

P&Z Category: Subdivision Design

Staff recommended Policy Changes

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

Topic	Easements
UDC Section(s):	5.6 (6)
<p>What is the problem: Construction and/or excavation over designated easements could damage infrastructure or create unforeseen cost to repair infrastructure within easements.</p>	
<p>Staff Recommendation: Add the previous subdivision ordinance (Section 3.B.15) restricting any modifications, structures, or fencing within the easement unless approved by the City of Fair Oaks Ranch.</p>	
<p>P&Z Comments: Staff recommendation. P&Z Commission concurred with Staff.</p>	

Topic	Easements
UDC Section(s):	5.6 (7)
<p>What is the problem: The UDC does not contain language to help prevent vegetation from damaging overhang utilities due to overgrowth.</p>	
<p>Staff Recommendation: 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.</p>	
<p>P&Z Comments: Staff recommendation. P&Z Commission concurred with Staff.</p>	

Topic	Cul-de-sac streets
UDC Section(s):	5.5 (3)
<p>What is the problem: Lack of cul-de-sac regulations can create emergency services challenges in accessing properties located in a cul-de-sac.</p>	
<p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends a UDC policy addition to reference compliance with the International Fire Code and ASSHTO regarding cul-de-sac dimensions, ROW limits, and street length.</p>	
<p>P&Z Comments: P&Z recommended language to provide specific dimensions for cul-de-sac diameter (96 feet for residential and 146 for commercial), ROW limits(100 feet for residential and 150 feet for commercial), and maximum street length (750 feet for residential and commercial).</p>	

Topic	Streets
UDC Section(s):	9.4 (2) a vi
What is the problem: Current UDC regulations have insufficient minimum requirements that can result in premature street failures.	
Staff Recommendation: 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.	
P&Z Comments: P&Z requested additional language regarding base material type and grade and wanted base material to be based on Traffic Impact Analysis and Geotech Report.	

P&Z Category: Infrastructure

Staff recommended Policy Changes

Topic	Infrastructure Construction Process
UDC Section(s):	9.2 (5)
What is the problem: The current UDC does not provide provisions for construction of utilities and drainage infrastructure which would allow contractors to construct infrastructure that does not meet UDC minimum design standards. This could result in the City having sub-standard infrastructure.	
Staff Recommendation: Add language requiring developers to obtain a permit for the construction of utilities and drainage infrastructure.	
P&Z Comments: P&Z Commission concurred with Staff.	

Topic	Street Designation for Stormwater Design Criteria
UDC Section(s):	9.7 (1) c ii and iii
What is the problem: The current UDC does not provide a criteria for connector or local streets for design storm capacity. This could result in public safety issues due to under-designed infrastructure.	
Staff Recommendation: Add language to include criteria for connector and local streets.	
P&Z Comments: P&Z Commission concurred with Staff.	

Administrative Policy Changes

Topic	Fiscal Surety and Assurance of Construction and Maintenance
UDC Section(s):	9.3 (2)
What is the problem: The UDC requires infrastructure improvements to be constructed prior to plat recordation.	
Staff Recommendation: Administrative Clean Up - Add language requiring infrastructure improvements to be constructed after plat recordation or issuing a development permit.	
P&Z Comments: P&Z Commission concurred with Staff.	

Topic	Water Quality Protection
UDC Section(s):	8.4 (5) a b
What is the problem: Language exempting areas within the city limits of Fair Oaks Ranch located outside of the Edwards or Trinity Aquifer Contributing or Recharge Zone is not needed because all areas are within the Edwards or Trinity Aquifers.	
Staff Recommendation: Administrative Clean Up - Remove language as it does not apply.	
P&Z Comments: P&Z Commission concurred with Staff.	

Topic	Design Standards - Purpose and Intent
UDC Section(s):	9.1 (3)
<p>What is the problem: The UDC does not contain driveway design criteria. This can result in future maintenance issues due to insufficient design and construction. Additionally, water and sanitary sewer construction standards are needed to prevent undersized public infrastructure.</p>	
<p>Staff Recommendation: Administrative Clean Up - add the City's design regulations and specifications for driveway construction and for water and sanitary sewer construction.</p>	
<p>P&Z Comments: P&Z Commission concurred with Staff.</p>	

Topic	Survey Control Point Markers
UDC Section(s):	9.8 (1) e
<p>What is the problem: The UDC lacks terrain recognition allowing for corner markers to be placed above ground, which could create tripping hazards or other public safety issues.</p>	
<p>Staff Recommendation: Administrative Clean Up - Add language to reduce the required depth of the corner markers in dense terrain.</p>	
<p>P&Z Comments: P&Z Commission concurred with Staff.</p>	

P&Z Category: Drive-Ins

Staff recommended Policy Changes

Topic	Drive-in Facilities
UDC Section(s):	6.6 (3)
What is the problem: The UDC does not recognize privacy issues (noise, light pollution) for residents located near the lot lines of drive-in facilities.	
Staff Recommendation: Add language establishing a minimum buffer of 25 feet along property lot line and add requirements for screening along adjacent residential lot line.	
P&Z Comments: P&Z Commission concurred with Staff.	

Topic	Drive-in Facilities
UDC Section(s):	6.6 (3) b
What is the problem: The current UDC minimally recognizes vehicle queuing for drive in facilities. If not enhanced, back up of vehicles unto streets may create a road hazard.	
Staff Recommendation: Add language requiring stacking spaces criteria be based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. And staff recommends two stacking spaces for each gas pump.	
P&Z Comments: After reviewing various information (including surrounding municipalities) regarding queueing requirements, the Commission requested detailed criteria for specific facilities such as banks, kiosks, restaurants, vehicle lube, car washes be provided in the UDC.	

P&Z Category: Parking Lots

Staff recommended Policy Changes

Topic	Parking Lot Location Setbacks
UDC Section(s):	6.7 (3) b
What is the problem: Developers may construct parking areas approximately 10 feet for non-arterial and 15 feet for arterial feet from the street right-of-way, which is too close to roadways to maintain Hill County character.	
Staff Recommendation: Recommends all streets (arterial and non-arterial) have a minimum landscape setback of 20 feet.	
P&Z Comments: P&Z Commission recommends 30 and 50 feet, respectively as they feel current regulations significantly reduces the preservation of natural landscaping.	

Topic	Parking Lot Layout - Landscaped Islands
UDC Section(s):	6.7 (4) c iv
What is the problem: The UDC does not provide minimum size for landscaped islands in parking lots. If not defined, plant life and vegetation sustainability could be comprised.	
Staff Recommendation: Recommends a minimum of sixty (60) square feet based on the Texas A&M planting guide minimum square footage requirement.	
P&Z Comments: Recommends at least one (1) parking space size with no single landscaped area less than fifty (50) square feet.	

Topic	Landscape Buffer along Ralph Fair Road
UDC Section(s):	6.7 (5) b
What is the problem: Ralph Fair Road is an arterial street with a different landscape buffer from other arterial streets as defined in in Section 6.7(3) (b) where all arterial streets are to be 20 feet. The only arterial streets in the City are Ralph Fair Road and I-10 Frontage	
Staff Recommendation: To maintain consistency, staff recommends landscape buffering along Ralph Fair Road be twenty (20) feet.	
P&Z Comments: Recommends an increase in the landscape buffer along Ralph Fair Road from ten (10) feet to fifty (50) feet.	

Staff not recommended Policy Changes

Topic	Golf Cart Parking Requirements
UDC Section(s):	6.7
What is the problem: UDC does not recognize Fair Oaks Ranch as a "golf cart community."	
Staff Recommendation: No change recommended as golf carts can fit into standard parking spaces.	
P&Z Comments: Recommend adding language requiring 30 percent of the total required parking spaces and minimum dimensions required.	

Administrative Policy Changes

Topic	Parking Requirements
UDC Section(s):	6.7 (2)
What is the problem: The draft UDC moves minimum parking requirements from Table 6.2 to Table 4.2. But, Table 4.2 does not address on-street parking spaces or bicycle parking.	
Staff Recommendation: This administrative amendment references bicycle parking requirements which are currently in the UDC under Section 6.7 (14) and clarifies that on-street parking may not be counted toward off-street parking requirements.	
P&Z Comments: Update the UDC language to include minimum bicycle spaces requirement for mixed-use, commercial, office, and retail.	

P&Z Category: Building Standards

Staff not recommended Policy Changes

Topic	Portable Storage Buildings
UDC Section(s):	6.4 (10)(b)
What is the problem: UDC provides a portable storage building to be placed, at the minimum, 3 feet from the property line which may lead to privacy issues.	
Staff Recommendation: Due to the various lot sizes in the City, increasing to 10 feet could be problematic.	
P&Z Comments: For privacy, P&Z recommends the minimum distance from the property line should be 3 feet to 10 feet.	

P&Z Category: Landscaping

Staff recommended Policy Changes

Topic	Residential transitional Shrub Standards
UDC Section(s):	6.5 (5) e i
What is the problem: Requiring a six-foot minimum spacing between planting could allow for inadequate screening in transition areas. Need to decrease the center to center planting distance to retain Hill Country Character.	
Staff Recommendation: Staff concurs with P&Z's recommendation.	
P&Z Comments: P&Z recommends decreasing the center to center planting distance from six feet to three feet.	

Staff not recommended Policy Changes

Topic	Landscape Requirements
UDC Section(s):	6.4
What is the problem: An increased lot landscape percentage in certain zoning districts may help to retain Hill Country character.	
Staff Recommendation: Staff does not recommend as Chapter 5, Table 5.1 lists the maximum impervious cover allowed for each lot based on zoning district: Rural Residential 20%, Neighborhood Commercial 80%, Community Facilities 60%, and Logistics 70%. Additionally, requiring increased landscaping will create challenges for landowners in maintaining healthy landscaping.	
P&Z Comments: Recommends increasing the required landscape percentage of Rural Residential from 0 to 50 percent and Neighborhood Commercial, Community Facility, and Logistics from 15 to 20 percent.	

Topic	Residential Transition Standards
UDC Section(s):	6.5 (5) c
What is the problem: Residential lots adjacent to non-residential lots may not have adequate screening requirements for privacy.	
Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the policy change be deferred to the category "setbacks".	
P&Z Comments: Recommends a minimum requirement of a 20-foot-wide landscaped transitional area in addition to the required setback requirements.	

Topic	Landscape and Tree Requirements for Parking Lots
UDC Section(s):	6.5 (6) b
What is the problem: The low frontage, side, and rear landscape percentages for parking lots could create concentrated clusters of landscaping percentage instead of even distribution.	
Staff Recommendation: Landscape transition areas and landscape buffers and existing percentages adequately address landscape requirements.	
P&Z Comments: Recommends increasing the percentage of frontage parking landscaping from 10 to 20%, street side from 6 to 10%, and rear side from 0 to 3%.	