



# City of San Antonio

## Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** 19-7904

**Type:** Staff Briefing - Without Ordinance

**In control:** Planning Commission

**On agenda:** 10/23/2019

**Title:** Resolution approving proposed changes to Chapter 35, the Unified Development Code (UDC), Section 35-310-01 Table 310-1 Lot and Building Dimensions Table, relating to Lot and Building Dimensions in "RM" and "MF" districts. Staff recommends Approval. (Catherine Hernandez, Development Services Administrator, (210) 207-5085, catherine.hernandez@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** 1. RM MF Code Updates, 2. RM MF CCR

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:

Resolution amending the Unified Development Code (UDC), Chapter 35, of the City Code of San Antonio, Texas, with changes to Section 35-310-01 Table 310-1 Lot and Building Dimensions Table.

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Pursuant to a City Council Request (CCR) jointly submitted by Council District 1, Development Services staff was asked to review areas within District 1 that have multi-family zoning not consistent with adopted land use plans or current patterns of development and possibly update Section 35-310, relating to existing "MF-33" and "RM-4" zoning designations to address the growing need for housing without compromising the integrity of neighborhoods.

Development Services Department (DSD) staff organized an RM/MF Task Force, consisting of 16 members from both neighborhoods and the development community. The Task Force met seven (7) times to discuss proposed changes to current "RM" Residential Mixed District and "MF" Multi-Family Districts regulations.

Planning Commission Technical Advisory Committee (PCTAC) will consider the item on Monday, October 21, 2019.

## **ISSUE:**

The current “RM-4” and “MF-33” zoning designations allow for construction up to 35 feet and 45 feet in height respectively. There are neighborhoods within Council Districts 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, that have “RM” and “MF” zoning prevalent within their neighborhoods as well as other areas of the city, that have lots zoned for this type of development scattered throughout the neighborhood, either through a rezoning approved decades ago or the 2001 UDC code conversion. Redevelopment of these properties is resulting in incompatible height and lot coverage than adjacent developed properties.

The proposed amendments to the “RM” and “MF” regulations that the Taskforce is recommending address height, front setback and street orientation.

- The proposed code amendment related to height would restrict the height for these districts if directly abutting a single family residential use creating a more appropriate scale for development of multifamily properties within single family residential streets.
- To address the lack of a minimum front setback for “MF-33” zoning, the proposed amendments to the “MF” regulations will create a more consistent setback across the blockface for development of multifamily developments within residential blocks.
- The proposed amendment that addresses street orientation would require development of 2 to 4 units on these lots that are within residential blocks to have a front entry and walkway face the street for the unit abutting the street, creates the street orientation consistent with the entire residential blockface.

There were other items discussed by the Taskforce related to re-defining height, percent of lot coverage, requiring multiple units to be attached, site plan requirements prior to building permit, and water management and LID requirements that didn’t receive consensus. As these items have a more global impact and will affect other zoning districts, the Taskforce agreed to table these until the 2020 UDC amendment process to allow more discussion if submitted by any of the Taskforce members during the application process.

## **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 for the Mixed Residential Districts and Multi-Family Districts.