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Overview:
Background, history, and strategies

Policy:
Policy Statements to guide and provide rationale for consideration of areas for annexation

Program:
Process for identifying areas for potential annexation and places them in a Program Document

Plan:
A document, required by state statute, to initiate full purpose annexation proceedings
Benefits of Annexation Policy

- Facilitates proactive planning for future growth
- Promotes orderly growth and development
- Allows for efficient delivery of municipal services

**Actual & Projected Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City of San Antonio</th>
<th>Bexar County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>223,412</td>
<td>337,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>408,442</td>
<td>504,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>687,151</td>
<td>830,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>988,971</td>
<td>1,185,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,392,931</td>
<td>1,392,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,545,602</td>
<td>1,714,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,737,176</td>
<td>1,940,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,940,009</td>
<td>2,144,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2,399,274</td>
<td>2,685,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of San Antonio  Bexar County
Overview

Background
- Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) Map

History
- 1940 (36 Sq. miles, 254,000 people)
- 2012 (473 Sq. miles, 1.3 million people)

Strategies
- Promote Economic Growth
- Facilitate Long-Range Planning
- Protect Future Development
- Foster Intergovernmental Relations
Policy Categories

1. Projected Growth
2. Ability to Provide Municipal Services
3. Need to Protect Public Health, Safety, and Welfare
4. Intergovernmental Relations Strategies to protect current and future interests
5. Fiscal Impact of Annexing and not Annexing
6. Non-Annexation Agreement Conditions
1. Projected Growth

- Planned Regional Growth Center
- Anticipated Development
- Undeveloped Land
2. Municipal Services

- Clarify service delivery boundaries between jurisdictions
- Annex areas that benefit from a level of service calibrated for a suburban vs rural area
- Shall not adversely impact services to existing areas, but may allow for more efficient future services

Fire and EMS

Police Services
3. Public Health, Safety, and Welfare

- Enforce building codes, land use, and zoning regulations
- Extend development regulations to protect environmentally sensitive areas
- Provide zoning and land use around Military operations
- Apply standards and annex before development occurs
4. Intergovernmental Strategies

- Protect ability to expand
- Oppose new political bodies that may negatively impact City
- Factors for release of ETJ or corporate limits:
  - Equal exchange
  - Adequate land use control in released area
  - Helps clarify service delivery boundaries
  - No negative fiscal impact
  - Cumulative effect of individual releases
5. Fiscal Impact

- Fiscal Impact Analysis for all proposed annexation
- Annex to capture revenue from growing population surrounding City
- Annex commercial areas to support residential areas
- Annex to keep economic activity, and associated tax revenue, within City limit
6. Non-Annexation Agreements

- Must be offered on land with Agricultural Exemptions
- Industrial Districts for Economic Development should consent to voluntary annexation at end of agreement

- Non-Annexation Agreements should be listed in Annexation Program
- Consider the extension of regulations and fee-based services to prepare for potential future annexation
- Consider revenue sharing for areas with taxing authority (e.g. Public Improvement Districts)
Policy Changes Summary

New Proposed Evaluation Categories
- Level of Development
- Intergovernmental Relations
- Non-Annexation Agreement Conditions

Categories Carried Forward from Current Policy
- Ability to Provide Municipal Services
- Protection of Public Health, Safety and Welfare
- Fiscal Considerations
Annexation Program

- Identifies areas where City may chose to initiate annexation proceedings
- Projected for Ten-Year Period
- Estimates proposed Year for each annexation
- Inclusion does not obligate City to annex
- Exclusion does not prohibit an area from being annexed
Preparation of Annexation Program

Multi-department team approach

Step 1: Collect data for analysis

Step 2: Analyze data based on annexation policy statements

Step 3: Conduct a ‘Level of Service Analysis’ for proposed areas

Step 4: Conduct Fiscal Impact Analysis
Preparation of Annexation Program

**Step 5:** Determine final set of proposed areas of the Annexation Program

**Step 6:** Executive Leadership Team Review of Draft Annexation Program; Share with City Council prior to public information meetings

**Step 7:** Draft Annexation Program goes through Public Process and Hearings

Fire Station Locations
External Communication

- Property Owners in City and ETJ shall be involved in creation of Annexation Program
- Public comment sought for annual updates
Annexation Plan

- Full Purpose
- Limited Purpose
- General Provisions
  - Contiguous to City limits within ETJ
  - 1,000 feet minimum width
  - 10% maximum existing city’s area
Full Purpose Annexation

- Full City Services
- Extends all Regulations
- Full Taxing Authority
- Requires 3-Year Municipal Annexation Plan
3-Year Annexation Process

- Notify property owners
- Compile “Inventory of Services”
- Prepare proposed “Service Plan”
- Conduct 2 public hearings

- Begin negotiations with property owners (if necessary)
- Finalize Service Plan
- (Potential) arbitration of Service Plan
- Annexation may only occur in 37th month, after plan is adopted
Exemptions to 3-Year Process

- Contains 99 or fewer residential tracts
- By petition of property owner (voluntary)
- By petition of > than 50% of property owners

2005 QVC Center Voluntary Annexation

2005 Hunters Pond Voluntary Annexation
Limited Purpose Annexation

- Extends some City Regulations
- No City Services
- No City Taxes
- Requires Planning Study
- Requires Regulatory Plan
- Proposed for areas planned for future Full Purpose Annexation
Annexation Recommendations

- Forward Annexation Policy Document for Adoption
- Develop a 10-Year Annexation Program in Fiscal Year 2013
Comprehensive Plan

- Outlines growth scenarios that can be implemented through Annexation
- Provides context for creating Annexation Program
- Articulates where municipal services may be needed to meet future needs
Comprehensive Plan Purpose

- Update 1997 Master Plan Policies
- Help Implement SA2020
- Articulates the form of future physical growth
- Accommodates, distributes and projected growth
- Guides strategic decision making - annexation and transportation planning
- Guides infrastructure investments and incentives
- Reconciles existing plans, policies, and assumptions

Cover of SA2020
Complements SA2020 Goals

- Promote active living through a better built environment such as walkable neighborhoods and complete streets to encourage biking and walking
- Improve the ratio of infill and suburban development targeted and built inside Loop 410 versus greenfield development outside of Loop 1604
SA2020 Goals Continued

- Connect new employment centers to housing locations to decrease work commute times and overall vehicle miles traveled.

- Promote jobs in the arts; public participation in the arts; with the goal of increasing the economic impact of the arts AND enhancing our image as a world class city where people who like the arts want to live.

- Create a vibrant community that reflects San Antonio’s diverse range of artistic expression that builds on our rich cultural heritage.
World Class Cities

- Provides high quality of life and urban design
- Memorable sense of place

- Attracts people to visit
- Economic development magnet for entrepreneurs and creative class

Paris, France
San Francisco, California
Strategies

- Balance location and intensity of new development
- Ensure transportation plans support land use
- Coordinate with Military
- Coordinate incentive programs
- Predict service demands
- Guides utility and infrastructure investment
- Guides annexation program
Mega-Regions in Texas

- Dallas/Fort Worth
- Austin
- Houston/Galveston
- San Antonio
- Texas Triangle Mega-Region
Comparison of Adopted Plans in other Cities

- Austin – 2012
- Fort Worth – 2012
- El Paso – 2012
- Dallas – 2006
Other Texas Cities

Other Texas Cities with Comprehensive Plans Underway

- Garland – anticipated adoption 2012
- San Marcos – anticipated adoption 2013
- Waco – anticipated adoption 2013
- Denton – anticipated adoption 2014
Summary of Best Practices

- Population Projections and Distribution
- Community Design Manual
- Working/Technical Papers
- Annexation Program
- Strategic and Implementation Plans
- Fiscal Sustainability
- Frequent Updating of Plans

- Growth Scenarios Planning and Impact Analysis:
  - Natural resources
  - Financial
  - City Services and Infrastructure
  - Transportation
  - Economic/Market
San Antonio Comprehensive Plan History

- Law of Indies
- 1933 First Master Plan
- Updated 1951, 1980, & 1997

San Antonio Survey – late 1800s

San Antonio Map
Current City Master Plans

Overarching policy documents
- Example: Master Plan Policies, SA2020

Level I: Functional Plans
- Example: Major Thoroughfare Plan, Historic Preservation Plan

Level II: General Plans
- Example: North Sector & West/Southwest Sector Plans

Level III: Specific Plans
- Example: River North Neighborhood Plan

Level IV: More Specific Plans
- Example: Westside Reinvestment Plan
Evaluation of Current Plans

- Too little coordination between plans (e.g. geographic plans and functional plans)

- Inconsistent growth assumptions, if any (different planning horizons and sources)

- Emphasis on Neighborhood Planning since 1998
  - Does not address key regional critical issues – sustainability, mobility, design, and economic competitiveness

---

Museum Reach of the Riverwalk

King William Fair
Evaluation of Current Plans

- No implementation strategy to achieve overall policy goals
- Not strategic – does not prioritize multiple goals
- Capital improvement infrastructure projects not strategically coordinated to support future land use goals
- Not designed to implement SA2020 vision for a world class city
Key Elements of Proposed Comprehensive Plan

- **Background**
  - Existing Conditions
  - Trend Indicators
  - Population Estimates/Projections
  - Working/Technical Papers

- **Strategies**
  - Preferred Growth Scenario
  - Core strategies (Housing, Natural Resources, Sustainability, Economic Development, Land Use & Urban Design, Historic Preservation)
  - Enhanced Strategies (Transportation, Public, Military, and Intergovernmental Cooperation)

- **Implementation Tools**
  - Annexation Policies
  - Capital Improvement Program
  - Reinvestment/Redevelopment Prioritized Areas
  - Development Regulations

Cevallos Lofts
Beneficial Outcomes

- Policy guide for prioritization of City investments
- New growth in all sectors of city
- Prioritize areas for new growth
- Guide future transportation system plan
- Determine market demand for future services
- Further coordination of military presence
- Update UDC: designed to implement the plan
- Mechanism to coordinate all functional plans

San Antonio Head Start

UTSA Downtown Campus
Process Initiation

- Emphasis on Multi-Departmental and City Partner Cooperation
- Coordinate Growth Scenario Planning with MPO 2040 Plan
- Undertake Working Papers/Technical Studies:
  - Infill Development Capacity Analysis
  - Future Jobs and Economic Opportunity in City limits
  - Alternative Scenario Fiscal Impact Analysis
- Stakeholder Engagement
Questions, Discussion, and Next Steps