

Exhibit A
Summary of Proposed UDC Categories

Category	Hill Country Aesthetics
UDC Section(s):	Section 4.6 (2), 7.4 (1)(c), and 13.2
<p>What is the problem: Hill Country character, feel, or design aesthetic is referenced several times in the Comprehensive Plan and in the UDC. Several sections of the UDC refer to a Hill Country design standard. Having no definition of Hill Country aesthetics or character creates challenges for design criteria.</p> <p>Council Direction: Remove all references of Hill Country Design Aesthetics in the UDC.</p> <p>Staff changes: The proposed revisions remove references to “Hill Country Design Aesthetic” In Section 4.6 Zone Districts for Mixed Use Village and Community Facilities. In Section 7.4 General Standards and Guidelines, subsection (1)(c) referencing Hill Country aesthetic is removed. Lastly, in Section 13.2 the definition of Mixed Use Village is revised to remove the reference to Hill Country Design aesthetics to be consistent throughout the UDC.</p>	

Category	Screening
UDC Section(s):	4.6, 4.10,6.4 (1), 7.5 (9), 7.7, 11.1 (1)(d), 11.1 (2)(b),11.2 and 13.2
<p>What is the problem: Screening is not consistently required to be opaque in nature throughout the UDC, which could reduce the privacy of adjacent residential lots.</p> <p>Council Direction: Provide a recommendation ensuring screening consistency, solid or opaque.</p> <p>Staff changes: Staff changed all landscape screening to “opaque landscape screening” throughout the UDC. Some of the examples of changed section were “living screening”, “evergreen plants” and “dense shrubs and vegetation.” Staff also added “opaque” to section of the UDC that only referenced “landscape screen.” In some sections of the UDC that referenced “suitable screening devices,” language was added to direct the reader to Section 7.7 Design Standards “Screening Standards.” Finally, a definition was added to Section 13.2 to define “Opaque Landscape.”</p>	

Exhibit A
Summary of Proposed UDC Categories

Category	Subdivision Design – Street Frontage
UDC Section(s):	5.4
<p>What is the problem: Lots served by private well and/or private septic are required to have a minimum street frontage of 150 feet or 200 feet. Clarification is needed regarding minimum street frontage along cul-de-sacs due to limited street frontage.</p> <p>Council Direction: This is a new proposed amendment that was not previously presented to the City Council.</p> <p>Staff changes: Staff added additional verbiage to include an exception to the requirement for minimum street frontage for lots on a cul-de-sac. Staff proposes that the minimum be reduced to 100-feet for lots on a cul-de-sac or knuckle-sac. The length was determined based on the 150-foot diameter requirements for cul-de-sacs, which would allow for four lots at a 100-foot minimum street frontage requirement.</p>	

Category	Subdivision Design – Block Length
UDC Section(s):	5.5 (Table 5.2)
<p>What is the problem: According to Section 5.5, Table 5.2 Block Length and Character the maximum block length for Neighborhood Residential Zone Districts is 800 feet. The maximum block length creates a need for additional street infrastructure which does not match the character of the Neighborhood Residential zone (minimum lot size of one acre). Assuming each lot has 150 feet of street frontage, an intersection or knuckle-sac would be required every 10 houses (5 houses on each side of the street) to meet the maximum block length requirement.</p> <p>Council Direction: This is a new proposed amendment that was not previously presented to the City Council.</p> <p>Staff changes: Staff reviewed the maximum block length requirement for surrounding cities and all fell within the range of 800 feet to 1,500 feet. Staff proposes a 1,200-foot maximum block length which is a 50% increase from the current requirement and falls within the typical range. Assuming each lot has 150 feet of street frontage, this would result in 16 houses (8 houses on each side of the street) per block.</p>	