



GLASSHOUSE POLICY

We need to answer four questions:

1. Where can people live?
2. Where can people work?
3. Where can people play?

In 2042, a projected 1,328,046 will live in the City of Austin.

How do we design an Austin for all?

I keep hearing about this “Affordability Crisis”

Most economically segregated City in the country

Austin has a 41,000 affordable housing unit shortfall (2014 estimates put that number at 48,000)

Poor land-use policy has driven up cost of living

- Sprawl and mobility costs driven up by suburbanization

- Lack of transit accessibility

- Lack of affordable housing

Source: 2014 Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis, City of Austin

How are market changes actually affecting people?

More than 1/4 of Austin residents have sought additional employment to pay for housing costs.

31% of renters have gone without health care to afford housing.

Overall, half of renters and 28 percent of owners pay more than 30 percent of their gross income toward housing costs and are “cost burdened.”

Mobility's role in the affordability conversation

Each year, the average Austinite spends \$8500 on transportation costs to and from work.

Residents of low density areas that have to travel longer distances spend around 33% more time per year on their commute compared to a resident of a higher density area.

Isn't there also a mobility crisis?

Yes, and it is in part due to our current land use policies

Today, almost 350,000 people commute into the City of Austin from the surrounding region each morning

80% of those people drive alone in a single-occupancy vehicle (SOV)

Sprawl has contributed to our growing mobility crisis

From 2000 - 2010, Austin was one of the urban areas that sprawled the most in the country.

Sprawl and affordability

Increases in sprawl are associated with:

- Higher housing occupancy costs and higher public service deficits

- Less accessible public transit

- overreliance on single-occupancy vehicles limits physical as well as economic mobility.

In non-sprawl, mixed-use areas:

- Vehicle miles traveled fall

- Annual traffic fatalities fall

- Trips by transit and walking increase

- Reduced class segregation

Getting back to CodeNEXT

A good CodeNEXT would:

1. Meaningfully reduce the rate of housing cost increases
2. Contribute to mode shift away from single-occupant car commutes
3. Increase economic and racial integration

Any conversation about CodeNEXT should
answer one of those questions

There are best practices to facilitate high capacity transit

Light Rail	Bus Rapid Transit	Commuter Rail	Other Transit
<p>Pushkarev and Zupan (1977) 16 residents per gross acre</p> <p>Guerra and Cervero (2011) Optimal: 30 residents per gross acre for average cost system (\$50M per mile)</p> <p>Optimal: 67 residents per gross acre for system cost of \$100M per mile</p> <p>Guerra and Cervero (2010) Optimal: 56 residents and jobs per gross acre for average cost system</p>	<p>Guerra and Cervero (2010) Optimal: +/- 17 residents and jobs per gross acre depending on system cost</p>	<p>Various Ridership linked primarily to employment in CBD.</p> <p>Residential densities in station areas can boost ridership, but focus of transit service on peak travel may not support TOD to the degree of all-day frequent service.</p>	<p>Pushkarev and Zupan (1977) For local bus: 4-15 dwelling units per net acre, depending on level of service</p>

There are best practices to facilitate housing price stabilization

According to the (Obama) White House's Affordable Housing Toolkit:

- Establish by-right development

- Eliminate off-street parking requirements

- Allow accessory dwelling units

- Enact high-density and multifamily zoning

Each of these can be achieved through CodeNEXT



GLASSHOUSE POLICY

Francisco Enriquez

francisco@glasshousepolicy.org