

C42 Amendments - Summarized Public comments matrix

Houston Planning Commission



**PLANNING &
DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT**

No.	Brief comment	Page No.	Section No.	Response	Action
1	Narrow lots if needed should be defined to less than 25' wide and not less than 40' as city of Houston needs affordable housing. How did we arrive at 40'? Shared driveway projects tend to be on larger tracts of land.	6	42-1	A 40' wide lot can preserve space for one on-street parking while taking direct driveway access. Planning receives shared driveway projects on smaller sites as well, especially now because the detentions requirements were updated last year to have similar detention requirements like front loading lots.	No change
2	The 18' paving requirement for the public street to take shared driveway access is in direct contrast to the previous C42 changes that were introduced after discussion with fire marshal's office.	11	Sec 42-145	The requirement about 18' paving for the public street to propose shared driveway lots cannot be enforced at platting stage as it is in the public ROW. This will still continue to be part of IDM requirements and developments still have to comply with it.	No change
3	The 19' garage building line will only increase the number of residents that will double park across the entire approach and driveway. This is an enforcement issue.	20	Sec 42-157	The 19' garage BL will help get the cars not park across sidewalks. Double parking generally happens on open ditch streets where there is great distance between the roadway and the garage.	No change
4	Requirement of balconies on narrow front loading lots can cause potential leak issue and also adds significant cost. I suggest allowing a window of a certain size (I suggest a 4050), since the heat in Houston keeps most people from using the balcony. Is there still a need for front door and walkway along the street is not clear. What do you do with homes on lots over 40' wide that meet the 1/3 but the front door (as defined) is set back from the garage? Does it need a walkway connecting to sidewalk?	21	Sec 42-157	Agree with the idea of allowing windows of certain size. If the lots are narrower than 40' and balconies/windows are provided, front door does not have to be in the front of the home. For 40' or wider lots, if the front door is setback no more than 4 feet from the garage, it will meet the proposed ordinance requirement. If the front door is further than 4 feet, it will not meet the ordinance requirement. Walkway connecting to public sidewalk is not required in this case.	Allow windows as an option instead of balconies.
5	The title of the section is not matching the first two lines in the section. Questioning the necessity for walkways to a sidewalk along a public ROW that might not be required to be built. Recommends reducing pedestrian walkway width from 36" to 24". Walkway takes away place for required tree.	22	Sec 42-xxx	The minimum clear width for a wheelchair is 36" per ADA regulations. The reasoning to require a walkway connection between the entry feature and sidewalk is to allow direct access to each home for pedestrians.	Revise the first two lines in the Entry feature section to make the requirement clear.
6	On-site guest parking will prevent anyone from building more than 5 units due to guest parking requirements. Parking on-site will cause loss of land and increase impervious cover. 6 packs may not be built.	28-29	42-186	On-street parking is for public and guest parking must be provided within the site. On-street parking for private development use as guest parking space is taking it away from the public.	No change
7	Clarification of language of "when possible" in regards to alley access.	31	42-188	"when possible" was added to capture situations where an alley has been encroached or it exists but is unimproved and the property is mid-block. It will be an administrative process under Director's discretion to use other options if the alley is not available for access.	Will revise the language to remove "when possible".
8	Concerns about alleys and HPW changing IDM. Additional concerns about utilizing an alley, detention and drainage. Where does the detention go? The city property or the owner's property thereby making the usable lot size smaller?	31	42-188	Planning has proposed changes to Chapter 9 in IDM regarding drainage and detention requirements for public alleys. The plan is for these changes to happen simultaneously with Chapter 42 amendments. Drainage and detention are requirements within IDM and will continue to be.	No change
9	Suggests change to only require access on CoH maintained alleys.			Alleys are important infrastructure in the City and should be utilized as much as possible.	No change
10	Concerns that this won't work on a 40' lot.	31	42-188	Planning proposed changes to Chapter 15 IDM to set a minimum residential driveway width of 10'. Therefore it is possible to have 22' un-interrupted space along the street.	No change

11	Combined driveways are unsafe and parking will be reduced. Cars trying to get into the left and right bays will have to make 5 point turns to get in and out. This design may work for greater building lines but later car will try to utilize the sidewalk to make their turn. HPW puts no parking signs when just one or two people on the street request it and the goal of preserving on-street parking is lost. No study has been presented that buyers want this style approach. Builders will elect to build on larger lots at very high price range due to cost of land.	32	42-188	19' proposed garage building line is a minimum requirement. The setback could be greater if the development requires it. Planning has requested that HPW revise Chapter 15 to provide property owner notification regarding no-parking signs.	No change
12	Wants to know the status of lots recently platted but not yet into permitting			Lots that are platted and recorded prior to the effective date of the ordinance can develop under the old rules.	Will add relevant text to further clarify this point.
13	What about older existing platted properties that were 25' wide?			Lots that are platted and recorded prior to the effective date of this ordinance can develop under the old rules.	No change
14	Would like a graphic example of "Courtyard Access Drive"			Look at Courtyard style development section. It is the private driveway within a courtyard style development	No change
15	Provide clarification on market based parking.	28	42-186	The proposed market based parking area applies only to the four housing types we are proposing with these amendments. It is not universal allowance.	No change
16	Wants to know definition of MUR and where it is defined in the ordinance.			MUR is already defined in 42-1 and was added during the Residential Buffering amendments	No change
17	Proposes a change for gate setbacks to match MFR spacing.	11	42-145	There are no changes proposed to the distance for a gate crossing a shared driveway from the major throughfare ROW.	No change
18	Where in IDM are shared driveway turnaround details listed.	12	42-145	Referring to the 8' turning space. Have to include in C42.	Will make the change
19	Definition of collector from MTFP or any collector	12	42-145	Collector identified on MTFP	No change
20	Questions 15' BL along 80' or less ROW.	14	42-150	This requirement is consistent with other residential development requirements under C42.	No change
21	Revise "CenterPoint Energy" to a generic utility provider.	22	42-157	Will remove reference to "CenterPoint Energy" and revise it to generic "Private utility service provider"	Will make the change
22	Clarification on definition of ground.	24	42-161	This is measured similar to the existing language.	No change
23	What is the minimum paving width for a flag lot?	29	42-187	16' wide with 4' radius 20' deep into the property. Beyond that no restriction.	N/A
24	Why is there a new limit to length of staff length being 200'? Was there an issue?	10	42-145	Yes	N/A
25	Change the word "Will" to "shall".	32	42-188	Will change the word "Will" to "shall".	Will make the change
26	Can Alley/PAE/Staff portion of lots allowed to be used in calculation of COS?	32	42-188	No because COS cannot be impervious surface	N/A
27	Please provide a graphic example.	36	42-188	OK. Will add exhibit for narrow lots when odd number of lots are proposed.	Will add exhibit.
28	30' height measurement is not consistent with the International Fire Code D 105.1, Aerial Fire apparatus Access Roads which says that the highest roof surface shall be determined by the measurement to the eave of a pitched roof, the intersection of the roof to the exterior wall, or the top of parapet walls, whichever is greater.	45 and 54	42-237 and 42-194	Agree that height should match International Fire Code D105.1. Per Section D 105.1	Will make the change in the text
29	Concerned about 40' frontage requirement and cul-de-sac lots that are large which may not meet frontage requirement.	32	42-188	Frontage is already defined in the ordinance. This requirement applies to all new developments and not existing lots. If proposing lots on a tract less than or equal to 15,000sf with narrow frontage (less than 40'), use flag lot design, shared driveway or combined driveway approach while subdividing.	No change
30	Do all the housing styles apply to City and ETJ or just City?			Counties have chosen to not have these rules apply in the Houston's ETJ	Will add language that these rules apply only in the City
31	16' may not work for flag lots			Both the lots take access from the staff and therefore portion of the driveway and the 4' radius can overlap with the other lot.	Will introduce an exhibit

32	Can "drive aisle" behind property line be the same 16 feet or would it be 24'?			Refer to BCE IBC for the drive aisle width. It is 22' for double loaded and 18' for single loaded with 90 degree parking.	N/A
33	Proposal to limit 5-8 unit MURs to collectors and major thoroughfares.			Agree to only allow 5-8 units only on collectors and major thoroughfares	Will add language to only allow 5-8 unit MUR's on collector and major thoroughfares
34	Propose size limit for ADU.			Considering size limit of 1,500sf for second dwelling unit	Will limit the size of second unit to 1,500sf
35	If you create on-street parking, can that count towards your guest parking requirement?			No. On-street parking is for the general public.	N/A
36	Currently detention is required for alley improvements and this could have been fixed in IDM, but hasn't been.			Planning has proposed changes to Chapter 9 in IDM regarding detention requirements for public alleys. The plan is for these changes to happen simultaneously with Chapter 42 amendments.	N/A
37	Suggests not to allow on-street parking in areas with open ditches and along streets with narrow paving widths.			This is already part of IDM Chapter 15	N/A
38	Increase guest parking requirements to 1 space per 4 units.			Planning believes this requires more engagement	No change
39	Can courtyard style developments not be limited to public streets?			Yes. Courtyard style developments can happen along private streets.	Will make the change
40	Why isn't parking determined by bedroom size vs unit size?			The concept is to encourage the construction of smaller units. Per the US census demographic data, household sizes are shrinking and there is need for smaller homes.	N/A
41	Why are Opportunity zones part of considerations for market based parking?			Opportunity zones are economically distressed areas where city encourages practical and innovative investments that benefit both investors, as well as the existing residents and business. The relief on parking regulations will help encourage more development and also increase the ridership where public transit is a need and not a luxury.	N/A
42	Is parking on-street for 24 hours against the law?			Yes, According to 26-93, It shall be unlawful for any person to leave parked or standing vehicles in any public street, alley or other public place for a longer continuous period of more than 24 hours.	N/A
43	Is Market based parking is biggest component of this			No, It is one of the components.	N/A
44	Will all these be considered as a total proposal or will it be split into sections			It is one proposal package with different housing types and there will be one consideration on the entire proposal.	N/A
45	Why is the garage building line not proposed as 20 feet			19' is adequate length for most cars to park without blocking the sidewalks.	
46	Changing flag lot width to 16' and allowing flag lots along major thoroughfares is a concern. How many lots can be part of a flag lot development?			Reducing the width from 20' to 16' would allow more buildable area. Flag lots along a major thoroughfare will require a turnaround. Maximum number of lots allowed on flag lots would be 4. Any more lots may utilize shared drive, PAE etc for access.	Will make the change
47	Suggests modifying 50' ROW width requirement to include MUR.			Agree to allow MUR's on streets with 50' ROW	Will modify language to allow MUR's on streets with 50' ROW
48	General support to the recommendations of additional housing options and suggests integrating lighting standards from buffering ordinance into new housing recommendations for all residential buildings.			MUR's are small scale residential developments with minimum impact on abutting properties and therefore, lighting regulations from buffering ordinance do not apply.	No change
49	General support to the recommendations that it will open the door for more creative and attainable housing options. It would allow the opportunity to create projects that are more walkable, pedestrian friendly and limit the number of street cuts. Loves courtyard style development and suggests adding Live/Work units to the ordinance.			Live/Work units are already allowed under the codes.	No change

50	Market Based Parking buffer should be reduced. 1/2 mile from bus or bike route does not mean there is actually a safe way to get from the development to the bus stops or trails. Many areas cannot handle any more street parking, and with no pedestrian realm or bike infrastructure to support multi-modal options, this street parking directive is counter productive to safety.			Based on public comments, the Market Based Parking buffer is recommended to be significantly reduced in the revised proposal.	Will update the language to reflect the revised buffer distances for Market-based parking
51	Concerned about pedestrian safety as sidewalks are frequently obstructed, visibility triangle requirements are not respected and rules are not enforced. Penalties need to be applied to violators.			LPAC recommendations include limiting the interruptions to the sidewalks via private driveways. The requirement of 19' GBL will allow sufficient space for larger vehicles to park on the driveways and not block the sidewalk.	N/A
52	Front loader residents are more social than flag lots and courtyard style developments as they wall themselves off.			In the proposed amendments, flag lots or shared driveway developments are required to face the street instead of walling off. Front loading narrow lots will also be required to provide doors/windows/balconies to provide eyes on the street.	N/A
53	Shared approach is unsafe, reduces parking on the driveway, creates problems with maneuverability and is difficult to sell. Public Works puts up no parking signs on street with narrow paving. No study is presented that buyers desired this style approach.			City is trying to provide housing options while preserving the public right of way for multiple uses. Buyers should have a number of options.	No change
54	Moving GBL from 17' to 19' will decrease densification. No amount of distance will prevent cars from blocking sidewalks.			Other design recommendations are available if the 19' driveway doesn't work in some situations.	N/A
55	General support and would like to see ADUs all over Houston provided COH rewrote all deed restrictions to allow them.			Comment noted. COH has no authority to amend private deed restrictions.	N/A
56	MUR should be allowed with 45-48' frontage.			In case of narrower lot proposed for MUR, a variance may be requested.	No change
57	Proposals are aimed towards changed low-income neighborhoods only. Does this replace Chapter 42?			The rules are for all developments and these are amendments to Chapter 42.	N/A
58	Propose that all new private driveways and parking spaces be constructed of permeable materials. While this plan helps keep the building footprint the same size, it potentially allows for the addition of large increases in the amount of land to be covered with hard surfaced driveways and parking areas. This will only aggravate Houston's drainage problems.			Comment considered	No change
59	Concerned about street parking, non-continuous sidewalks and swales make for a mish-mash. Proposed standards will only help developers. Crux of the issue seems to be transportation related.			The proposed rules apply to new developments only. Recently the sidewalk ordinance was enacted that requires sidewalks along all developments or pay fee in lieu of.	No change
60	Don't remove minimum parking requirements; doesn't address drainage issues; ADUs should meet setback requirements.			ADU's must meet required setbacks	No change
61	Hold a dedicated workout with both Planning Dept and Public Works to address inefficiencies			Planning is working with other departments especially HPW on this project and proposed changes to IDM that will be simultaneous.	N/A
62	don't exclude lots narrower than 50' from being able to do MUR's. Oddball lots could most benefit from more development options. For MUR's and Courtyard style development increase the non-opaque fence height to 7' max instead of 4'. Expand the definition of SFR to include Duplex + ADU.			Variance option is available to handle the oddball lots. 4' fence is the standard that has been used in other ordinance where structures are allowed closer to the street.	No change
63	shared driveway changes will lead to more on-street parking. And, people should not be expected to improve the entire alley.			Proposed standards don't require a property owner to improve an alley across the entire block. And, will not require the property owner to remove obstructions in the alley.	N/A

64	Suggests to fix the stormwater detention requirement which makes MUR's cost-prohibitive because commercial detention rules are applied. Proposes that for MUR developments on properties 15,000sf of less, make stormwater detention requirements align with SFR projects. In addition, allow MUR developments to utilize a "Houston Incentives for Green Development" approved gravel parking system like TrueGrid as pervious cover for up to 10% of the lot area. With this rule, smaller MUR developments could utilize up to 75% (65% + 10%) of the lot for parking and building.			Planning proposed changes to IDM Chapter 9 stormwater detention requirements.	N/A
65	Require developers to use existing alleys. The city is allowing developers to destroy the walkability of Sunset Heights/East Sunset Heights by permitting driveways over sidewalks — despite existing alleys that other homes use. The development of driveways also means trees nearing 100 years old are bulldozed for concrete that contributes to our city's heat pocket and flooding.			Current proposal is to require alley access for properties abutting alleys where possible.	N/A
66	Who will repair when the combined driveway when broken? Why pushing the garage further back?			Only the driveway approach within the ROW is shared. The owners of the lot are required to maintain their driveways. 19' garage building line will prevent vehicles blocking the sidewalk and improve walkability.	N/A
67	Add bus rapid transit in the market based parking.			Bus Rapid Transit is added	N/A
68	Eliminating or reducing the number of parking will not make more people walk or cycle. Make the streets and intersections safer and add as many trees as possible. Decreasing the minimum parking space will only cause more drivers to park in prohibited places and put pedestrians at risk. Reducing setbacks and increasing units will reduce visibility, increase flooding risk, and possibly reduce the green area.			Reduced parking requirements is to provide affordable housing options for those who have fewer or no cars by choice or by necessity.	No change
69	Do more research on neighborhoods and market-based marking. At first, there is plenty of parking on the streets but after a few years of bungalows converting to denser townhouses, all the available street parking is consumed and the utilities are not present to support the population.			The amendments proposed address the issue of lots being subdivided and the available street parking lost. Recommendation is to subdivide without increasing the number of driveways.	N/A
70	Major thoroughfares could be much more appealing with higher density living from commercial/residential mix properties with reduced setbacks			There are existing rules to encourage commercial development along major thoroughfares	N/A
71	I am strongly opposed to any narrow lot developments or MUR's in acres homes. Putting more than one residence on a lot is nothing more than an apartment home, not a single family home. With the new single family homes being built in Acres Homes, there are more than enough where renting can be accomplished. All of the type of housing being proposed now by the planning department will cause severe over crowding and a severe rise in crime.			Narrow lot developments are already happening across the city. The purpose of the amendments is to require homes to face the public street and have fewer driveways to avoid conflicts with the pedestrian realm.	N/A
72	Allow ADU and the primary residence on the same meter.			ADU's are allowed and a process exists to approve meters. It is possible to receive service using one meter or separate meters.	N/A
73	The City's support of historic districts and minimum lot size programs works against affordable housing and private solutions to diversity and inclusion.			These amendments do not supersede deed restrictions, historic districts, minimum lot size or minimum building line ordinances.	N/A
74	Share example of visibility triangle proposal			This will be used for corner lots when the access is from the side or rear.	N/A
75	Against eliminating setbacks			This proposal is reducing setbacks for rear/side access lots and increasing setback for garages.	No change
76	The committee did not have adequate community representation and public engagement is limited. There are already higher-density development projects within the city that exceed current infrastructure capacities, and there are many neighborhoods that could benefit from more greenspaces.			Various stakeholders are part of the committee including SNA which represents all the super neighborhoods. The development is already happening and the intent of these amendments is to create equitable, walkable and affordable housing options for all Houstonians.	No change
77	Reduce minimum separation between structures in courtyard style development from currently proposed 20' to 10'.			The minimum separation distance between structures across the courtyard is 20 feet. This will help with having a good size courtyard that can become a common amenity instead of just a 10' green strip.	No change

78	Make sure all neighborhoods have sidewalks to walk on and putting bike lanes on the street should not reduce vehicle lanes.			Refer to sidewalk ordinance requirements.	No change
79	The shared driveway and alleyway requirements are incoherent. How are you supposed to make a builder spend 11 months waiting for an alley permit and \$60k + to develop the alley. Much longer and much more if the alley has obstructions owned by others.			If the alley is obstructed, other access options may be chosen	N/A
80	Allow upto 4 stories for MUR's just like the townhouses which are more space efficient and result in more affordable housing than townhouses. Allow market based parking for neighborhoods with easy access to frequent transit stops thereby reducing pollution			To comply with IFC, 4 stories is not allowed and the max height limit is 30' from grade plane to the roof surface and roof surface is defined per Sec D in IFD. (the highest roof surface shall be determined by the measurement to the eave of a pitched roof, the intersection of the roof to the exterior wall, or the top of parapet walls, whichever is greater.)	Will make the change
81	Having one shared driveway between two homes is not practical. the maneuverability to back in and out of your garage is very limited. What do you do when your neighbor parks in the driveway; thus, blocking entry/exit? Homeowners will be forced to park in the street. It also creates the need for common area agreements/easements to be agreed upon by the two owners. Alleys are a great idea but you will spend a lot of time and money on permitting/engineering only to have the traffic department say the radius of the alley cannot encroach on the neighboring properties.'I'm in favor of all other aspects to increase density.			Combined driveways will not need a shared access agreement because the shared portion is only in the right of way. Planning proposed changes to IDM Chapter 15.	N/A
82	The Livable Places Initiative addresses valid and worthwhile elements of evolving Houston into a more humane place to live, work, and play. However, as proposed, it poses several threats to the current quality of life for residents and property owners. The proposals threatens min lot size and setback regulations for inner-city neighborhoods. Houstonians will not give up their vehicles. many of these townhouses are poorly built and require repairs within five years of construction. How does this reality add to "livability?" Urban livability also includes protection from severe weather, and access to and enjoyment of parks and green spaces.			The proposed amendments will not supersede any deed restrictions or minimum lot size and minimum building lie ordinances. All the developments still have to meet the requirements of Chapter 33 (Tree and shrub ordinance)	N/A
83	Put supermarkets in neighborhoods instead of making a parent walk 1/2 mile to get groceries			Not in LPAC scope	N/A
84	Recommended expanding volunteer parking and ADA enforcement.			Not in LPAC scope	N/A
85	Make the sidewalks walkable and handicap friendly. Due to weather conditions and with kids it is not practical to commute bike. Suggests making all intersections 4-way stops and fix sidewalks			Not in LPAC scope	N/A
86	Need cameras to stop illegal dumping and loitering at corner stores.			Not in LPAC scope	N/A
87	Houston needs many more shade trees in existing built up areas so that people can walk comfortably and stand in the shade while waiting for the bus. Even though I support tree planting requirements for newly built housing, I am more concerned about adding street trees in existing residential areas because it is not adequate.			Not in LPAC scope	N/A
88	Combined driveway for narrow lots is a safety concern unless the setback is large. Preference is for individual 12' approaches.			Comment considered	No change
89	General support to the recommendations of diverse housing options, reducing number of driveways and improving safety for all road users.			Comment noted	N/A
90	Suggests to end subdivision of lots causing traffic and parking issues.			Comment noted	N/A
91	Suggests to enforce deed restrictions.			Comment noted	N/A
92	Stronger sidewalk requirements and suggests connecting sidewalks to paved streets at corners.			Comment noted	N/A
93	These changes will not solve the housing gap.			Comment noted	N/A

94	Likes all of the proposals except the shared approach for narrow lots as it seems dangerous to go into on-coming traffic lanes to park.			Comment noted	N/A
95	Support the recommendations as housing demand and the need for affordability increases with the increase in population. Especially the ADU proposal as it will propagate multi-generational living and increase housing affordability.			Comment noted	N/A
96	Combined driveway approach "Y" shaped design is difficult to navigate so drivers aren't focused on pedestrians. Front loading driveways are straight, easier to navigate so allow drivers to focus on pedestrians. Fewer driveways do NOT reduce the number of pedestrians or the number of residents leaving their homes. The quantity of pedestrian/car encounters remains unchanged.			Comment noted	No change
97	By making alley improvement mandatory, forces costs of maintaining alleys onto homeowners. Builders merely perform the work--- homeowners bear the cost. The cost of alley improvements decreases the value of the current homeowner's property.			Comment Noted	No change
98	Do not like shifting parking to public streets, cars parked on narrow streets and reducing parking minimums. Likes ADUs. Don't like how developers break up large lots into smaller pieces to avoid drainage requirements.			Comment noted	N/A
99	Likes shared driveways over narrow lots because they preserve sidewalks.			Comment noted	N/A
100	Reducing setbacks and repealing parking minimums are great ways to make Houston more affordable.			Comment noted	N/A
101	The limitations on the lot widths and height of MUR should be loosened. The rules must be more accommodating for smaller single family and MUR's to allow more density. Bike parking should be flexible as many people want to store their bikes inside.			Comment noted	N/A
102	Shared driveways are better for pedestrians. The concrete in the shared driveway is failing after 20 years, so that is a concern.			Comment noted	N/A
103	Existing streets weren't built for MURs. They'll worsen congestion, air quality and flooding and will reduce greenspace.			Comment noted	N/A
104	Can't do front entrances on lots less than 35' wide. Balconies are expensive and will make homes less affordable. They also present design issues.			Comment noted	N/A
105	Provide pre-approved plans for MURs to make it easier and less expensive for developers.			Comment noted	
106	Too many parked cars on the streets already. They cause visibility issues and create unsafe situations.			Comment noted	N/A
107	Shared driveway projects are low quality, isolated from the neighborhood and have high HOA fees.			Comment noted	N/A
108	Good way to maximize space and reduce need for cars and parking spaces. Opportunity for small investors.			Comment noted	N/A
109	Make it easy to do 200-1,000 sf dwelling units. 1,400 sf =lot size should be allowed everywhere as long as the coverage ratio is met. Parking should be left to the market. Security and crime reduction is key to successful high density housing			Comment noted	N/A
110	Support no min. parking and suggest to make it across the board. Remove no. of units cap on non deed restricted lots and allow atleast 5 stories before restricting height. Require less street frontage for lots and reduce the building lines.			Comments noted	N/A
111	Combined driveways will increase on-street parking on narrow streets and there is no room for bike lanes or green strip for trees to grow.			Comments noted	N/A

112	People like to live in a home with private yard and 2 story homes. Guests prefer parking on private driveway. No parking signs everywhere leave hardly any room for on-street parking.			Comments noted	N/A
113	shared driveway is a good idea but does not work. Streets are full with parked cars, parked cars are broken into and no-parking signs is a concern.			Comments noted	N/A
114	Homeownership includes being able to park on driveway, wash car, play with kids etc. Proposed rules with increase car thefts, parked cars block the street.			Comments noted	N/A
115	Combined driveway will create disputes between neighbors, increase service calls and force guests to park on already cramped streets creating safety issues. It creates parking, safety, and livability concerns.			Comments noted	N/A
116	Forcing people to use public transit and making city more dense.			Comments noted	N/A
117	Increased density has overburdened the streets and traffic capabilities.			Comments noted	N/A
118	Must provide incentive for private property owner in terms for property tax breaks.			Comments noted	N/A
119	Excellent plan for Hiram Clarke and West Fuqua area to encourage low income housing			Comments noted	N/A
120	Some issues with increasing the garage building line are increased detention requirement, loss of backyard space, potential for double stacking cars and loss of living space.			Comments noted	N/A
121	Need to be adopting measures that make housing development easier, not more difficult and expensive			Comments noted	N/A
122	There are already too many single-family residents and garages converted to multi-tenant apartments that have insufficient parking resulting in an overflow of vehicles onto adjacent properties, streets and even sidewalks. Many of these properties are within the definition of being within a 1/2 mile of bus stops, a 1/4 mile of bike lanes, etc., but it does not compel these tenants/residents to give up their vehicle. This will make poor situation worse.			Comments noted	N/A
123	Developers must be required to provide park space for recreation as city densifies.			Comments noted	N/A
124	Current requirements are restrictive and market based parking is a great idea			Comments noted	N/A
125	2ft fence setback is dangerous and even non-opaque fences block visibility when close to ROW			Comments noted	N/A
126	Provide increased visibility and sidewalks while preserving pedestrian buffers when within 500ft of a school.			Comments noted	N/A
127	Shared driveways reduce privacy, security, increase in crime, decrease property values and create traffic congestion. Neighborhood character lost, noise and air pollution negatively impacting quality of life are other concerns.			Comment noted	
128	Each property owner should have their own driveway. On-street parking will congest the ROW and create safety issues.			Comment noted	N/A
129	Houston is already too densely populated, and lacks the necessary transportation infrastructure to support these recommendations. Prioritize substantial investment in the transportation system and simplify proposal language.			Comment noted	N/A
130	I believe this will further congest Houston neighborhoods and result in residents and visitors parking further from the home. The garage setback will adversely effect first floor living space.			Comment noted	N/A
131	I oppose shared driveways due to the tight turn radius and believe longer driveways will reduce yard space and encourage excess vehicles in the driveway blocking the sidewalk.			Comment noted	N/A
132	We want to be able to have friends and family over. That is why we buy homes with a driveway.			Comment noted	N/A

133	I cannot imagine living next to someone and sharing a driveway. People are bad about parking efficiently. Townhomes are tight enough as it is without the walkway from the sidewalk to the front door requirement. There will be no room for green space or trees. Don't we get taxed differently if we do not have enough property that can absorb rainwater?			Comment noted	N/A
134	The courtyard style houses will be my choice after retirement.MUR's will be good option for youth who are not ready to buy a home. MUR's could be built to fit with SF neighborhood character.			Comment noted	N/A
135	I agree with changes that make homes more affordable but, I oppose street parking due to the increased safety risk.			Comment noted	N/A
136	I thought the public has voted down zoning on multiple occasions? What I read here amounts to zoning. My neighborhood does not want increased density. How am I going to access the other side of my garage if the driveway is only 12' wide?			Comment noted	N/A
137	I want room for myself and guests to park. Unfortunately, a lot of areas in Houston do not have ideal street parking and/or the streets are too narrow to park there without getting hit.			Comment noted	N/A
138	Collaborate with Incremental Development Alliance.			Comment noted	N/A
139	Parking minimums are not good for the city. Why is any plan that is meant to increase density include provisions for excess parking? Developers/homeowners should assess how much real estate should be dedicated to parking to suit their needs Overflow onto the streets, that is a separate issue but even in Montrose and Midtown there seems to be ample street parking everywhere, including high-traffic areas.			Comment noted	N/A
140	Thank you for working to tame Houston development from a "wild west" model to something more civilized. Keep up the great work!			Comment noted	N/A
141	Eliminate setback requirements and allow for mixed-use zoning along major thoroughfares in majority-residential areas.			Comment noted	N/A
142	More bike and bus lanes. More parking near essential facilities.			Comment noted	N/A
143	Eliminating Parking in a poorly planned city is not a good idea.			Comment noted	N/A
144	Propose 2 guest parking spots per 6 units in MUR's. Removing 28' private street requirement is good. Remove 10' front building line. Second dwelling unit should not be larger than 1800sf. Offsite parking is not a good idea.			Planning believes that this needs more engagement.	No change
145	I hope there will be more dense housing developed. smaller individual yards with neighborhood green areas, courtyard style buildings and MUR's should be allowed. Tranist options and sidewalks must be improved to meet ADA rules.			Comment noted	N/A
146	Expand market-based parking to the whole city. That will increase the competition for street parking and will need a plan for parking permit areas and parking meters. For now thrilled to see the expansion of market based parking to include frequent bus and bike facilities to promote affordable infill developments in places where it will have big impact.			Comment noted	N/A
147	This Planning program needs to consider more of the larger developments and long term growth of neighborhoods and base development on the infrastructure capacity instead of arbitrary numbers.			Comment noted	N/A
148	19' building line is a great improvement. With this, the lot becomes inherently more livable. I wonder how residents will handle a common drive.			Comment noted	N/A
149	The recommendations will reduce affordability.			Comment noted	N/A
150	Develop standard options along with Public Works to focus on effeciency instead of cutting quality.			Comment noted	N/A

151	Parking requirements should be made based on the individual area.			Comment noted	N/A
152	Not everybody has a huge vehicle. And not everyone is healthy enough to walk/bike.			Comment noted	N/A
153	Developers are potentially going to eliminate shade provided by trees.			Comment noted	N/A
154	Walkable and bikeable streets are good for mobility impaired/wheel chairs. They would give us all more choices. Fewer cars driving slower would be safer.			Comment noted	N/A
155	No more parking lots. There are empty parking spaces on and off street everywhere.			Comments noted	N/A
156	Remove height and unit count restrictions. Mandatory sidewalks with shade trees should be required.			Comments noted	No change
157	Need homes with backyard and entertainment. Stop builders from making property taxes to rise.			Comments noted	N/A
158	For MURs and Courtyard Style Developments, require the developer not use the exact same model for adjacent developments. Include all new developments to provide water quality treatment. Require developer to provide a multi-use path or plan. Require a fee for the implementation of a raised or protected pedestrian crossing. Require that developments propose tree canopy coverage equal to existing tree canopy coverage.			Comments noted	No change
159	Push for market based parking city wide to create pedestrian friendly walkable places and better land use around transit. parking is a terrible land use and reducing min. and market based parking will help walkability of our neighborhoods.			Comment noted	No change
160	Current requirements are forcing everyone to drive even if someone physically can't, cannot afford to, or prefer not to.			Comments noted	N/A
161	All the changes they are talking about increase the cost of housing in Houston, even more than it already is, and are only going to create a further shortage of housing.			Comment noted	N/A
162	Creating initiatives is necessary for the future progress of any metro-city. But your worrying about the extreme small details about making developments as efficient as possible without considering the functionality of those future development from a future homeowner or renter point of view. These recommendations are complicated for architects, engineers and developers alike that results in ultimately designing a poor functioning development from likeability and sell-ability.			Comment noted	N/A
163	Any and all changes to this ordinance should be based on the type of housing that is currently existing in that neighborhood deed restricted or not. Per Mayor Turner, multi units such as apartments are supposed to be built on certain streets in Acres Homes and not within a subdivision. I have seen a few Duplexes built in Acres Homes but feel they attract tenants that are in college and younger than residents in older established neighborhoods. They should only be built in areas close to colleges or downtown. All newly built multi units must be built gated with 1 entrance and 1 exit. All parking should be within the gates and not outside the units or anywhere on the streets. There should be no housing above the prices of existing homes nearby.			Comment noted	N/A
164	This is not what people want and it is unsafe. We are a family who walks and bikes. Having cars parked on the street is dangerous and remove the narrow lot development from the proposal			Comment noted	N/A
165	Bike trails are only open from dawn to dusk and cannot be couted as transit unless open 24 hours.			Comments noted	N/A
166	Opposed to this ordinance as it will have a negative impact on the redevelopment of the residential market inside the loop. Many of these properties have razed the old home (usually in poor condition) and replaced it with an attractive 2 townhomes with ease of parking. This proposal would require a configuration that is not supported by the limited size of the lots. This would force more cars to park on narrow streets			Comments noted	N/A

167	the large delivery vehicles do not fit on narrow driveways and guest have no room to park			Comments noted	N/A
168	The streets are always with parked cars and it is problem on trash day			Comments noted	N/A
169	Support the changes to create variety of housing options and flexibility in parking. Plan nicely fits with the findings of Livable Centers Study conducted by the Montrose TIRZ.			Comments noted	N/A
170	Streets filled with cars, congestion, unsafe for pedestrians, narrow streets with open ditches cannot handle on-street parking, disconnected sidewalks, inclement weather and extreme heat are a concern.			Comments noted	N/A
171	Strongly support. This is what Houston needs. Less concrete in front of homes, allow market to decide parking, allowing more ADU's, reducing lot size minimums, encouraging variety of homes instead of just single family homes and apartments. We need to plan for future that is not reliant on automobiles.			Comments noted	N/A
172	Revise the current parking requirements to better fit the current parking situations in the more dense neighborhoods. The current parking requirements are already very permissive, and this has caused situations in new developments where parking is grossly insufficient.			Comments noted	N/A
173	I am a big fan of providing more opportunities for "missing middle" housing to be legal in Houston, and for reducing the parking requirements overall. I really hope this is accompanied by a corresponding increase in other transit opportunities.			Comments noted	N/A
174	This is exactly what has ruined the Heights.			Comments noted	N/A
175	Houston is the ONLY major city with quality affordable housing, and that is mostly because it is easy to build and these reforms do that. I support.			Comment noted	N/A
176	The proposals will do the opposite of what their goal is and ruin the existing neighborhood fabric. We are trying to mimic failing city models while ruining the existing transport routes with bicycle lanes that are not used. Return to drawing board.			Comment noted	N/A
177	Support the LPAC recommendations. It makes sense to allow fewer parking spaces for smaller residences that are close to public transportation. There are many single occupant households and may not have two cars and not all people can drive, want to drive or can afford to drive. Vistors can park on the street. Applaud the committee members for recognizing that different types and sizes of housing are needed. The gargae front townhouse has not served us well.			Comment noted	N/A
178	40' frontage measured at ROW or building line setback?	6	42-1	Frontage is already defined and is measured along the ROW	No change
179	Remove, no thought for irregular lots or other constraints which may restrict site development	12	42-145	Comment noted	No change
180	10' B/Lfor major thoroughfare, where residential driveways are not from the major thoroughfare	13	42-150	Chapter 42 already has provisions for reduced BL along major thoroughfare when lots are backing to it.	No change
181	what if the parking is located on the side of the lot abutting the ROW but does not take access there?	18	42-153	In this case, the property is not considered fronting the major thoroughfare.	No change
182	Does this exhibit (shared driveway from a major thoroughfare) meet the near perpendicular requirement?	19	42-153	Yes it does per 42-145	No change
183	Why restrict maximum lot size for courtyard style development	26	42-181	The concept is to encourage smaller units on smaller lots.	No change
184	A 1200 sqft unit requires 2 parking spaces in courtyard style development, but only 1 parking space if traditional single-family, either primary or secondary unit. Correct the parking space rules to be standard for all dwelling types. Less than or equal to 1,000 sqft and more than 1000 sqft.	28	42-186	Based on feedback received MUR parking will be revised to units with 1000sf or less will need one parking space and more than 1000sf will need 2 spaces per unit. No changes to the parking requirement for single family residential units.	Will make the change

185	Define high frequency bus stops, high comfort bike ways and other criteria for identifying areas where no minimum parking is required	28	42-186	High frequency bus stops means the bus arrives every 15 mins and blue stops means the bus arrives every 30 mins. High comfort bike ways means the protected bike lanes	Will make the change to clarify
186	No need for multiple hard copies of documents/surveys/etc but the language should be cleaned up to needing one electronic copy.	7	42-46	A copy can also mean an electronic copy.	No change
187	How to develop corner properties without an alley?			Corner lots must take side/rear access via flag lot, shared driveway or PAE from the side street unless it is not a major thoroughfare.	Will make the change to clarify
188	How many curb cuts are allowed on mid block narrow lot if proposing duplex or second dwelling unit?			Only one curb cut of 12' maximum is allowed on mid block narrow lot.	Will make the change to clarify