



# City of San Antonio

## Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** 18-5228

**Type:** Staff Briefing - Without Ordinance

**In control:** Planning Commission

**On agenda:** 9/12/2018

**Title:** Consideration, discussion, and recommendation on proposed Unified Development Code (UDC) amendments including proposed changes to Section 35-310.05a. - Single-Family Residential District, Section 35-341. - "MXD" Mixed-Use District, and Section 35-343. - "IDZ" Infill Development Zone. (Logan Sparrow, Principal Planner, (210) 207-8691, Logan.Sparrow@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department).

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** 1. IDZ Draft Ordinance, 2. MXD Draft Ordinance, 3. R-1 and R-2 Draft Ordinance

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

**DEPARTMENT:** Development Services Department

**DEPARTMENT HEAD:** Michael Shannon, PE, CBO

**COUNCIL DISTRICTS IMPACTED:** Citywide

**SUBJECT:** UDC Zoning Amendments

**SUMMARY:**

Make recommendations on amendments to Chapter 35, Unified Development Code, of the City Code of San Antonio, Texas, Section 35-343 Infill Development Zone, Section 35-310.05a Single-Family Residential, and Section 35-341 Mixed Use District.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

Pursuant to a City Council Request (CCR) jointly submitted by Council Districts 1 and 7, Development Services staff was asked to review current Infill Development Zone regulations and bring forth possible recommendations to improve development standards that protect the essential character and integrity of San Antonio's established neighborhoods.

DSD staff organized an IDZ Task Force, consisting of 15 members from both neighborhoods and the development community. The Task Force met seven times to discuss proposed changes to current "IDZ" regulations. The Task Force also recommended changes to the "MXD" Mixed Use District regulations, and recommend adoption of two new small-lot single-family residential zoning categories.

During the first PCTAC meeting, several members expressed concern over specific regulations related to design requirements, size limitations, and allowances for minor amendments. Subsequently, DSD staff reconvened the IDZ Task Force, which has since recommended edits to the draft ordinance to address these concerns. The PCTAC will reconsider the proposed recommendations on Monday, September 10, 2018.

## ISSUE:

Current IDZ regulations, while broadly permissive, have led to conflict between the development community and the neighborhoods that they are attempting to build in. Currently, “IDZ” development standards are minimal and lack important detail. As a result, “IDZ” has garnered a reputation as an unpredictable development tool.

The proposed amendments to the “IDZ” regulations require more detail from applicants seeking that zoning district and give the public a much better understanding of the proposed project which will help to streamline projects that would otherwise be stalled by unpredictability, especially for smaller projects within established neighborhoods.

The IDZ Task Force also recommended that the current Mixed Use District regulations be updated by enhancing the site plan requirements and relaxing setbacks to open up the zone for development outside of Loop 410, where “IDZ” zoning is not available.

Lastly, the Task Force recommends the creation of two new zoning districts: “R-1” Residential Single-Family District and “R-2” Residential Single-Family District to ease the burdens on property owners that currently have no alternative than “IDZ” for the development of their property.

Amendments since the PCTAC last considered the draft ordinance include:

Proposed Recommendations Before TAC Consideration	Proposed Revisions
Required applications to be considered by HDRC before Zoning Commission consideration if within Historic or RIO district.	Removed the HDRC review requirement prior to the rezoning process.
Established max size of 5 acres for any “IDZ”.	Removed maximum size for all “IDZ” projects.
Proposed “IDZ” zoning designations did not differentiate regulations based on size.	“IDZ-2” and “IDZ-3” have different regulations depending if they are over or under one acre.
Proposed that “IDZ-1” rezoning requests be required to submit a detailed site plan, but waived if the use was only for a single-family home.	“IDZ-1” required to submit a site plan and Ground Plan Comparison Form. Waived if only developing a single-family home.
Proposed that “IDZ-2” rezoning requests be required to submit a detailed site plan and a Ground Plan Comparison Form.	“IDZ-2” less than 1 acre required to submit a detailed site plan and Ground Plan Comparison Form. “IDZ-2” over 1 acre to submit a site plan showing the location of proposed uses and location of the buildable area.
Proposed that “IDZ-3” rezoning requests be required to submit a detailed site plan, a Ground Plan Comparison Form, and a massing model.	“IDZ-3” less than 1 acre required to submit a detailed site plan and Ground Plan Comparison Form. “IDZ-3” over 1 acre to submit a site plan showing the location of proposed uses and location of the buildable area.
Proposed that “MXD” Site Plan show height of all structures.	As a result of the discussion related to “IDZ-2” and “IDZ-3” projects greater than 1 acre, the requirement to show height of all structures was eliminated. However, the site plan may show maximum building height.
No amendment language was included in the draft to allow for a slight increase in intensity/density for “IDZ” rezoning requests.	Added a 10% range to allow for increase in density, acreage, or decrease in open space. Mirrors language in the “MXD” draft.

## ALTERNATIVES:

As an alternative, the Planning Commission may choose not to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Unified Development Code.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends Approval of the proposed amendments to the Unified Development Code.