

# City Council Review of UDC Amendments – April 4, 2024

Topic	Subdivision Design: Cul-de-Sac streets
UDC Section(s):	5.5 (3)
<b>What is the problem:</b> Lack of cul-de-sac regulations can create emergency services challenges in accessing properties located in a cul-de-sac.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Include references to comply with the International Fire Code and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) regarding cul-de-sac dimensions, ROW limits, and street length.	

**City Council Action - Accepted**

Topic	Subdivision Design: Easements
UDC Section(s):	5.6 (1)
<b>What is the problem:</b> Subdivision public utility easement dedication without minimum width requirement can result in substandard easement widths.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Add the easement requirements from the previous subdivision ordinance (Section 5.A) requiring widths for single (15 feet) and multiple utility easements (20 feet).	

**City Council Action - Accepted**

Topic	Subdivision Design: Easements
UDC Section(s):	5.6 (6)
<b>What is the problem:</b> Construction and/or excavation over designated easements could damage infrastructure or create unforeseen costs to repair infrastructure within easements.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Add the previous subdivision ordinance language (Section 3.B.15) restricting any modifications, structures, or fencing within the easement unless approved by the City.	

**City Council Action – Accepted**

Topic	Subdivision Design: Easements
UDC Section(s):	5.6 (7)
<b>What is the problem:</b> The UDC does not contain language to prevent vegetation from damaging overhanging utilities due to overgrowth.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Add the previous subdivision ordinance language (Section 5.D) that provides separation between the utility and the vegetation growth to require an additional 6-foot width on each side of the utility easement at a height of 10 feet.	

**City Council Action - Accepted**

Topic	Landscaping: Transitional Shrub Standards
UDC Section(s):	6.5 (5) e i
<b>What is the problem:</b> Requiring a six-foot <b>minimum</b> spacing between planting could allow for inadequate screening in transition areas. This also restricts the ability of the property owner to provide more dense plantings as needed or desired.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Decrease the center-to-center planting distance from six feet to a minimum of three feet to allow for greater screening while still allowing landscaping adequate room for growth.	

**City Council Action - Accepted**

Topic	Drive-In Facilities: Drive-in Facilities
UDC Section(s):	6.6 (3) b
<b>What is the problem:</b> The UDC minimally recognizes vehicles queueing for drive-in facilities. If not enhanced, back up of vehicles onto streets may create a road hazard.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Add language requiring stacking spaces criteria based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual for most uses. Gas pump stacking spaces requirement is determined by the municipality; therefore, two (2) stacking spaces are recommended.	

**City Council Action - Accepted**

Topic	Drive-In Facilities: Drive-in Facilities
UDC Section(s):	6.6 (3) e and f
<b>What is the problem:</b> The UDC does not recognize privacy issues (noise, light pollution, etc.) for residents located near the lot lines of drive-in facilities.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Added language that establishes a minimum buffer of 25 feet along the property lot line and added requirements for screening along adjacent residential lot line.	

**City Council Action – Follow Up**

Topic	Parking Lots: Parking Lot Location Setbacks
UDC Section(s):	6.7 (3) b
<b>What is the problem:</b> Developers may construct parking areas approximately 10 feet for non-arterial streets and 15 feet for arterial streets from the street right-of-way, which is too close to roadways to maintain a Hill Country character as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Provide a minimum landscape setback of 35 feet for non-arterial streets and 40 feet for arterial streets. This compares with the City of Boerne's requirement.	

**City Council Action – Not Accepted**

Topic	Parking Lots: Landscaped Islands
UDC Section(s):	6.7 (4) c iv
<b>What is the problem:</b> The UDC does not provide a minimum size for landscaped islands in parking lots. If not defined, plant life and vegetation sustainability could be comprised.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> A minimum of sixty (60) square feet based on the Texas A&M minimal planting guide minimum square footage requirement is recommended.	

**City Council Action – Not Accepted**

Topic	Parking Lots: Landscape Buffer along Ralph Fair Road
UDC Section(s):	6.7 (5) b
<b>What is the problem:</b> Ralph Fair Road is an arterial street with a different landscape buffer from other arterial streets as defined in Section 6.7 (3) (b) where all arterial streets are to be 15 feet. The only arterial streets in the City are Ralph Fair Road and I-10 Frontage.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> To maintain a Hill Country character per the Comprehensive Plan, landscape buffering along Ralph Fair Road shall be forty (40) feet. Note: for properties with parking lots, this mirrors the proposed setback requirement found in 6.7(3)(b) - this buffer requirement is not in addition to the setback requirement.	

**City Council Action – Not Accepted**

Topic	Infrastructure: Infrastructure Construction Process
UDC Section(s):	9.2 (5)
<b>What is the problem:</b> The current UDC does not include a requirement of city-issued permits for construction of utilities and drainage infrastructure. This could allow contractors to construct infrastructure that does not meet current design and construction standards, resulting in sub-standard infrastructure.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Add language requiring developers to obtain city-issued permits for construction of utilities and drainage infrastructure.	

**City Council Action – Accepted**

Topic	Subdivision Design: Streets
UDC Section(s):	9.4 (2) a vi and vii
<b>What is the problem:</b> Current UDC regulations have insufficient minimum requirements that can result in premature street failures.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Add language increasing minimum requirements to 10 inches for base foundation and the following material to be used: Flexible Base Material (Type A or D, and Grade 1-2 or 5) and hot-mixed asphaltic concrete (HMAC), Type "D" as per Texas Department of Transportation Standard Specification for Construction of Highways, Streets and Bridges.	

**City Council Action - Accepted**

Topic	Infrastructure: Street Designation for Stormwater Design Criteria
UDC Section(s):	9.7 (1) c ii and iii
<b>What is the problem:</b> The UDC does not provide criteria for Connector or Local streets for design storm capacity. This could result in public safety issues due to under-designed infrastructure. The UDC includes criteria for Arterial and Collector streets.	
<b>P&amp;Z Recommendation:</b> Add language to include criteria for Connector and Local streets.	

**City Council Action – Follow Up**