



## Meeting Notes

**August 10, 2021**

### **Call to Order**

Recording started by Tamara Fou.

Sonny Garza, Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

### **Welcome by Co-Chairs**

Mr. Garza took the roll and presented the speaker rules. 14 committee members were present during roll call. There were 64 participants.

**Director's Report:** Margaret Wallace Brown, Director, Planning & Development Department welcomed everyone to the meeting, announced that Livable Places Action Committee meetings may be hosted in-person at the annex chambers beginning in September, introduced the Code Studio consultant team, and provided a technical amendment review status update.

**Suvidha Bandi:** Today's discussion points are:

- Recap of June meeting
- Continue number of units on a lot discussion
- Accessory dwelling unit (ADU) size discussion
- ADU grant project
- Homework activities and expectations for the next meeting
- Public comments at the end

We want to discuss preliminary ideas to present to the Technical Advisory Group (TAG).

During the previous June meeting we discussed:

- Allowing 3 or 4 units per lot
- Parking for additional units
- ADU sizes and the current regulations that exist in Houston today
- ADU standards used in other cities
- Common ADU sizes found in Houston

After the meeting, staff also published a survey to gather input from the public on the topics we're discussing. I wanted to provide some important information about the survey and some concerns that the community has expressed so far:

- Livable Places is not an ordinance and the City has not proposed any changes yet. It is a Planning Department initiative to update development regulations to implement action steps described by various planning efforts like Plan Houston and Resilient Houston. These plans included community input and other growth/resiliency considerations.
- The City has no authority to override active private deed restrictions.

- 
- Any changes that come out of this effort would not apply where prohibited by deed restrictions.
  - The Committee is still discussing allowing more units on a lot in areas where it is not prohibited by active deed restrictions.
  - We're still looking into other factors that must be evaluated such as parking, ground coverage, infrastructure, etc.
  - The survey is intended to ensure that we hear the communities' needs/concerns early in the process so that nothing is overlooked.
  - The survey has received around 1200 responses so far and closes on August 16<sup>th</sup>. Please take the survey if you haven't already to share your thoughts.

We went through a majority of the responses and heard the following highlights:

- Concerns: deed restricted communities, flooding, insufficient infrastructure, overcrowding, traffic, safety, noise, parking scarcity, school capacity, loss of green space and trees, property values, and quality of life.
- Supportive feedback: increasing housing options, affordability, walkability, managing sprawl, building net worth, using other modes of transit, encouraging infill development, living closer to workplaces and amenities, supporting families in need.

I want to take a moment and talk about different lot types based on some of the concerns that we heard. There are two different types:

- Single-family restricted lots: restricted to 1-2 units (max), include active deed restrictions and/or platted after 1999. The City is not proposing any changes to these lots.
- Unrestricted lots: platted prior to 1999, no active deed restrictions, multiple units already allowed, need to comply with multi-family regulations and review. These are the only types of lots that the City is discussing potential changes to.

**Example:** 5000 SF unrestricted lot:

- If the property owner wants to build a duplex, the project is considered single-family and approved.
- If the property owner wants to build a detached unit in the back of the lot once the duplex is built, the property is now considered multi-family.
- A 28ft-wide private street is required for fire access on multi-family lots with density less than 30 dwelling units per acre.
- As the property already fronts on a public street, it's unnecessary and impractical to provide a 28ft private street in the front. This is one of the hurdles keeping these development types from getting built.
- There are many older neighborhoods in Houston that already have duplex and triplex units with rear units.

To avoid multi-family designation and review, these types of lots are getting developed in two ways:

- Subdivided into 3 individual lots with a shared driveway
- Subdivided into 2 front loaded lots

---

**Photographic examples of homes that could be built on a typical 5000 SF unrestricted lot: See recording**

- Older duplex development with an additional rear unit (3 units)
- Shared driveway development (3 units)
- Front-loaded single-family homes (2 units)
- Older triplex development with an additional rear unit (4 units)
- What feels better or more appropriate for Houston?
- Building more units on a lot doesn't automatically mean too crowded or too tall.
- With reasonable parameters, multi-family structures can fit within a neighborhood's existing character.

**Concept:** Preliminary proposal:

- Create 2 new categories of residential lots that could have more than 2 units that could still be reviewed under the single-family residential development review process.

Category 1:

- Allow 3-4 units
- Lot coverage requirement
- Establish criteria for height/stories
- Relax multi-family regulations for smaller parcels
- Parking will be discussed separately

Category 2:

- Allow 5-8 units
- Lot coverage requirement
- Establish criteria for height/stories
- Some multi-family regulations apply
- Parking will be discussed separately

Reasons to make this change:

- Promotes more housing types
- Increasing demand for smaller units
- Smaller households are becoming more common
- A decrease in homeowner households while an increase in renter households

**Concept Considerations:** For allowing more units:

- Restrictions
- Lot size
- Existing units on the lot

- 
- Existing density of development on the lot
  - Ground coverage and drainage detention requirements

**Concept Considerations:** For allowing reduced parking:

- Existing off-street parking
- Available curb space
- Street condition
- Proximity to other transit options
- Ground coverage and drainage detention requirements
- Affordable housing proposals

### **New Residential Lot Category Questions? Comments?**

**Ron Lindsey:** Does the City currently prohibit 2 garage units above a garage if they are rental?

**Margaret Wallace Brown:** It's 900 SF for one unit. Yes, it does prohibit 2 units above a garage.

**Ron Lindsey:** If you drop the parking requirements, the logic would be that the tenant doesn't have a car. So, you have to also have a requirement in the lease that the tenant can't have a car. This needs to be part of the ordinance.

**Suvidha Bandi:** It would be an enforcement issue. We can't enforce whether future property owners wouldn't have a car.

**Ron Lindsey:** If that's the requirement, it can be enforced by neighborhood complaints, which could be effective too.

**Curtis Davis:** Use car ownership trends as a basis? Could be part of your consultants' scope or have the transportation department analyze further? That way we can understand the trends in the areas that you're considering allowing this to happen in. This also must deal with the availability of public transit to support this. I don't know of any jurisdictions in the country that allow a restriction that says "thou shall not have a car if one rents or buys a house in a given location", and I think that might be problematic. As a sample analysis, consider districts that have resident-only parking, the frontage of lots in a block, and the availability of linear feet of curb space for parking. There should also be a coordinated response to revise the building code that would support this. This does require significant analysis beyond our gut opinions.

**Suvidha Bandi:** Parking will be discussed separately towards the end of this housing topic.

**Mike Dishberger:** It's difficult discuss parking separately. They're so interconnected. Maybe set a maximum unit size of 800-900 SF to guarantee one-person households within a rental to minimize opportunities to have more than one car per unit. If you allow the unit to get up to 1500 SF, you end up getting a mini house and the odds of getting two cars increases dramatically.

---

**Sonny Garza:** We want to get peoples' thoughts on the 3-4 unit residential lot and 5-8 unit residential lot categories. We will discuss parking and agree that it's part of what we're discussing. If we can't figure out a solution for parking for the 5-8 unit category, for example, we might kill the 5-8 as a separate category.

**Shawn Massock:** We're still talking about single-family lots even with the two categories? I'm not a fan of the 5-8 units on lot. It's just making single-family more of a multi-family category. I'm interested in the opportunity for a single-family lot to have 1-2 ADUs.

**Suvidha Bandi:** We are not talking about single-family lots. We're talking about unrestricted lots. That means the lots don't have any restrictions, platted prior to 1999, and are allowed to have any number of units currently but were platted with a certain size that could have up to 3-4 units currently. With these unrestricted lots, they could allow 3-4 units but only with a PAE when it doesn't have certain density. They can't develop into triplexes or quadruplex like I what I was showing in the images. All the comments that I've heard so far are talking about ADUs. That is the next topic. The ADUs happen on a single-family lot; you have a main unit and you build a detached unit in the back. What we're talking about here is about unrestricted lots.

**Sandy Stevens:** I agreed with Mr. Dishberger regarding how you look at these ADUs and how many units. It does impact parking and impacts my thinking about those units. But I'll wait to discuss parking further later.

**Ron Lindsey:** I'm confused because the slides used showed garage apartments. So, you're talking about unrestricted reserves platted before 1999 and instead of dividing them up into single lots, they could remain as one lot and have multiple units on it? So, the question is how many units before you hit the multi-family designation for that lot? Is that correct?

**Suvidha Bandi:** Yes. It hits multi-family today the moment a third unit is built, but we could probably change that. That's the proposal.

**Ron Lindsey:** Then I think we should be talking about the number of dwelling units per acre instead of the raw unit count. 4 units on a 4-acre unrestricted lot is a lot different than 4 units on a 10,000 SF unrestricted lot.

**Suvidha Bandi:** You're talking about properties platted as reserves. I'm talking about properties that were platted before 1999 that don't have any restrictions where today you could already have as many units as you want if you're complying with the multi-family regulations. But these multi-family regulations on development with lower density (less than 30 dwelling units/acre) require that private PAE. The PAE causes a burden. Eliminating that PAE requirement would help people develop a property as a triplex, quadruplex, a duplex with a detached unit in the back, or a triplex with a detached unit in the back.

**Ron Lindsey:** A raw unit count is not very effective at understanding the issue. The issue is best discussed with density per acre.

**Margaret Wallace Brown:** I think part of the confusion is that regardless of the size of the lot, 3 units on a lot currently make the development multi-family. Yes, it's about density, but it's also about what's the trigger for it becoming multi-family. Even if you had an acre lot and put 3 units on it, it's still considered multi-family.

---

**Ron Lindsey:** I understand. Let's talk about doing away with the unit count limit but then have a unit density that comes into play as well.

**Margaret Wallace Brown:** We'll come back to density after we discuss the multi-family unit count trigger question.

**Kirby Liu:** Can you go to slide 13? I support the idea that 3-4 units shouldn't trigger the multi-family review, but what's the reasoning behind 4 units as opposed to another number? I ask because if you imagine the 3 subdivided units shown on the right as stacked duplexes, you technically have 6 units on this parcel which would then trigger a multi-family review. Why is 4 units the cut off? Does something change based on the lot size?

**Suvidha Bandi:** It's mostly based on current financing requirements. Up to 4 units is still considered residential under current financing options. Also, 4 units reflects the older 1920s-1930s missing middle housing type traditions within the city that fit well with neighborhood character. Also, if the property is big and a developer wants to do up to 8 units while meeting fire and other requirements, maybe that should be allowed too. The goal of the discussion today is to get your feedback on these ideas.

**Luis Guajardo:** What's the problem statement again for those of us who aren't developers?

**Margaret Wallace Brown:** Regardless of the size of the land, 3 units on a lot triggers the multi-family review process. The multi-family review process is more onerous than the single-family review process and there are different financial vehicles required. The problem that we're trying to solve is that the way our codes are currently written, the product of the 3 fee simple single-family lots is the most anyone can put on a 5000 SF lot. If you wanted to do all those units on one lot, you are currently forced to go through the multi-family review process which includes the 28ft wide PAE driveway requirement which typically prevents the 3 unit triplex style option from being built. There's a need for products of smaller square footages with less expensive price points. Can we expand our rules enough so that property owners or developers in communities that aren't single-family restricted can provide a bigger variety of options for Houstonians? If we can put 4 units on one lot, we could potentially achieve more affordable units than the fee simple approach that typically happens now.

**Megan Sigler:** Can you clarify what a reserve is? Is there an area in Houston where you can show us where there are lots of non-deed restricted lots? You're not talking about single-family platted lots. You're talking about a reserve?

**Margaret Wallace Brown:** No, we're talking about residential lots which are different than reserves. This is a complicated and layered conversation—we wanted to talk about this in a more piecemeal approach, but maybe it's more confusing. It's multi-layered.

**Megan Sigler:** Then we need to discuss density. Parking and utilities need to be part of the conversation up front. There are Planning Commission meetings currently where neighbors do not want 3 units next to them and now there could be 4 units next to them? It's hard to commit to a number when we don't know what else could be affecting it.

**Ron Lindsey:** I want to second that. When I work on a project, the first question is: how much parking can I get on this site? Then I know how many units I can put on it. I know we're trying to get to a non-car city but

---

currently we aren't, so you have to consider that reality. It starts with parking and then goes into the infrastructure. Neighbors are most concerned about parking.

**Zion Escobar:** Yes, I also agree with Megan and Ron. It's multi-layered. I'm speaking on behalf of Freedmen's Town. Having one size or one number is difficult based on utilities and restricted capacity for new development based on our historic nature. We don't want unchecked density but there could be benefits for things like granny flats. Considering these things in silos makes it impossible for me to have an accurate opinion. I'd recommend us having a conversation that includes the factors or some kind of decision tree. This could be good or bad depending on which lot we're talking about. Parking is an issue as well. There already isn't enough parking. We have narrow streets. While we could help someone on a single-family lot, we could be hurting several neighbors if that new resident comes with a car because we can't require them to not have a car. We don't want to over burden any tapped out infrastructure. For our historic area, the complications are where the answer lies for us. Considering these things in buckets doesn't allow me to make an honest decision.

**Mike Dishberger:** I'm not so concerned about utilities. I'm a builder. When you want to build homes, you have to get a wastewater reservation letter and there are parts of town where they'll tell you that you can't put this many units on the lot. We're only talking about unrestricted properties without deed restrictions. We're talking about how many duplexes we can put on a property. I build in the Heights and Washington corridor. Big 100 unit apartments pop up on swaths of land there. When allowing more than 4 units as a builder, I can just do a re-plat and make it into some smaller parcels and put 4 units each on them. I don't think you need 7 units to rent out as a homeowner. I agree with everyone else, this is multifaceted and complicated.

**Curtis Davis:** Margaret's statement was very clear and it should be transcribed and sent back out to us as to what we're trying to solve for within the restrictions of this regulatory process. I also think we're trying to solve for something beyond the constraints of the regulatory process and that deals with the quality of the city. Generally, as one creates more density, you also create a condition in which compromise is necessary in order to achieve the quality of density that you'd like. Many of us have lived in dense places (Boston, Brooklyn, etc.) and there are all kinds of compromises relative to parking, density, noise, etc. that we accept to realize a certain quality that comes with that. Think Charleston or Savannah as something that this effort could achieve. I don't need to think about this as solving for absolute resolution on any of the given issues. We just need to understand the dynamics of compromise that need to be made so that we can adequately pull it all together and come to a consensus. This is a pro-piecemeal approach. If I'm a resident who's not an urban planner, who's never lived outside of Houston, I'm going to have a certain perspective and will speak to it. It may be parking or something else. We as a group need to flesh out where the issues are and then understand that creating density will require compromise.

**Sonny Garza:** Should we split this discussion up based on the 2 residential categories? First concentrate on the 3-4 unit concept? Get those details worked out and then move on to the 5-8 unit concept? To me, the 3-4 unit concept is just about relaxing the multi-family regulations for smaller parcels. It's possible that the 5-8 unit concept might not be feasible based on all the infrastructure implications that we're talking about. Get some consensus on the 3-4 unit concept first so that we can take that to the TAG team?

**Ron Lindsey:** Yes, I'd go with that idea.

---

**Margaret Wallace Brown:** What if we came back to you next month with something to shoot at that said change the definition, address the parking and density so that we can have a fully rounded direction for the committee to really react to (that's multi-layered)?

**Sonny Garza:** Yes, I think that's reasonable. If everyone wants to go in-depth, I don't think we can do it all at once. It would be helpful to be presented with one concept with all the items that go with it. Tackle the 3-4 unit concept with all its variables first. Then we move onto the same kind of presentation for the 5-8 unit concept.

**Lisa Clark:** Yes, I think that's a better plan. We might have a huge conversation about all the various pieces and then find that parking tosses everything that we discussed out. It's more prudent to do an in-depth presentation on each concept.

**Zion Escobar:** Can we see real world examples of each example within these presentations? So we can respond to a very specific example and understand the specific consequences for each of those elements?

**Margaret Wallace Brown:** Yes, we can do that.

**Sonny Garza:** So present only the 3-4 unit concept comprehensively, instead of piecemeal, for our next meeting? Work through the 5-8 unit concept in another meeting if it's even a viable option?

**Margaret Wallace Brown:** Yes.

**Sonny Garza:** Any other questions before we move on?

**Zion Escobar:** So, we're only talking about unrestricted residential lots? Or single-family lots in those case studies next time?

**Suvidha Bandi:** This is not about single-family lots. We'll only be talking about unrestricted lots or lots that were platted before the single-family designation was established.

**Curtis Davis:** It would be good to also include information about what we can regulate and what we would like to achieve in the next presentation. For example, the goals are higher density, more affordable housing, better quality of urban life, a walkable city, etc. Maybe 5 or 6 "what we're trying to achieve" statements in light of "what we can reasonably regulate." Then we can look at the question of compromises as a risk question. For example, "Is it worth these risks to achieve these outcomes in these cases?" I think it comes down to that.

**Suvidha Bandi:** Yes, that's a great idea.

### **Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADUs) Sizes**

**Suvidha Bandi:** When I say accessory dwelling unit, I mean:

- Only allowed on single-family restricted lots when not prohibited by deed restrictions.
- Only one detached ADU is permitted on a lot with a single unit.
- The maximum unit size is currently 900 SF
- It currently requires one additional parking space



- 
- The lot size must be at least 3500 SF
  - It could be added on top of a garage or a detached unit all by itself
  - Chapter 42 allows a single-family lot to have one main unit and one detached unit of 900 SF
  - To build an ADU on a lot smaller than 3500 SF, we start calculating the density. If two units aren't allowed within the 27 dwelling units/acre, then ADU cannot be built.

Permitted detached ADU size ranges in other cities:

- San Antonio (800-1200 SF max)
- Austin (1100 SF max)
- Sacramento (1200 SF max)
- Minneapolis (1300 SF max)

Considering that there's a need for smaller households and smaller family size rental units:

- If the units are attached on a single-family lot, there's currently no size requirement; the 2 attached units could be the same size. When the unit is detached, 900 SF is the max unit size.
- If we need the size limit, what should be the max unit size?
- Why do we need to have a size requirement? Mostly to ensure that the ADU functions as an accessory dwelling, complements the current scale of the neighborhood, but can still accommodate a small family.

The common unit sizes across the country:

- 400-600 SF – 1-bedroom unit
- 700-900 SF – 2-bedroom unit
- 1000-1300 SF – 3-bedroom unit

**Preliminary idea:** 2 different size requirements:

- Continue to allow the 900 SF max size units and remove the minimum parking requirement. Property owners can still choose to provide parking if they have the space on the property and want to provide the additional parking space. The parking requirement has been the major hurdle to build these unit types based on the Committee's previous feedback.
- Allow for a new option for 900-1200 SF max size units for small families with a parking requirement that's based on a certain criteria.

### **Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) Questions? Comments?**

**Ron Lindsey:** Now we're talking about no parking again. If you're not going to require parking for a dwelling unit, you must consider some way to restrict the ability of that occupant to have a vehicle. Otherwise, you create a parking problem. I don't think you should go beyond 900 SF for ADU sizes. That'll handle a 2-bedroom unit. ADUs should not be targeted to large families. It'll overwhelm the neighborhood. 1200 SF would create bad results. Also, homeowners aren't always professional landlords and don't always have the ability to maintain the unit. I've seen units not get maintained properly in my experience.

**Megan Sigler:** How do you ensure homeowner occupancy on site? What prevents a developer from building the 4 units and renting them?

---

**Suvidha Bandi:** We are discussing secondary home on a single family lot. 4 units are not allowed. To answer your question about occupancy, some other cities across the country require the property owner to live on the property. I'm not suggesting that we go that route but that's an option. The intent of ADUs is to allow a property owner to build wealth. We can't always enforce a property owner occupancy requirement.

**Megan Sigler:** We do need to really think about unintended consequences. These ADUs could be quite profitable and we might not always get what we want with them.

**Suvidha Bandi:** These 900 SF ADUs are already allowed today.

**Mike Dishberger:** I'm in favor of the up to 900 SF ADU option without a parking requirement. We've built a bunch of these units in the Heights and in Shady Acres over the past 20 years and they're typically build for elderly tenants or students. If the purpose is to increase affordable housing options, then I don't think we need a homeowner occupancy requirement. I think these units are needed for affordable housing opportunities. If you go over 900 SF, then it starts to get a little too big.

**Ron Lindsey:** I just assumed there'd be a homeowner occupancy requirement. I'd be concerned with an absentee owner. I'd like to avoid creating substandard housing. If all units on the lot would be rentals, then I might even have a problem with going larger than 300 SF per unit.

**Sonny Garza:** To Megan's point, I live in the inner city in a neighborhood with lots of duplexes/triplexes/fourplexes and the criteria today doesn't allow those units to be built in the ways they were in the past. If those older unit types are what we're picturing, that'd be great, but that might not always be what would end up getting built.

**Curtis Davis:** I agree with every concern raised to this point. The intent should be achieving a variety of housing options. This form of density allows all of the above. Having an ADU might facilitate someone to afford to buy a new house or help someone stay in place. There are many nonprofits or developers who would be willing to build this type of unit. Absentee owners are always an issue. They wouldn't be a special issue with ADUs.

**Suvidha Bandi:** I'm talking about restricted single-family lots with 1 main unit and 1 detached ADU only. We wouldn't allow for more than 1 ADU permitted on a restricted single-family lot. This is different than units on unrestricted lots. ADUs in Houston are only detached secondary dwelling units on restricted single-family lots.

**Sonny Garza:** So the consensus generally is that we're in favor of the 900 SF max unit option that does not require an additional parking space. We're less in favor of the 1200 SF max option? Any other commentary on the 1200 SF option?

**Zion Escobar:** One thing we haven't talked about with these ADUs is the concern about Airbnb which gives an opportunity for outside folks to come in and create parking issues. Could we exclude Airbnb or other commercial uses for ADUs? Our Freedmen's Town residents are concerned about ADUs for this reason. However, I understand that Airbnb of ADUs could be seen as a benefit for other communities. I would love to hear other opinions/recommendations about this issue.

---

**Suvidha Bandi:** Yes. Airbnb of ADUs could happen today or tomorrow. There really isn't any mechanism for the City to enforce this. The only change we're talking about today is whether we should remove the additional parking requirement. Only HOAs or deed restrictions regulate Airbnb abilities. I don't think Airbnbs are within the scope of what we're discussing today.

**Sonny Garza:** Yes, typically that's the purview of deed restrictions or HOAs to police that sort of thing. It far steps outside of the City's ability to do it. There are also some big legal questions right now about how deed restrictions affect short-term rentals. In my neighborhood, the deed restrictions only exclude commercial uses and there are still tons of Airbnbs in the neighborhood. To the best of my knowledge, we can't do anything with the deed restrictions in my neighborhood to address it. What we're discussing today will not touch on how that unit is rented. That's outside the purview of these ordinance changes.

**Kathy Payton:** I think ADUs are beneficial with some restrictions, especially for families that are cost burdened. This could be a way to increase income for some of those households by making this opportunity available. I think this really impacts Fifth Ward and Fourth Ward where you don't have those deed restrictions in place.

**Curtis Davis:** To support what Zion and Kathy just said, we should create an unintended consequences box for this exercise. We know that we won't be able to capture everything. But when issues come up, we can use this to refer to others who are better positioned to research these issues more thoroughly and come back with a response.

#### **Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) Grant Project:**

**Lynn Henson:** ADU grant project: awarded AARP 2021 Challenge Grant that will allow the Planning Department to do a few things:

- Host a design competition to create a new ADU design book for Houston homeowners.
- Host some educational workshops, including a virtual workshop on August 26<sup>th</sup> to discuss the benefits and design of ADUs.
- Host a free workshop hosted by Kol Peterson. The first 10 participants will receive copy of Kol Peterson's book.

#### **Homework:**

- Take the survey on Let's Talk Houston\Livable Places
- Read the CNU article by Dan Parolek about missing middle housing
- Read the AARP article about the ABCs of ADUs

**Next Meeting:** September 7<sup>th</sup>

#### **Public Comment:**

**Barbara McGuffey:** The definitions that we're talking about might change the effectiveness of deed restrictions going forward. We shouldn't be doing a one size fits all approach. This should be an opt-in like walkable places, not forced on everyone. If this is intended to provide more options for neighborhoods and help with affordability, then factor in a way for neighborhoods to weigh in. Buffering would be an issue. Green space on a lot would be an issue. We need to keep some green spaces in these lots. We can't think of these things in silos.

---

**Tramaine Chatman:** I think there'll be parking issues. You might have a 2-bedroom unit with 3+ cars. I strongly oppose reducing the parking requirements.

**Rhonda Jones:** What does unrestricted reserve mean? I'm located within the ETJ. I have a vacant lot near my house. It would affect me if someone placed a duplex on the vacant property next to me.

**Walker Shores:** I can't currently live in the neighborhood where I grew up in. I think more housing diversity helps with this. There are people who can live in locations without parking but it's not always available. Don't just consider the negative consequences. Consider the positive ones too. They'd create more business, foot traffic, etc.

**Lauren:** What about making it easier for prefab houses or trailers in backyards?

**Meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.**