

Exhibit A  
Summary of Proposed UDC Categories to Review

Category	<b>Setbacks</b>
UDC Section(s):	4.6
<p><b>What is the problem:</b> This is a policy decision with no known conflicts in the current UDC.</p>	

Category	<b>Screening</b>
UDC Section(s):	4.6 and 4.10
<p><b>What is the problem:</b> Screening is not required to be opaque in nature, which could reduce the privacy of adjacent residential lots.</p>	

Category	<b>Subdivision Design - Street Frontages</b>
UDC Section(s):	5.4
<p><b>What is the problem:</b> Lots served by private well and/or private septic are required to have a minimum street frontage of 150 feet or 200 feet. Clarification needed regarding minimum street frontage along cul-de-sac due to limited street frontage.</p>	

Exhibit A  
Summary of Proposed UDC Categories to Review

Category	<b>Site Development Applications</b>
UDC Section(s):	Chapter 3: Applications and Permits
<p><b>What is the problem:</b> Plat waivers and variances are used interchangeably. In one section it specifically states that a plat waiver is NOT a variance but states a plat waiver should be considered using the variance criteria. Ideally, definitions, processes, and criteria are needed to provide a clear distinction between the two.</p> <p>A. Plat waivers are waivers of the standards required for plat approval. For example, plat notes, signature lines, etc.</p> <p>B. Variances are formal approval to depart from the strict application of a UDC provision. For example, zoning-related development standards such as setbacks, landscaping, parking, etc.</p>	

Category	<b>Conservation Development Alternative</b>
UDC Section(s):	4.8, Table 8.1 , 8.3 (2)(a), 8.3 (5)(a)
<p><b>What is the problem:</b> As written, a minimum blended average of lot size with no specified minimum lot size may result in developers incorporating smaller and non-uniform lots in the Conservation Development area. The criteria in determining the density calculation needs to be further defined.</p>	

Category	<b>Trees</b>
UDC Section(s):	8.8
<p><b>What is the problem:</b> As written, tree preservation requirements apply to <i>redevelopments of any residential property</i>. For example, a home being rebuilt as substantial reconstruction resulting in an increase of the footprint would need to comply with tree preservation requirements. This conflicts with the current City Council guidance provided at the February 2023 and October 2024 workshops.</p>	

Exhibit A  
Summary of Proposed UDC Categories to Review

Category	<b>Hill Country Aesthetics</b>
UDC Section(s):	Throughout the Unified Development Code
<p><b>What is the problem:</b> 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/character creates challenges for design criteria. For example, the Comprehensive Plan states “More than 97 percent of respondents agreed that preservation of things like trees, open spaces, and roads designed to reflect the City’s ‘character and heritage is important to me” (p.37).</p>	

Category	<b>Signs</b>
UDC Section(s):	Chapter 10
<p><b>What is the problem:</b></p> <p>A. The recent statutory UDC amendments did not incorporate new statutes from the 2021 Texas Legislative session relative to signs (ETJ, content, etc.). A comprehensive review of existing regulations is needed.</p> <p>B. Enhanced regulations on size, type and location to ensure signs do not create traffic hazards, impairment of motorists, sight of vision and distraction, or conflict with the desired appearance of the City is warranted. For example, the number and location of election signs at the poll site (City Hall complex).</p> <p>C. There is currently no allowance for variances. For example, a community requests placement of an informational sign to be posted on their privately-owned open space. As the UDC does not permit such signs, and there is no variance provision, it is strictly prohibited.</p>	

Exhibit A  
Summary of Proposed UDC Categories to Review

Category	Table 4.2 Uses
UDC Section(s):	4.9
<p><b>What is the problem:</b></p> <p>A. Certain land uses are missing from Table 4.2 (Use Table). For example, "Retirement Community", "Non-Commercial Stables", and "Golf Courses."</p> <p>B. Large grouping of uses may be broken out to provide better regulations of permitted uses. For example, Single-family Residential Attached/Townhomes/Patio Home/Duplex/Multi Unit Home (3-4 Units).</p> <p>C. Ninety percent of the uses in Table 4.2 do not identify off-street parking requirements.</p>	

Category	Conditional Uses
UDC Section(s):	4.10
<p><b>What is the problem:</b></p> <p>A. No allowance or criteria provided for Park Maintenance Facilities. This could lead to storage sheds and pump houses being located within proximity to residential lots.</p> <p>B. No allowance or criteria provided for Non-Commercial Stables related to lot size and location of stables. This could lead to animal facilities being located within proximity to residential lots.</p>	