we're, requiring as a gatekeeper requirement are enhanced streetscapes, in the days we are, requiring the internal circulation routes, there are four different options for those , one of those options does include vehicular, mobility in in addition to pedestrian and others are multimodal, including

[2:02:37 PM]

others are multimodal, including bike lanes and sidewalks and then there are some that are just pedestrian only, and so all of this would be sort of contributing, in terms of where we're getting to in terms of the street network, but then also, the fees in lieu would certainly be going towards the build out of infrastructure. I hope that gets to your question.

>> It does. So there's fee in lieu that is not just about affordable housing but also about, stormwater infrastructure . Yes, absolutely. Building a road connection where it doesn't already exist that would come out of fee in lieu. Yeah.

>> The fees in lieu are it's, it's, so all of the fees in lieu are sort of, put together in that 70% density bonus area. And those would be broken out evenly according to our draft proposal. So a third dedicated to affordable housing, a third, dedicated to infrastructure and community benefit, and a third dedicated to parks.

[2:03:37 PM]

dedicated to parks.

>> Okay. And as far as if a street were to go through a tract of land that was not subdivided, what kind of leverage do we have through this infrastructure to get ahead of their land use planning processes, to make sure we can get people on foot or on bikes to the train, is where I'm really heading with this. Yeah, yeah.

>> I mean, the goal of the density distribution areas is really to have mobility that is connected to other places and have this be a pedestrian oriented environment.

>> And I don't know if the transportation public works representatives in the room have any other things to add beyond this. But the goal is to create connectivity to the open space that exists, as well as to the opportunity for multimodal transit bikes, transit, among other things.

>> I see Mr. Baruah is here with us, thank you. Upul baruah, interim assistant director, Austin transportation and public

[2:04:38 PM]

Austin transportation and public works department. In addition to the south central waterfront plan, we also have the street impact fee program. So when a new development comes in, they either have to implement the street network that is laid out in smp or pay into the fee structure so that the city can build some of the street network out there and that is going to be a tool to connect the density to the future transit stations out there. Okay I'm very interested in that conversation because this area, well, some would claim that it's going to be redeveloped regardless of city council's actions.

>> I think we need to be very wise about the fact that there are limitations to what a public entity can do to make private landowners, work with us on some of these issues, and I just want to make sure we're all at the same table and that we're not missing opportunity for folks who want to be able to bike and walk to the train to be able to use that infrastructure. And so I think I know a ton of work has gone into this on the staff

[2:05:40 PM]

gone into this on the staff side. And with south central waterfront, commission in the downtown commission trying to work on some of these issues. But I really want to make sure as these redevelop, that there is a way of making sure that the community's best interests are at the forefront of our minds,

because if we miss this boat, it's going to be 1 or 2 generations before somebody else gets to take another round at it.

>> Absolutely.

>> Thank you. Thank you.

>> I think I'll also clarify very quickly the community that's identified for the 30% of density bonus, which is transit supportive infrastructure, that for this area has not, been fully clarified. We anticipate through the public, process, through project. That project connects going through right now more clarity will be provided and we will be more specific in terms of what we mean by transit supportive, in infrastructure. And so certainly that's another sort of, carrot to, increase density and the ability to build more in this area for the

[2:06:44 PM]

more in this area for the developer and in return receive transit supportive infrastructure as a result.

>> I really appreciate that. I know over the past number of years, we've had conversations around if you end up with private development, building their own roads and their own parks and their own community benefits, they have the ability sometimes to put a fence around it and lock it up and make sure that other people can't access public spaces. And I think that's something really important for us all to consider moving forward, to make sure these community benefits are actually something that the community can go and touch the grass and watch the bats and, and do all the things that we want to do in Austin.

>> We, we, readily agree and have included the requirement of public access easements for all open space.

>> And that designation is related to private, space. So any, internal circulation route, any dedicated open space that a developer provides as a result of using this density bonus program would have a required

[2:07:44 PM]

program would have a required public access easement, meaning open to all.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. And I appreciate you asking those clarifying questions, because those are really important components to consider. Council member qadri, you had a question.

>> Yeah. Thank you, well, no questions. And I appreciate everyone's very thoughtful questions. And I appreciated the presentation. I just had a quick statement to make. If that's okay, I just wanted to say,

really appreciate the presentation. We've been working with the community stakeholders and the commissioners every step of the way here. It's been a long time coming, so I'm grateful for city staff and our community volunteers for getting us where we are today on this, I will say there are some remaining questions is how to how the loss of waterfront, of the waterfront tirz impacts the density bonus program. And I look forward to exploring that with staff, and we need to make sure we chart a path forward to address infrastructure needs and the park vision overall. So I look forward to getting more information, in the upcoming weeks.

>> Thanks. I will just say that this is one financial tool in the toolbox where we're not

[2:08:45 PM]

the toolbox where we're not solving everything with this, but we are distinctively separate from, the tirz in terms of a tool to sort of realize the build out of this area. But we look forward working with your offices, as well as other city departments, to sort of make sure that there is a weaved fabric. And I identified approach for the other tools in the toolbox to make this place whole.

>> Great. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. Thank you for the presentation, I appreciate it. I just had kind of a colliding small town Austin politics moment. And, so Eric Goff walks into the room in a Boston T shirt for followed by Deshotel.

>> And you're talking about touching grass and watching bats. It's such an Austin day in Austin, and so, as we but as we prepare to move forward into the next presentation, council member qadri, I wanted you to be able to ask your question about ev chargers.

[2:09:45 PM]

ev chargers.

>> Yeah, thank you. And my apologies for all the mess that I might have made, I had two questions on ev chargers, my first question, I will give it five seconds, how would the areas around our proposed caps be treated in the proposal that you had outlined earlier? Sure.

>> Thank you. Eric Thomas with the planning department, currently, the areas where we're proposing to have caps above roads, would just correspond to how they're currently classified by the existing roadway types, similar to how staff didn't feel comfortable moving forward with an amendment to the underground charging prohibition. At this stage in development, we felt like we didn't have time to, fully address the caps. However, if an amendment were offered that said something to the effect that charging is prohibited along a roadway that abuts a cap, then we'd be happy to support that and assist in development of language, or answer any questions that would

[2:10:47 PM]

answer any questions that would come up with that great.

>> And my second question, is there something we can do to treat those areas more like our transit corridors? Since we'd like those caps to be places for people and not cars?

>> Absolutely, yes, I think we could.

>> Okay, great. Yes

>> That's it. Those are my two questions.

>> Awesome.

>> Thank you. Appreciate it. And with that I do believe we are prepared to move into our last combined briefing, this is item number six on the housing and planning committee side. And item number four and the mobility committee side. This is our briefing on downtown parking requirements. I please introduce yourself.

>> Hello. Good afternoon, Cole kitan transportation and public works department, case manager for downtown parking modifications. Phase one. This is our first public presentation on the proposed changes, we've been hard at work since February, working with our our downtown stakeholders to come up with those proposed changes, we were also able to participate in last week's open house with the other, ldc amendments. So, as

[2:11:49 PM]

other, ldc amendments. So, as background, on February 1st, council adopted resolution, initiating changes to the land development code to modify parking regulations in downtown so that these regulations help achieve the goals of reducing the overall number of new parking spaces built within downtown Austin to meet parking needs. More efficiently, and creating a more walkable, pedestrian oriented, built environment with fewer large above ground parking structures, these modifications could include implementing parking soft caps and requiring a fee for parking built above soft caps, reducing the maximum motor vehicle parking allowed for development downtown, and requiring developers to decouple parking as part of the gatekeeper requirements for the downtown density bonus program. So the reason this, this code amendment is included in this, with the other amendments is, is because the fta new starts

[2:12:52 PM]

because the fta new starts application includes a existing land use criteria, which looks at our existing supply of parking downtown compared to the number of employees downtown. So a more quantitative criteria about what exists today, but it also has a more qualitative criteria under economic development effects, which looks at our transit supportive plans and policies. And that's where looking at parking maximums and how they would be considered transit supportive and may support a higher rating. So late last year, urban land institute convened a technical assistance panel, looking at downtown Austin parking, looking at strategies to encourage less vehicular transportation and parking and developments. And this, this, this uli panel confirmed a lot of the problems that we understood to be true, which is parking ratios remain high in downtown is over parked,

[2:13:53 PM]

high in downtown is over parked, but it also highlighted some of the issues. And has revealed a lot of things such as the source of the parking demand is unclear . So the uli panel was specifically asked, how can the city of Austin facilitate and encourage less vehicular transportation and parking within downtown, to accomplish our 50 over 50 mode share? So looking back at those issues that they had uncovered about market and industry concerns, they also pointed out that cities like Austin with a strong real estate market can actually benefit from pushing the boundaries and trying to come up with innovative, innovative solutions to reduce our parking supply. But they also pointed out a shift, in a friction is needed in order to make this shift, but they, highlighted that we've we've seen, market

[2:14:54 PM]

that we've we've seen, market movement. So it's encouraging to see that the market is actually providing lower parking ratios than, than in the past. And in some instances, providing no parking at all. So as part of their, panel report, they provided policy recommendations, which, which, you'll see as part of, being incorporated, incorporated into our staff recommendation. Burns, but they include using parking caps to limit the amount of parking built downtown. But allowing developers to pay a fee, in order to exceed that, that parking cap, also encouraging decoupling of parking from residential assets, encouraging shared parking as well as improving the biking and walking experience. So, moving on, staff's approach to coming up with a proposed changes was looking at the last ten years

[2:15:55 PM]

looking at the last ten years worth of development downtown Ann, and understanding what those parking calculations, ended up being. So over the last ten years of approved site plans, we have 76 cases, which equaled 30,000 parking spaces. So you can see, at minimum it was zero, but at maximum it was 2000 spaces, with the average being about 400. And these are cases, as you can see, throughout all

of downtown. So looking closer at how parking is calculated, the amount of parking allowed is calculated based on a site's land uses and parking ratios in appendix a of the land development code, a snippet of that table is shown to the right, but parking has not been required in downtown since 2013 and citywide since 2023. However, appendix a is still used to calculate parking maximums and required excess accessible spaces. In 2013, when those parking maximums were

[2:17:00 PM]

those parking maximums were introduced, it capped parking at 60% of what was previously required in appendix a, and with the ability to exceed that parking cap up to 110% upon request. Prior to 2013, a minimum of 20% of all developments and 60% for residential uses, was required with no parking maximum, so looking at what this means using an example development on the right, you see that for every 275ft² of office space, appendix a says there should be one parking space and for restaurant space, space, it's one one parking space per 75ft². So with this development at 100% of appendix a, that would have been 779 spaces at the 60% cap, it would have been 467. However,

[2:18:03 PM]

would have been 467. However, this development provided 526 spaces of above ground parking, which is 68% of appendix a. So what we wanted to do then was look at all of these cases, across how many parking spaces they provided and what was the comparison to appendix a? So on average, throughout all of the cases, they provided 50% of, of the parking found in appendix a or otherwise required in appendix a, with the 80th percentile being 79. So that means 20% of these cases, over the last ten years, provided more than 79% of appendix a, using that same example and pointing it out on the graphic, you can see that the 526, spaces was 68% of appendix a. So

[2:19:04 PM]

was 68% of appendix a. So working with our our downtown stakeholders, they also wanted to see this information broke down by use type because different uses have different parking demands, so this first one is commercial and the average was 53% of appendix a, which is, which is lower than, the, the total. Similarly for hotels, this was the, the, the lowest parking demand compared to appendix a, which was on average 34. For mixed use developments, it was 56. Average for office space, it was 30. And then the highest one, which, increased is the overall average was for residential, residential uses only at 73. So looking at

[2:20:05 PM]

uses only at 73. So looking at all this information, we're trying to understand what to do with it. So looking at, what happened versus what could have been, out of the what could have been was 57,000 spaces at 100% of appendix a. Fortunately, that wasn't the case, even though that was completely feasible and allowed within the land development code as it is currently written. So instead, about a little more than 50% was provided or, at 30,000 spaces if we used the caps that the uli report identified, it would have amounted to a little bit less than what actually was provided at 29,000, but even at the 60% cap amount, it would have been 34,000. So the amount of parking spaces provided was still less than, the 60% cap.

[2:21:07 PM]

still less than, the 60% cap. So, looking at the cases across the different thresholds, only 36% of cases exceeded the current 60% parking maximum. However, that makes up 41% of the parking provided. So still a significant contribution to why our parking is oversupplied, only 18% of cases provided greater than 80, and only one case exceeded 100. But it was still, below the overall average at 361 spaces, and then on the lower end, 30% of cases actually provided less than 40% of appendix a, which is where we want to see that percentage grow, and then overall, just more than half of the cases fell between that 40% and 80% of appendix a. So moving into our staff recommendation, after,

[2:22:09 PM]

staff recommendation, after, meeting with our downtown stakeholders and, and looking at the data over the last ten years, we're proposing to revise the existing soft parking cap, for properties zoned CBD and dmU. We would reduce the parking cap from 60% to 40. And then developments under 10,000ft² S, or with 70 or fewer residential units can continue to include up to 60, and this was in a way to differentiate the scale and size of the different development types downtown, however, all, all developments would be able to, exceed the soft parking cap under certain conditions, which don't exist today. So, the director may allow more parking than the soft cap if, it's found that there's no risk to public

[2:23:11 PM]

that there's no risk to public health and safety or welfare and that it aligns with planning policies in the area and one of the following conditions is included. Parking is part of a shared parking facility, or parking is rented or sold separately from building space, or parking is designed and constructed for conversion to usable building space in the future, or parking is underground or mitigation fees are paid

for parking built above the parking maximum that go toward multimodal improvements. And then the last point being that we would reduce the absolute maximum amount of parking allowed currently from 110% to 80% of parking spaces in appendix a, and all developments would still be allowed up to 100% of parking spaces, so long as the additional parking spaces above 80% were included. Underground so what this looks like even further comparing the

[2:24:14 PM]

like even further comparing the existing regulations to the proposed regulations, there are no minimum parking requirements today, with 60% of appendix a allowed and up to 110, 110% allowed without conditions, and we would be moving towards a 40% of appendix a, cap with up to 80% of appendix a allowed with conditions, and then up to 100% if the additional parking is underground. So what that amounts to is instead of potentially having 110% of appendix a, all above ground, we're limited to 80% of appendix a allowed above ground and an additional 20% underground. And of that, 80, 40% of the parking would have to have a condition applied to it. So the next steps will be presenting to planning

[2:25:15 PM]

will be presenting to planning commission on April 30th, and then back to council on may 30th. And with that, I'll take any questions.

>> Any questions colleagues, just to more of a statement. That's fine, you said with that you'll take any questions, how about statements or statements, I just, I just wanted to say thank you to staff.

>> Really appreciate the great work, and all the stakeholders, as usual. And I just want to be clear for this body and those watching at home that the intent of decoupling parking was to apply to all developments as a given in the process, not as an option for extra parking. The current staff recommendation is decoupling parking as one option of several for that extra 20% of appendix a to get the developer to 100. So I just want to make sure that the downtown density bonus update will have decoupling parking as a gatekeeper requirement, and this and then that. This could be amended. And I want to make sure

[2:26:15 PM]

amended. And I want to make sure the developers are being encouraged to think about shared parking, underground parking, or convertible design for any extra parking. So therefore I think would be good if the recommendation could require decoupling and one of those extra options for the extra percentage not decoupling as just one of the options. Great thank you.

>> And I actually do have a question. So, there was one thing that you mentioned and I probably should know this, but I don't the mitigation fees where do those go.

>> So today the mitigation fee doesn't exist. So we would have to establish a mitigation fund, by separate ordinance. And those and those funds would be, allowed to construct multimodal improvements, whether it's sidewalks, curb ramps, transit enhancements, bike facilities.

>> Thank you. You anticipated the second half of my question because you specifically said the thing about multimodal investments. And so that was going to be the second half. Thank you, Mr. Ken. I appreciate it. No other questions. All

[2:27:16 PM]

it. No other questions. All right, y'all. Well, that's it, so, considering there are no other questions there, I will let chair Ellis. Conclude and adjourn our mobility committee meeting before we resume with the remaining items for housing and planning, agenda?

>> Yes.

>> And just before I adjourn our meeting, are there any other future items people want to identify? I will refrain from reading our lengthy list of interesting topics, but if there's anything else we wanted to throw on the list today.

>> Thanks. I don't think so.

>> With that, 2:27 P.M, we are adjourned for the mobility committee.

>> Thank you everybody, thank you, council member Ellis. So, as we continue, we're going to take up items number two, three and seven remaining on our agenda, that will start us off with item number two, which is regarding a discussion on, on the status of the timeline for land development code amendments, and it looks like you beat me to it, saying, Steph

[2:28:18 PM]

you beat me to it, saying, Steph , we're ready for your presentation. So please introduce yourself.

>> Yeah. Good afternoon, Steve greenhouse. I'm a division manager in the planning department here to provide an update on the timeline for land development code amendments, and really today, several of the other items on the agenda, stole my thunder. So this will be a very brief update on the land development code amendments. So since mid-march, council has initiated an amendment to the north Lamar Justin tod regulating plan, which applies to the crestview tod area council, has initiated an amendment to the north burnet gateway regulating plan and council has initiated an amendment to the university neighborhood overlay. Council took action in March to adopt several land development code

amendments, including amendments related to on site water reuse, the butler trail and the north burnet gateway regulating plan. The bulk of staff work on code amendments in the spring is focused on advancing a package of significant transit supportive amendments, which you heard about, earlier on this

[2:29:19 PM]

heard about, earlier on this agenda. And the committee will, has heard about several of those amendments today, and they will be moving forward to planning commission and council over the weeks ahead. In addition to the transit supportive code amendment package, we anticipate other key code amendments will be coming to council between now and fall of 2024, including an amendment to the north burnet gateway plan, which is on the council agenda for may 2nd amendment, sponsored by the development services department. To move forward on the second phase of site plan light and to improve the infill plat process, which are currently expected to come back to council on may 30th and amendment sponsored by the economic development department. To create an incentive in the code for live music and creative space, which is currently expected to come to council on July 18th. And finally, an amendment sponsored by the watershed protection department related to Colorado river protections, which is currently expected to come to council in fall 2024. Updated timelines for all code amendments and progress will continue to be included in

[2:30:20 PM]

will continue to be included in the Gantt chart that is available on the speak up Austin website, and for more information or to provide feedback, folks can visit [speak up Austin org](https://speakup.austin.org) forward slash ldc updates or can provide an email to [ldc updates at Austin, texas.gov](mailto:ldcupdates@austin.texas.gov) or leave a voicemail at the phone number on the screen. And with that, I'm happy to answer any questions you may have about the code amendments, timeline moving forward throughout the rest of the year.

>> Thank you. You are not kidding. That was the fastest. Any questions y'all I think we're good to go. Thank you. Appreciate you. All right. And so with that, I believe we have our panelist making their way forward. So thank you again, colleagues and staff, I'm super excited to introduce this next item, the district one office.

[2:31:20 PM]

item, the district one office. We've been taking a deep dive or 2 or 19 into the potential for agrihood as we search for more innovative ways to provide attainable housing options and to address our housing

shortages in Austin today, we are very fortunate to have a super diverse group of folks with diverse backgrounds and experiences, to share the room, and I believe our experts are fully prepared to get everybody as excited as I am about agrihood. By the end of this panel. So I will let our panelists introduce themselves and we can get the conversation started. Why don't we start from left to right? My left. Your right.

>> Green is good, good afternoon, council members. My name is Chris Jackson. I'm a landscape architect, and urban designer planner, with tbq partners and also really involved in the community. And just grateful to have this conversation today. So thank

[2:32:22 PM]

conversation today. So thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> And I am Aaron Flynn. I'm the co-founder of green gate farms. And though my family's ranch in Texas for six generations, I am the first in the family to become a certified organic farmer. My husband and I run two farms, one in east Austin and then another in bastrop county, and our farm is known for its open door for training new farmers. Farm based education programing. And for the past nine years, we've helped to create the village farm agrihood. The only tiny home development in the country designed around a certified organic farm.

>> Hello, I'm Michelle achintya, I'm the education director at farmshare. Austin farm share is a nonprofit teaching farm just east of Austin, where we have a mission to grow a healthy, equitable, and just food system. And we do that through farmer training and through food access . We do mobile markets and home delivery to underserved neighborhoods, mostly in the

[2:33:24 PM]

neighborhoods, mostly in the eastern crescent of Austin, with support from the city of Austin. And then we have a couple different farmer training programs for adults who are interested in starting careers in farming. I personally have almost 20 years of farming experience, both from the midwest and here, and, it's an honor to be able to train the next generation of farmers.

>> Thank you very much. We appreciate it. And we have three folks joining us virtually. So I'll let you guys. It'll be we'll it's the thunderdome. Just go for it.

>> Well, maybe I'll start. Can everybody hear me?

>> We can. Yes.

>> Great. So I'm Vince Kantor, I'm the vice president of the core companies, and I was responsible for the design, financing and construction of the agrihood project in Santa Clara, which is a total development project of 361 units comprised of both market rate and affordable housing, as well as approximate one and a half

[2:34:25 PM]

as approximate one and a half acres of open space. With a portion of that space reserved for a working farm. And I will turn it over to Laura Hermanson, who is with farm scape.

>> Hi, I'm Laura Hermansen, I'm the owner of farm scape. We are the largest urban farming company in California, and we're a licensed landscape architects, contractors and farmers. We work with Vince on the core project from the design all the way now through to the maintenance and programing, and we'll be there, seeing this project through. And we manage 15 agrihood across the state of California from Orange county, where we do the rancho Mission Viejo projects, all the way out to Tracy in northern California.

>> In afternoon, everyone, my name is Casey hill, and I'm here representing the county of Santa Clara, as a food systems manager . New role for the county of

[2:35:27 PM]

. New role for the county of Santa Clara in the office of the county executive. And let's see, one of, I would say my key role and responsibilities, especially as it relates here, is to identify gaps, opportunities across our countywide food system and to improve coordination. So I'm here to help coordination. And, Vince and Laura to really lead as subject matter experts. Thank you.

>> Thank you all very much. Thank you to the folks joining us in chambers today and to the folks joining us virtually, just assume we know nothing, so like I told the mayor earlier, there are there are no dumb questions. Let's ask all the questions and get the most information possible from this fantastic panel. So the way that we did it today, we basically prepared for brie board, question topics to get our panel started. So I welcome you all to join with any questions that you have as we make our way through the discussion, the four broad topics essentially, though, are one, the case for agrihood, number two, what is needed for agrihood to be successful in

[2:36:29 PM]

agrihood to be successful in Austin, number three, national best practices, and this will be us lean in or deferring to the folks in Santa Clara county. And then, next steps and recommendations from our panel. Unknown caller, unknown caller.

>> Sorry about that, so we in addition to the unknown caller, are going to start with, answering or attempting to answer question number one, or at least addressing it, with the case for agrihood, and we're going to start with our one and only, east Austin example with Aaron Flynn from green gate farms and village farm. If you wouldn't mind giving us about five minutes of your time and expertise.

>> Yes. Thank you. I'm thrilled to introduce you to village farm, the agrihood community we've helped create in east Austin for the past nine years. Not only does our agrihood community prove that this concept works, it shows that agrihood are ready for prime

[2:37:31 PM]

agrihood are ready for prime time, it's time that agrihood are made available to everyone. It's time that agrihood be considered a necessity, not just a developer's amenity. It's time for city supported agrihood as our agrihood demonstrates that well-designed, farm centered communities can offer affordable housing, they can increase food security, preserve farmland, improve health and well-being, create new careers for farmers and provide essential services during climate emergencies. Our agrihood is a green oasis, and you can see how it started up top and what it's become, that's keeping Austin sustainable and beautiful. Our agrihood, my agrihood adventure began 20 years ago when my husband suggested we leave our careers in public health and start a vegetable farm, and I was horrified. I had no interest in getting into farming, but I

[2:38:32 PM]

getting into farming, but I said, if we could do farming in a new way, then we could do it. So he agreed we would do a community supported agriculture farm. So in 2006, we found land to rent in east Austin. It was an old Swedish farmstead on decker lane that had been built by the Bergstrom family in 1902. It had a barn. You can see in this picture it had a barn, farmhouse, outbuildings and more than ten acres of good land. Best of all, it had a great keep Austin weird vibe because lots of musicians and filmmakers had lived there over the years. We even heard that Matthew mcconaughey did his senior film project there when he was a student at UT. I don't know if that's true, but that's what I heard, so our goal was to create a beautiful yet productive community farm, and our green gate was open to everyone, and everyone came our csa farm provided us with a reliable income and supportive customers, and that set the foundation for more than 30 enterprises. We had

[2:39:34 PM]

more than 30 enterprises. We had volunteers and internship programs, farm camps for kids and adults, field trips for musicians, field trips for schools and colleges, and a unique venue for artists and musicians. And then we formed a lot of partnerships. Our partnerships with nonprofits and neighbors have included, the east Austin feeding program with black women in business, the multicultural refugee coalition, and the Dell children's center for the prevention and treatment of childhood obesity. Our partnerships have been varied, and they really are formed according to what our neighbors need. Ultimately, our farm blossomed into a thriving community resource that's fed and educated people of all ages and incomes. Then in 2015, Roberts communities, an Arizona based developer, bought the 2250 acre rv and mobile home complex that encompassed our farm. His plan was to level the farm for an expansion of his adjoining rv

[2:40:37 PM]

an expansion of his adjoining rv park. Because there were no funded policies or zoning regulations protecting our farm, we focused our energies on persuading the developer to create an agrihood. We were inspired by our friends in Georgia. In 2004, two chefs created an agrihood called serenbe. They were able to preserve 1400 acres south of Atlanta by creating a farm centered development. Fortunately, our developer was intrigued. He visited serenbe and other agrihood around the country and most importantly, he hired tbq partners, an Austin based firm. And Chris Jackson is going to tell you more about his involvement, he was instrumental in the success of village farm, and he's gone on to get involved with many other agrihood is so ultimately it was tbq partners. Roberts communities, the city of Austin sustainability department , and green gate farms that came

[2:41:38 PM]

, and green gate farms that came together and agreed on a plan to create a neighborhood of tiny homes that preserved all the historic buildings. A four acre farm, edible landscaping and multiple community and pocket gardens. As I mentioned, this is the only kind of development like it in the country today. This development supported agriculture is nearing completion and it's home to about 150 residents and the agrihood has had wide appeal. Our residents include military veterans, international businessmen, first time home buyers, parents with children and this is all in 30 399ft S. These are little houses, we've even had divorced couples. Happily divorced couples buy houses near each other so they can be near each other, but not together. And then a number of parents have purchased homes for their adult children so they can be nearby. I think what has been the most surprising and inspiring part of this

[2:42:39 PM]

inspiring part of this experience is how this kind of design has fostered such deep connections. Neighbors really look out for each other. Just recently, a newer resident, an elderly woman in poor health who had just moved in recently, died suddenly. The neighbors decided to host a memorial for her, though they didn't really know her well. They invited her family to use our farmhouse for a service, and then they dedicated a tree in our orchard to her memory. Every day we hear how grateful neighbors are to live in a green oasis where they can walk to the farm for food and fun and events and exercise. This beautiful agrihood space has inspired residents to live healthier. The garden club has designed a 60 pot plot community garden. The bird club is teaching residents how to care for geese and ducks and chickens, and is restoring a historic chicken coop while other residents are focused on

[2:43:40 PM]

other residents are focused on creating a blue zone, starting a walking club and other activities. These deep connections also extend to our farm during winter storm uri in 2021, we didn't have to call our neighbors to come help. They showed up. They helped us cover our crops and insulate our irrigation. They were amazing. They provided extra hands when we needed them most. And then when the freeze was over again, our neighbors helped us glean what we could from the farm. Having that extra help and the emotional support made all the difference. And as we face, as we all face more climate challenges, having this kind of support is crucial, especially for farmers. Now that we have shepherded our community supported agriculture farm into a developer supported agrihood, we're eager to help Austin become a leader in agrihood of all kinds, but especially of city supported agrihood is this kind of food and nature

[2:44:41 PM]

kind of food and nature integrated neighborhood should be available to everyone. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. We really appreciate your presentation. Any questions so far. All right. So we'll keep the party rolling, and talk about what's needed for success. As you can imagine, oftentimes when things are new you, they don't get done because, not because it's impossible. It's because we don't know how to do it yet. And we have to put the mechanisms in place to get them done. So we're going to talk about what's needed for success in Austin with this kind of really interesting, amazing model, Michelle from farm share is going to spend a few minutes. And Chris also is going to talk to us a few minutes about, the things that we need to put into place, to, to see this happen, see it become a reality in Austin. And more than one instance.

>> Yes. Thank you, yeah, I mentioned earlier, Aaron, I've had the opportunity to work together. And prior to that,

[2:45:42 PM]

together. And prior to that, early in my career, I was a bit on a journey as a, as a landscape architect to try and bring hyper local food production to all these new communities, and especially trying to meet folks in their 20s that might be renting and have access to community amenities, hopefully farmers, other, other, ways to learn how to, produce, use local for food, but then be able to take that and hopefully, you know, purchase a property in the future and then be ready to farm, that was a real struggle. And so I think one of the, one of the major barriers to entry, was the access to farmers and also farmers that were interested in educating. So that's, that's a bit of a tie up here in a moment, another other thing that we've run into as a, as a constraint and where I think there could be an opportunity is really land use policy. And I think even just the presentation earlier was a great precedent for looking at these, regulating

[2:46:43 PM]

for looking at these, regulating plans and overlays, just like we have, urban design overlay for great streets or the uno district in west campus. There's these overlay which offer additional requirements to do you know, excellent new places. And I think a chance here could be in our most rural parts of our urban transect, could there be overlays that really incentivize really two things. One, of which could be the preservation and investment in urban agriculture, and another one other complementary or perhaps menu item could be the idea of regenerative landscape, another great example of this that we're seeing in our most impervious cover, areas of town is the investment in the draft city of Austin functional green, which I think is a menu of green infrastructure for new developments. 80% impervious cover over. But this chance to

[2:47:44 PM]

cover over. But this chance to sort of utilize this layered system and we thought that, you know, this could be a really good, option for again, the least dense part of our urban transect. And then just a few other things just to share with you as a resource as you have questions today. But our firm has worked on a series of agrihood is really across the state of Texas, primarily in north Texas, that we've had a farm sustaining in the neighborhood called harvest in north Dallas that has had a farm for 10 or 12 years now, a series of three farmers. And really the biggest constraint that that that community has had is, is the farmer prepared to farm and educate. And so they're able to give the farmer, land for basically a dollar a year, but then the, the farmer one to farm and not necessarily bring it to market, so it's really kind of crossing the T's and dotting the

[2:48:46 PM]

crossing the T's and dotting the I's of this mutualistic benefit that I think our, our friends here will be able to share in a minute, just a couple other names of farms that we've been working on are Shirley farms, pecan square and most recently two step, these are all, farms, I think. Yeah, like I mentioned, mostly in north Texas. And then one as well, over in the, like, greater Houston area.

>> Thank you, so at farm share, we have been training farmers since 2014. We have 102 graduates of our farmer starter program, and, 78% of them are still either actively farming or working somehow in the food system, and 60% are actively farming. Many of those people are looking for land on which to start their own businesses. Many of them are very interested in

[2:49:48 PM]

of them are very interested in growing food for the community. Only 25% of our students have access to land when they come into the program. So this is a huge barrier. The national young farmers coalition, Ann, assessed that nationwide, wide access to land is the number one barrier to starting a farm. And it's very much true in our community as well. So one of the things that we're trying to do is how do we continue to support these new farmers so that they can actually create a long term career in agriculture. And the role in agrihood could play in that could be really instrumental and there's this beautiful way where it can connect. Affordable housing can connect that food access and food security piece with the farmer training and farmland preservation piece. So that can be this multifunctional, support system to tie these really essential pieces of our day to day lives together. These are pictures of farm share. We have a 13 acre certified organic farm

[2:50:49 PM]

a 13 acre certified organic farm about ten miles east of the airport, and, that's our cabbage patch. So to give you an idea of what kind of a farm versus a community garden, there could be many different functions within an agrihood. One of the things to make this successful is to involve the farmer in the planning process. From the very beginning. So there's a lot of different goals, a lot of different approaches that can be part of an agrihood. But to start that that questioning, that visioning and that values and that goal setting from the beginning with the developer and with the farmer, so that the infrastructure that the farmers need to be able to be successful can be designed within the planning of the community as a whole. Part of that is also housing for the farmer. So many of our, our new new farmers are looking for farms with housing and so, because of the cost of living in Austin, are often, not

[2:51:51 PM]

living in Austin, are often, not able to live, near the farm or, or they're not able to find land with a house on it. So the more that we can keep the farmer with the farm would be very, very helpful. And we need to recognize farmers for the skilled trades people that they are, that they are, that they are bringing into valuable skills to the table and invaluable knowledge to the table. And should be, should be compensated for that, just like any other expert would be when, doing consulting and helping build build a project such as this.

>> I'm sorry, is it it my part of the song, yeah. Just one last thing, we were involved as a consultant team, to work on the Dallas urban agricultural plan as well, which is, available, publicly. And there's

[2:52:52 PM]

available, publicly. And there's some great kind of key takeaways, several that we mentioned now. And I think it's, you know, in real time working on the policy side, to implement that plan. Thank you.

>> Thank you, I appreciate that. And I think this is a super good segue. And it also offers me the opportunity to, to carefully articulate my questions. So we're going to move into national best practices, and that's something that, you know, given that Austin has won, Houston has a couple central Texas has a handful. Just sort of thinking through the, what things are best practices nationally, but then coming back down and getting a little more granular and figuring out what's best practices for us, so we're really anxious to hear from you, Santa Clara folks, to, to give us some general idea about national best practices, I think right now, Austin, with our one agrihood, as our example, I want

[2:53:53 PM]

agrihood, as our example, I want you to sort of take away that Aaron made a point of saying that this is the only one of its kind in the nation. Right. And so I think in a lot of ways, what we're trying to figure out is a model that we can duplicate it, so sort of national best practices to get a general idea of what the template looks like and then go from there and to making it, you know, sort of uniquely suit our unique region. But I'll definitely just hand it over to you all to talk to us about, national best practices and really fostering a network between government and between developers and farmers to really sustain these agrihood. I think the conversation is multi-tiered, and as you can see, it's like, you know, it intersects the you know, Aaron, your introduction was so perfect because we're talking about housing. We're talking about health and wellness. We're talking about, you know, one of the things that came up during the course of our early conversation was around

[2:54:54 PM]

conversation was around isolation, and we were talking about elderly folks and how frequently that is the problem with their health is the isolation. And so there's so many things that we get to touch on here, and I'll stop talking and let you guys take the floor. Thank you.

>> Okay, so, again, this is Vince Kantor with the core companies. So where to start? So with Santa Clara and with the agrihood that we developed in Santa Clara, you know, I've been working on that project for the last eight years, and I've pretty much seen every aspect overseeing every aspect of its development. I'd say there's a few things that are unique about the Santa Clara agrihood that are worth mentioning. And I'll try not to dive too deeply into the financing, but just to give you an understanding of the agrihood in Santa Clara, it's roughly a 5.8 acre, 5.8 gross acre site. As I mentioned in my opening comments. The approvals

[2:55:54 PM]

opening comments. The approvals that we received from the city of Santa Clara were for 361 units, and those 361 units were spread between three projects. There was a 165 unit senior affordable housing project, which is a tax credit finance project. There's 160 unit market rate development project, and then there's 36 townhomes, and then in addition, like I said, there's the open space that includes the farm and why am I mentioning that? Well, in Santa Clara, it was really the mix of market rate and affordable housing that helped, in a nutshell, finance, the agrihood and finance, the construction of the open space with very little direct investment from the city of Santa Clara. And so, I don't have a site plan to share with you, I could happily follow up after this meeting to provide that information, but

[2:56:54 PM]

that information, but essentially what transpired with the agrihood project when we closed our financing in 2021 after spending many years getting it entitled, we had, four simultaneous closings, and it was the closings of the market rate parcels, the townhome project and the market rate, apartment project that essentially created a subsidy and loan and proceeds that went to the city of Santa Clara, that the city of Santa Clara then reinvested into the project. Some of that money went to support the senior housing project, some of that money went to go support the development of the open space in the farm. And so it was very innovative from a financing standpoint, which is really the point that I want to mention and highlight that, but two, there was also a deep history, and deep ties, agriculturally, that the site represented. So you know, from, I would say the early 1900s all

[2:57:55 PM]

I would say the early 1900s all the way until about 90, 1990, there were a variety of uses that occurred on the site, but, one of the most notable uses of the property was that it was a demonstration orchard that was managed by the university of California. And so there had been agriculture on the site for many, many years. There there were, a lot of folks and stakeholders that were interested in preserving the agricultural use of the property, it was our task to try and find a site plan and a financing scenario that kind of balanced the city's need for affordable housing and the community's need for maximizing the site for open space and agricultural uses. And so, so, you know, we did find that solution. It took about, I would say, from my perspective, about six years of entitlement related

[2:58:56 PM]

six years of entitlement related work to process the zoning approvals, the environmental clearances, to get everything in place to start construction and to finance the project, you know, since that time, I think we got the entitlement approvals in 2019, we broke ground, started construction in 2021. If you were out at the site today, what you would see is a completed townhome project, a fully completed and leased up senior housing project, and a fully functioning farm, the market rate project is on hold just given market conditions and interest rates, but that doesn't prohibit us from funding the agricultural activities, that are going to be that are happening and will continue to happen on the site, so I'll pause there and maybe, respond to any questions or turn it over to Laura Hermansen to speak a little bit further about the actual farm use.

>> Colleagues. Any questions so far? I have a couple, so far, so, I'm certain it doesn't

[3:00:00 PM]

, I'm certain it doesn't surprise you that my ear fell off on my head when you said six years for the zoning environmental particulars and entitlements. I'm I'm hoping that a part of what we do during the course of this conversation is figure out how to not take six years, so just curious if you could just give us, you know, some insight there into whether or not you feel like at the end of that six years, if you had to duplicate the process, it wouldn't be that long. Again how do I want to answer that with the agrihood and Santa Clara, I would just say there was a very, deep history with the site and there were various stakeholders that were very vocal throughout the entitlement process. Some stakeholders wanted to maximize the land for open space. Some stakeholders wanted to maximize the land for high density housing development. And when I

[3:01:01 PM]

housing development. And when I say high density, I'm talking anywhere from 10 to 20 stories. Some stakeholders wanted commercial uses on the property. Some stakeholders didn't want any uses on the property. One of the things that's unique about the Santa Clara agrihood it's surrounded on three sides by existing single family homes, that, you know, would prefer to avoid traffic impacts and all the other environmental impacts that would, you know, come from any housing development, and so you know, would would we have liked the process to take half that, half that amount of time? Of course, a quarter of that time, even better, but the reality is there were just political dynamics that we had to balance. And, you know, we were competitively selected for the project back in 20. He let me think about this. The fall of 2015 is when the core companies was selected as the developer

[3:02:02 PM]

was selected as the developer for the project. We spent about a year visioning the project with the community, coming up with a plan that we thought was respectful and responsive to neighborhood and community concerns we got through that process, had a study session with the council, the study session, for a variety of reasons, wanted to see, a different configuration of the land, there were very unique political dynamics that, how do I want to say this? Were such that there was a visioning firm that came came into the process and re-envisioned the site after we had spent, you know, close to two years working on the property, reconfigured the site, reconfigured the location of the farm, so it was just, you know, without getting in too much

[3:03:03 PM]

without getting in too much detail, it was just delays related to the, various ideas that, stakeholders within the community had. And so it was a challenge and, you know, Laura can testify to this. There are plenty of moments of frustration as a developer trying to get something done, trying to get affordable housing built, trying to get an affordable housing project built with an average army of 45, with 30% of the units set aside for permanent supportive housing. I mean, the list goes on. There were so many reasons why this project was notable for, you know, reasons primarily related to the affordability of the project and the opportunities that it created for our senior community in Santa Clara. But again, you know, the history of the site was such that there were vested stakeholders that we needed to be engaged with, mindful of, and respectful of. So, you know, I'm sure there's folks that are that are very passionate about development in Austin.

[3:04:05 PM]

development in Austin.

>> No way. Not here.

>> That's that's just a dynamic as a developer that our concerns deal with.

>> Well thank you. I appreciate that that clarification. I think the only other question I have, and I really want to be mindful of the time, the only other question I had was you said that you were able to move forward with the senior housing component, the townhome component, but that the market rate component had stalled. And so I'm curious to hear how you because you said the market rate component had stalled, but you're still able to finance the farm piece. Yes. Curious about the relationship between the two and then how you're able to finance the farm part without the market rate piece? Because I think the assumption that a lot of us make, is that the market rate subsidizes everything else, but clearly that's not the case.

>> If you can imagine on a property that has a mix of housing, uses. So it's in this

[3:05:07 PM]

housing, uses. So it's in this case in the Santa Clara agrihood, it's contributions, annual contributions that are coming from the owners of the townhome development, the owner of the market rate apartment project, and the owner of the senior housing project. But those contributions are all coming together. We have our property manager that collects those assessments and then basically funds the operations of the space from those assessments. And so just because the market rate project is stalled, the way our our legal agreements and framework was structured, it doesn't mean the market developer is all of a sudden off the hook, that is not, in fact, the case whatsoever. There are contributions that need to be made. There was a set of ccnr's and governing documents that came into place when we closed our financing that were required by, you know, our public lenders, which involved the county of Santa Clara. The city of Santa Clara, and so, you know, those is there was a lot of thought

[3:06:07 PM]

is there was a lot of thought given to how do we make sure that this development and specifically the agrihood and all of the great community benefits can be financed, even in the event that one of the, one of the housing components doesn't move forward or is delayed due to market conditions.

>> Thank you. I appreciate that, those were my questions. I'm comfortable with you all moving forward.

>> Great. Well, I think that this is a good time to mention to something that's a little bit different about the agrihood that farm scape works on, and a little bit different about core agrihood, which is the food is not sold. We don't sell the food at the agrihood and I farm scape don't lease the land from Vince. So farm scape joined this team in 2015 as well. And prior to me starting farm scape I worked as an organic farmer, and I worked at a farm that owned the land and, I was in north Los Angeles county and despite the fact that I had great clients and a

[3:07:07 PM]

I had great clients and a thriving csa program and a number of other things going for me, it was very challenging to make a living as a farmer with any proximity to a city, the price of land going up all the time. And so the farm scape model is we are treated like landscaping in the byproduct of what we do is we grow organic food. And so as Vince and I were working on this plan and working on the budget on it year after year, we were just changing the size of the property that was going to be landscaped, and we have a per square footage rate, and Vince was able to fit that into his budget model. As all these things were changing and then the pandemic hit and it changed again. So because of that, we were able to be really flexible and something that, I agree with that. One of our previous speakers said was about having the farmers be involved from the very beginning. So when we got involved in 2015, we were already thinking about how this farm was going to look on April

[3:08:08 PM]

farm was going to look on April 23rd, 2024. How is it going to be managed? How are our, you know, different groups of people getting really excited about the farm and being super involved and then going on vacation for several weeks and not being involved at all. How are we going to get this, people involved included, but maintain something that looks really professional while we are right on the front, of Winchester boulevard, which is a very busy street. And so something that was of major importance to us was professional management of the farm. And so, again, because I don't lease this land from Vince, I'm there as a landscaper , I'm working for him as a subcontractor on this piece of property. And the standards are very high for what it is that I have to provide. And, so that's ended up being a better model for us. And when farm scape was looking at different models around the country, one of the previous speakers referenced serenbe. We looked at that, we looked at agri Topia in, Arizona

[3:09:09 PM]

looked at agri Topia in, Arizona and a few other places. One of the things that we noticed is that when a farmer is leasing land from an hoa, they it's kind of a messy model in some ways. Because of that, farmer wants to move on to a different, location. Then this hoa is tasked with finding another farmer. Generally, hoa members are not great, you know, don't have a huge background in farming, don't really know what to select, aren't able to really assess out a farmer's business plan and tell if this person would be good or or, the right fit for the community and vice versa. Many farmers don't understand and hoa, I certainly didn't, and it was why, as time went on, I became a landscape contractor and started doing landscape architecture as well. Because this is such an interesting and niche field where you're doing

both organic farming, but working within this very specific housing model. So that's how we ended up with the

[3:10:11 PM]

that's how we ended up with the secret sauce that has us managing 15 agrihood successfully today. Whereas if one of my farmers takes another job, I'm able to, you know, I have people that are training so we can continue seamlessly with our work.

>> Thank you. I appreciate that. I think, I think you definitely answered the questions, that we had about sort of that generally what the financing looks like, if all the pieces don't come together at the exact same time. I think one of the things that I'm missing here, and I'm not sure about my colleagues, and I'll let you guys speak for yourselves, but one of the things that I'm missing here from the perspective of thinking through the national best practices is I'm not quite hearing very specifically what was required from the relationship between the project and the municipal government. Part Burt. And I guess what I'm asking, you know, specifically, you know, does it need to go

[3:11:13 PM]

you know, does it need to go from a zoning classification of single family this to multifamily? Blah. You know, I guess, something very specific about what was required from a policy perspective is the one thing I'm not really hearing yet.

>> Okay.

>> So from a policy perspective, I can maybe shed a little bit of light on that. So going back in time. So this is predating core's involvement in the early 2000. The property, our aggregate property was, owned by the state of California. The state had stipulated that the property, the 5.8 acre property, be developed with 165 units and one acres of open space, one acre of open space. When we were competing for the rfp, we probably competed against 3 or 4 other development companies I can't remember. We were the only company that came up with a plan

[3:12:14 PM]

company that came up with a plan to incorporate a farm, into our site design layout, and that was us leaning into the community dynamic at the time back in 2015. Now to back up a little bit further, there had been a previous, development adjacent to our site where there was a development agreement that encumbered the entire property, including that the aggregate property and the challenge was there. The previous developer had the entitlement approvals to build 165 units and one acres of open space.

But unfortunately, just as they were about to take the next step with their financing, redevelopment agencies were dissolved in California and a key source of their financing dried up. And so the project is stalled and it stalled from about 2006 until 2015, when we were selected, what we had to do was basically

[3:13:15 PM]

what we had to do was basically pass state legislation to allow for the mix of uses that we were proposing to develop. Fortunately, there was enough political momentum to do that, but it was no easy feat. But in terms of your question about what specific city land use policies or programs in place, there weren't really any, nothing that was, you know, specifically saying that the property had to be developed with the farm. And if you developed it with a farm, it had to be this size or, you know, any other regulations that could come into play, that didn't really exist, but what did exist within the city was the political will to do something very innovative. And what core's proposal offered was a range of market rate and affordable housing uses, with no soft money commitment from the city of Santa Clara. And so that was, you know, basically us, you

[3:14:17 PM]

you know, basically us, you know, coming forward and acknowledging that cities didn't really at least the city of Santa Clara at the time we proposed the project didn't have the resources to invest. But again, going back to an earlier comment that I made, it was the sale of the market rate property acts that helped create the subsidy. That was then relent into the senior project and into the open space that was I'm trying I'm trying to explain it as as succinctly as I can, but that's really what was unique with the core agrihood and the financing strategy.

>> And similarly on that, to piggyback, by using the model where you're you're landscaping and then you have a farm stand where people are allowed to take the food, you bypass a lot of regulations Ann, because we don't need to have the health department involved. Thanks to, the in California, we have something called the farm stand act. And so it's something that we made a choice early on that

[3:15:18 PM]

we made a choice early on that we don't want to be, cooking in our farm. We don't want to be retailing, food. You know, we don't want to be set up as an independent farm that is then leasing land, because then we would start to trigger a bunch of these things that make this a lot more complicated. And what this is meant to be is a, you know, a food amenity for the immediate vicinity. And so, at the core agrihood, we are going to have an honor system farm stand, which is permitted, in the state of

California. So nothing special was required beyond that. And as you get out into the exurbs, a lot of that land is already permitted or is already zoned as farming. And so it becomes even easier.

>> Thank you. I appreciate that, and so, I don't have any further questions for, council member

[3:16:18 PM]

questions for, council member Ellis.

>> I'll ask a very high level one. What are the types of communities that might be excited about this type of program? Is it necessarily food deserts or is it other parts of the community that would be willing to start that conversation with us, to help us figure out how we're going to how we would try to start something like this in Austin?

>> Well, I have communities I have every type of community, like an amenity like this, because everybody likes to eat. And so it's one of those few things that gets everyone excited, also, so even people who are against the core agrihood came up to me after our presentations to tell me about a tomato that they used to grow in their backyard in New Jersey. Like, everybody has some story about growing food that really got them excited. And so we've done them with affordable housing. We've done them with, active adult or senior housing facilities. We've done them with

[3:17:22 PM]

facilities. We've done them with veterans homes more than once. So we've done, we've done this with every sort of community out there. High end, low end and everything in between. So so, there's a model that can fit everything as Vince mentioned, if there's the political will to make something like that work.

>> And just to piggyback on Laura's comment, I'm so grateful to farm scapes involvement in the Santa Clara agrihood and Laura Hermanson has been a phenomenal partner. Her company has been a great partner to work with, we've been working together as Laura mentioned, since 2015. And so just to give you an example of, it's silly, but it's not. But, you know, so, you know, the farm is planted up and running, I'm walking the space. It's maybe one of the first times I'm walking the completed project. And, you know, the beauty of it is just, you know, incredible. And it's hitting me. And I'm talking to Laura. And Laura made a comment. She's like, yeah. You know, I

[3:18:24 PM]

She's like, yeah. You know, I grew or I'm growing this, this particular type of tomato in this particular type of peach tree. Based on feedback I received from the community when we went through the

entitlement process. And those are conversations I don't remember having with stakeholders. But Laura did. And it just goes to show you just the I think the, the care and, just the community focused approach, that farm scape kind of brought to the discussion. And I'm just so grateful for their involvement.

>> Well, thanks. And, and the reason I'm able to do it is because I can afford to be there, which is a comment one of our previous speakers made. I am paid and compensated because we worked it out that I'm working there as a landscaper. We get an hourly wage. I don't have to sell that tomato in order to, you know, be able to pay my bills, and so that that's been a way that this has really worked out and we've been able to provide the care and detail, throughout this process.

[3:19:25 PM]

throughout this process.

>> Thank you. Did we have comments from folks here in the room, too?

>> Thank you. And I'm going to make my way to them. For what it's worth, I'm gonna I'm gonna because I think to some degree we combined our questions and answers for number three and four. So I think you guys will get an opportunity to piggyback on that, unless, of course, you feel very inclined to also respond to the council members question.

>> I just wanted to, to tell you that that farm shares gotten contacted by private landowners that are very interested in seeing their homestead being developed into some sort of agrihood as a way of being able to, to give a lasting legacy to the community, and that we really need to pay attention to where water access is here, in particular, and where prime farmland is as well. But in particular, water access, any other questions there, and so, yeah, to the point that I was

[3:20:28 PM]

yeah, to the point that I was making, I think we, we sort of combined our number three, our numbers three and four. Number four, was an opportunity to really talk about next steps and recommendations from the group, so, you know, just hearing from each of you briefly on what you recommend we do next. You know, how do we approach developing agrihood in Austin, and why do you think, I think this kind of development is important as we continue to grow as a city. Those are the things that I think we really touched on. We talked about the value, you know, the inherent intrinsic value of food sovereignty. I mean, what's the value of not doing it, you know, or what's the cost rather of not doing it, so there's that, but I'd like to start from here and from our, our virtual guests. If there's anything you'd like to leave us with on next steps and recommendations. Burns, as we conclude, recommend options that we could take moving forward as we talk to the body as a whole and then move to our guests that

[3:21:29 PM]

and then move to our guests that have joined us in person, well, let's see where to start. Yeah. I mean, as far as recommendations, if there's surplus lands or, you know, candidate properties in the city of Austin, you know, again, the way we were able to make this agrihood work was to combine it with a variety of housing uses. Right. And so and people touched on it a little bit. So the townhomes were really envisioned to be for first time home buyers. The senior project that, has the deepest levels of affordability in the project. You know, some seniors pay in these. This is the minority of seniors, but we do have project rental assistance as one of the, financing strategies in the affordable building, some folks pay as low as 100 to \$150 a month in rent with the rest of the with the delta being covered by project based vouchers. And so I would just say, you know, if there's sites that that maybe

[3:22:29 PM]

if there's sites that that maybe have a history of agriculture, if there's a council or if the decision makers in Austin are, you know, proponents of saying, you know, really interesting and vibrant mixed use communities kind of thrive, you know, if there's dialog and coordination with other funding partners that would come into play, whether it's the local housing authority within the city of Austin, you know, they're definitely a partner, you know, in the case of the Santa Clara agrihood, we received a sizable funding commitment from the county of Santa Clara, so there were bond proceeds that were created through measure a, which was, a critical piece of legislation that created close to \$1 billion for the county to develop affordable housing projects with, you know, getting to know your funding partners at the state and county levels, and then, you know, having the, the dialog and the discussion, I

[3:23:32 PM]

dialog and the discussion, I think that's an important step in the overall process. Yeah. I don't know if there's any. Laura, is there anything you would add to this, well, mine is mine is a, two talk about money.

>> Farmers need to talk about money. The developers need to talk about money. Start talking about money to each other early and often, does, you know, at core, what we ended up doing over time? You know, originally the farm was many acres, and over time, it got, more of like a jewel box farm because of the price of maintenance and other things we need to do include. And staying connected as a team. If you're a farmer brought in early in the process, staying connected to your developer and the millions of hurdles they need to jump through to get projects funded is very, very interesting and will help you land at a project that you can farm in perpetuity with very,

[3:24:32 PM]

farm in perpetuity with very, understood expectations between the community, the developer, and you as the farmer. If you want, as the developer in the community for there to be educational opportunities, make sure that those are funded in the, project from the get go so that everyone's really clear about expectations. When you finally come out the other side and open up your farm.

>> Yep.

>> Awesome. Thank you. And for our folks in the room, we'll start on this end. This time.

>> Yeah. Thank you. Just and again, I'm here, as a landscape architect planner, but I'm also representing or putting on the hat of our clients. That would be a developer of Vince or or friends and, to talk about money. I did have some good, I think precedents for, some of the projects we've been working on. I know, a handful of them have been plus or -1000 acre. Master plan communities and, who

[3:25:34 PM]

Master plan communities and, who is the client that wants this, amenity and this access, tends to be someone that wants hyper local food, but beyond that, they want amenities that they maybe had when they were a little more connected to the city. So maybe they, they move and their family is coming out for schools and more space, etc. But the fundamental amenities that they want are access to open space and trails and community, and then also they want to be able to park their car and just go out their door like this space is home. And then, also to restaurants and places of entertainment. So we, what we have found is the farm ends up being a great component to that for a 1000 acre community. Often times, the first phase of infrastructure in Texas is about \$15 million. So that includes a lot of a lot of

[3:26:34 PM]

that includes a lot of a lot of the boring stuff, Qureshi and storm pipes, etc. And then the farm component has been about plus or minus three hundred thousand dollars of the 15 million, which is 2% of the cost, a big advantage that our developer friends have found is the infrastructure, traditional gray like storm pipes and curbs is not something that is building community. And so this three, \$300,000 or 2% portion of that phase one investment is one that can start to build a brand, a sense of place and home, that has really helped, kind of kick start that, that sense of community and thank you.

>> Well, I really appreciate our California friends for talking about money and what farmers need, because that's it's really the case here as well. I mean, it's a new conversation, and we need to really get into those

[3:27:34 PM]

need to really get into those details and I think in Texas, what I've seen is there's been a lot of developments calling themselves agrihood. But what is what does that mean? I feel like we need to codify what an agrihood is. The urban land institute has some suggestions on what that can be, but I think the first thing is to make sure that these things, these agrihood are defined, and then also that developers have, incentives or rewards for completing projects as proposed. Because we I've seen a lot of really pretty pictures, and it's great when they actually get accomplished, the other thing is, I think in Texas, we have a lot of space and our farms can be bigger and in and I can't stress enough how important it is in farm share can certainly jump in here that that we provide a farm that's large enough or, creative enough so that elder farms farmers can mentor younger farmers because right now we are losing the expertise of elder farmers, who are often selling their land and

[3:28:36 PM]

are often selling their land and leaving the state. And that expertise goes with them. So if a, well, a well-designed agrihood provides an opportunity for farmers that they can't get anywhere else. And I feel like we really want to make sure that that farmer piece is really examined and like, how can we advance more farmers in our community?

>> Yeah.

>> Yes. Thank you. Aaron, I think it's important to recognize that as we are dealing with a changing climate, we really have to lean into the locally adapted knowledge that our elder farmers have. So I just wanted to echo that. I also want to echo the idea that that Laura was was talking about where where farmers can be paid for their service and paid as public servants, like a firefighter or an emt, versus being paid for the product that they're making. I think that is a is a really innovative way to

[3:29:36 PM]

a is a really innovative way to build a relationship between farmer and community. And the ecological services, too. Yes yes. So, you know, we're looking at, at building this climate resilient community with food security, food right there. So when you know, if something comes through and there's no food on the grocery store shelves, you can go, you know, walk down the street and talk to your talk to your neighbor farmer. And we're looking at at long terme, workforce development and long terme, support for people who want to do this work, who want to feed the community, who want to reconnect with, with their with their farming ancestry. We have a lot of people who who have skipped a generation or two in their in their farming connection and are really looking at at rebuilding those bridges and want to do that in community and want to do that near good schools and near the amenities that that living in a

city bring you. You know, the farmers also want that. Yeah. So I just want to I just want to end by, by reminding us all that

[3:30:37 PM]

end by, by reminding us all that in the, the, the state of the food system report, that was published by the, the city of Austin, office of sustainability, we are losing 16.9 acres of farmland to development every single day. And we of all the food that we eat in Travis county, less than 1% of it is grown locally. So this is this is immediate and impactful work that we're talking about here. So thank you .

>> Absolutely. And thank you all. I really appreciate it. Any other questions or comments from my colleagues. Does it look like it. So you all, know how excited I am and not even just because like to your point, I am one of those one generation removed farmers. But it doesn't go far. You know, I was the kid trying to grow the avocado and, you know, pit. And first I knew it was in me. Right. You know, and I think it's in a lot of us and a lot like a lot of the other,

[3:31:37 PM]

a lot like a lot of the other, you know, elements of the resurgence of the maker movement. You know, we're getting back to things, not because they're cool, but because they work, you know, the what's the expression? Organization is born of function growing our own food is functional and sufficient. And we talk a lot about resilience, but don't necessarily make the association, so I really appreciate this conversation. I think it just gets bigger from here, especially as we recognize the intersection. So thank you all so much for your time. We really, really appreciate you being here. I think you might officially get sick of coming to city hall at some point. So we're going to have to figure out what the incentives look like to keep you coming, because we'd like very much for y'all to stay a part of the conversation. But, from my colleagues and I and the city of Austin, thank you for your contribution to this important dialog. Really appreciate it. And so, I would like to actually make a motion, and. Oh, look at this guy over here. Yeah. So I'm gonna make a motion. Colleagues regarding this topic, if you take a look

[3:32:39 PM]

this topic, if you take a look at the motion sheet, in front of you and up above on the screen, I move that we recommend to the entire council that we direct, management to comprehensively explore Shaw agrihood, including, all the things listed here. And I'll read it off for you if you'd like, but are there any questions before I ask for a second to the motion, and it looks like I have a second to the motion. So the, I made the motion and it's seconded by council member qadri, and I guess all in favor say aye. And it looks like the three of us present, for this meeting of the housing and planning committee, unanimously

vote to bring the item before the body as a whole. And I, I am going to because we are a little bit early, I'm going to take the opportunity to read it for you. Give me just a moment, our motion sheet, essentially reads like a like an item for consideration. A resolution, whereas in agrihood is a planned community that

[3:33:39 PM]

is a planned community that integrates agriculture into residential neighborhood. And whereas agrihood facilitate food production as well as provide green space, recreation, esthetics and value for a community. And whereas the urban land institute defines agrihood as single family, multifamily or mixed use community built with a working farm or community garden as the focus. And whereas there are numerous examples from around the country, of agrihood being developed in cities, and whereas in Austin there are opportunities to utilize some of the last remaining farm properties for agrihood that focus on affordable housing, accessible housing, workforce housing, and improved food access, whereas best practices points to a need for policy changes to allow incentives for farmer informed agricultural components, incentives for developers and the design of a community and public funding to support mixed use, affordable residential, commercial and

[3:34:40 PM]

residential, commercial and agricultural. And whereas possible partners for any local program to support agrihood include existing farm owners, farmers, affordable housing developers, property management companies, urban farm consultants, school districts, land conservation organizations, and city and Travis county and. Now therefore, be it resolved, the planning committee, the housing and planning committee, the housing and planning committee, recommends that the city council direct the city manager to investigate whether there are existing impediments to agrihood development and best practices for programmatic support or local funding in order to achieve agrihood that are comparable to those in other parts of the country. Be it further resolved, the housing and planning committee recommends that city, the city council direct the city manager to explore the use of agrihood as a pilot program in the northeast. Planning district, given its unique mixture of public land assets, existing farmland, collaborative planning

[3:35:42 PM]

farmland, collaborative planning between the county and the city, and the existence of the city's only current agrihood, be it further resolved, the housing and planning committee recommends the city council direct the city manager to explore additional ways to provide local support for agrihood. At a minimum, the city manager should explore the feasibility of adopting a zoning typology for the agrihood

concept. The availability of local or state tax incentives, the availability of partnerships with federal agencies and congressional offices, options to collaborate with the county on agrihood development. The creation or curation of an agrihood dashboard that tracks potential sites, needs and opportunities for agrihood within the combined city county geography and establishes metrics for any further agrihood considerations and lastly, increased programmatic support for the sustainability office and any other city staffing

[3:36:43 PM]

and any other city staffing related to agrihood. And with that, it looks like it's coming before the body, and I'm excited about that, but lastly, on our list of things that we're supposed to cover today, we have item number seven, which is to bring forward any items for, future consideration. Ann. So this is where we get to highlight, the things that we'd like to, to cover in the future. I have a few, but I'd like to offer my colleagues the opportunity to bring theirs forward. Also my list. It is, so as we highlight, items to bring forward for the future for myself, I'd like to, join in a meeting with the public health committee to review our rapid rehousing strategies and partnership opportunities with Travis county, repurposing underutilized buildings and alternative building materials and methods. Oddly enough, that brings us right back to

[3:37:43 PM]

brings us right back to agriculture. Because when I'm talking alternative building materials, I'm talking hemp, and rezoning any parkland that is not currently zoned as P for public to its appropriate destination designation. And then lastly, presentation of our long awaited black disposition study. Possibly off site at a relevant location, and it appears as though there are no other future. Our California friends are still here. I probably should have told y'all you could leave a while ago. My apologies. Thank y'all for sticking it out to the end.

>> Have a good day.

>> Thank you all. We appreciate you, and with no no further considerations and no other items to come before the body today, we are going to say right before we close, thank you again to city staff for coordinating this joint committee meeting. And again, thank you to all who joined us for the aggregates panel. I believe that aggregates have extraordinarily great potential to thrive. I think

[3:38:43 PM]

potential to thrive. I think somebody said something about living. Working? No, a vibrant, thriving, mixed community. And that's what I want Austin to be is a vibrant, thriving, mixed community with

different housing types and different community types, and so with that, as we appreciate all the opportunities around housing and food access and security and, workforce opportunities, education and how we can contribute to our city's climate and sustainability goals, I will adjourn this meeting of the housing and planning committee