Topic	Related Section(s)	No.	Item for Discussion	Explanation	Priority Level	Date Discussed
Notification Requirements	42-49; 42-83	1	Simplify notification area for applications with variances (inside City), special exceptions (inside City), and public hearings (City and ETJ) in order to improve effectiveness and accommodate for future automation within the PlatTracker application submittal program.	Notification will be done by staff. Simplify notification area to accommodate for future automation and inform property owners most affected by the development.	Immediate	01/12/17
		2	Number of days in advance of the Planning Commission meeting the notification letter for an application with variance, special exception, or public hearing should be sent to adjacent property owners to ensure adequate notice.	To provide enough time to the public so that they are informed of the proposed development in an area. Time frames for mail delivery have increased and residents have been concerned that they have not received the notification in time to make arrangements to come to the meeting or meet with their civic group about the plat or replat.	Immediate	01/12/17
		3	Notification sign removal following Planning Commission action or withdrawal of application from consideration.	No mechanism in place to remove a notification sign after an action has been taken on a proposal. To reduce blight in a neighborhood.	Immediate	01/12/17
Subdivision Name Standards	42-41	4	Eliminate complex subdivision names that result from the current subdivision naming standard for a replat requiring a public hearing.	Subdivision names can be long when including the original plat name and may not have any significance to the new development. Difficult to determine the name when several replats have been done in the area. When replatting two different sections with different names, a variance would be required for a name change.	Immediate	02/09/17
		5	Establish a clear connection between the subdivisions naming standard policy to the ordinance.	A naming standard policy exists but is not a part of the ordinance and applicants can dispute its validity.	Immediate	02/09/17
		6	Current standards do not prohibit the use of derogatory, defamatory, or vulgar words or phrases within a subdivision name.	No current standards to address use of derogatory, defamatory, or vulgar words or phrases within a subdivision name.	Immediate	02/09/17
City Planning Letter	42-1; 42-42; 42-44; 42-45	7	Current practice allows the use of a City Planning Letter in place of a title report; however, the ordinance definition of Title Report does not include the City Planning Letter.	A city planning provides the same information that a current title report does as it relates to platting City planning letters have used by policy for several years. Allowance for a city planning letter should add interchangeably in the ordinance that includes specific information to be included. City planning letters can be a more cost effective method in providing necessary platting information similar to a current title report.	Immediate	02/09/17
Park Sector Numbers	42-1	8	The number of park sectors identified in the ordinance does not match the current number of park sectors.	More park sectors have been added within the city limits and there should be a reference to them instead of the actual numbers listed in the ordinance.	Immediate	02/09/17
Time for submittal	42-53	9	The ordinance does not allow flexibility to account for holiday cycles and other unique needs for the submittal of a complete application.	This is necessary to avoid possible delays in review.	Immediate	02/09/17

Topic	Related Section(s)	No.	Item for Discussion	Explanation	Priority Level	Date Discussed
General Plans	42-50	10	There are no clear criteria for when a revised general plan must be submitted when the street pattern within a section does not match the approved general plan.	A change in street pattern may result in intersection spacing issues. Additional streets may be required per the ordinance and critical elements of connectivity maybe missed or may cause additional variance requests. Planning Commission may have granted variances based on A street network and with changed developer's plan, a second look at the GP's street network is warranted. GP should include all property under one ownership or common legal interest but sometimes property is sold by metes and bounds creating intersection spacing issues.		
		11	The ordinance is not clear on timing requirements for platting sections within a general plan. Related problems that may occur include, but are not limited to, right-of-way connectivity issues, and large unrecorded tracts.	Certain portions of GP gets sold to MUD's, schools, HCFCD, private property owners etc. that may result in losing important street connections or create unrecorded tracts or land lock tracts. Identify all adjacent property information accurately on GP like drill sites, pipelines, fee strips, unrecorded subdivisions, other adjacent proposed developments and Houston Bike Plan routes.		
		12	Non-sequential numbering of sections within a general plan may create confusion during the application review due to the lack of clear pattern or application submittal order.	Key elements of the property that need to be platted maybe missed and difficult to research. Required right-of-way per the ordinance may be missed. It can become a problem in maintaining orderly development and record-keeping if non-sequential numbering is allowed.		
Aligning Requirements	42-122	13	Certain requirements within the Infrastructure Design Manual do not align with those within the ordinance.	Avoid conflicts when designing and laying out streets and right-of-ways in the City. Certain requirements within the Infrastructure Design Manual do not align with those within C42 like requirement of TIA during platting process, approval of drainage plans by PWE prior to final plat approval, approval of final design drawings for easements prior to final plat approval and requiring 10' BL along a stub street not to be extended. Address visibility issues while granting variances with reverse curves less than 2000' along major thoroughfare.		
		14	The Major Thoroughfare and Freeway Plan (MTFP), the MTFP Policy Statement, and the MTFP Hierarchy Table were recently updated. As a result, certain requirements and standards within the ordinance do not align with the MTFP documents.	The MTFP (Major Thoroughfare and Freeway Plan) determines the right-of-way widths and travel lanes in the city for major thoroughfares, major and minor collectors and identifies freeways and highways. Principal thoroughfares, major and minor collectors need to be defined in C42 and width requirements need to be established. Recognize the need for some of these thoroughfares to be wider than 100'.		
		15	The ordinance does not clearly delineate when a MTFP amendment would be required instead of a variance request for MTFP related changes like substandard radius for major thoroughfares.	Ordinance does not provide clear guidance on when a MTFP (Major Thoroughfare and Freeway Plan) amendment would be required. As a policy a 500' buffer on either sides of the alignment is used to decide if an amendment is warranted. Evaluate the effect of changes in major thoroughfare alignment that cause reduced curve radius variances.		

Topic	Related Section(s)	No.	Item for Discussion	Explanation	Priority Level	Date Discussed
Submittal Requirements		16	Applicants are not required to provide street centerline information at the preliminary plat stage. This lack of information may lead to compliance issues that require significant design changes at the final plat approval.	The tangent and centerline radii data are not required to be shown at preliminary plat stage; however, if the plat is marked up at final plat stage it may cause delay in review or require an applicant to go back to preliminary stage to address variances. Lack of street centerline information at the preliminary plat submittal stage creates compliance issues that require significant design changes at the final plat approval.	Leadership Selection	
Street Extension	42-130; 42-134	17	Requiring a "stub street" into a fee strip owned by a governmental entity with flood control jurisdiction results in a lack of vehicular and pedestrian connectivity.	Providing the stub street will meet the ordinance requirement; however, from a practical application standpoint a street crossing the fee strip becomes a responsibility of the fee owner. This primarily occurs with pipelines, drainage/flood control channels etc.		
Intersection Spacing	42-130	18	Intersection spacing requirements create the network of street right-of-ways that forms the foundation of a region's transportation network. These standards have not been reviewed comprehensively in nearly two decades.	The requirement for intersection spacing along collector streets is vague. As result local street standards are being applied to collector streets. Due to the MTFP (Major Thoroughfare and Freeway Plan) changes in street classification and the need for collector streets to support major thoroughfares, it is time to evaluate the intersections spacing standards. The blocks in the inner City are different from the block in suburban areas and they have different needs and may require different standards.		
		19	Current methodology of measuring street intersection spacing does not clearly align with the ordinance section for General layout and arrangement of street systems.	Intersection spacing could be interpreted to mean distance between two intersections along a street. Ordinance does not clearly state that it is the overall distance between two through streets that provide connectivity and not distance between a street and a cul-de-sac or loop street. Rethink the min. and max. intersection spacing distance requirements and also add requirements for major and minor collectors. Evaluate min. intersection spacing requirements based on the street design and median opening distance. Explain the criteria used to identify affected properties while measuring intersection spacing distances.		
Right-of-way Widths	42-122	20	Streets that were dedicated prior to the current rules created right-of-ways (ROW's) that are now considered insufficient width. The current ordinance requirements have a one-size-fits-all method for widening that does not account for the history of ROW creation or the unique adjacent characteristics.	Explore new criteria for the ordinance that addresses the widening of streets that were dedicated prior to the current requirements and now considered insufficient width considering the history of ROW creation or the unique adjacent characteristics. Ordinance does not clarify when half, more than half or less than half of the dedication can be required to come from one side because of previous dedications.		
		21	The street width exception area has not been revisited since its creation.	A designation in the ordinance that identifies streets in a particular area that do not require additional widening unless the existing right-of-way is less than 50 feet. This requirement may need to be revisited taking a look at the streets criteria and strategy.		
		22	The ordinance does not reference or make a clear connect to the separately adopted "Street Width in Place Ordinance" affecting the Fourth Ward.	A clear reference is not made to the "Street Width in Place Ordinance" affecting Fourth Ward. The ordinance only references the City Ordinance No. 1999-1344 and the streets bounded by this area and thus create confusion for the applicants.		

Topic	Related Section(s)	No.	Item for Discussion	Explanation	Priority Level	Date Discussed
		23	Certain intersections require additional ROW beyond the standard designated width required by the ordinance to accommodate traffic turning movements and visibility.	There is nothing in the ordinance to address certain intersections that may require additional ROW beyond the standard designated widths to accommodate traffic turning movements and visibility issues. This brings up safety concerns and sometimes conflicts with other County's requirements. Evaluate the need to require more ROW at subdivision entrances for turn lanes.		
		24	Current practice results in the dedication of right-of-way based on the proposed use of the individual development and not a comprehensive review of the land uses along the street. As a result, a street can have a varying right-of-way width along a single segment and make it difficult to implement design standards within the Infrastructure Design Manual.	A commercial street that once was a residential street, based on the ordinance can have a varying right-of-way width of 50 and 60 feet. Projects proposing lots are required to only dedicate ½ of the width necessary to make the street ROW 50 feet wide and with reserves, area required to dedicate ½ of the necessary width to make it 60 feet. Ordinance does not provide guidance for street ROW widths for subdivisions that provide stub streets on acreage properties.		
Cul-de-sac	42-131	25	The cul-de-sac design standards have not been reviewed or revisited since 1999 and do not have a clearly understood justification to match with current development design practices.	A cul-de-sac is a street with only one outlet on one end and terminates in a vehicular turnaround on the other end. The ordinance current design references trips per day per single family residential units. Analyze if the current design is based on vehicular trips per day or public utility service and also analyze if the current design aligns with the city Infrastructure Design Manual (IDM) and other chapters in the code of ordinances.		
Points of access	42-189	26	The current standards for the maximum number of lots from one point of access have not been reviewed since 1999 and do not have a clearly understood justification with current development design practices.	The ordinance requires two points of vehicular access to a public street outside the boundaries of the subdivision when a subdivision includes more than 150 lots. Analyze if it is more a safety issue or traffic volume issue. Infill, redevelopment vs greenfield. In the City there are cul-de-sac streets that several lots take access from one point. Analyze if with new subdivisions should there be more points of access for subdivisions with no. of lots much greater than 150, like 400 or 500 lots. Evaluate if over 150 lots, the right the standard to require another point of vehicular access. Are these standards appropriate and understood with current development design practices. Even though developments with type 2 PAE's or shared driveways have more than one access points to a public street, some of them keep the secondary gates locked. This is limiting connectivity and ease of travel in practicality.	Leadership Selection	

Topic	Related Section(s)	No.	Item for Discussion	Explanation	Priority Level	Date Discussed
Curves	42-132	27	The current standards for curves along a street (commonly called "reverse curves") have not been reviewed since 1999 and do not match current design standards within the Infrastructure Design Manual and applicable county requirements.	A reverse curve is a curve along a street that is composed of two curves turning in opposite directions. Reverse curves are separated by a tangent, a straight line that allows a car to go straight before it goes into another curve. Curves have a centerline radius. The current standards have not been reviewed to match current IDM and other county requirements. IDM requirements are changing; Harris County requires certain design standards that are not currently addressed in 42, which causes conflicting requirements. Fort Bend and Montgomery counties traffic operations groups may have differing standards relative to street type and geometric requirements/guidelines.		
Alleys	42-1,120 (b) , 156 (c)	28	The ordinance has no clear design standards for alleys.	In the City, there are existing public alleys. Some single family developments located in the City developed to include lot configurations to take access from existing public alleys like those in the Heights area. There are no clear design standards for alleys even though there are defined as public rights-of-way. Evaluate the need for alleys to have centerline, radius and building line, garage building line requirements. As defined in the ordinance alley is a public or private right-of-way that is not used primarily for through traffic and that provides vehicular access to rear entrances to buildings or properties that front on an adjacent street. In the City and ETJ, suburban areas, many single family developments are built with lots that take sole access from an alley. Analyze if alley definition should expand to become a through street.		
Lot Access to Streets	42-188	29	The Major Thoroughfare and Freeway Plan (MTFP), the MTFP Policy Statement, and the MTFP Hierarchy Table were recently updated. As a result, requirements related to lot access to street need to be revisited with these changes in mind. When street classifications are added should there be ROW width and access requirements for these street types that are not covered in the ordinance. Should there be access requirements for lots taking direct access from Major Collectors?	Lots that take access from a Major Thoroughfare must meet certain criteria which include lot size, turn around, building setbacks and historically the character of the lot configuration in an area may not align with the MTFP changes. In the City, there are local streets and collectors that transition to Major Thoroughfares and the segment of the street that is a collector or local street will have a different building line requirement than the segments that transition to a Major Thoroughfare. However, the requirements related to building line needs to be revisited with these changes in mind to protect the character of neighborhoods and thinking ahead of how an area will develop over time.	Leadership Selection	
		30	Narrow lots with direct driveway access to the public street create multiple driveway connections within close proximity of each other. This removes on-street parking options and increases potential pedestrian/vehicle conflicts.	Narrow lots with direct driveway access to the public streets create multiple driveway connections within close proximity to each other. Eliminates on street parking and increase potential pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. Lot widths for certain lot configuration types with front loading garages should remain wide enough to accommodate the public space and streetscape frontage. This eliminates on street parking, options and increase potential pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. Owners end up parking in the ROW.	Leadership Selection	

Topic	Related Section(s)	No.	Item for Discussion	Explanation	Priority Level	Date Discussed
Rules governing partial replats of certain property	42-193	31	No mention of replatting Open Space and COS reserves in section. Historically, when a use is not specified in this section, to replat that reserve a variance from the section will be required.	Open Space and Compensating Open Space (COS) reserves are often always platted with single family residential lots. When there is no separately filed deed restrictions that address the replatting of these reserves and when these reserves are being replatted into other uses, a variance is required. The mention of replatting Open Space and COS reserves and additional uses may be helpful.		
Building Line Standards	42-150	32	The Major Thoroughfare and Freeway Plan (MTFP), the MTFP Policy Statement, and the MTFP Hierarchy Table were recently updated. As a result, requirements related to building line need to be revisited with these changes in mind. Building Line requirements for properties located along grade separated Freeways. Evaluate BL requirements for major and minor collectors and also, add language for grade-separated freeways vs. frontage roads.	Some older plats have platted ROW between the parcel and what is now a freeway. Evaluate the need for for properties along a local street or major thoroughfare when the parcel and the freeway are grade separated but the road from which the parcel takes access does not technically serve as a frontage road. Evaluate BL requirements for major and minor collectors and also, add language for grade-separated freeways vs. frontage roads.	Leadership Selection	
		33	Coordinate with the Walkable Places Committee on a comprehensive evaluation of the building line standards. Building Line standards should be updated to support urban, walkable places where appropriate.	Refer item to Walkable Places Committee to comprehensively evaluate building line standards in relation to Commercial, Multi-Family and Mixed use developments and coordinate outcomes with Walkable Places Committee. Evaluate building line standards as they relate to Single Family development. Develop standard pedestrian enhancement items that will be required with reduced BL variances. Consider 54” cantilevered encroachment into the BL for balconies instead of 30” currently allowed. Consider 54” cantilevered encroachment into the BL for balconies instead of 30” currently allowed.	Leadership Selection	
Visibility Triangles	42-161	34	Align visibility triangle and ROW cutback standards with the Infrastructure Design Manual and related county design standards.	Provide Consistency between County and City requirements related to cutbacks. Requiring cutbacks within the City to accommodate installation of ADA ramps and utilities. Draw a distinction between visibility triangles, cutbacks and visibility easements.		
Lot Design Standards	42-180	35	The current lot design standards have not been reviewed comprehensively in nearly two decades and may not align with current development practices and market trends.	Current lot design trends in the City are narrow lots with denser properties. Owners end up parking on the driveway blocking the sidewalks. Combination of Shared Driveway developments with 10’17’ lots remove on street parking and increase potential pedestrian/vehicle conflicts while taking advantage of high density. Infill Development in the city with plats that include 10’17’, flag lots, and shared driveways. Current standards allow multiple lots to feature a front loading driveway/garage and do not mandate access from rear or via shared driveway only. Consider shared driveway developments where the end units are not oriented to the length of the shared driveway and may cause the vehicles to back out. No clear criteria for flag lots and does not require a single driveway.		

Topic	Related Section(s)	No.	Item for Discussion	Explanation	Priority Level	Date Discussed
Compensating Open Space	42-183	36	The current compensating open space standards have not been reviewed nearly two decades and may not align with current development practices, market trends, and design best practices.	Compensating Open Space (COS) in the ordinance means one or more areas designated as common open space on a plat used to reduce the minimum lot size requirements. COS should be more accessible to all in a subdivision. A variance is required to share COS between sections. A minimum distance from all lots in a subdivision(s) should be considered when sharing COS. The requirement of COS being accessible to all residents in subdivision may not be sufficient when wanting to improve walking and biking for the public. The COS standards should be reviewed comprehensively to align with current development practices, market trends, and design best practices for the future. Need to better define the shape and location to stop adjacent property owners from fencing in the COS area. Clarify that driveway access is allowed through open space reserves only and not through landscape, or COS reserves.		
Minimum Lot Size Area	42-197; 204(b4), 204(c); 204 (c6)	37	Consider minor changes to the recently adopted amendments for the Special Minimum Lot Size designation to improve the implementation of the program.	Consider allowing MLS to be established based on the size or pattern of how the sites were built, rather than the actual lot size (e.g., calculate MLS using size of 2 lots together, if a neighborhood was built consistently with one house on 2 lots)		
Multi-Family Residential	42-231	38	The current ordinance standards for multi-family are tailored to larger developments and place an impractical set of standards on smaller developments.	Ordinance requires a multifamily development with density less than 30 units/acre to provide at least 1 private street. This section of the ordinance may create impractical development for lots of small scale multifamily projects, especially for projects which only add a garage apartment on a site with a duplex. Planning Commission has granted multiple variances to this type of projects. Performance standards for these small scale projects should be considered. Number of loading berths requirement for MF developments that cover multiple blocks should be evaluated.		
Reserve Design Standards	42-190	39	The current reserve design standards have not been reviewed comprehensively in nearly two decades and may not align with current development practices and market trends.	In the City with infill development some reserves with a smaller square footage and frontage may be more suitable for some development. Evaluate the frontage requirement of an unrestricted reserve or Commercial reserve being limited to 60 feet and the size being limited to 5,000 square feet minimum. Add criteria for the depth of the frontage for a reserve.		
Transit Corridor Development	42-401; 402, 403	40	The current standards Transit Corridor Development have been in place now for over a decade and may not align with current development practices and market trends. Coordinate with the Walkable Places Committee on a comprehensive evaluation of this item.	The current standard for Transit Corridor Development will be fully explored by the Walkable Places Committee. Consider Single Family Development along Transit Corridor Development, define pedestrian amenities and performances standards, evaluate making Transit Corridor requirements mandatory for properties along transit corridor or type A streets. Evaluate the need to incorporate requirements similar to transit corridor requirements along major streets that have potential to become more walkable and pedestrian friendly corridors.	Leadership Selection	
Ordinance Flexibility	Varies	41	Ordinance has primarily one-size-fits-all standards and does not allow adequate flexibility for large scale, unified land developments to incorporate immerging development trends and best practices.	A comprehensive view of large scale, unified land developments to incorporate immerging development trends and best practices.		

Topic	Related Section(s)	No.	Item for Discussion	Explanation	Priority Level	Date Discussed
Technical Amendments	Varies	42	Ordinance has been amended multiple times over the past two decades since it was last comprehensively rewritten. As a result, the flow of the ordinance should be considered.	Evaluate the need for all transportation related items or other types of related items be located together to provide easy access for applicants.		
		43	Revisit ordinance language to ensure it is adequate for enforcement purposes.	Review the language ordinance to ensure it is adequate for enforcement purposes.		
		44	Minor miscellaneous revisions to ordinance language to clarify intent and understanding.	Make minor revisions to the ordinance language to clarify intent and understanding		
Subdivision Layout Requirement	42-4	45	A requirement to plat, replat or amend while proposing new construction or additions to cross lot or reserve lines	A non-single family residential property owner proposing to build other than residential over lot or reserve lines would be required to replat to accurately portray property boundaries and convert lots into a reserve. The ordinance is not clear on this requirement and creates challenges during permit review.		