Notice of Meeting for the
2030 Comprehensive Plan Update Committee
of the City of Georgetown
December 5, 2019 at 4:00 PM
at Georgetown Health Foundation, 2425 Williams Dr # 101, Georgetown, TX 78628

The City of Georgetown is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If you require assistance in participating at a public meeting due to a disability, as defined under the ADA, reasonable assistance, adaptations, or accommodations will be provided upon request. Please contact the City Secretary's Office, at least three (3) days prior to the scheduled meeting date, at (512) 930-3652 or City Hall at 808 Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Georgetown, TX 78626 for additional information; TTY users route through Relay Texas at 711.

Legislative Regular Agenda

A  Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes from the October 24 and November 7, 2019 regular meetings of the Steering Committee. - Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst
B  Presentation and discussion of the 2030 Implementation Plan Strategies - Sofia Nelson, Planning Director
C  Public Comment
D  Next Meeting Date/Time/Agenda. - Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

Adjournment

Certificate of Posting

I, Robyn Densmore, City Secretary for the City of Georgetown, Texas, do hereby certify that this Notice of Meeting was posted at City Hall, 808 Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Georgetown, TX 78626, a place readily accessible to the general public as required by law, on the _____ day of _________________, 2019, at ____________, and remained so posted for at least 72 continuous hours preceding the scheduled time of said meeting.

__________________________________
Robyn Densmore, City Secretary
SUBJECT:
Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes from the October 24 and November 7, 2019 regular meetings of the Steering Committee. - Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

ITEM SUMMARY:

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
.

SUBMITTED BY:
Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes 10.24.19</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes 11.7.2019</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes of Meeting of the  
2030 Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee  
City Hall, Community Room  
808 Martin Luther King, Jr. St. Georgetown, Texas 78626  
Thursday, October 24, 2019 6:00 pm

In attendance: Mayor Dale Ross; Ercel Brashear; Lou Snead; Linda McCalla; Danelle Houck; Suzy Pukys; Hugh Brown; Josh Schroeder; Tommy Gonzalez; PJ Stevens; Wendy Cash

Staff present: Sofia Nelson; Nat Waggoner; Susan Watkins

Regular Session –
Mayor Dale Ross called the meeting to order at 6 pm.

A. Consideration and possible approval of the minutes from the September 19, 2019 meeting of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee. – Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

Motion by Brashear to approve the minutes, second by Schroeder.

B. Presentation and possible recommendation of updates to the Land Use Element – Nat Waggoner, PMP, AICP

The purpose of this meeting is to:

- **Inform**: Share summary results of the updates to the land use policies, categories and the land use map. Share a summary of the direction from the 10/22 workshop and inform the Steering Committee of future public input opportunities.

- **Action**: Confirm drafted policies and review changes to land use categories and land use map. The outcome of this meeting is for the Steering Committee to provide sufficient direction on the recommended changes for Council and the public consideration at meetings in October and November.

At the meeting, the Steering Committee will be asked:

- Do the updated categories support our land use/housing policies and the community’s input? How could they be more supportive?
- Does the updated map reflect the changes you recommended? Are additional changes needed?
- Are there additional stakeholders we should consult in the land use update process?

The agenda for the meeting includes:

- 6:00pm – 6:15pm: Presentation
- 6:15pm – 7:30pm: Land use policies, categories & map recommendations

Waggoner began the discussion with an overview of land use policies established by the Committee, and review of these policies to determine how they match with current development patterns, how those pattern match with compatible uses and existing uses. Waggoner also presented changes that have been made as a result of the Committee’s feedback and engaged in discussion with the Committee members on modifications to regional nodes and consolidation
of the nodes, employment centers that were added to the map and shifting of existing employment centers, and density changes. The Committee members participated in mapping activities and discussed the teams’ recommendations with staff.

C. Public Comment
D. Next Meeting Date/Time/Agenda – Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

Adjournment – Motion for adjournment by Brashear second by Schroeder. Meeting was adjourned at 7:30 pm.

____________________________________  __________________________________
Approved, Mayor Dale Ross                      Attest,
Minutes of Meeting of the
2030 Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee
City Hall, Community Room
808 Martin Luther King, Jr. St. Georgetown, Texas 78626
Thursday, November 7, 2019 6:00 pm

In attendance: Mayor Dale Ross; Tommy Gonzalez; Josh Schroeder; Doug Noble; Danelle Houck; Suzy Pukys; Linda McCalla; Wendy Cash; Paul Secord

Staff present: Sofia Nelson; Nat Waggoner; Susan Watkins

Regular Session –
Mayor Dale Ross called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

A. Consideration and possible approval of the minutes from the October 24, 2019 meeting of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee. – Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

The minutes were not included in the agenda packet and will be on the next meeting’s agenda.

B. Presentation and possible action on the updates to the 2030 Land Use Element – Nat Waggoner, PMP, AICP

The purpose of this meeting is to:
- Inform: Share summary results of the updates and public comment. The City will continue to take public comment on the draft map through the 2030 website until Sunday, November 3rd at 5pm.
- Action: The outcome of this meeting is for the Steering Committee to provide a recommendation to City Council of the proposed updates.

At the meeting, the Steering Committee will be asked:
- Do the updated categories support our land use/housing policies and the community’s input? How could they be more supportive?
- Does the updated map reflect the changes you recommended? Are additional changes needed?
- Are there additional stakeholders we should consult in the land use update process?

Staff discussed the input received from the Planning and Zoning discussion, as well as the October 30 Public Meeting and the Georgetown Development Alliance. There was discussion on the land use percent share evaluation, FLUP categories, and the key updates for residential and non-residential uses. The Committee broke into groups and participated in an activity to review land use policies, categories and the FLU map.

C. Public Comment
What work have you done to update the FLUM?

• Renamed and refined land use categories
• Divided parks and recreation and open space into separate categories
• Adjusted densities within categories
• Created Community Commercial and Regional Center categories
• Planned for land use with the use of legos
• Added residential and non-residential ratios
• Utilized the fiscal impact model

What are the benefits of the updates to FLUM?

• It helps citizens and developers understand the vision for the city as they plan for development of their property
• Expansion of mixed density opportunities
• Greater integration of MF & Commercial
• Addresses concerns of too much MF development
• Increased and spread out opportunities for commercial nodes- this will help with traffic node and opportunities for amenities nearby
• Outlines possible densities
• Created Regional Commercial and Community Commercial nodes
• Included ratios for non-residential and residential development
• Helps to plan out infrastructure

What concerns you about the updates to the FLUM?

• Does the map reflect current infrastructure? Infrastructure drives development
• Clarity needed on how residential ratio were developed
• Understanding how the FLUM will be implemented
• Within nodes how will ratios be implemented?
• What is guidance vs. what will require a map amendment?

What concrete changes are needed, if any?

• Clarify language regarding mix density residential
• Establish a priority land use for each category
Mayor Ross opened the Public Hearing. Tim Haynie commented on employment centers. Mayor Ross closed the Public Hearing.

D. Next Meeting Date/Time/Agenda – Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

Adjournment – Motion for adjournment by Mayor Ross. Second by Gonzalez. Meeting was adjourned at 7:24 pm.

____________________________________  __________________________________
Approved, Mayor Dale Ross  Attest,
SUBJECT:
Presentation and discussion of the 2030 Implementation Plan Strategies - Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

ITEM SUMMARY:
The draft Your Georgetown 2030 Implementation Plan is organized into three (3) strategies. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss these strategies and provide a recommendation to the City Council which will be presented to the City Council at their December 10, 2019 workshop.
The Your Georgetown 2030 Implementation Plan’s strategies are:
1. Regulatory Framework – the “Rules” for land development
2. Decision Framework – how “Rules” are applied by City Council and the Boards/Commissions that evaluate/recommend land development decisions
3. Plans, Programs and Partnerships – work plans needed to achieve goals, recurring City functions and coordination with other local governments and non-profits.
For a deeper understanding on how each strategy will be implemented, to include a summary of the associated action items. The three attached documents will be the basis of the discussion at the meeting:
1. Top 3 Implementation Strategies for 2030 Plan Memorandum (summary of recommended actions)
2. Draft Housing Toolkit (full listing of all tools available to the City)
3. Executive Summary of the Housing Toolkit (set of recommended Tools for inclusion in the 2030 Implementation Plan)
Also attached for your reference, if needed are:
1. Housing Technical Study Summary Memo, which outlines the key findings of the Housing Element
2. Steering Committee Land Use Recommendations, a graphic representation of the solutions needed to meet the 2030 Goals for land use

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
None

SUBMITTED BY:
Nat Waggoner, PMP, AICP

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 3 Implementation Strategies for 2030 Plan</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Housing Toolkit</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary of the Housing Toolkit</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Technical Study Summary</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Subject: 2030 Update Top 3 Implementation Strategies

From: 2030 Update Project Team

Date: 11/27/2019

Purpose: Define the top three strategies to Implement the Goals of the 2030 Plan

The 2030 Implementation Plan is organized into three (3) strategic initiatives to address the 2030 Goals established by the City Council.

1. **Regulatory Framework:**
Action items that involve updates to the regulations and standards (“rules”) for the development of land, primarily zoning and subdivision. These “rules” are the basic keys to ensuring that the form, character, and quality of development reflect the City’s goals related to land use. Key action items involve:
   - In-depth review of Unified Development Code (UDC) to ensure it enables the implementation of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan vision
     - Standards and incentives to allow for a diversity of housing types
     - Standards for gateways and corridors (landscaping, signage, building design, streetscape and walkability)
   - In-depth review of land uses categories to ensure transition of uses

2. **Decision Framework**
The City staff, Council and supporting Boards and Commissions play a role in the implementation of the 2030 Plan through their analysis, recommendations and legislative actions. The Implementation Plan includes specific actions staff will take to improve criteria and processes used in the decision-making process related to land development; specifically, those legislative decisions made by the City Council that impact the expansion of the city limits and the provision of infrastructure including roads, utilities and the creation of special financial districts.
   - Zoning map change criteria and Planned Unit Development approval criteria
     - “For the purpose of establishing and maintaining sound, stable, and desirable development within the territorial limits of the City, the Official Zoning Map may be amended based upon changed or changing conditions in a particular area, or in the City generally, or to rezone an area or extend the boundary of an existing Zoning District or
Overlay District. All amendments must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.”

ii. “The Planned Unit Development District (PUD) is intended to allow flexibility in planning and designing for unique or environmentally sensitive properties and that are to be developed in accordance with a common development scheme. PUD zoning is designed to accommodate various types of development, including multiple housing types, neighborhood and community retail, professional and administrative areas, industrial and business parks, and other uses or a combination thereof. A PUD may be used to permit new or innovative concepts in land use and standards not permitted by zoning or the standards of this Code.”

• Development Agreements
  i. “An agreement approved by the City Council for a development that could not otherwise be accomplished under this Code or the Code of Ordinances. A Development Agreement may modify or delay certain requirements of this Code (including any Manuals adopted by reference in the Code) and/or any other provisions of the City Code of Ordinances.”

• Annexation
  i. “The process by which a municipality expands its boundaries into adjacent areas not already incorporated into the municipality."

• Special Purpose Districts
  i. “Political subdivision(s) created pursuant to Article III, Section 52, and/or Article XVI, Section 59, of the Texas Constitution and that are authorized by law to provide water, wastewater, stormwater, and other services (“Districts”), in order to allow development within the City’s corporate boundaries and extraterritorial jurisdiction that is generally consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan”

3. Plans, Programs, Partnerships
The 2030 Plan is a long-range decision-making tool which provides strategic guidance for the future growth and development goals of our community. To achieve these goals, the 2030 Implementation Plan includes multi-year strategies for work that exceeds the level of this long-range planning effort including:

• Small area planning for preservation, redevelopment, or reinvestment
• Health and Human Services Element
• Historic Preservation Element
• Overall Transportation Plan (OTP)
• Parks and Recreation Element
Programs involve the routine activities of City departments and staff, as well as special projects and initiatives. This Implementation Plan includes actions which build upon existing programs, introduces new programs and expands community outreach efforts including:

- Home Repair
- Capital Improvement Planning (CIP)
- Annual Reporting (2030 Plan)

Many of the goals of the 2030 Plan were developed through participation and input from local government and nonprofit partners. Successful implementation will require direct coordination, agreements, or funding support.
## Housing Toolkit Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Issues from Housing Study</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1, P3</td>
<td>Assure physical preservation of existing affordable/workforce housing&lt;br&gt;The study found that much of the existing non-subsidized moderately priced housing stock is over 40 years old</td>
<td>Housing rehab incentives&lt;br&gt;• Expand home repair programs to reach moderate income workforce owner-occupied households and small-scale rental properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1, P3</td>
<td>Assure economic preservation of existing affordable / workforce housing&lt;br&gt;The study showed that the stock of for-sale existing housing priced under $250,000 has been rapidly decreasing, while rental rates in existing units have also been creeping upward</td>
<td>Housing rehab incentives&lt;br&gt;• Create dedicated funding source eligible to be used for both workforce and lower income housing rehab&lt;br&gt;• Add long term pricing/income restrictions to rehabbing incentives for workforce/ moderate-priced housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2, P4</td>
<td>Assist established neighborhoods experiencing change&lt;br&gt;The subarea profiles show historic sales price trend data with significant increases in some subareas in price/square foot</td>
<td>Neighborhood Plans and Programs&lt;br&gt;• Small area plans, neighborhood empowerment zones, neighborhood conservation districts or overlays, and/or neighborhood association program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1, A2, A3</td>
<td>Address increasing lack of affordability for low to moderate income residents and workers&lt;br&gt;Employment data from the study showed that the number of low to moderate income jobs in Georgetown and Williamson County is increasing, while the supply of housing affordable to such workers is limited relative to demand; 51% of renter households in Georgetown were cost-burdened in 2016;</td>
<td>Direct assistance to homebuyers&lt;br&gt;• Develop down payment assistance programs&lt;br&gt;• Create dedicated funding source eligible to be used by both workforce and lower income home purchasers&lt;br&gt;• Explore use of Neighborhood Empowerment Zones&lt;br&gt;Assist supply expansion of workforce housing&lt;br&gt;• Encourage more quality LIHTC development by reviewing tax credit policy to ensure it is supportive of the 2030 policies and future land use map&lt;br&gt;• Density bonuses for affordable / workforce housing creation&lt;br&gt;• Identify incentives that would encourage a fuller range of housing opportunities, both form and price point, when a special district or negotiated standard for development is being considered&lt;br&gt;Partner to build on the successful housing work being done locally and regionally&lt;br&gt;• Housing finance corporation&lt;br&gt;• Public facilities corporation&lt;br&gt;• Partnerships with nonprofits, impact funds&lt;br&gt;• Community land trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Issues from Housing Study</td>
<td>Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1, D2, D3</td>
<td><strong>Continue increasing the diversity of new housing development types</strong>&lt;br&gt;The housing inventory showed two main housing types are present, with the main housing choice being detached single family (85% Single Family, 15% Multi-family for the planning area (City Limits + ETJ). Many of the more affordable housing types documented in the study were moderate-density or niche types such as duplexes, fourplexes, attached townhome / rowhouses, manufactured homes, and small-lot detached</td>
<td><strong>Increase flexibility of development regulations</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Allow greater variety of housing types and lot sizes in UDC&lt;br&gt;• Density bonuses for inclusion of moderate density, moderately priced housing types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1, A2, A3</td>
<td><strong>Mitigate increasing costs of developing and delivering new housing</strong>&lt;br&gt;Interviewees in the housing and development industry described how development costs such as infrastructure are high and rising, and some are attempting to reach lower price points with smaller lots and attached product; however, no new rental housing for moderate prices is being produced and limited homeownership opportunities for workforce households</td>
<td><strong>Review of UDC requirements</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Review for unintended costs to build and opportunities to support increased density&lt;br&gt;<strong>Financial assistance to housing developers and builders meeting housing policies</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Development agreements&lt;br&gt;• Special financing districts&lt;br&gt;• Fee waivers&lt;br&gt;• Create dedicated funding source for housing development incentives and agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy: Preserve existing housing stock that contributes to diversity and affordability.

**Potential Tool**
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**Potential Funding Options**

**Recommended Funding**

**Implementation Steps (Year or Steps Required in Advance)**

**Potential Impact to Housing Need (low income workforce/owner/rental)**

**How a Performance Measure is assessed and how success is measured?**
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**Cons**

**Appropriate for Geographically Disparate Area (Yes or No)**

**Sample Texas Cities / Programs**
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### Housing Toolkit

#### Affordability Term Extensions
- **Preservation of existing affordable units, other than tax credits.**
- **Type of Action (program, policy, study): Program**
- **General fund/staff time/in exchange for other program participation or development incentive**
- **Staff time (x)**
- **Catalyzing developments to identify longer affordability terms.**
- **Develop program to provide support for property owners with innovations that use Low Income Housing Tax Credit.**
- **Preserves LIHTC units running end of affordability term.**
- **# of units preserved with extended terms**
- **Low cost tool**
- **Not many LIHTC units are yet at risk of affordability terms expiring.**
- **Yes.**
- **Texas Housing Foundation - Public Housing Authority with arrangements in five county central Texas region.**

#### Community Reinvestment Act Funds
- **Annual grant agreements to meet Community Reinvestment Act requirements**
- **Bank grants ($-$$)**
- **Roundtable of interested banks**
- **Programming & Execution**
- **Minimum neighborhoods for low income/working households.**
- **Repairs made near/neighb orhood improvements**
- **Promotes partnerships. Banks insert CRA requirements while advancing community policies.**
- **Marketing/outreach time needed to develop program/partnerships.**
- **Yes**
- **City of Alien Home Repair for non-CDBG eligible activities like fencings.**

#### Policy: Preserve existing neighborhoods in targeted areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Tool</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Funding Options</th>
<th>Recommended Steps (Year or Steps Required in Advance)</th>
<th>Potential Impact to Housing Need (low income/working ownership/tenant)</th>
<th>How is performance managed?</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Appropriateness for leveraging (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Sample Texas Cities / Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small/medium neighborhood</td>
<td>Single family neighborhoods, each neighborhood classified by housing type and price, and subject to periodic updates.</td>
<td>Bond funds</td>
<td>1. Establish annual funding for small medium neighborhoods. 2. Create process for neighborhoods to nominate themselves for small area plan. 3. Create database of neighborhoods for small area plan.</td>
<td>The data set shows historic sales price trends with significant increases in some areas over the past five years. Preservation of existing neighborhoods.</td>
<td>One per year</td>
<td>Economic analysis on defined areas; support for neighborhood preservation and compatibility</td>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Potential community concern on any transition in small area plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family neighborhood</td>
<td>Multi-family neighborhoods, each classification based on housing type, price, and subject to periodic updates.</td>
<td>Bond funds</td>
<td>1. Establish annual funding for multi-family neighborhoods. 2. Create process for neighborhoods to nominate themselves for small area plan. 3. Create database of neighborhoods for small area plan.</td>
<td>The data set shows historic sales price trends with significant increases in some areas over the past five years. Preservation of existing neighborhoods.</td>
<td>One per year</td>
<td>Economic analysis on defined areas; support for neighborhood preservation and compatibility</td>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Potential community concern on any transition in small area plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Policy: Support owners ability to stay in homes in neighborhoods with rapid value increases without limiting the sale of the home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Tool</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Funding Options</th>
<th>Recommended Steps (Year or Steps Required in Advance)</th>
<th>Potential Impact to Housing Need (low income/working ownership/tenant)</th>
<th>How is performance managed?</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Appropriateness for leveraging (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Sample Texas Cities / Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Repair</td>
<td>Repair program for low income homeowners to rehabilitate homes for eligible repairs.</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>1. Review and update UDC next budget cycle 2. Establish annual funding for small medium neighborhoods. 3. Create process for neighborhoods to nominate themselves for small area plan.</td>
<td>The data set shows historic sales price trends with significant increases in some areas over the past five years. Preservation of existing neighborhoods.</td>
<td>One per year</td>
<td>Economic analysis on defined areas; support for neighborhood preservation and compatibility</td>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Potential community concern on any transition in small area plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Example Texas Cities / Programs

- **City of Austin**: City of Austin recently reduced minimum lot sizes to allow single family homes at a lower price point in a master planned community. The City of Remington through the updates to the zoning code, waived an existing district to include more housing types. The largest block of the previous district was the different levels of approvals required for anything that was non-traditional single family. In the "lower version" these secondary and tertiary approval processes were removed. The current district allows for a variety of housing types within the same district. Single family homes (60' X 100') (SFH), duplexes, townhomes, and single family single (800 sq. ft. lot with separate sales access). To define the variety of housing types, building codes, and property values, we limited each block face to one consistent housing type.

- **City of Corpus Christi**: City of Corpus Christi, recently reduced minimum lot sizes to allow single family homes at a lower price point in a master planned community. The City of Remington through the updates to the zoning code, waived an existing district to include more housing types. The largest block of the previous district was the different levels of approvals required for anything that was non-traditional single family. In the "lower version" these secondary and tertiary approval processes were removed. The current district allows for a variety of housing types within the same district. Single family homes (60' X 100') (SFH), duplexes, townhomes, and single family single (800 sq. ft. lot with separate sales access). To define the variety of housing types, building codes, and property values, we limited each block face to one consistent housing type.

- **City of San Antonio**: City of San Antonio recently reduced minimum lot sizes to allow single family homes at a lower price point in a master planned community. The City of Remington through the updates to the zoning code, waived an existing district to include more housing types. The largest block of the previous district was the different levels of approvals required for anything that was non-traditional single family. In the "lower version" these secondary and tertiary approval processes were removed. The current district allows for a variety of housing types within the same district. Single family homes (60' X 100') (SFH), duplexes, townhomes, and single family single (800 sq. ft. lot with separate sales access). To define the variety of housing types, building codes, and property values, we limited each block face to one consistent housing type.
### Home Repair for Affordable Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant program for workforce rebuilding homes for eligible repairs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Action (program, policy, study, Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Funding Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Steps/Year or Steps Required in Adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact to Housing Need (low income/workforce (ownership/rental))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How performance managed: How is success measured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighborhood Exemption Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isolate the creation of a neighborhood exemption zone and other tools to provide targeted neighborhood support.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Action (program, policy, study, Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Funding Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy: Support owners ability to stay in homes in neighborhoods with rapid value increases without limiting the sale of the home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Sale Tax Abatement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Funding Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Utility Billing Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant funds for paying utility bills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Action (program, policy, study, Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Funding Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Homestead Exemption Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide education to eligible homeowners on how to obtain an exemption.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Action (program, policy, study, Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Funding Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Support Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships with non-profits that assist existing home owners with existing home owners maintaining affordability.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Action (program, policy, study, Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Funding Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy: Maintain and promote neighborhood character and quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Funding Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Level of Expense Legend

- $$$ - $50K - $100K
- $$ - $10K - $50K
- $ - under $10K

### Housing Toolkit

- Potential Tool
- Home Repair for Empowerment Zones

### Education Assistance

- Partnership with non-profits that assist existing home owners maintaining affordability.
- Partner time

---

### Good Neighbor Fund

- Non-profits, Staff time
- Staff time (5)
- Package information and provide through available city communication channels.
- Low-income and workforce homeowners
- # of homes with exemption
- Low cost action
- Unknown number of homeowners in need of education
- Yes

---

### City of Georgetown

- Faith in Action Georgetown

---

### Example Texas Cities / Programs

- Fort Worth has 6 NEZs, all in CDBG-eligible areas. Plano designated its own discretion (can be graduated).
- Example for Georgetown (though Georgetown could still apply a limit at its own discretion).
- City of Georgetown

---

### Low-cost action Unkno wn number of homeowners in need of education

- Yes
- Some real estate associations have education materials.

---

### Georgetown (Yes or No)

- Yes, existing program.
- City of Georgetown

---

### Performance measured: How is success measured?

- Pro
- Con

---

### Georgetown's proposal well-suited for future incremental City property tax increases and thus does not have income restrictions (what HUD would require, making it a good example for Georgetown). (though Georgetown could still apply a limit at its own discretion).

---

### DRAFT

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Capacity Building</th>
<th>Material Fundable Program</th>
<th>Material Funding Options</th>
<th>Recommended Funding</th>
<th>Implementation Steps (Year or steps) Required (d留守儿童)</th>
<th>Potential Impact to Housing Need (low income/workforce) (ownership/rental)</th>
<th>How is performance measured?</th>
<th>How is performance measured?</th>
<th>Material Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Material Funding Options</th>
<th>Recommended Funding</th>
<th>Implementation Steps (Year or steps) Required (d留守儿童)</th>
<th>Potential Impact to Housing Need (low income/workforce) (ownership/rental)</th>
<th>How is performance measured?</th>
<th>How is performance measured?</th>
<th>Material Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Policy: Support and increase rental choices for low-income and workforce households unless the housing is a substandard.

Additional PFCs to acquire sites and partner with developers to create tax-exempt mixed-income housing.

1. Create a PFC to acquire sites and partner with multifamily developers to create tax-exempt mixed-income housing.

- Provides affordable multifamily rental; tax exempt status requires 50% of units to be restricted to OMLA tenants; restrictions on rent and income end at the end of 10-15 year financing. Existing study identified that 60% of units are restricted to OMLA tenants.

Preserves LIHTC units, current rent and income restrictions; creation of affordable rental; no more restrictive requirements of GMLA or HOMC. Staff noted that current process (tax-exempt rent) is cost-effective and has resulted in affordable rental.

- Loss of potential future tax revenue

- No incentives provided for affordability terms

- Affordable housing partnerships

- None

- Small

- Affordable housing partnerships

- Staff noted that current process (tax-exempt rent) is cost-effective and has resulted in affordable rental. Savings have been generated elsewhere with partnerships.

- Affordable housing partnerships

- Savings have been generated elsewhere with partnerships.
Policy: Support rental choices for senior households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Funding Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (e.g., access to or near public transit)</td>
<td>Infrastructure (e.g., access to or near public transit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income housing</td>
<td>Low-income housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental assistance</td>
<td>Rental assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for LIHTC</td>
<td>Support for LIHTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support GHA</td>
<td>Support GHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City defined process</td>
<td>City defined process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development using LIHTC for low-income households</td>
<td>Development using LIHTC for low-income households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for rental choices for senior households</td>
<td>Support for rental choices for senior households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy: Increase homeownership choices for workforce households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Funding Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (e.g., access to or near public transit)</td>
<td>Infrastructure (e.g., access to or near public transit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income housing</td>
<td>Low-income housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental assistance</td>
<td>Rental assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for LIHTC</td>
<td>Support for LIHTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support GHA</td>
<td>Support GHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City defined process</td>
<td>City defined process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development using LIHTC for low-income households</td>
<td>Development using LIHTC for low-income households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for rental choices for senior households</td>
<td>Support for rental choices for senior households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development agreements:
- Includes development agreements that include: construction, design and construction, and development agreements with city policies.

Example Texas Cities / Programs:
- Commercial incentives: Zoning incentives (e.g., density bonus, extra lot area, or transfer of development rights) to create more units or more affordable units.
- Sandwiched units: Units located between more expensive units, which can be more affordable to low-income families or individuals.
- Inclusionary Housing Programs: Programs that require developers to include a certain percentage of affordable units in their developments.
- Low-income rental units: Units that are dedicated to low-income households, often through a long-term lease agreement.
- Homeownership incentives: Incentives such as tax credits, grants, or loans to encourage homeownership.
### Housing Toolkit

**Community Land Trust**

- **Definition**: A Community Land Trust (CLT) is a nonprofit organization that holds and manages land for the benefit of a defined and changing community. CLTs can be established by local governments or other entities.

- **Implementation**: A CLT can be established through legislation or administrative action. To establish a CLT, the city must pass an ordinance or resolution creating the CLT.

- **Funding Options**: Potential funding options for establishing a CLT include grants, loans, and in-kind contributions. The city may also consider partnering with private entities to fund the establishment of the CLT.

- **Success measured?**: The success of a CLT is typically measured by the number of homes it helps create, as well as the number of people it serves.

- **Why measure to apply for grant?**: The success of the CLT will be measured through the number of homes created, the number of people served, and the impact on the community.

### Housing Study

#### Health and Human Services Element

- **Description**: A Health and Human Services Element is a component of the Comprehensive Plan that outlines the city’s needs and goals related to health and human services.

- **Potential Opportunities**: Potential opportunities include partnerships with public and private entities to create new housing options.

- **Related Requirements**: Health and Human Services Element (6)

#### Policy

- **Support for Non-Profit Community to Create Housing Opportunities for the Most Vulnerable Residents (including but not limited to homeless, seniors, young aging out of the foster care system, and people with disabilities)**

  - **How performance is managed?**
  - **How is performance measured?**
  - **Appropriation for Department (Yes or No)**

---

**Table: Housing Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Potential Funding Options</th>
<th>Required in Advance</th>
<th>Required/Related to Implementation Plan Elements Required in Advance</th>
<th>How performance is managed?</th>
<th>How is performance measured?</th>
<th>Appropriation for Department (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Sample Texas Cities / Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy, encourage and incentivize new housing and renovations or additions to existing housing</td>
<td>Grant, Federal (Federal)</td>
<td>Grant, Federal (Federal)</td>
<td>Grant, Federal (Federal)</td>
<td>Grant, Federal (Federal)</td>
<td>Grant, Federal (Federal)</td>
<td>Grant, Federal (Federal)</td>
<td>Grant, Federal (Federal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Example Texas Cities / Programs**

- Austin
- Dallas
- Houston
- San Antonio
- El Paso
- Corpus Christi
- McAllen
- College Station
- Lubbock
- Arlington
- Fort Worth

---

**Notes:**

- The table above represents a summary of the potential opportunities for establishing a Health and Human Services Element within the Comprehensive Plan.

- The table includes a list of related requirements and a description of potential opportunities, along with potential funding options and how performance is measured.

- The table also includes a list of example Texas cities and programs that have established similar elements within their Comprehensive Plans.

---

**Policy:**

- The policy supports the non-profit community to create housing opportunities for the most vulnerable residents, including but not limited to homeless, seniors, young aging out of the foster care system, and people with disabilities.

- The policy aims to encourage and incentivize new housing and renovations or additions to existing housing.

- The policy recognizes the importance of creating new housing options to meet the needs of the most vulnerable residents.

---

**Implementation:**

- The implementation steps for the policy include:
  1. Establishing a Health and Human Services Element within the Comprehensive Plan.
  2. Developing a comprehensive inventory of land and other resources for affordable housing.
  3. Identifying possible regional CLTs for expansion into neighboring areas.
  4. Evaluating the feasibility of establishing a special revenue fund.
  5. Identifying public/private partnerships with builders.
  6. Creating high-capacity tools to address the magnitude of the need.

---

**Affordability Analysis:**

- The affordability analysis highlights the need for workforce and moderate-income housing.

- The analysis also considers the potential impact of current financial incentives and future reimbursements from lot sales or tax increment districts.

---

**Policy Impact:**

- The policy impact is measured by the number of homes created, the number of people served, and the impact on the community.

- The policy impact is tracked through the completion of the comprehensive plan.

---

**Urban Development and Transportation (UDT) Plan:**

- The UDT Plan is a comprehensive plan that outlines the city’s vision for its urban development and transportation systems.

- The UDT Plan includes a land use plan, a transportation system plan, and a comprehensive plan.

- The UDT Plan is implemented through the development of specific projects and programs.

---

**Community Engagement:**

- The community engagement process is a critical component of the UDT Plan.

- The community engagement process includes outreach to stakeholders and the public to ensure that the plan reflects their needs and priorities.

- The community engagement process is facilitated through public meetings and stakeholder engagement sessions.

---

**Conclusion:**

- The Housing Toolkit provides a comprehensive guide to establishing and implementing affordable housing programs.

- The toolkit highlights the importance of partnerships, funding mechanisms, and evaluation metrics.

- The toolkit is designed to help cities create sustainable and effective affordable housing programs.

---

**References:**

- Austin Housing Plan.
- San Antonio Comprehensive Plan.
- City of Dallas Comprehensive Plan.
- Houston Comprehensive Plan.
- City of San Antonio’s Accomplishments by the Number to track progress (https://www.sanantonio.gov/humanrelations/about/0308061619/chilenet)

---

**Notes:**

- The Housing Toolkit is a valuable resource for cities looking to develop affordable housing programs.

- The toolkit provides a comprehensive overview of the processes and mechanisms involved in developing affordable housing programs.

- The toolkit is designed to help cities create sustainable and effective affordable housing programs.

---

**Appendix:**

- Additional administrative and legal costs to run.
- City gives up portion of property tax revenue during life of zone.
1. Evaluate policies for potential housing

**MUDs help offset up-front infrastructure costs; the developer who would otherwise have to recoup them through home sales prices helps keep home sale prices more affordable in projects outside city limits.**

**Successful development completion and absorption, rapidity of developer’s reimbursement.**

City controls, wide range of improvements can be funded.

**ILT has far higher than City-spg, lower sale price somewhat offset by higher FIT.**

Consider on case-by-case analysis, no precedent for present contingent upon certain price range of homes, but may be possible.

Georgetown (TX) has existing MUDs, no precedent available regarding improvements for affordability.

### Potential Tool

- **Revenue bond**
- **Municipal Utility District (MUD)**
- **Local Improvement District (LID)**
- **Special Utility District (SUD)**

### Policy: Ensure land use designations and other policies allow for and encourage a mix of housing types and densities across the community.

- **Development of zoning, building codes, and property valuation laws.**
- **Alignment of land use policies and transportation policies.**
- **Support LIHTC.**
- **Districts.**
- **Public Improvement.**
- **Municipal Utility.**

### Policy: Promote aging in place opportunities by aligning land use policies and transportation policies that promote a housing market capable of accommodating residents throughout all stages of life.

- **Development of zoning, building codes, and property valuation laws.**

### Municipal Utility Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Funding Options</th>
<th>Recommended Steps</th>
<th>Implementation Steps (Year or Steps Required in Advance)</th>
<th>Potential impact to housing need (low income/workforce) (owner/rent)</th>
<th>How is performance managed?</th>
<th>Appropriate for Georgetown (Yes or No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>build on existing policy</td>
<td>workforce renters</td>
<td>if funds available, change in percentage of cost burdened renters</td>
<td>no cost to city. Some of only funding available to build units in workforce housing areas</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Improvement Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Funding Options</th>
<th>Recommended Steps</th>
<th>Implementation Steps (Year or Steps Required in Advance)</th>
<th>Potential impact to housing need (low income/workforce) (owner/rent)</th>
<th>How is performance managed?</th>
<th>Appropriate for Georgetown (Yes or or No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>build on existing policy</td>
<td>workforce renters</td>
<td>if funds available, change in percentage of cost burdened renters</td>
<td>no cost to city. Some of only funding available to build units in workforce housing areas</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Improvement Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Funding Options</th>
<th>Recommended Steps</th>
<th>Implementation Steps (Year or Steps Required in Advance)</th>
<th>Potential impact to housing need (low income/workforce) (owner/rent)</th>
<th>How is performance managed?</th>
<th>Appropriate for Georgetown (Yes or or No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>build on existing policy</td>
<td>workforce renters</td>
<td>if funds available, change in percentage of cost burdened renters</td>
<td>no cost to city. Some of only funding available to build units in workforce housing areas</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development Regulations

- **Zoning: adding diverse density zones with different lot sizes and types and varying mix of housing types.**
- **Revised development regulations to facilitate housing for a variety of housing types within the same district.**
- **Single family (on slightly reduced minimum lot size – 4500 sq. ft.), duplexes, townhomes, patio homes, and small multi-family units for a variety of housing types within the same district.**
- **City of Kerrville through the updates to the zoning code, revised an existing district to include more housing types.**
- **Reduction in minimum lot sizes for a variety of housing types within the same district.**

### Health and Human Services Element

- **The City Charter lists a Health and Human Services element in the Comprehensive Plan.**
- **Support of a needs assessment of potentially affordable populations to refine the scope and focus of the Health and Human Services element.**
- **Develop a Health and Human Services element for the comprehensive plan, as required by City Charter.**
- **Remains, Low-Income.**

### Example Texas Cities / Programs

- **McKinney recently reduced minimum lot sizes to allow single family homes at a lower price point in a master-planned community.**
- **Kerrville uses the updated codes, revised an existing district to include more housing types.**
- **HIll Country implementation of a new Low-MIP (low-income mortgage insurance program) will make it easier to develop moderate-density housing through bring the diversity of housing types and lot sizes (for UR).**
- **McKinney and others have seen success in using special utility districts (SUDs) to help offset up-front infrastructure costs; the developer who would otherwise have to recoup them through home sales prices helps keep home sale prices more affordable in projects outside city limits.**

### City of San Antonio's Accomplishments by the Number to track progress

- **Success measured? How is success measured?**
- **Cost/effort**
- **Yes**
- **City of San Antonio's Accomplishments by the Number to track progress

**Document diversity**

- **Georgetown (TX) has existing MUDs, no precedent available regarding improvements for affordability.**

- **Example Texas Cities / Programs**

- **McKinney recently reduced minimum lot sizes to allow single family homes at a lower price point in a master-planned community.**
- **Kerrville uses the updated codes, revised an existing district to include more housing types.**
- **HIll Country implementation of a new Low-MIP (low-income mortgage insurance program) will make it easier to develop moderate-density housing through bring the diversity of housing types and lot sizes (for UR).**
- **McKinney and others have seen success in using special utility districts (SUDs) to help offset up-front infrastructure costs; the developer who would otherwise have to recoup them through home sales prices helps keep home sale prices more affordable in projects outside city limits.**

### Policy: Ensure land use designations and other policies allow for and encourage a mix of housing types and densities across the community.

- **Development of zoning, building codes, and property valuation laws.**
- **Alignment of land use policies and transportation policies.**
- **Support LIHTC.**
- **Districts.**
- **Public Improvement.**
- **Municipal Utility.**

### Policy: Promote aging in place opportunities by aligning land use policies and transportation policies that promote a housing market capable of accommodating residents throughout all stages of life.

- **Development of zoning, building codes, and property valuation laws.**

---

**Housing Toolkit**

**Draft 11/27/2019**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support services to support aging in place</th>
<th>Type of Action (program, policy, study)</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Evaluate opportunities to build an enhanced support services program to provide transportation, healthcare, food services, and utility billing assistance to seniors, which should be addressed through the health and human services element.</th>
<th>Number of seniors participating in program, annual survey of seniors to evaluate awareness and participating</th>
<th>Support for Georgetown's sizable senior population, protect vulnerable populations</th>
<th>Additional cost</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Additional cost</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs - Comprehensive Energy Assistance Program utility assistance program (<a href="https://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/community-affairs/ceap/">https://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/community-affairs/ceap/</a>)</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$50K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2/26/19
Re: State of Housing Background Materials

Background
On May 24, 2016 Council directed completion of an update to the Housing Element and also a Housing Feasibility Study. Council asked to evaluate the City’s housing needs of three populations: low income, workforce and senior. City Council appropriated funds in the Fiscal Year 2017 budget and approved a contract for services which included an update to the Housing Element and Housing Feasibility Study, hereinafter referred to as the “Housing Toolkit” or ‘Toolkit’. The update to the Housing Element and the development of a Toolkit within the overall 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update will align the City’s development, fiscal and land use strategies.

![Figure 1 - Housing’s Role in Future Land Use](image)

2030 Plan Update goal development
During the December 11, 2018 City Council workshop, the project team presented Council a review of the existing land use goals and a summary of the public input to date. Council recommended that a housing specific goal be considered. At the January 3, 2019 Steering Committee meeting, after reviewing the existing land use goals, the committee found that recent public input themes related to housing were not included and therefore not reflective of recent community input.

At the January 10, 2019 Joint Session of City Council and Planning & Zoning Commission, the group arrived at consensus on a Housing specific goal:

“Ensure access to diverse housing options and amenities and preserve existing neighborhoods for residents of all ages, backgrounds and income levels.”
2030 Housing Element Update

Included in the newly formed housing goal are three specific themes: affordability, diversity and preservation. Together, the three themes provide a fuller community housing strategy that preserves existing housing stock and accommodates future needs by creating greater consumer choice by 2030. The 2030 Housing Element uses the data from the technical study and concerns from the public input to inform the policies for each of the areas.

Key Terms Used in this Report

- Affordable housing - regardless of income level, affordable housing is housing for which all combined expenses—mortgage or rent, utilities, insurance and taxes—cost no more than 30% of gross household income.

- Area Median Income (AMI) – used by HUD to determine eligibility for housing programs. This calculation is used in this report to reflect regional conditions and the household incomes eligible for federally subsidized units. The AMI for Williamson County is used to calculate eligibility in Georgetown.

- Median Household Income – half of households earn below and half earn above
  - $81,818 WilCo (2016 US Census ACS 1 year estimate)
  - $67,379 Georgetown (2016 US Census ACS 1 year estimate)

- Cost Burden – paying more than 30% of gross income toward housing
- Low-income (Industry standard)- Often households that make 50% or 30% or less than AMI
- Workforce (City of Georgetown UDC) - Workforce Housing Developments are available for those whose incomes are less than or equal to 80% AMI
- Senior (Industry standards) - Can be age restricted at 55 or 62, Census data addresses 65+
- Planning Area - Geographical study area that includes the City limits of Georgetown and the extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ)

**Technical Studies**

Community Development Strategies (CDS) was hired as a sub-consultant to Freese & Nichols, the prime consultant for the 2030 Plan Update, to complete a technical study of housing. The components of the technical study consisted of a) Housing Inventory, b) Subarea Profiles and an c) Affordability Analysis as detailed below.

**Housing Inventory**

**Purpose**

The Housing Inventory serves as a full accounting of housing units and households in the City’s planning area. The inventory provides the type, age, lot size, tenure, and household composition of the city’s housing stock. This report tallies and catalogues the various types of housing existing in Georgetown. The Inventory has two primary data sources: (1) the Williamson Central Appraisal District (WCAD) and (2) Nielson / Claritas, a private sector provider of demographic data estimates based on recent data available from the Federal Bureau of the Census and other sources. The geographic Planning Area covered includes the entirety of the City’s incorporated jurisdiction plus its extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ). While the Nielsen / Claritas data is ascribed generally to the year 2018, the WCAD data is specifically ascribed to a download period of June-July 2018. The inventory includes maps for comparison of the characteristics across the city. CDS delivered a Housing Inventory in July 2018. The information was presented to the Housing Advisory Board on July 23, 2018. Additional information was presented to the Comp Plan Steering Committee on November 1, 2018.

**Key Findings**

The report concludes that housing product options not evenly distributed across the planning area and there are decreasing options among lower price points. The Planning area has the following characteristics:
Housing Unit Characteristics

- 16.6% MF/83.4% SF
- Median home size 1,994 sq ft., Average home size 2,159 sq. ft.
- Median lot size .23 acre, Average lot size 1.17
- 33,842 total units
- Median Homes Value (excluding multi-family) $269,593
- Average Value (excluding multi-family) $309,797
- $146 per sq. ft. (median 2018)
- Median Year built (all units) 2004

Household Characteristics

- 22.4% Renters/77.6% Owners
- Average size 2.47 persons
- Homeowner average of 9 years, Renter occupied 3 years
- Median Household income is $81,219 (94% AMI), Average is $103,384

Subarea Profiles

Purpose
The subarea profiles provide a basis for making policy recommendations through an understanding of housing as it exists across the city. The granularity of the subarea profiles allows the City to make recommendations for specific geographies or recommendations that may apply to the entire study area:

- Housing diversity (type, lot size)
- Housing choice (square footage, price point)
- Historic cost trends (MLS sales and rental data 2008-2018)
- Existing affordable housing stock (market rate and subsidized)

The Subarea map consists of 14 areas. The map was developed using housing characteristics of housing age, type, density and value. Other considerations included well known boundaries such as neighborhoods Sun City (age-restricted), zoning overlays such as the Old Town / Downtown, Census Block Group boundaries and elementary school zones although the zones had limited impact on the subarea boundaries. The subareas are not intended to define “neighborhoods”. The review of housing characteristics for the subareas included Multiple Listing Service (MLS) sales information from the Austin Board of Realtors, US Census data and field research.

The Subarea information was presented at:
- August 20, 2018 Housing Advisory Board meeting
- September 6, 2018 Steering Committee meeting #4
- September 18, 2018 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting
Findings

• Some subareas have no or little housing product diversity or rental options. Other subareas such as those in the center city have a wide variety of housing types and ages.
• Older duplexes, four-plexes and multi-family properties play an important role in affordable housing stock.
• Neighborhood change is a concern for some existing residents.
• Household characteristics are depicted geographically and varies widely across subareas. A summary for each of the subareas is attached to this memo (Attachment 1 – Subarea Profiles).

Affordability Analysis

Purpose
The Affordability Analysis provides a general picture of the need for affordable rental and for-sale housing in the Georgetown Planning Area defined as the City of Georgetown City Limits and its extra-territorial jurisdiction. The report is broken into three parts: Affordable Housing Demand (including regional employment data), Affordable Housing Supply, Analysis and Recommendations.

Housing Demand and Supply information was presented at the following meetings:
• September 24, 2018 Housing Advisory Board meeting
• October 15, 2018 Housing Advisory Board meeting
• November 1, 2018 Steering Committee #5
• November 6, 2018 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting

Findings

The bullets below represent the generalized findings of the 11/1 Steering Committee:

• Rental Demand
  Housing is an economic development issue
  Surprised by high renter cost burden
  Surprised Georgetown AMI is lower than WilCo
  Surprised that there are a significant amount of more renters are cost burdened than owners
  The data suggests there is a segment of the population for whom Georgetown is unaffordable

• For Sale Demand
  Do Sun City numbers skew planning area numbers?
  Lower income is more cost burdened
  Surprised that anyone under $20K could own a home
  Not enough houses for $50K incomes
  When looking at regular employment you can’t afford the job
  Income does not equal ownership
- **Rental Supply**  
  Send to Council: Georgetown needs more 2 plex, 4 plex  
  Used to be no more than 20% class A, we have 40% because of cost to build  
  Lower rents for single family than expected  
  Duplexes = affordability  
  Surprising that more subsidized units than Class B

- **For Sale Supply**  
  Surprised nothing under $399K west of I-35  
  Townhouses/condos play a role in the market  
  Density is the answer  
  # of units under $275K in next 12-18 months, making some progress  
  Surprised to know wages not growing as fast as housing costs  
  2008-2018 Wages not growing as fast as housing costs increase UDC, increase cost

**Demand**  
Housing demand is influenced by regional employment trends, household income, age, ability and desire to rent or own, among other factors. CDS analyzed employment data for the region using the Williamson County geography.

**Regional Employment trends**  
Nearly half of all jobs (81k/165k) in Williamson County are in industry sectors with lower average wages, these sectors are exhibiting growth in overall jobs (*Texas Workforce Commission Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages* (QCEW) – August 2018)

- Retail Trade  
- Educational Services  
- Accommodation and Food Services  
- Health Care and Social Assistance

Strong growth in high-wage sectors in Williamson County (*Texas Workforce Commission Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages* (QCEW) – August 2018)

- Manufacturing  
- Professional and Technical Services

Life Sciences, including Health Care, has been identified as a target industry for Georgetown to pursue. While success in this pursuit would bring a number of higher-wage jobs, it will also grow the number of lower-wage jobs associated with Health Care, which has a wide range of wages for that sector. (*City of Georgetown, Target Industry And Workforce Analysis, 2017*)
Rental Supply

The last four years since 2014 have included generally rising rents in the greater Austin region, though the increases appear to be plateauing since 2017. This may be because overall supply has been increasing with new property deliveries, nearly all of which have been considered Class A, since land and construction costs generally limit the financial feasibility of new unsubsidized development to only upscale projects. The market rate (non-subsidized or income-restricted) multifamily properties in Georgetown that supply more affordable rental units either fall into the Class “B” designation by the real estate investment community or are unrated. They tend to be older properties (the newest dates to 2001). Lease rates for one-bedroom units tends to range from $750 to $900 per month. Two-bedroom units range from approximately $900 to $1,100, with such units at a few properties slightly higher priced. The total number of units in the listed properties is 1,293.

Georgetown also has a significant supply of multifamily properties that have been publicly subsidized in some fashion (federal tax credits, public housing, etc.) and have income restrictions on tenants to remain affordable to lower income residents. Three such projects are under construction, two of which will offer market rate units. Some properties are age-restricted to seniors. The total number of units in these properties is 1,916, including the under construction properties, and of which 1,697 units are income-restricted. Multifamily apartments are not the only source of rental units in the Georgetown Planning Area. Housing consumers also look for individual or small-scale rentals. Unfortunately, comprehensive data is not available to summarize and analyze these transactions. A particular type of rental unit in Georgetown for which no large transaction or listing sample was available is the small-scale multi-unit property (mostly quadplexes) and duplexes. These are mostly concentrated in neighborhoods on just south of the historic core, just west of I-35 off Leander Road, and in

![Figure 4 - Regional industry trends, wages and percentage of employment](image-url)
relatively older residential areas off Williams Drives also just west of I-35. A small sample of listings from field research indicates that typical rents in these properties may be comparable to Class B market rate multifamily units for the same number of bedrooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Restricted</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourplex</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5 – Multi-family rental percentages by product type*

**For Sale Supply**

Market data for the Georgetown Planning Area from the MLS transactions in recent years show that there is very little excess inventory of existing homes available; this is evident from the relatively small difference between listing price and sales price, and also the short average days on market (less than 40, down from a typical 70 to 90 a few years earlier). The sales volumes in the bottom two price ranges, below $275,000 (1,230 total sales), are a dramatic drop from previous years. In the 2014-2016 period, sales in these two categories totaled 3,087. These lower price categories represent “entry level” prices for first-time buyers at or below area median income (approximately $67,000 and $82,000 for Georgetown and Williamson County respectively as of the 2016 American Community Survey – see the analysis in the next section). However, the area housing market is rapidly shrinking the available inventory of such homes.

*Figure 6 – Multi-family rental percentages by product type*
**Sun City Factor**

One of the frequently asked questions when housing data was presented in 2018 was how much Sun City skewed any city wide statistics. CDS ran a report that was able to separate the geography that approximately encompasses Sun City (eight Census block groups) from the rest of Georgetown. The findings are below:

- The age restriction for living in Sun City is that one person in the household must be at least 55 years of age. Of the 7,787 households represented in the eight Census block groups, 6,419 (or 82%) of the households are headed by persons 65 years or older as of 2016.
- Included in the overall Georgetown tally, 65 and older households account for approximately 44% of total households. Removing Sun City, this share drops to approximately 25%.
- Because Sun City is dominated by owner households, its impact on renter data for the city overall is small. A similar share of total renter households in the Sun City Block Groups are cost-burdened as compared to the city excluding Sun City.
- A lower share of Sun City owner households have a mortgage than in Georgetown overall. This is likely because many Sun City residents purchased their homes with cash, having equity from previous homes they owned. Interestingly, a higher share of Sun City owner households with mortgages were estimated to be cost-burdened than in the rest of the city.
- Sun City accounted for a very high share, 69%, of all over-65 owner households in Georgetown. Of these households, a higher share were cost-burdened than in the remainder of the city – approximately 25% to 18%.
Analysis & Recommendations
The current housing needs for the three groups requested by Council are presented below.

The chart above illustrates the number of Georgetown households at each of the HUD defined income levels using the Williamson County Area Median Income of $77,800 for 2016. The American Community Survey (ACS) conducted by the Census provides the number of households by income level for the City of Georgetown. That figure can then be apportioned to the AMI levels to provide an estimate of number of households by AMI level. The ACS 2016 1 Year estimate for the City of Georgetown was a total of 25,235 households, with 10,271 of those households headed by a householder over the age of 65.

Low Income households
The findings for the approximately 3,000 low income households with incomes less than 30% of the Area Median Income were that:

- 69% of renters (1,100/1,600 HHs) are cost burdened
- 68% of owners (950/1,400 HHs) are cost burdened

Possible policies to address this high cost burden include policies to increase rental inventory and preserve homeownership for low income households.

Workforce households
The findings for the approximately 8,000 workforce households with incomes between 30% and 80% of the Area Median Income were that:

- 80% renters (2,000/2,500 HHs) are cost burdened
- 42% owners (2,300/5,500 HHs) are cost burdened
- Limited supply for sale under $250K
Possible policies to address this high cost burden and limited supply of affordable for sale housing include policies to increase rental inventory, preserve homeownership, and increase homeownership opportunities for workforce households.

**Senior households**

The findings for the approximately 10,000 senior households with incomes between 30% and 80% of the Area Median Income were that:

- 67% renters (1,000/1,500 HHs) are cost burdened
- 24% owners (2,000/8,500 HHs) are cost burdened

Possible policies to address this high cost burden include policies to increase rental inventory and preserve homeownership for senior households.

**Future Housing Need**

The future needs for housing are projected using the anticipated growth rate for Williamson County from the Texas State Data Center for the year 2030.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 # Households</th>
<th>2030 WilCo Population % change (est.)</th>
<th>New housing units by 2030 for estimated population growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williamson County</td>
<td>173,125</td>
<td>x 55%</td>
<td>≈ 96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City + ETJ Area</td>
<td>34,182*</td>
<td>x 55%</td>
<td>≈ 19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>25,235*</td>
<td>x 55%</td>
<td>≈ 14,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas State Data Center, ACS 2016 1 Year Estimate
* 2016 ACS used in lieu of City of Georgetown Planning and Development counts to provide regional comparison
The above chart provides a simple analysis of possible housing units needed in 2030 to accommodate the City’s 2016 household population by income based a 55% growth rate, as described in the preceding figure.

**Public Input**

One of the seven themes that emerged from the extensive public input conducted during 2018 was to focus on housing & affordability. A summary of the public input from the various outreach opportunities can be found in the attached Housing Public Input Report (Attachment 2).
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Ms. Nelson,

RE: Email dated December 26, 2018- Subject: 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update ACC Comment No.1

Email dated October 10, 2019 – Subject: 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update ACC Comment No.2

Please file the contents of this email and its attachments as 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update ACC Comment No.3

The No.1 priority of government is the safety of its people. This priority is being abandoned by our city’s 20130 Comprehensive Plan Update officials and staff by planning for permanent location of the airport in the heart of our densely growing city and totally atop the EARZ.

The presentation by you and your quality planning staff of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update, Future Land Use Map (FLUM), land use policies, categories, and approval schedule to the city council on November 12, 2019 remained essentially unchanged from that presented to city council on October 22, 2019. The presentation continues to ignore flagged citizen concerns and comments of the public hazards of the airport’s location. ACC comments No.1 and 2 provide comprehensive explanation of the public safety, health, and environmental hazards of this location and mandatory need for NEPA compliance for the airport operations 2016, 20 year, 52 projects, $60 Million PROGRAM of new federal and state funded capital improvements demonstrated by preparation of a fully scoped EIS and resultant ROD to ensure government transparency and accountability for this hazardous PROGRAM.

These concerns are heightened by no reduction in FAA’s data showing over 70% of ALL air crashes occurring during take offs or landings; over 80% of ALL aircraft using the airport being piston engine toxic leaded fueled aircraft with resultant health hazards; TV dramatizations such as “Air Disasters” and air crashes at other airports displayed on news media outlets; refusal of the city and FAA to provide flight rules to mitigate low level debilitating flight noise over homes, schools, churches, and nursing homes over city established “safety and noise
sensitive” areas; and citizen airport noise complaints reaching the Congress and creating the Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus.

In addition, every member of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update staffs is well aware of city plans to subdivide and develop over 100 acres of airport property into leased tracts for use by FBO’s authorized to use every known type of hazardous materials; that EPA recognizes over 30 types of hazardous materials for use in aviation electronics, engine, and airframe repairs and remodeling; and no pro-active inspection/enforcement controls exist for EARZ protection regarding hazardous materials handling, storage, use, containment, and disposal. **TCEQ has no regulatory means of mandatory EARZ leased subdivisions review/approval and no means of pro-active advance hazardous materials inspection/enforcement until AFTER A DISASTER.**

This email’s attachments include ACC statements to the GTAB from August through November 2019 demonstrating a seamless relocation of airport operations to a safe, superior site is a practicable alternative to the airport’s current hazardous location. More information will be provided in future GTAB meetings. **The GTAB has refused to discuss this issue at its meetings nor provide open public meetings or workshops for such purpose.**

The current 20 year Airport Master Plan developed intentionally and entirely without NEPA concerned citizen input and participation for health, safety, and environmental concerns of those on the ground contains a $60 Million PROGRAM of new federal/state taxpayer funded capital improvements which totals over TWICE the total of ALL PRIOR federal/state funding in the airport’s over 70 years civilian airport history. The draft 2030 Plan Update schedule for final development and approval of the plan has NO SCHEDULED open public hearings specifically allocated to the FLUM's airport location to ensure governmental transparency and accountability for this governmental decision.

**The ACC has two demands regarding the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update process:** (1) an item inserted in the draft 2030 Plan Update completion schedule between the January 14th City Council Workshop and the Public Outreach on the draft plan providing for stand alone newspaper advertised open public hearings process structured on FAA EIS format for full public examination of ALL cumulative social, economic, and environmental (safety, health) impacts of the new $60 Million PROGRAM, mitigation measures for elimination or reduction of adverse impacts, and FULL examination of ALL practicable ALTERNATIVES to the PROGRAM including the AIRPORT’S OPERATIONS LOCATION. These hearings must be open to ALL impacted members of the Community and Region and representatives of interested Agencies unencumbered by individual speaker time limits or individual addresses on individual structured topics. A transcript of hearings proceedings must be made part of the adopted 2030 Plan Update, AND;
The adopted 2030 Plan Update be strongly flagged within the document stating that due to cumulative potential public safety, health, and environmental adverse impacts to those on the ground the airport location shown on the FLUM is a subject of documented public controversy AND the airport’s operations must be relocated to a safe and superior site as expeditiously as possible.

On behalf of the ACC and Respectfully,
Hugh C.(Carl) Norris, Jr.
Member: ACC
Mobile: (512) 925-5202
Good morning Mr. Chairman, and members of the GTAB. My name is Wendy Dew. My residence is 30109 Spyglass Circle, Georgetown, Texas. I am a member of the Airport Concerned Citizens (ACC).

My comments address ACC demands for a professional study showing how our airport can be seamlessly relocated at no cost to existing taxpayers. As a citizen and taxpayer of Georgetown, I am a co-owner of the airport unlike TxDOT and FAA who behave as if they own it. In its current location approved by our leaders for permanent placement in the heart of our planned city rapidly growing to 200,000, it remains a hazardous threat to the health, lives and properties of our citizens, the esteem of our future city and a regional hazard. It's inevitable expansion with the city's growth will result in unacceptable operations, extended runways, destruction of existing neighborhoods and will politically tear this city apart.

Other cities facing similar situations have relocated their airports. Near examples are Temple, and Austin. Others exist across the nation such as St. George Airport that I use when visiting Utah family. These examples show that FAA not only approves airport relocations to safer, superior sites, but in some cases will provided grants to assist relocation and in all cases has continued grants for the new location. What this city desperately needs is an airport relocation plan. This board has the authority to make a recommendation for such a plan to City Council.

We are all familiar with the concept of trading the value of a property for another by written agreements. This can be done for the seamless relocation of the airport to a safe, superior site at no cost to existing taxpayers. We need a plan developed by professionals. In this case, our professionals must be experts in FAA airport design and regulations, negotiations and document preparations with private owners and governmental units, and highest and best use land conceptions, land sales and closings. One won't find these and other areas of expertise in one firm. If I were in charge of a Blue Ribbon Committee for the plan and its mission as stated, I would demand a planning agreement between the city and a single joint venture of professional firms and individuals with one firm in charge selected on basis of demonstrated expertise in joint venture management to fully implement the study's mission.

Our airport has tremendous highest and best land use redeveloped value. The property is in the planned heart of our city, three miles from Court House Square and Old Town, and within the fastest growing metro-area in the nation. It has ready access to IH-35, SH 130, the Sheraton Hotel and Conference Center, major city roadways, and other highways. It is surrounded by utilities, quality schools, and is leveled and drained for rapid development. Current developments such as the Rivery, Wolf Ranch Center, Wolf Lakes Village and development of the old Mueller Airport property demonstrate its best use would be as the financial and
business center for Georgetown including up-scale shopping, restaurants, and residential housing.

Our ACC August 9, 2019 statement outlined six tools or issues readily available for use by a selected professional joint venture consultant team for the study. There are others. The City Council routinely funds projects for excess budgeted revenues, over $1 Million for Austin Ave. Bridges alternatives, city offices, other federal funded projects including a recent $390,000 cost share for a bus line few folks ride. This study is vital for the future of our city and region.

Mr. Chairman, this board has the responsibility of its appointed public service members to recommend to the City Council that it establish, prior to the end of this calendar year, a Blue Ribbon Committee to implement this vitally needed study.

Comments and questions to me would be appreciated.
Good morning Mr. Chairman, and members of the GTAB. My name is Hugh C. Norris, Jr. My residence is 4400 Luna Trail, Georgetown, Texas. I am a member of the Airport Concerned Citizens (ACC), a group of over 100 city households.

My comments this morning on behalf of the ACC continue the four ACC statements from August 9th through Ms. Dew's statement this morning focused on our ACC demands for a professional study showing how the Georgetown Municipal Airport (GTU) can be seamlessly relocated to a safe, superior, and protected site at no cost to current taxpayers.

When the old Airport Advisory Board developed without critical public participation the 1980 GTU Airport Master Plan, the scientific knowledge of the EARZ, the Edwards Aquifer, and mapping of both had not been developed to their extent today. Now we know different. If a GTU adjacent property had been prior developed for use as a livestock feedlot/packing and rendering plant or a munitions or hazardous materials production plant and been previously grandfathered into the city during that time, the city leaders would have taken notice and pressed by public objections for its relocation long before now. Because the GTU is an airport, with recognized value to the overall local economy and public official's concealment of its hazards from the ground dwelling public, our city leaders have resisted recommendations for its relocation to a safe site.

The ACC September 13th statement described historical actions leading to the legislature's statue requiring TxDOT to provide a State Airport for Central Texas and the agency's professional study to determine needs for such an airport. That 2003 20 year study showed minimum requirements to the year 2023 as 750 acres, a runway minimum of 7,000 ft and cost of $59 Million. Our area has experienced a surge in unexpected added growth and aviation needs since 2003 with more on the way. City, TxDOT and FAA officials have been working for the past near 30 years to make that state statute fit the GTU. Trying to fit those 10 pounds of need into the 3 pound GTU bag will politically tear this city apart. Seamless relocation of the GTU is the only sane political alternative.

A variety of relocation models are available for study by a joint venture of professionals. The most favored by ACC is an "Airport Authority" recommended by CH2MHill, Inc. in its 2013 GTU "Business Case Analysis". Why? Because an airport authority can be legislatively created and protected to operate outside the city limits, entirely off the EARZ, with access to key roadways, and by a board of directors under city control. The model most favored is a modified type of the Ft. Worth Alliance Airport (AFW). The AFW is a product of a partnership between a private land owner, the City of Ft. Worth and FAA. A similar airport developed by Georgetown
leadership and financing would provide all Reliever Airport services envisioned by the legislature for ABIA and Central Texas of a vast array of flight services, charter passenger, air cargo, corporate and government aviation to serve the entire region. In lieu of destruction of city neighborhoods, this regional Reliever Airport could provide runways of 8 to 10,000 ft with strength for regional aviation needs, relocation of existing GTU FBO's, protection from non compatible land uses, safe flight rules, provisions for adjacent private land development, utilities, connecting roadways, and taxes for appropriate entities.

As previously described, the ultra-upscale highest and best land use retail value of GTU property is in excess of $100 Million. Moreover, based on the 164 acres Wolf Lakes Village projected 2050 taxable value, developed GTU's taxable property valuation could exceed $6 Billion. Targeted Certificates of Obligation to developed GTU ultra-upscale properties even under today's tax rate would exceed $25 Million per year. In addition, the city could ensure to prospective purchasing site developers extension of needed utilities, off-site improvements, and a TIRZ for all public facilities required for construction of GTU properties.

It is important for the city's planning purposes that prior to the end of this calendar year the City Council establish a Blue Ribbon Committee charged with implementing a professional study showing how the GTU can be seamlessly relocated at no cost to existing taxpayers. Let's work together to create a safer, superior, GTU for the health, safety, and environment of our Central Texas region and protect our "City of Excellence".

Mr. Chairman, this board must recommend to the city council to act on this stated need immediately. Questions and comments are requested from the board