

City of San Antonio

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 15-4655

Type: Staff Briefing - Without

Ordinance

In control: Planning Commission

On agenda: 8/26/2015

Title: Reconsideration of a portion of Item 29 from the August 12, 2015, Planning Commission Agenda

related to proposed Unified Development Code (UDC) amendments submitted by an Individual or Public/Private Organization in accordance with Section 35-111 of the UDC for editing, clarification, or

rule interpretation. (Melissa Ramirez, Policy Administrator, (210) 207-7038,

melissa.ramirez@sanantonio.gov and Tony Felts, Senior Planner, (210) 207-8214,

tony.felts@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. Appendix A - Amendments Summaries, 2. Amendment Submittals

Date Ver. Action By Action Result

DEPARTMENT: Development Services Department

DEPARTMENT HEAD: Roderick Sanchez, CBO, AICP

COUNCIL DISTRICTS IMPACTED: Citywide

SUBJECT:

Reconsideration of a portion of Item 29 from the August 12, 2015, Planning Commission Agenda related to amendment proposals to the Unified Development Code (UDC) submitted by an Individual or Public/Private Organization, specifically, Items D1 and D2 submitted by AIA San Antonio Chapter and M1, M4, M8, M10, and M11 submitted by Donald Oroian.

SUMMARY:

Consideration of proposed UDC amendments submitted by an Individual or Public/Private Organization in accordance with Section 35-111 of the UDC for editing, clarification, or rule interpretation.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

File #: 15-4655, Version: 1

On July 13, 2015, the Planning Commission Technical Advisory Committee (PCTAC) considered proposed amendments to the Unified Development Code (UDC) which were submitted by 13 individuals or organizations as part of the UDC five-year update cycle.

The amendments were considered for their conformity to the specifications outlined in Section 35-111 of the UDC which requires that amendments submitted by parties other than those from city agencies, boards, and commissions, be either editing or clarification.

ISSUE:

The PCTAC reviewed and made a recommendation for each amendment, and have forwarded these recommendations to the Planning Commission for consideration. For each amendment, the Planning Commission may determine one of the following options:

- 1) That the amendment is of a clarification or editing nature and the amendment will move forward for detailed consideration by the PCTAC and will move forward in the process
- 2) That the amendment is not of a clarification or editing nature and the amendment will **not** move forward for detailed consideration by the PCTAC and will **not** move forward in the process
- 3) That the amendment is not of a clarification or editing nature but that the amendment should be considered for detailed consideration by the PCTAC and will move forward in the process as an amendment sponsored by the Planning Commission.

See Attachment A for the amendments, with PCTAC Recommendations.

ALTERNATIVES:

For those amendments which the Commission deems to <u>not</u> meet the criteria of Section 35-111, the Commission may choose to either:

- 1) Move all of amendments forward for further review by the PCTAC, applicable boards and commissions, and city council;
- 2) Move only some of the amendments forward for further review by the PCTAC applicable boards and commissions, and city council; or
- 3) Move none of the proposed amendments forward for further review by the PCTAC applicable boards and commissions, and city council.