Task Force Member Rebuttal of Staff Record in “Comparison Matrix” and Meeting Records as per the Video Recordings:

2.5.2. [Driveways] STAFF RECORD INCORRECTLY SHOWS TASK FORCE ONLY PROPOSING 2.5.4. AS A SINGLE REFORM. Should show full consensus of all points rather than only presenting point #4.

March 22, 2018: Staff proposed compromise language for a multi-part fix which received consensus support: 1) Minimum 20-foot distance between curb cuts; 2) Driveways only 8’ – 12’ wide in front of the facade; 3) only allowing 2 curb cuts at properties with 2 or more dwellings; 4) Allowing for the maintenance and renovation of existing footprint of current non-conforming drives; 5) Specifying that the driveway could still only extend past façade on one side of the building for single-unit structures.

[ 6. ] There was also an intent [as recorded in Staff’s Matrix comments] to have a different set of language for 5+ unit properties and potentially eliminate their requirement for a front walkway. Staff committed to preparing such language to present to Task Force for a vote, but failed to do so.

December 11, 2018: Staff declared this an “open item” and forced formal vote on point #4, refusing any vote, discussion on, or inclusion of other points adopted by consensus in March.

2.7.1. [Front Yard Fences] STAFF RECORD INCORRECTLY SHOWS TASK FORCE PROPOSING ONLY TO CHANGE HEIGHT. Should show consensus: Chain link fences are allowed south of Pinckey St and east of N New Braunfels Ave.

• It was agreed that chain link front-yard fences would be allowed south of Pinckney St and east of N New Braunfels at our very first meeting. Further discussion at the second meeting was suspended by Staff amid ongoing debate regarding whether the permissions should be extended to everywhere south of Parland Place. Staff tabled further discussion until the Task Force wrap-up meeting—which was later canceled.
• Inclusion of “hog wire” fences as exception to prohibition of steel mat (proposed by S.D. / Staff)
• Task Force was told by Staff they needed to get us a definition of CMU prior to our deciding to keep or eliminate the prohibition. None provided.

2.8.2. [Front Yard Structures] STAFF RECORD INCORRECTLY SHOWS TASK FORCE PROPOSING NEW LANGUAGE. TASK FORCE’S ONLY RECOMMENDATION REMAINS STRIKING THE WORDS: new independent waste containers

Staff explained original language meant no resident was allowed to place trash bins at the curb for collection. To clean up the issue, there was a motion in May from the Task Force to modify
existing language by deleting the words “new independent waste containers.” Motion achieved consensus, but Staff refused to allow a formal vote, first suggesting the “Refuse containers...” language, then insisting they had to consult with Solid Waste regarding regulations prior to allowing a vote on the motion to delete “new independent waste containers.” In December when the “Refuse containers...” language appeared in Staff’s Matrix as a Task Force recommendation, there was a motion made to delete the language from the column describing it as a Task Force’s recommendation. Staff dismissed the meeting before allowing a vote.

3.2.2. [Building Height] STAFF RECORD INCORRECTLY SHOWS TASK FORCE PROPOSING NO CHANGES. Should show: Intentionally deleted.

Motion to keep existing language failed. This was tabled for “next meeting” after further discussion of how to fix the language after the motion to keep it failed. It was never addressed at another meeting of the Task Force. Therefore, the Task Force’s proposed change, by default, is complete removal of the standard.

3.4.6. [Principal Elevation Features] STAFF RECORD INCORRECTLY SHOWS TASK FORCE PROPOSING NO CHANGES. Should show consensus: “For additions or renovations to existing structures, windows on the facade(s) fronting a primary street (and secondary street in the case of corner lots) shall match within 75% the height to width dimensional proportions (e.g., 2:1), configuration (e.g., 1 over 1 light division), and appearance (e.g., recess, trim, and sill) of existing windows if the other windows are uniform in size and proportion. Replaced windows shall also match the existing window(s) in framing and material as found on existing or adjacent structures on site.”

Staff clarified for the Task Force that “most NCDs don’t address material or trim,” provided several examples, and said ours is “the only NCD with this very strict requirement.”

There was a motion co-crafted by Task Force and Staff to change, as shown above. No vote was allowed after discussion and Staff tabled the issue in order to prepare and present refined language to the Task Force “at the next meeting” which would achieve the flexibility sought by the motions, with an aim to also allow window openings to be enlarge or reduced, and clarify that the intent of the NCD was not to trigger an exact like-for-like requirement. No language was ever presented at subsequent Task Force meetings.

3.6.3. [Garages, Carports,...] Motion, as passed, removed the words “second story” in the first sentence.

CURRENT STAFF VERSION OF RECORD HAS TYPO, WORDS NOT SHOWING AS REMOVED.
New Language Proposed 9/27 and not decided upon

Properties which are bordered on at least one side by non-residential use properties shall not be required to comply with standards set forth in this document but shall be governed only by the thousands of rules set forth elsewhere in the City of San Antonio UDC and ICC. For purposes of this exclusion, non-residential use properties shall include: commercial-use property, military base, multi-family structure of greater than 3 units, park land, paved parking lots, vacant lots zoned MF33 or higher, and institutional property such as churches and schools.

Alleys, streets, undeveloped lots with R-4 or below zoning, and accessory dwellings are ignored for the purposes of this paragraph, and what is directly across that alley, street, lot, etc from the subject property shall be what is considered to “border” the subject property.

After lengthy discussion, including Staff saying that UDC has provisions to make exceptions for home bordering commercial enterprises, this language was tabled for later review, emailed to Task Force for further consideration, but left out of Staff’s record. Concept unresolved.

CURRENT STAFF VERSION OF RECORD HAS NO RECORD OF LANGUAGE NOR DISCUSSION

OTHER COMENTS:

3.1.2. - 3.1.3. [Building Size / Massing] Task Force member presented photographic evidence from various portions of the neighborhood showing the historic Standard was not in conformity with the prevalent design elements of existing Multifamily structures in the neighborhood.

3.6.1. [Garages, Carports...] If Staff is successful in having the Task Force’s December 11th recommendation for 3.6.1.1. overturned by Zoning or City Council: additional language will be necessary to allow uniform enforcement in the future. i.e. 9/27: Example of 130 Davis Ct. discussed at length. It was determined language needed to be added to the NCD to clarify that in this type of structure only the front unit needed to comply with old NCD language in 3.6.1.1., while rear unit needed only to comply with 2.4.1. Task Force revisions to 3.6.1.1., as voted Dec 11, eliminates the need for these additional clarifications.

For the Record, December 11, 2018: Task Force members completed, presented, and submitted for the Record “Supplemental Materials” including maps detailing the results their 2018 walking surveys. [Attached.] The NCD Neighborhood Maps Appendix “Garage Configuration” was found to be approximately 20% unrecorded and some Task Force members found their properties recorded incorrectly. There was not enough time allotted to the 2018/2019 review for the data gathered to be broadly used in the final revision, as anticipated wrap-up meetings to clarify intent and finalize language recommendations holistically were never scheduled.
Supplemental Materials for NCD Task Force Meeting

December 11, 2018
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Conforming Property Representation = 8.68% of the parcels*

*This map was generated by Task Force members who physically inspected each property in 2018, collecting over 24,000 data points. Not all NCD standards were surveyed, so “Conforming Property” may be over-represented.
This map was generated by Task Force members who physically surveyed each “Garden Subdistrict” property in 2018. Many homes have multiple accommodations that could potentially be used for vehicles. This map shows the “Primary Parking Configuration,” meaning the parking accommodation nearest the curb cut. For Example: a two-car wide driveway leading to a detached structure with potential to be a two-car garage was recorded as “Detached Rear Structure.” A three-car wide driveway leading to a detached structure with potential to be a one-car garage was recorded as a “Double / Non-Conforming Drive.” Fully air-conditioned structures were assumed to be living quarters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Image</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>MF 2-4</th>
<th>MF 5+</th>
<th>Corner Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>ALLENSWORTH ST</td>
<td><img src="Google" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>ALLENSWORTH ST</td>
<td><img src="Google" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>ALLENSWORTH ST</td>
<td><img src="Google" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>ALLENSWORTH ST</td>
<td><img src="Google" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>ALLENSWORTH ST</td>
<td><img src="Google" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>ALLENSWORTH ST</td>
<td><img src="Google" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Image</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>MF 2.4</td>
<td>MF 5+</td>
<td>Corner Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>ANDREWS ST</td>
<td><img src="google.com" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>ANDREWS ST</td>
<td><img src="google.com" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>ANDREWS ST</td>
<td><img src="google.com" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>ANDREWS ST</td>
<td><img src="google.com" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>ANDREWS ST</td>
<td><img src="google.com" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>ANDREWS ST</td>
<td><img src="google.com" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
210 ANDREWS ST

- Front setback w/ 9' avg
- Driveway 8'-12' wide x only on 1 side
- Front Walk 4' from Driv, Curb to Front Door
- Front yard fences:
  - 6'-9' x 16' wide, COVERED front porch
- MF 1.2.4.1.a. - 1-2nd Floor 2 parking spaces behind facade of home

211 ANDREWS ST

- Front setback w/ 9' avg
- Driveway 8'-12' wide x only on 1 side
- Front Walk 4' from Driv, Curb to Front Door
- Front yard fences:
  - 6'-9' x 16' wide, COVERED front porch
- MF 1.2.4.1.a. - 1-2nd Floor 2 parking spaces behind facade of home

212 ANDREWS ST

- Front setback w/ 9' avg
- Driveway 8'-12' wide x only on 1 side
- Front Walk 4' from Driv, Curb to Front Door
- Front yard fences:
  - 6'-9' x 16' wide, COVERED front porch
- MF 1.2.4.1.a. - 1-2nd Floor 2 parking spaces behind facade of home

214 ANDREWS ST

- Front setback w/ 9' avg
- Driveway 8'-12' wide x only on 1 side
- Front Walk 4' from Driv, Curb to Front Door
- Front yard fences:
  - 6'-9' x 16' wide, COVERED front porch
- MF 1.2.4.1.a. - 1-2nd Floor 2 parking spaces behind facade of home

219 ANDREWS ST

- Front setback w/ 9' avg
- Driveway 8'-12' wide x only on 1 side
- Front Walk 4' from Driv, Curb to Front Door
- Front yard fences:
  - 6'-9' x 16' wide, COVERED front porch
- MF 1.2.4.1.a. - 1-2nd Floor 2 parking spaces behind facade of home

223 ANDREWS ST

- Front setback w/ 9' avg
- Driveway 8'-12' wide x only on 1 side
- Front Walk 4' from Driv, Curb to Front Door
- Front yard fences:
  - 6'-9' x 16' wide, COVERED front porch
- MF 1.2.4.1.a. - 1-2nd Floor 2 parking spaces behind facade of home

- Geocentric facing toward must be detected & facade main entry

- MF 1.4.x.1.a. - 1-2nd Floor 2 parking spaces behind facade of home

- MF 1.4.x.1.b. - 1-2nd Floor 2 parking spaces behind facade of home