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## SECRETARY

Patrick Walsh, P.E.

## Meeting Policies and Regulations

## Order of Agenda

Planning Commission may alter the order of the agenda to consider variances first, followed by replats requiring a public hearing second and consent agenda last. Any contested consent item will be moved to the end of the agenda.

## Public Participation

The public is encouraged to take an active interest in matters that come before the Planning Commission. Anyone wishing to speak before the Commission may do so. The Commission has adopted the following procedural rules on public participation:

1. Anyone wishing to speak before the Commission must sign-up on a designated form located at the entrance to the Council Chamber.
2. If the speaker wishes to discuss a specific item on the agenda of the Commission, it should be noted on the sign-up form.
3. If the speaker wishes to discuss any subject not otherwise on the agenda of the Commission, time will be allowed after all agenda items have been completed and "public comments" are taken.
4. The applicant is given first opportunity to speak and is allowed two minutes for an opening presentation. The applicant is also allowed a rebuttal after all speakers have been heard; two additional minutes will be allowed.
5. Speakers will be allowed two minutes for specially called hearing items, replats with notice, variances, and special exceptions.
6. Speakers will be allowed 1 minute for all consent agenda items.
7. Time limits will not apply to elected officials.
8. No speaker is permitted to accumulate speaking time from another person.
9. Time devoted to answering any questions from the Commission is not charged against allotted speaking time.
10. The Commission reserves the right to limit speakers if it is the Commission's judgment
that an issue has been sufficiently discussed and additional speakers are repetitive.
11. The Commission reserves the right to stop speakers who are unruly or abusive.

## Limitations on the Authority of the Planning Commission

By law, the Commission is required to approve subdivision and development plats that meet the requirements of Chapter 42 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Houston. The Commission cannot exercise discretion nor can it set conditions when granting approvals that are not specifically authorized by law. If the Commission does not act upon a Sec. I agenda item within 30 days, the item is automatically approved. The Commission's authority on platting does not extend to land use. The Commission cannot disapprove a plat because it objects to the use of the property. All plats approved by the Commission are subject to compliance with applicable requirements, e.g., water, sewer, drainage, or other public agencies.

## Contacting the Planning Commission

Should you have materials or information that you would like for the Planning Commission members to have pertaining to a particular item on their agenda, contact staff at 713-837-7758. Staff can either incorporate materials within the members Agenda packets, or can forward to the members messages and information.

## Contacting the Planning Department

The Planning and Development Department is located at 611 Walker Street on the Sixth Floor. Code
Enforcement is located at 1002 Washington Street.
The Departments mailing address is:
P.O. Box 1562

Houston, Texas 77251-1562
The Departments website is: www.houstonplanning.com

E-mail us at:
Planning and Development
Suzy.Hartgrove@houstontx.gov
Plat Tracker Home Page:
www.HoustonPlatTracker.org

## Speakers Sign In Form

## Instructions:

1. So that the Commission's Chairperson can call on those wishing to address the Commission, please provide the information below. Make sure the information is legible. If you have questions about the form or a particular item while filling out this form Planning and Development Department staff members are available at the front of the room to answer any questions. Hand the completed form to a staff member prior to the meeting's Call to Order.
2. It is important to include your "position" so that the Chairperson can group the speakers by position.
3. If you are a part of an organized group of speakers and want to address the Commission in a particular order please let a staff member know prior to the beginning of the meeting.
4. The Chairperson will call each speaker's name when it is his or her turn to speak. The Chairperson will also call out the speaker to follow.
5. As the called speaker you should move forward to the podium, state your name for the record, and then deliver your comments.
6. If you have materials to distribute to the Commission hand them to a staff member at the beginning of your presentation. Staff will distribute the information to Commission members on both sides of the table as you begin your comments.
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# Houston Planning Commission Agenda 

## October 16, 2014

Meeting to be held in Council Chamber, City Hall Annex 2:30 p.m.

## Call to Order

## Director's Report

- Approval of the October 2, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
I. Platting Activity (Subdivision and Development plats)
a. Consent Subdivision Plats (Christa Stoneham)
b. Replats (Christa Stoneham)
c. Replats requiring Public Hearings with Notification (Dorianne Powe-Phlegm, Teresa Geisheker, Marlon Connley and Aracely Rodriguez)
d. Subdivision Plats with Variance Requests (Dipti Mathur, Mikalla Hodges, Muxian Fang, Aracely Rodriguez and Marlon Conley)
e. Subdivision Plats with Special Exception Requests (Mikalla Hodges)
f. Reconsiderations of Requirement (Mikalla Hodges and Ryan Medlen)
g. Extension of Approvals (Ryan Medlen)
h. Name Changes (Ryan Medlen)
i. Certificates of Compliance (Ryan Medlen)
j. Administrative
k. Development Plats with Variance Requests (Kimberly Bowie and Ryan Medlen)
II. Establish a public hearing date of November 13, 2014
a. Amended Golfcrest Addition partial replat no 2
b. Craig Woods partial replat no 14
c. Museum Terrace replat no 2
d. Riverside Terrace Sec 6 partial replat no 1
e. Riverside Terrace Sec 7 partial replat no 1
f. Riverside Terrace Sec 12 partial replat no 1
g. West Houston partial replat no 2
h. Westmoreland Farms Amended First partial replat no 2
III. Consideration of an Off-Street Parking Variance for a property located at $\mathbf{3 2 1 7}$ Montrose Avenue (Kimberly Bowie)
IV. Consideration of an Off-Street Parking Variance for a property located at $\mathbf{6 8 0 4}$ MLK Blvd (Kimberly Bowie)
V. Consideration of a Hotel Motel Variance for an Aloft Hotel located at 1201 Houston Chronicle Boulevard (Marlon Connley)
VI. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Special Minimum Lot Size Area Application for Allen AC Subdivision (Misty Staunton)
VII. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Special Minimum Lot Size Area Application for Glen Cove Sections 2 and 3 Subdivision (Misty Staunton)
VIII. Consideration of an Appeal of the Decision of the Houston Archaeological and Historical Commission on September 25, 2014 for a Certificate of Appropriateness for:
a. 1201 Rutland Street - Houston Heights Historic District West (Delaney Harris-Finch)
b. 1205 Rutland Street - Houston Heights Historic District West (Delaney Harris-Finch)
c. 1207 Rutland Street - Houston Heights Historic District West (Delaney Harris-Finch)
d. 409 Harvard Street - Houston Heights Historic District South (Diana DuCroz)
e. 544 Harvard Street - Houston Heights Historic District South (Diana DuCroz)
f. 528 Highland Street - Woodland Heights Historic District (Diana DuCroz)
IX. Please excuse the absence of Commissioner Bohan.
X. Public Comment
XI. Adjournment


## Minutes of the Houston Planning Commission

(A CD/DVD of the full proceedings is on file in the Planning and Development Department)
October 2, 2014
Meeting to be held in
Council Chambers, Public Level, City Hall Annex
2:30 p.m.

## Call to order:

Chair, Mark Kilkenny called the meeting to order at 2:42 p.m. with a quorum present.
Mark A. Kilkenny, Chair
M. Sonny Garza

Susan Alleman
Keiji Asakura
Fernando Brave
Kenneth Bohan
Antoine Bryant
Lisa Clark
Truman C. Edminster III
James R. Jard
Paul R. Nelson
Linda Porras-Pirtle
Algenita Davis
Mike Sikes
Martha Stein
Eileen Subinsky
Blake Tartt III
Absent
Shaukat Zakaria
Mark Mooney for Absent
James Noack
Clay Forister for Absent
The Honorable Grady Prestage
Raymond Anderson for
The Honorable Ed Emmett
EXOFFICIO MEMBERS
Carol A. Lewis
Daniel W. Krueger, P.E.

## DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's Report was given by Patrick Walsh, Director, Planning and Development Department.

## APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Commission action: Approved the September 19, 2014 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Motion: Clark Second: Subinsky Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## I. PLATTING ACTIVITY (Consent items A and B, 1-123)

Item 70 was changed from approve to defer for Chapter 42 planning standards. Item 77 was changed from approve to defer for further study and review. Items removed for separate consideration: 31, 45, $52,65,70,71,72,79$, and 80.

Staff recommendation: Approve staff's recommendations for items $\mathbf{1} \mathbf{- 1 2 3}$ subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Approved staff's recommendations for items $1 \mathbf{- 1 2 3}$ subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Garza Second: Sikes Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
Commissioners Edminster, Porras-Pirtle, and Sikes abstained and left the room.
Staff recommendation: Approve staff's recommendation to approve items 31, 45, 52, 65, 70, 71, 72, 79, and 80 subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Approved staff's recommendation to approve items 31, 45, 52, 65, 70, 71, 72, 79, and 80 subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Subinsky Second: Clark Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## Commissioners Edminster, Porras-Pirtle, and Sikes returned.

## C PUBLIC HEARINGS

124 Alys Park
C3N
Approve
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance to allow a shared driveway to extend longer than 200 feet subject to the paving section of all public right of ways or 20 feet and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variance and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Edminster Second: Zakaria Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None Speakers for item 124: Antonio Bove, Richard Humphreys, Brook Ingraham, and Laury Adamssupportive; Richard Smith, City Engineer, City of Houston Public Works and Engineering Department

## 125 Amended Plat of Almeda Place partial replat C3N Approve no 4

Staff recommendation: Approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions. Commission action: Approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Jard Second: Edminster Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
126 Braeswood partial replat no 2 C3N Defer
Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks for Chapter 42 planning standards.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks for Chapter 42 planning standards. Motion: Garza Second: Clark Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

127 Craig Woods partial replat no 12
Approve
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variance and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Porras-Pirtle Second: Sikes Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## 128 Grand Lismar Estates

## C3N Disapprove

Staff recommendation: Disapprove the plat.
Commission action: Disapproved the plat.
Motion: Asakura Second: Davis Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
129 Hilldale partial replat no 1
C3N
Approve
Staff recommendation: Approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Motion: Garza Second: Subinsky Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
130 Hyde Park partial replat no 3
C3N
Approve
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variance and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Jard Second: Garza Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None Speakers for item 130: Mary Lou Henry, applicant , Stephen Zimmerman and Natassia McMillian supportive

## 131 Melody Oaks partial replat no 12 C3N Defer

Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks at the applicant's request.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks at the applicant's request.
Motion: Clark Second: Davis Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## D VARIANCES

132 Alexandra Grove
C3P
Approve
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variances and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variances and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Garza Second: Asakura Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
133 Aliana Sec 35
C3P
Defer
Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks per the applicant's request.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks per the applicant's request.
Motion: Forister Second: Clark Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

134 Ansleigh Park
C2R
Defer
Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks per the applicant's request.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks per the applicant's request.
Motion: Davis Second: Nelson Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks per the applicant's request.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks per the applicant's request.
Motion: Garza Second: Davis Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
Speaker for item 136: Reginald E. McKamie - opposed

## 137 CST Store Beechnut

C2
Approve
Staff recommendation: Approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions. Motion: Foriester Second: Edminster Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## 138 Dell Court Townhomes <br> C2R <br> Defer

Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks to allow time for Legal review of deed restrictions.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks to allow time for Legal review of deed restrictions.

Motion: Clark Second: Edminster Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
Items 139, 140, 141, and 142 were taken together at this time.

| 139 | Hayden Lakes GP | GP | Approve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 140 | Hayden Lakes Sec 7 | C3P | Approve |
| 141 | Hayden Lakes Sec 8 | C3P | Approve |
| 142 | Hayden Lakes Sec 9 | C3P | Approve |

Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variances and approve the general plan and the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variances and approved the general plan and the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Clark Second: Garza Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## 143 Houston Heights Swift Replat C2R Approve

Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks to allow time for additional information. Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks to allow time for additional information. Motion: Edminster Second: Asakura Vote: Carries Abstaining: Sikes

## 144 Koehlers $1^{\text {st }}$ Addition partial replat no 2

C2R
Approve
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance for a 5' BL along Eli Avenue and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variance for a 5' BL along Eli Avenue and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Porras-Pirtle Second: Edminster Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
145 Lakin Park Villas
C2R
Approve
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variance and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Garza Second: Asakura Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## Commissioner Edminster abstained and left the room.

## 146 McKenzie Park Reserve

C2
Approve
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variance and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Davis Second: Anderson Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
Commissioner Edminster returned.

## 147 North Post Oak Terrace

C2
Approve
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variance and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Subinsky Second: Sikes Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## 148 Saudi Arabia Royal Consulate

C2R
Defer
Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks per the applicant's request.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks per the applicant's request.
Motion: Garza Second: Clark Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
149 Southwest Wire Rope
C2R
Defer
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Defer the plat for two weeks for further study and review.
Motion: Jard Second: Brave Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
Speakers for item 149: Neil Atkinson- no position stated; Susan Lawson and Harry Lawson -
opposed
150 Uptown North C2R Withdrawn
151 Villages of Cypress Lakes GP
GP
Approve
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance and approve the general subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variance and approved the general plan subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Clark Second: Anderson Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## 152 Woodmill Creek Sec 1

## C3P

Defer

Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks per the applicant's request.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks per the applicant's request.
Motion: Nelson Second: Jard Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

153 Yard Depot FM 529
C2
Approve
Staff recommendation: Approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Motion: Clark
Vote: Unanimous

Abstaining: None

Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variance and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Motion: Davis Second: Edminster Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

155 Reserves at FM 529 and Kentwick
C3P
Defer
Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks to allow time for additional information.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks to allow time for additional information. Motion: Porras-Pirtle Second: Sikes Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## F RECONSIDERATION OF REQUIREMENTS

156 Aliana Sec 38 C3P Defer
Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks for Chapter 42 planning standards.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks for Chapter 42 planning standards.
Motion: Forister
Second: Davis
Vote: Unanimous
Abstaining: None

Items 157 and 158 were taken together at this time.

| 157 | Ashley Pointe Sec 8 | C3R | Approve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 158 | Ashley Pointe Sec 12 | C3R | Approve |

Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variances and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variances and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Davis Second: Stein Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
159 GR Business Plaza
C2R
Approve
Staff recommendation: Grant the requested variance and approve the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.
Commission action: Granted the requested variance and approved the plat subject to the CPC 101 form conditions.

Motion: Garza Second: Clark Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
Commissioner Edminster abstained and left the room.
160 Houston Kenswick Trade Center C2R Approve
Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks for drainage plan requirements.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks for drainage plan requirements.
Motion: Jard Second: Zakaria Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
Commissioner Edminster returned.
Items 161 and 162 were taken together at this time.

Commission action: Deferred the general plan and the plat for two weeks for further study and review.
Motion: Zakaria Second: Edminster Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

Items G, H, and I are taken together at this time.

## G EXTENSIONS OF APPROVAL

163 Aldine Western Road Street Dedication Sec 1 EOA
164 Bangladesh American Center EOA
165 Central Park West Sec 4 EOA
166 Ella Boulevard Street Dedication Sec 1
167 Gault Road Acres
168 Hardy Center South
169 Irish Pub Kenneallys
170 Josey Ranch Road at Central Creek Drive Street Dedication

## H NAME CHANGES

## 171 Colquitt Court Sec 2 partial replat replat 1 NC Approve

 (prev. Colquitt Court partial replat no 1)I CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE

| 172 | 19871 N. Plantation Estates | COC | Approve |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 173 | 1715 Northpark Drive | COC | Approve |

Staff recommendation: Approve staff's recommendation for items 163-173.
Commission action: Approved staff's recommendation for items 163-713.
Motion: Subinsky Second: Garza Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## J ADMINISTRATIVE NONE

## K DEVELOPMENT PLATS WITH VARIANCE REQUESTS

174402 W 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street DPV Approve
Staff recommendation: Approve the development plat, with the requested 6' BL along Ashland Street.
Commission action: Approved the development plat, with the requested 6' BL along Ashland Street.
Motion: Zakaria Second: Edminster Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

Staff recommendation: Approve the development plat, with a 15 ' building line along Buffalo Speedway and to allow reuse of the existing curb cut along Buffalo Speedway to provide vehicular access to the lot but only if a turnaround is provided on-site without creating a second curb cut along Buffalo Speedway and approve the plat.
Commission action: Approved the development plat, with a 15' building line along Buffalo Speedway and to allow reuse of the existing curb cut along Buffalo Speedway to provide vehicular access to the lot but only if a turnaround is provided on-site without creating a second curb cut along Buffalo Speedway and approved the plat.

Motion: Edminster Second: Clark Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None Speaker for item 175: Marvel Wimbley, applicant

## 1761700 Haver Street

DPV
Approve
Staff recommendation: Approve the development plat with a staggered building line along Windsor Street of 5', a distance of approximately 31-11" along Windsor Street starting at the southwest corner and set back to 15 ' along the remaining portion of the lot to help preserve an existing 100 yr substantial oak tree along with the following conditions:

1) Submit an approved tree preservation plan with any site work plan and building plans
2) The owner/builder must receive approval from the Urban Forester prior to cutting any of the tree limbs.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks.
Motion: Edminster Second: Jard Vote: Carries Abstaining: None Opposed: Subinsky
Speakers for item 176: Zeeba Paksima, and Trevor Jefferies - supportive; June Spencer, M.C.
Swearingen, Olive Hershey, Ursula Edwards, Shelia Millar, and Mark Romanchoch - opposed
II. ESTABLISH A PUBLIC HEARING DATE OF OCTOBER 30, 2014 for:
a. Brookhaven partial replat no 1
b. Craig Woods partial replat no 13
c. Kings Crossing Sec 9 replat no 1
d. Riverwood at Oakhurst Sec 4 partial replat no 1
e. Sage partial replat no 3
f. Silver Grove
g. Tanglewood Sec 12 partial replat no 2
h. Woodland Acres partial replat no 1

Staff recommendation: Establish a public hearing date of October 30, 2014 for items II a-h. Commission action: Established a public hearing date of October 30, 2014 for items II a-h. Motion: Sikes Second: Garza Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

## III. CONSIDERATION OF AN OFF-STREET PARKING VARIANCE FOR A PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3217 MONTROSE AVENUE

Staff recommendation: Defer the development plat for two weeks to allow time for further study and review of the existing site conditions and to confirm the number of parking spaces that can be provided on site.
Commission action: Deferred the development plat for two weeks to allow time for further study and review of the existing site conditions and to confirm the number of parking spaces that can be provided on site.

Motion: Jard Second: Edminster Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
Speaker for item III: Nelli Nikova - opposed

## IV. CONSIDERATION OF AN OFF-STREET PARKING VARIANCE FOR A PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6804 MLK BLVD

Staff recommendation: Defer the plat for two weeks to allow time for further study and review of the supporting data for the studies performed on existing sites to calculate the proposed parking reduction and the proposed parking layout.
Commission action: Deferred the plat for two weeks to allow time for further study and review of the supporting data for the studies performed on existing sites to calculate the proposed parking reduction and the proposed parking layout.

Motion: Garza Second: Edminster Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
Speaker for IV: Lynn Conner - supportive
Item 70-Town Lake Parkway Sec 1 was reopened and reconsidered at this time with the Commission approving staff's recommendation to approve the plat. Motion: Zakaria Second: Clark Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
V. CONSIDERATION FOR THE DESIGNATION OF A SPECIAL PARKING AREA FOR THE MENIL COLLECTION AND CAMPUS
Motion: Garza Second: Nelson Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
VI. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A SPECIAL MINIMUM LOT SIZE AREA APPLICATION FOR GLENCOVE SECTIONS 2 \& 3 SUBDIVISION
Staff recommendation: Deferred the application for two weeks for further study and review. Commission action: Deferred the application for two weeks for further study and review. Motion: Zakaria Second:Edminster Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
VII. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A SPECIAL MINIMUM LOT SIZE AREA APPLICATION FOR LINDALE SECTIONS 3 AND 5 SUBDIVISION
Staff recommendation: Approve the consideration of a special minimum lot size area application for Lindale Sections 3 and 5 subdivision and forward to City Council.
Commission action: Approved the consideration of a special minimum lot size area application for Lindale Sections 3 and 5 subdivision and forwarded to City Council. Motion: Subinsky Second: Sikes Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None Speakers for item VII: Mike Bowlin, Gwen Guidy, and Kathleen Gutierrez - supportive
VIII. CONSIDERATION OF AN APPEAL OF THE DECISION OF THE HOUSTON ARCHEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL COMMISSION ON AUGUST 28, 2014 FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR 521 Euclid Street-Woodland Heights Historic District
Staff recommendation: None
Commission action: Upheld the decision of the Houston Archeological and Historical Commission to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for 521 Euclid Street- Woodland Heights Historic District Motion: Garza Second: Jard Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None
Speaker for item VIII- Robert Garner and Nathan Kopeky - supportiv

## IX. PUBLIC COMMENT <br> NONE

## X. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business brought before the Vice Chair, Sonny Garza adjourned the meeting at 6:17 p.m. Motion: Sikes Second: Subinsky Vote: Unanimous Abstaining: None

Mark Kilkenny, Chair
Patrick Walsh, Secretary

| Item | App |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Subdivision Plat Name | Type |

## A-Consent

| 1 | Alaniz Plaza | C2 | DEF1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Alexan Main Street | C2 |  |
| 3 | Amended Plat of Almeda Place partial replat no 4 | C3F |  |
| 4 | Arbor Trails Sec 2 | C3P |  |
| 5 | Atascocita Forest Sec 26 | C3P |  |
| 6 | Atascocita Volunteer Fire Department | C2 |  |
| 7 | Azalea District Sec 2 | C3P |  |
| 8 | Azalea District Sec 3 | C3P |  |
| 9 | Balmoral GP | GP |  |
| 10 | Bammel Green Plaza | C2 |  |
| 11 | Basgh Plaza | C2 | DEF1 |
| 12 | Bauer Landing Sec 2 | C3F |  |
| 13 | Bountiful Beauty | C3F | DEF1 |
| 14 | Brenwood Manor Town Homes | C3F |  |
| 15 | Bridgeland Josey Ranch Road and Hidden Pass Drive Street Dedication | SP |  |
| 16 | Castle Royal Drive at Cave Creek Drive Street Dedication | SP |  |
| 17 | Center Square Lofts | C2 | DEF2 |
| 18 | Cinco Trace Drive Street Dedication Sec 1 | SP | DEF1 |
| 19 | Commerce Court | C2 | DEF1 |
| 20 | Contemporary Main Plaza partial replat no 1 | C3F |  |
| 21 | Contemporary Main Plaza partial replat no 2 | C3F |  |
| 22 | Cottage Grove Green GP | GP |  |
| 23 | Craig Woods partial replat no 12 | C3F |  |
| 24 | El Dorado Clear Lake City Sec 2 | C3F |  |
| 25 | El Dorado Clear Lake City Sec 3 | C3F | DEF2 |
| 26 | Fallbrook Church North Addition | C3P |  |
| 27 | Fieldstone Sec 10 | C3F | DEF2 |
| 28 | Fieldstone Sec 11 | C3F | DEF2 |
| 29 | Fisher Street Townhomes | C3F |  |
| 30 | Forest Village Sec 8 | C3P |  |
| 31 | Glenbrook Sec 1 | C2 | DEF2 |
| 32 | Goodman Homesite | C1 |  |
| 33 | Grace Covenant Baptist Church | C 2 |  |
| 34 | Grand Vista Water Plant | C2 | DEF1 |
| 35 | Grand Vista Sec 7 | C3F | DEF1 |
| 36 | Grand Vista Sec 9 | C3F | DEF1 |
| 37 | Grant Meadows Sec 5 | C3F |  |
| 38 | Harris County ESD no 48 Station no 5 | C2 |  |
| 39 | Harris County MUD no 433 Water Plant no 2 | C 2 |  |
| 40 | Harvest Green Sec 1 | C3F |  |
| 41 | Harvest Green Sec 2 | C3F |  |
| 42 | Harvest Green Sec 3 | C3F |  |


| Item <br> No. | Subdivision Plat Name | App <br> Type | Deferral |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 43 | Harvest Green Sec 4 | C3F |  |
| 44 | Harvest Green Sec 5 | C3F |  |
| 45 | Hidden Arbor | C3F | DEF2 |
| 46 | Hilcrest partial replat no 1 | C3F |  |
| 47 | Hilldale partial replat no 1 | C3F |  |
| 48 | 110 Bella Terra | C3F |  |
| 49 | Inway Oaks Estates Sec 2 | C3F |  |
| 50 | Live Oak Landing | C3F | DEF1 |
| 51 | LMF Retail Sec 2 | C2 |  |
| 52 | Long Meadow Farms Water Plant Site no 3 | C3F |  |
| 53 | Mayfair at Clarkson | C3P |  |
| 54 | Melody Oaks partial replat no 9 and extension | C3F |  |
| 55 | Mittlesteadt Estates | C3F | DEF1 |
| 56 | Northgrove Sec 5 | C3F |  |
| 57 | Owens Road Street Dedication and Reserves | C3P |  |
| 58 | Peachtree Plaza | C2 |  |
| 59 | Raintree Village Sec 10 | C3P |  |
| 60 | Raintree Village Sec 11 | C3P |  |
| 61 | Raintree Village Sec 12 | C3P |  |
| 62 | Retreat on Bingle GP | GP |  |
| 63 | Saman Business Plaza | C2 |  |
| 64 | Sams Club Valley Ranch | C2 |  |
| 65 | Scarsdale Vision | C2 |  |
| 66 | Shadow Creek South Sec 2 partial replat no 1 | C3F |  |
| 67 | Shadow Creek South Sec 2 partial replat no 2 | C3F |  |
| 68 | Southampton Place partial replat no 2 | C3F |  |
| 69 | Spring Pine Forest Drive Street Dedication Sec 1 | SP |  |
| 70 | Summer Creek Baptist Church Campus of Woodridge Baptist Church | C2 |  |
| 71 | Sunset Ridge Sec 6 | C3P |  |
| 72 | Temple Terrace partial replat no 2 | C3F |  |
| 73 | Texas Advanced Manufacturing Solutions | C3F |  |
| 74 | Towne Lake Central GP | GP |  |
| 75 | Towne Lake Sec 34 | C3P |  |
| 76 | Towne Lake Sec 41 | C3P |  |
| 77 | Village at Carballo | C2 |  |
| 78 | Village at Spring Branch | C3F |  |
| 79 | Waterford Trails Sec 1 | C2 | DEF1 |
| 80 | West Airport Boulevard Street Dedication Sec 1 | C3F | DEF2 |
| 81 | Westheimer Estates partial replat no 4 | C3F | DEF1 |
| 82 | Woodlands Creekside Park West Sec 35 | C3P |  |
| 83 | Woodlands Creekside Park West Sec 36 | C3P |  |
| 84 | Woodridge Forest GP | GP |  |
| 85 | Woodridge Forest Sec 9 | C3F | DEF1 |

## B-Replats

Item
App
No.
Subdivision Plat Name
Type

| 86 | Aetna at Interwood | C2R |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 87 | Alfano Street Lots | C2R | DEF1 |
| 88 | Apache Multipurpose Campus Sec 2 | C3R |  |
| 89 | Carnegie Homes on Lillian Street | C2R |  |
| 90 | Carnegie Homes on West Bell Street | C2R |  |
| 91 | Central Houston Nissan | C2R |  |
| 92 | Chateaux at the Ovid | C2R |  |
| 93 | City View Lofts at West 18th | C2R |  |
| 94 | Evanelica Apostles Reserve on Ashford Point | C3R |  |
| 95 | First Urban | C2R | DEF1 |
| 96 | Fisher Estates at Yale | C2R |  |
| 97 | Floyd Street Estates | C2R |  |
| 98 | Grand Crossing replat no 1 partial replat no 1 | C3R | DEF1 |
| 99 | Hardy Northgate Crossing | C2R |  |
| 100 | Hudson Plaza | C2R |  |
| 101 | Hutchison Properties | C2R |  |
| 102 | Kasel Estates on Dorothy | C2R |  |
| 103 | Koehlers 1st addition partial replat no 3 | C2R |  |
| 104 | Lofts at Bauman Road | C2R |  |
| 105 | Lovejoy Townsite | C2R |  |
| 106 | Mangat Rampur Village Sec 1 | C3R | DEF1 |
| 107 | North Houston Gardens no 2 partial replat no 1 | C2R |  |
| 108 | Northpark Central Annex | C2R |  |
| 109 | Olde Good Things | C2R | DEF1 |
| 110 | Ovid Court | C2R |  |
| 111 | Parmer Properties | C2R |  |
| 112 | Pathfinder Park Sec 1 replat no 1 and extension | C2R |  |
| 113 | Paulette Place | C2R |  |
| 114 | Pro Vision Inc replat no 1 | C2R |  |
| 115 | Prologis at Intercontinental Airport | C2R |  |
| 116 | Rayford Road Crossing replat no 1 | C2R |  |
| 117 | Shadyvilla Pointe | C3R |  |
| 118 | Studiospace replat no 1 | C2R |  |
| 119 | Trails on Kansas Street | C2R |  |
| 120 | UKK Hospitality LLC | C2R |  |
| 121 | Verizon Summerbrook | C2R | DEF1 |
| 122 | Village at La Mirages | C2R |  |
| 123 | Village at the Bryan Heights | C2R |  |
| 124 | West 17th Street Views | C2R |  |
| 125 | West Bell Avenue Views | C2R |  |
| 126 | Woodhead Street Views | C2R |  |
| 127 | Zander Enclave | C2R |  |

## Item <br> App

No.
Subdivision Plat Name
Type

C-Public Hearings Requiring Notification

| 128 | Braeswood partial replat no 2 | C3N | DEF1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 129 | Carolina Place partial replat no 1 | C3N |  |
| 130 | Hyde Park Court Addition partial replat no 1 | C3N |  |
| 131 | Interfield Business Park | C3N |  |
| 132 | Little White Oak Park | C3N |  |
| 133 | Melody Oaks partial replat no 12 | C3N | DEF1 |
| 134 | Richmond Square | C3N |  |
| 135 | Shady Acres Extension no 3 partial replat no 1 | C3N |  |
| 136 | Whispering Pines Estates partial replat no 6 replat no 1 | C3N |  |

## D-Variances

| 137 | Aliana Sec 35 | C3P | DEF2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 138 | Ansleigh Park | C2R | DEF2 |
| 139 | Briar Pointe GP | GP | DEF1 |
| 140 | Cultural Collision Center | C2R |  |
| 141 | Dell Court Townhomes | C2R | DEF1 |
| 142 | Eldridge Forty Six | C2 |  |
| 143 | Enclave at Cypress Run GP | GP |  |
| 144 | Houston Heights Swift Replat | C2R | DEF1 |
| 145 | Live Oak Terrace | C 2 |  |
| 146 | Saudi Arabia Royal Consulate | C2R | DEF1 |
| 147 | Southwest Wire Rope | C2R | DEF2 |
| 148 | Springwoods Village District Sec 2 | C2 |  |
| 149 | Towne Lake Sec 35 | C3P |  |
| 150 | Woodmill Creek Sec 1 | C3P | DEF1 |

## E-Special Exceptions

151 Reserves at FM 529 and Kentwick C3P DEF2

## F-Reconsideration of Requirements

| 152 | Alden Woods Sec 1 | C3F |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 153 | Aliana Sec 38 | C3P | DEF1 |
| 154 | Houston Kenswick Trade Center | C2R | DEF1 |
| 155 | Jackrabbit Office LLC GP | GP | DEF1 |
| 156 | Jackrabbit Office LLC Sec 1 | C2 | DEF1 |
| 157 | Manors on Oakley Street | C2R |  |
| 158 | Samantha Fitness Center | C2R |  |

## G-Extensions of Approval

159 Bridgeland Hidden Creek Sec 20 EOA

| Platting Summary | ng Summary Houston Planning Commission | PC Date: October 16 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item |  | App |  |
| No. | Subdivision Plat Name | Type | Deferral |
| 160 | Bridgeland Hidden Creek Sec 23 | EOA |  |
| 161 | Cypresswood at Town Center | EOA |  |
| 162 | Family Life Assembly of God | EOA |  |
| 163 | First Baptist Church of the Woodlands | EOA |  |
| 164 | FM 529 Center | EOA |  |
| 165 | Greatlands Circle K | EOA |  |
| 166 | Hardy Center North | EOA |  |
| 167 | Harris County Emergency Services District No 16 Station 8 | EOA |  |
| 168 | HCMUD No 406 Detention Pond No 3 | EOA |  |
| 169 | Mason Grand | EOA |  |
| 170 | Menil Drawing Institute | EOA |  |
| 171 | New Life Baptist Church of Houston | EOA |  |

## H-Name Changes

None

I-Certification of Compliance

| 172 | 24606 Butterfly Lane | COC |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 173 | 21695 Dogwood Drive | COC |

## J-Administrative

None
K-Development Plats with Variance Requests

| 174 | 1700 Haver Street | DPV |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 175 | 1043 West 7 th $1 / 2$ Street | DPV |
| 176 | 2124 White Oak Drive | DPV |
| 177 | 4515 Yale Street | DPV |


|  |  |  |  | Location |  |  | Plat Data |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Item |  | App | App |  | Cityl | Key | Plat | Rsv |  |
| No. | Subdivision Plat Name | No. | Type | Co | ETJ | Map | Ac | Ac | Lots |

Customer

|  | Applicant's |
| :---: | :---: |
| Developer | Company |

## A-Consent

| 1 | Alaniz Plaza (DEF1) | 2014-2122 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | 419Q | 4.39 | 4.39 | 0 | South Texas <br> Surveying <br> Associates, Inc | South Texas Surveying Associates, Inc. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Alexan Main Street | 2014-2370 | C2 | Harris | City | 493P | 1.45 | 1.45 | 0 | Howard Smith Company | Windrose Land Services, Inc. |
| 3 | Amended Plat of Almeda Place partial replat no 4 | 2014-2479 | C3F | Harris | City | 493X | 0.30 | 0.00 | 8 | Cabe Builders | MOMENTUM EGINEERNG |
| 4 | Arbor Trails Sec 2 | 2014-2453 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 333G | 6.35 | 0.00 | 37 | L\&E Boettcher Family Partnership | Van De Wiele \& Vogler, Inc. |
| 5 | Atascocita Forest Sec 26 | 2014-2482 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 376H | 12.28 | 1.10 | 57 | Woodmere Development Co., Ltd | Robert Doley, Planner |
| 6 | Atascocita Volunteer Fire Department | 2014-2447 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | $337 Z$ | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0 | Joiner Architects | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 7 | Azalea District Sec 2 | 2014-2428 | C3P | Montgo mery | ETJ | 296A | 25.40 | 0.00 | 113 | Sig-Valley | Hovis Surveying Company Inc. |
| 8 | Azalea District Sec 3 | 2014-2431 | C3P | Montgo mery | ETJ | 296A | 17.40 | 0.28 | 81 | Sig-Valley Ranch, Ltd. | Hovis Surveying Company Inc. |
| 9 | Balmoral GP | 2014-2471 | GP | Harris | ETJ | 376R | 1037.50 | 0.00 | 0 | Land Tejas Park Lakes 1023, L.P. | Jones \& Carter, Inc. - The Woodlands |
| 10 | Bammel Green Plaza | 2014-2410 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | 371A | 1.54 | 1.54 | 0 | Jean McKinley Company | Jean McKinley Company |
| 11 | Basgh Plaza (DEF1) | 2014-2293 | C2 | Fort Bend | ETJ | 527 T | 3.55 | 3.55 | 0 | BANGLADESHAMERICAN SOCIETY OF GREATER HOUSTON | MAK Design |
| 12 | Bauer Landing Sec 2 | 2014-2475 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | 285P | 29.56 | 0.18 | 92 | LGI Homes | Pape-Dawson Engineers |
| 13 | Bountiful Beauty <br> (DEF1) | 2014-2082 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | 283E | 35.24 | 1.84 | 16 | KING'S LAND SURVEYING SOLUTIONS, LLC | KING'S LAND SURVEYING SOLUTIONS, LLC |
| 14 | Brenwood Manor Town Homes | 2014-2403 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | 407X | 10.90 | 4.81 | 74 | Brenwood Estates, Ltd. | R.G. Miller Engineers |
| 15 | Bridgeland Josey Ranch Road and Hidden Pass Drive Street Dedication | 2014-2443 | SP | Harris | ETJ | 366P | 4.19 | 0.00 | 0 | Bridgeland Development, LP | Brown \& Gay Engineers, Inc. |
| 16 | Castle Royal Drive at Cave Creek Drive Street Dedication | 2014-2510 | SP | Harris | ETJ | 376V | 1.23 | 0.00 | 0 | LAND TEJAS PARK LAKES 1023, L.P. | Benchmark Engineering Corp. |
| 17 | Center Square Lofts (DEF2) | 2014-2220 | C2 | Harris | City | 492G | 0.46 | 0.00 | 14 | Design3 | Field Data Srvice, Inc |
| 18 | Cinco Trace Drive Street Dedication Sec <br> 1 (DEF1) | 2014-2278 | SP | Fort Bend | ETJ | 484N | 5.08 | 0.00 | 0 | Nash Cinco NW, LLC | Brown \& Gay Engineers, Inc. |
| 19 | Commerce Court (DEF1) | 2014-2285 | C2 | Harris | City | 494N | 2.15 | 0.23 | 36 | Perry Homes | RVi Planning + Landscape Architecture |
| 20 | Contemporary Main Plaza partial replat no 1 | 2014-2255 | C3F | Harris | City | 532W | 12.27 | 3.37 | 179 | Main St. Investment Corp. | Manley Engineering and Associates Inc |


| Item <br> No. | Subdivision Plat Name | $\begin{aligned} & \text { App } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | App <br> Type | Location |  |  | Plat Data |  |  | Customer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Co | Cityl ETJ | Key <br> Map | Plat <br> Ac | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Rsv } \\ \mathrm{Ac} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Lots | Developer | Applicant's Company |
| 21 | Contemporary Main Plaza partial replat no 2 | 2014-2256 | C3F | Harris | City | 532W | 1.01 | 0.11 | 17 | Main St. Investment Corp. | Manley Engineering and Associates Inc |
| 22 | Cottage Grove Green GP | 2014-2456 | GP | Harris | City | 492B | 24.77 | 0.00 | 0 | Belt Line Partners, LP | Windrose Land Services, Inc. |
| 23 | Craig Woods partial replat no 12 | 2014-2441 | C3F | Harris | City | 451X | 0.29 | 0.02 | 3 | Houston Pars Properties | Bates Development Consultants |
| 24 | El Dorado Clear Lake City Sec 2 | 2014-2238 | C3F | Harris | City | 578T | 25.70 | 25.24 | 40 | JEN Texas IV, LLC | LJA Engineering, Inc.(West Houston Office) |
| 25 | El Dorado Clear Lake City Sec 3 (DEF2) | 2014-2241 | C3F | Harris | City | 578T | 17.82 | 8.29 | 46 | JEN Texas IV, LLC | LJA Engineering, Inc.(West Houston Office) |
| 26 | Fallbrook Church North Addition | 2014-2418 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 371C | 24.83 | 22.17 | 0 | JONES AND CARTER | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 27 | Fieldstone Sec 10 (DEF2) | 2014-2211 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 526 S | 24.15 | 1.02 | 94 | Fieldstone (Houston) ASLI VI, L.L.L.P. | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 28 | Fieldstone Sec 11 (DEF2) | 2014-2217 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 526 S | 28.48 | 3.82 | 85 | Fieldstone (Houston) ASLI VI, L.L.L.P. | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 29 | Fisher Street Townhomes | 2014-2487 | C3F | Harris | City | 452L | 0.50 | 0.09 | 5 | Perry Homes | Paksima Group, Inc. |
| 30 | Forest Village Sec 8 | 2014-2469 | C3P | Montgo mery | ETJ | 292D | 48.28 | 32.08 | 80 | Woodmere Development Co., Ltd | Robert Doley, Planner |
| 31 | Glenbrook Sec 1 <br> (DEF2) | 2014-1926 | C2 | Harris | City | 535S | 6.68 | 6.68 | 0 | Weingarten Realty Investors | CLR, Inc. |
| 32 | Goodman Homesite | 2014-2327 | C1 | Montgo mery | ETJ | 285D | 2.00 | 0.00 | 1 | C\&R Surveying Inc. | Tetra Surveys |
| 33 | Grace Covenant Baptist Church | 2014-2360 | C2 | Montgo mery | ETJ | 296M | 7.00 | 7.00 | 0 | Grace Covenant Baptist Church | J.A. Costanza \& Associates Engineering, Inc. |
| 34 | Grand Vista Water <br> Plant (DEF1) | 2014-2390 | C2 | Fort Bend | ETJ | 526R | 3.86 | 3.86 | 0 | Taylor Morrison of Texas Inc. | Costello, Inc. |
| 35 | Grand Vista Sec 7 (DEF1) | 2014-2385 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 526Q | 18.37 | 5.50 | 59 | Taylor Morrison of Texas Inc. | Costello, Inc. |
| 36 | Grand Vista Sec 9 (DEF1) | 2014-2396 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 526R | 9.16 | 0.52 | 28 | Taylor Morrison of Texas Inc. | Costello, Inc. |
| 37 | Grant Meadows Sec 5 | 2014-2509 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | 328 J | 15.95 | 5.43 | 60 | NANA PARTNERS | Costello, Inc. |
| 38 | Harris County ESD no 48 Station no 5 | 2014-2467 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | 446N | 5.73 | 5.73 | 0 | Coveler \& Katz | Weisser Engineering Company |
| 39 | Harris County MUD no 433 Water Plant no 2 | 2014-2458 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | 366Y | 2.51 | 2.51 | 0 | Mischer <br> Development, L.P. | Brown \& Gay Engineers, Inc. |
| 40 | Harvest Green Sec 1 | 2014-2495 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 566G | 17.60 | 2.27 | 59 | Johnson Development | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 41 | Harvest Green Sec 2 | 2014-2496 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 566F | 15.24 | 0.43 | 66 | Johnson Development | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 42 | Harvest Green Sec 3 | 2014-2497 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 566F | 23.00 | 2.52 | 93 | Johnson Development | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 43 | Harvest Green Sec 4 | 2014-2501 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 566F | 19.07 | 2.53 | 55 | Johnson Development | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 44 | Harvest Green Sec 5 | 2014-2502 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 566B | 18.34 | 3.36 | 44 | Johnson Development | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 45 | Hidden Arbor (DEF2) | 2014-2253 | C3F | Harris | Cityl <br> ETJ | 326L | 96.59 | 40.87 | 129 | JEN Texas IV, LLC | LJA Engineering, Inc.(West Houston Office) |
| 46 | Hilcrest partial replat no 1 | 2014-2405 | C3F | Harris | City | 492R | 0.11 | 0.00 | 2 | Jean McKinley Company | Jean McKinley Company |


| Item <br> No. | Subdivision Plat Name | App No. | App <br> Type | Location |  |  | Plat Data |  |  | Customer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Co | Cityl ETJ | Key <br> Map | Plat <br> Ac | Rsv <br> Ac | Lots | Developer | Applicant's Company |
| 47 | Hilldale partial replat no 1 | 2014-2464 | C3F | Harris | City | 451T | 0.50 | 0.00 | 4 | Richard Hart | Owens Management Systems, LLC |
| 48 | I 10 Bella Terra | 2014-2414 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | 485A | 53.74 | 49.77 | 0 | I-10 /Katy, Ltd. | Van De Wiele \& Vogler, Inc. |
| 49 | Inway Oaks Estates Sec 2 | 2014-2432 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | 290D | 4.02 | 0.04 | 19 | MRE, LLC | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 50 | Live Oak Landing (DEF1) | 2014-2268 | C3F | Harris | City | 449T | 4.08 | 0.21 | 74 | Live Oak | MOMENTUM EGINEERNG |
| 51 | LMF Retail Sec 2 | 2014-2409 | C2 | Fort Bend | ETJ | 525V | 3.87 | 3.87 | 0 | Fehr Grossman Cox Architects | Lentz Engineering, L.C. |
| 52 | Long Meadow Farms Water Plant Site no 3 | 2014-2514 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 526S | 4.20 | 4.13 | 0 | LM Development | Costello, Inc. |
| 53 | Mayfair at Clarkson | 2014-2462 | C3P | Harris | City | $451 Z$ | 0.77 | 0.39 | 13 | Beacon Builders | Total Surveyors, Inc. |
| 54 | Melody Oaks partial replat no 9 and extension | 2014-2486 | C3F | Harris | City | 451X | 1.03 | 0.00 | 14 | Perry Homes | Paksima Group, Inc. |
| 55 | Mittlesteadt Estates (DEF1) | 2014-2258 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | $330 Z$ | 20.93 | 4.79 | 77 | ILS PROPERTIES, LTD | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 56 | Northgrove Sec 5 | 2014-2524 | C3F | Montgo mery | ETJ | 249K | 38.32 | 12.48 | 48 | Toll Brothers | Costello, Inc. |
| 57 | Owens Road Street <br> Dedication and Reserves | 2014-2460 | C3P | Fort <br> Bend | ETJ | 567N | 8.17 | 1.93 | 0 | LRI Investment Group. Ltd. | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 58 | Peachtree Plaza | 2014-2408 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | $371 Z$ | 2.52 | 2.52 | 0 | Jean McKinley Company | Jean McKinley Company |
| 59 | Raintree Village Sec 10 | 2014-2515 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 446K | 1.32 | 0.00 | 10 | DHK <br> DEVELOPMENT, <br> INC. | M2L Associates, Inc. |
| 60 | Raintree Village Sec 11 | 2014-2527 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 446K | 12.12 | 0.00 | 72 | DHK <br> DEVELOPMENT, <br> INC. | M2L Associates, Inc. |
| 61 | Raintree Village Sec $12$ | 2014-2513 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 446K | 2.56 | 0.00 | 20 | DHK Developement Inc | M2L Associates, Inc. |
| 62 | Retreat on Bingle GP | 2014-2451 | GP | Harris | City | 450Z | 1.97 | 0.00 | 0 | Retreat on Crockett, LLC | Vernon G. Henry \& Associates, Inc. |
| 63 | Saman Business Plaza | 2014-2333 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | 290V | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0 | Balajelini | John G. Thomas and Associates, Inc. dba Thomas Land Surveying |
| 64 | Sams Club Valley Ranch | 2014-2434 | C2 | Montgo mery | ETJ | $256 T$ | 12.74 | 12.74 | 0 | The Signorelli Co / Commons of Lake Houston, LTD. | Dannenbaum Engineering Corporation |
| 65 | Scarsdale Vision | 2014-2242 | C2 | Harris | City | 616D | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0 | South Texas <br> Surveying <br> Associates, Inc. | South Texas Surveying Associates, Inc. |
| 66 | Shadow Creek South Sec 2 partial replat no 1 | 2014-2439 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | 250Y | 5.17 | 0.00 | 19 | Frankel Homes, Ltd. | R.G. Miller Engineers |
| 67 | Shadow Creek South Sec 2 partial replat no 2 | 2014-2440 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | 250Y | 1.97 | 0.00 | 6 | Frankel Homes, Ltd. | R.G. Miller Engineers |
| 68 | Southampton Place partial replat no 2 | 2014-2433 | C3F | Harris | City | 532D | 0.28 | 0.00 | 2 | Baughn | TKE Development Services, Ltd. |
| 69 | Spring Pine Forest Drive Street Dedication Sec 1 | $2014-2421$ | SP | Harris | ETJ | 292E | 2.93 | 0.00 | 0 | Harris County Improvement District No. 18 | C.L. Davis \& Company |


| Item <br> No. | Subdivision Plat Name | App <br> No. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { App } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Location |  |  | Plat Data |  |  | Customer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Co | Cityl <br> ETJ | Key <br> Map | Plat <br> Ac | Rsv <br> Ac | Lots | Developer | Applicant's Company |
| 70 | Summer Creek Baptist Church Campus of Woodridge Baptist Church | 2014-2290 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | $376 Z$ | 4.85 | 4.85 | 0 | WOODRIDGE BAPTIST CHURCH OF KINGWOOD | VTSM |
| 71 | Sunset Ridge Sec 6 | 2014-2507 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 376V | 12.87 | 0.04 | 66 | SSR-185 <br> Investments, Ltd. | Benchmark Engineering Corp. |
| 72 | Temple Terrace partial replat no 2 | 2014-2498 | C3F | Harris | City | 493J | 0.34 | 0.01 | 9 | Treigo Builder's, LLC | R.W. Patrick \& Associates, Inc. |
| 73 | Texas Advanced Manufacturing Solutions | 2014-2422 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | 290W | 68.22 | 68.22 | 0 | Texas Advanced Manufactoring Solutions | Town and Country Surveyors |
| 74 | Towne Lake Central GP | 2014-2520 | GP | Harris | ETJ | 367S | 1114.00 | 0.00 | 0 | CW SCOA West, L.P. | EHRA |
| 75 | Towne Lake Sec 34 | 2014-2494 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 367S | 27.08 | 3.15 | 75 | Caldwell Companies | EHRA |
| 76 | Towne Lake Sec 41 | 2014-2508 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 366R | 23.44 | 1.44 | 42 | Caldwell Companies | EHRA |
| 77 | Village at Carballo | 2014-2228 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | 259S | 2.26 | 2.26 | 0 | cas survey | CAS SURVEY |
| 78 | Village at Spring Branch | 2014-2491 | C3F | Harris | City | 451S | 7.99 | 0.39 | 103 | CDN-Long Point, LLC | Windrose Land Services, Inc. |
| 79 | Waterford Trails Sec 1 (DEF1) | 2014-2288 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | 290S | 18.40 | 18.40 | 0 | Kimley-Horn, Inc | Terra Surveying Company, Inc. |
| 80 | West Airport Boulevard Street Dedication Sec 1 (DEF2) | 2014-2206 | C3F | Fort Bend | ETJ | 566C | 7.86 | 0.00 | 0 | Johnson Development | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 81 | Westheimer Estates partial replat no 4 (DEF1) | 2014-2332 | C3F | Harris | City | 491X | 0.28 | 0.05 | 4 | Prebish Homes | Total Surveyors, Inc. |
| 82 | Woodlands Creekside Park West Sec 35 | 2014-2445 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 249Q | 17.51 | 1.62 | 42 | Bridgeland Devlopment L.P. | LJA Engineering, Inc (Woodlands Office) |
| 83 | Woodlands Creekside <br> Park West Sec 36 | 2014-2503 | C3P | Harris | ETJ | 249 U | 23.83 | 2.10 | 47 | Bridgeland Devlopment L.P. | LJA Engineering, Inc (Woodlands Office) |
| 84 | Woodridge Forest GP | 2014-2517 | GP | Montgo mery | City/ <br> ETJ | 296U | 292.00 | 0.00 | 0 | Cernus | LJA Engineering, Inc.(West Houston Office) |
| 85 | Woodridge Forest Sec 9 (DEF1) | 2014-2353 | C3F | Montgo mery | ETJ | $296 T$ | 17.80 | 4.93 | 45 | Cernus | LJA Engineering, Inc.(West Houston Office) |

## B-Replats

| 86 | Aetna at Interwood | 2014-2417 | C2R | Harris | City | 374T | 18.72 | 18.72 | 0 | Aetna Inc. | huitt-zollars |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 87 | Alfano Street Lots (DEF1) | 2014-2254 | C2R | Harris | City | 453A | 0.92 | 0.00 | 3 | David Latigo | Replat Specialists |
| 88 | Apache Multipurpose Campus Sec 2 | 2014-2345 | C3R | Harris | ETJ | 416K | 84.77 | 80.43 | 0 | Investment and Development Ventures, LLC | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 89 | Carnegie Homes on Lillian Street | 2014-2446 | C2R | Harris | City | 492H | 0.15 | 0.00 | 2 | AVA Custom Homes | ICMC GROUP INC |
| 90 | Carnegie Homes on West Bell Street | 2014-2455 | C2R | Harris | City | 493N | 0.13 | 0.00 | 2 | Carnegie Homes | ICMC GROUP INC |
| 91 | Central Houston Nissan | 2014-2407 | C2R | Harris | City | 532T | 6.71 | 6.71 | 0 | CENTRAL HOUSTON NISSAN | Lentz Engineering, L.C. |


| Plat | ng Summary |  | Houston Planning Commission |  |  |  |  |  |  | PC Date: October 16, 2014 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. | Subdivision Plat Name | App <br> No. | App <br> Type | Co | Cityl <br> ETJ | Key <br> Map | Plat <br> Ac | Rsv <br> Ac | Lots | Developer | Applicant's Company |
| 92 | Chateaux at the Ovid | 2014-2295 | C2R | Harris | City | 493F | 0.11 | 0.00 | 3 | TBM INVESTMENTS LLC | 4 Dimensional System Design |
| 93 | City View Lofts at West 18th | 2014-2459 | C2R | Harris | City | 452 U | 0.23 | 0.00 | 6 | Mary Matha Development LLC | Studio MET |
| 94 | Evanelica Apostles Reserve on Ashford Point | 2014-2243 | C3R | Harris | City | 528C | 2.16 | 2.16 | 0 | Luis Cerna | Replat Specialists |
| 95 | First Urban (DEF1) | 2014-2318 | C2R | Harris | City | 494N | 0.23 | 0.00 | 6 | Real Success LLC | Owens Management Systems, LLC |
| 96 | Fisher Estates at Yale | 2014-2436 | C2R | Harris | City | 492D | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0 | Fisher Homes | Century Engineering, Inc |
| 97 | Floyd Street Estates | 2014-2429 | C2R | Harris | City | 492H | 0.11 | 0.00 | 2 | NKS Development | TKE Development Services, Ltd. |
| 98 | Grand Crossing replat no 1 partial replat no 1 (DEF1) | 2014-2379 | C3R | Harris | ETJ | 485B | 46.94 | 44.07 | 0 | GRAND <br> PARKWAY/I-10 ASSOCIATES | Miller Survey Group |
| 99 | Hardy Northgate Crossing | 2014-2187 | C2R | Harris | ETJ | 292B | 13.81 | 13.81 | 0 | Kimley-Horn, Inc | Terra Surveying Company, Inc. |
| 100 | Hudson Plaza | 2014-2450 | C2R | Harris | City | 413V | 4.70 | 4.70 | 0 | IPM Seven Miles 2014 LLC | South Texas Surveying Associates, Inc. |
| 101 | Hutchison Properties | 2014-2474 | C2R | Harris | City | $573 T$ | 2.38 | 0.00 | 2 | Southwest Wholesale | Paksima Group, Inc. |
| 102 | Kasel Estates on Dorothy | 2014-2466 | C2R | Harris | City | 492D | 0.21 | 0.00 | 4 | Olde Good Things, Inc. | PROSURV |
| 103 | Koehlers 1st addition partial replat no 3 | 2014-2454 | C2R | Harris | City | 492H | 0.20 | 0.00 | 4 | Blackforest Holdings Inc. | Vernon G. Henry \& Associates, Inc. |
| 104 | Lofts at Bauman Road | 2014-2337 | C2R | Harris | City | 413 J | 0.36 | 0.03 | 4 | ABC Building Design | Tetra Surveys |
| 105 | Lovejoy Townsite | 2014-2470 | C2R | Harris | City | 494P | 0.10 | 0.00 | 2 | Townsite Custom Homes | The Interfield Group |
| 106 | Mangat Rampur Village Sec 1 (DEF1) | 2014-2136 | C3R | Harris | ETJ | 325B | 17.76 | 16.39 | 0 | OWNER | Advance Surveying, Inc. |
| 107 | North Houston Gardens no 2 partial replat no 1 | 2014-2415 | C2R | Harris | ETJ | 410B | 6.09 | 5.93 | 0 | Tecnotrat Metal Processing | John G. Thomas and Associates, Inc. dba Thomas Land Surveying |
| 108 | Northpark Central Annex | 2014-2419 | C2R | Harris | ETJ | $332 Z$ | 7.55 | 7.55 | 0 | Prologis | Halff Associates, Inc. |
| 109 | Olde Good Things (DEF1) | 2014-2362 | C2R | Harris | City | 453X | 0.23 | 0.00 | 4 | Olde Good Things, Inc. | PROSURV |
| 110 | Ovid Court | 2014-2438 | C2R | Harris | City | 493F | 0.19 | 0.00 | 4 | BM Developments, LLC | replats.com |
| 111 | Parmer Properties | 2014-2312 | C2R | Harris | City | 577N | 2.24 | 2.24 | 0 | Metro Erectors | LUPHER,LLC |
| 112 | Pathfinder Park Sec 1 replat no 1 and extension | 2014-2427 | C2R | Harris | ETJ | 445X | 7.69 | 7.69 | 0 | Pathfinder Energy Services, Inc. | Windrose Land Services, Inc. |
| 113 | Paulette Place | 2014-2485 | C2R | Harris | City | 493X | 0.14 | 0.00 | 3 | ADCS, LP | Paksima Group, Inc. |
| 114 | Pro Vision Inc replat no 1 | 2014-2361 | C2R | Harris | City | 573C | 15.50 | 15.50 | 1 | Pro-Vision | ASV Consulting Group, Inc. |
| 115 | Prologis at Intercontinental Airport | 2014-2406 | C2R | Harris | City | 374N | 12.59 | 12.59 | 0 | Prologis | Halff Associates, Inc. |
| 116 | Rayford Road Crossing replat no 1 | 2014-2493 | C2R | Montgo mery | ETJ | 293B | 18.17 | 17.14 | 0 | Kimley-Horn, Inc | Terra Surveying Company, Inc. |


| Item <br> No. | Subdivision Plat Name | $\begin{gathered} \text { App } \\ \text { No. } \end{gathered}$ | App <br> Type |  |  |  | Plat Data |  |  | Customer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Co | Cityl <br> ETJ | Key <br> Map | Plat Ac | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Rsv } \\ \text { Ac } \end{array}$ | Lots | Developer | Applicant's Company |
| 117 | Shadyvilla Pointe | 2014-2404 | C3R | Harris | City | 451X | 0.25 | 0.05 | 3 | GST Investments LLC | MOMENTUM EGINEERNG |
| 118 | Studiospace replat no 1 | 2014-2463 | C2R | Harris | City | 493Y | 0.34 | 0.04 | 8 | Studiospace | Plat Track |
| 119 | Trails on Kansas Street | 2014-2444 | C2R | Harris | City | 492C | 0.25 | 0.00 | 6 | LACASA INTERNATIONAL | ICMC GROUP INC |
| 120 | UKK Hospitality LLC | 2014-2477 | C2R | Harris | ETJ | 292T | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0 | UKK Hospitality LLC | Hovis Surveying Company Inc. |
| 121 | Verizon Summerbrook (DEF1) | 2014-2369 | C2R | Harris | ETJ | 371J | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0 | Verizon Wireless | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 122 | Village at La Mirages | 2014-2335 | C2R | Harris | City | 494F | 0.12 | 0.00 | 3 | cas survey | CAS SURVEY |
| 123 | Village at the Bryan Heights | 2014-2330 | C2R | Harris | City | 494F | 0.12 | 0.00 | 3 | cas survey | CAS SURVEY |
| 124 | West 17th Street Views | 2014-2449 | C2R | Harris | City | 452U | 0.75 | 0.01 | 20 | Prebish Homes | Total Surveyors, Inc. |
| 125 | West Bell Avenue Views | 2014-2519 | C2R | Harris | City | 493N | 0.11 | 0.00 | 2 | Mazzarino Development | Total Surveyors, Inc. |
| 126 | Woodhead Street Views | 2014-2452 | C2R | Harris | City | 492V | 0.12 | 0.00 | 2 | Rainer Custom Homes | Total Surveyors, Inc. |
| 127 | Zander Enclave | 2014-2522 | C2R | Harris | City | 452U | 0.15 | 0.00 | 4 | ZANDER HOMES | Bates Development Consultants |

C-Public Hearings Requiring Notification

| 128 | Braeswood partial replat no 2 (DEF1) | 2014-2133 | C3N | Harris | City | 532G | 0.16 | 0.00 | 4 | Roc Homes | Bates Development Consultants |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 129 | Carolina Place partial replat no 1 | 2014-2323 | C3N | Harris | City | 532G | 0.17 | 0.00 | 2 | Marlena Jones | Owens Management Systems, LLC |
| 130 | Hyde Park Court Addition partial replat no 1 | 2014-1791 | C3N | Harris | City | 492R | 0.11 | 0.00 | 3 | SUMMIT MIDTOWN L.L.C. | ICMC GROUP INC |
| 131 | Interfield Business Park | 2014-2236 | C3N | Harris | City | 493A | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0 | Interfield, Inc. | The Interfield Group |
| 132 | Little White Oak Park | 2014-2059 | C3N | Harris | City | 493C | 1.15 | 1.15 | 0 | WOIH Partners, LLC | Civil-Surv Land Surveying, L.C. |
| 133 | Melody Oaks partial replat no 12 (DEF1) | 2014-1697 | C3N | Harris | City | 451X | 0.28 | 0.00 | 3 | BB Residential Group | TKE Development Services, Ltd. |
| 134 | Richmond Square | 2014-1848 | C3N | Harris | City | 491X | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0 | CAS SURVEY | CAS SURVEY |
| 135 | Shady Acres Extension no 3 partial replat no 1 | 2014-1808 | C3N | Harris | City | 452Y | 2.49 | 0.00 | 28 | InTownHomes, Ltd. | Windrose Land Services, Inc. |
| 136 | Whispering Pines Estates partial replat no 6 replat no 1 | 2014-2174 | C3N | Harris | City | 451X | 0.34 | 0.01 | 3 | Paradigm Design | Hovis Surveying Company Inc. |

## D-Variances

| 137 | Aliana Sec 35 (DEF2) | 2014-2030 | C3P | Fort Bend | ETJ | 567A | 18.47 | 1.48 | 44 | Aliana Development | LJA Engineering, Inc.(West Houston Office) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 138 | Ansleigh Park (DEF2) | 2014-1895 | C2R | Harris | City | 493x | 0.15 | 0.00 | 3 | Pro-Surv | PROSURV |
| 139 | Briar Pointe GP (DEF1) | 2014-2321 | GP | Harris | City | 488N | 41.97 | 0.00 | 0 | RH of Texas Limited Partnership/K. Hovnanian of Houston II | Jones \& Carter, Inc. - The Woodlands |


|  |  |  |  | Location |  |  | Plat Data |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Item |  | App | App |  | Cityl | Key | Plat | Rsv |  |
| No. | Subdivision Plat Name | No. | Type | Co | ETJ | Map | Ac | Ac |  |

Customer

|  | Applicant's <br> Company |
| :---: | :---: |

140 \begin{tabular}{llllllllll}

| Cultural Collision |
| :--- |
| Center | \& $2014-2442$ \& C2R \& Harris \& City \& $493 P$ \& 0.69 \& 0.69 \& 0

\end{tabular}

Keller and
Associates, CPAs

Civil-Surv Land Surveying, L.C.

|  | Dell Court Townhomes | $2014-2349$ | C2R | Harris | City | 453 Y | 0.26 | 0.00 | 3 | Cymromenter <br> Investments, LLC. | RVi Planning + <br> (DEF1) | Landscape Architecture |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## E-Special Exceptions

151 \begin{tabular}{lllllllllll}
Reserves at FM 529 <br>
and Kentwick (DEF2)

 2014-2219 C3P $\quad$ Harris 

ETJ \& 408N \& 12.26 \& 10.31 \& 0 \& | 13.20 Acre Ground |
| :--- |
| Lease, L.P. | \& Terra Associates, Inc.

\end{tabular}

## F-Reconsideration of Requirements

| 152 | Alden Woods Sec 1 | 2014-2523 | C3F | Harris | ETJ | 368F | 36.56 | 9.58 | 86 | McGuyer <br> Homebuilders, Inc. | GBI Partners, LP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 153 | Aliana Sec 38 (DEF1) | 2014-2392 | C3P | Fort Bend | ETJ | 567A | 17.19 | 0.00 | 47 | Aliana Development | LJA Engineering, Inc.(West Houston Office) |
| 154 | Houston Kenswick <br> Trade Center (DEF1) | 2014-2246 | C2R | Harris | City | 335W | 21.50 | 21.50 | 0 | Houston <br> Intercontinental <br> Trade Center, L.P. | EHRA |
| 155 | Jackrabbit Office LLC <br> GP (DEF1) | 2014-2261 | GP | Harris | ETJ | 408Q | 3.66 | 0.00 | 0 | THE NATIONAL REALTY GROUP | The Pinnell Group, LLC |
| 156 | Jackrabbit Office LLC <br> Sec 1 (DEF1) | 2014-2210 | C2 | Harris | ETJ | 408Q | 3.66 | 3.66 | 0 | BNC CONSTRUCTION | The Pinnell Group, LLC |
| 157 | Manors on Oakley Street | 2014-2300 | C2R | Harris | City | 493W | 0.11 | 0.00 | 3 | Summit Midtown L.L.C. | ICMC GROUP INC |
| 158 | Samantha Fitness Center | 2014-2472 | C2R | Harris | City | 531X | 3.01 | 3.01 | 0 | Wu Property Management | Advance Surveying, Inc. |

## G-Extensions of Approval

| 159 | Bridgeland Hidden Creek Sec 20 | 2013-2689 | EOA | Harris | ETJ | 366N | 18.25 | 3.04 | 62 | Bridgeland Development, LP | Brown \& Gay Engineers, Inc. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 160 | Bridgeland Hidden Creek Sec 23 | 2013-2691 | EOA | Harris | ETJ | 366N | 11.70 | 1.75 | 31 | Bridgeland Development, LP | Brown \& Gay Engineers, Inc. |


|  |  |  |  | Location |  |  | Plat Data |  |  | Customer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item No. | Subdivision Plat Name | App No. | App <br> Type |  | Cityl <br> ETJ | Key <br> Map | Plat <br> Ac | Rsv <br> Ac | Lots | Developer | Applicant's Company |
| 161 | Cypresswood at Town Center | 2013-2564 | EOA | Harris | ETJ | 330T | 9.08 | 9.08 | 0 | Blazer Building Texas, LLC | John G. Thomas and Associates, Inc. dba Thomas Land Surveying |
| 162 | Family Life Assembly of God | 2013-2787 | EOA | Fort Bend | ETJ | 484M | 7.72 | 7.40 | 0 | Family Life Assembly of God | Lentz Engineering, L.C. |
| 163 | First Baptist Church of the Woodlands | 2013-2748 | EOA | Montgo mery | ETJ | 251V | 9.88 | 9.88 | 0 | First Baptist Church of the Woodlands | Hovis Surveying Company Inc. |
| 164 | FM 529 Center | 2013-2735 | EOA | Harris | ETJ | 407N | 5.96 | 5.96 | 0 | Doans \& Associates LLC | Hovis Surveying Company Inc. |
| 165 | Greatlands Circle K | 2013-2561 | EOA | Harris | ETJ | 371F | 2.00 | 2.00 | 0 | Circle K Stores Inc | Young Hobbs \& Associates |
| 166 | Hardy Center North | 2013-2767 | EOA | Harris | ETJ | 332M | 29.40 | 29.40 | 0 | Vigavi Realty, LLC | Jones \& Carter, Inc. |
| 167 | Harris County Emergency Services District No 16 Station 8 | 2013-2610 | EOA | Harris | ETJ | 289Y | 1.24 | 1.24 | 0 | Harris County Emergency Services District No 16 | Hovis Surveying Company Inc. |
| 168 | HCMUD No 406 Detention Pond No 3 | 2013-2598 | EOA | Harris | ETJ | 372X | 29.70 | 29.70 | 0 | Pinto Realty Development, Inc. | Brown \& Gay Engineers, Inc. |
| 169 | Mason Grand | 2013-2703 | EOA | Fort Bend | ETJ | 526W | 9.45 | 8.97 | 0 | NNE, Inc | Terra Surveying Company, Inc. |
| 170 | Menil Drawing Institute | 2013-2826 | EOA | Harris | City | 493S | 3.20 | 2.39 | 0 | Menil Foundation, Inc. | Lentz Engineering, L.C. |
| 171 | New Life Baptist Church of Houston | 2013-3036 | EOA | Harris | ETJ | 527G | 6.97 | 6.97 | 0 | DMAC CONSTRUCTION | PLS |

## H-Name Changes

None

I-Certification of Compliance

| 172 | 24606 | Butterfly Lane | $14-1029$ | COC | Mont. | ETJ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## J-Administrative

None
K-Development Plats with Variance Requests

| 174 | 1700 Haver Street | 14095367 DPV | Harris | City | 492 V | Zeeba Paksima |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 175 | 1043 West 7th 1/2 <br> Street | 14055439 DPV | Harris | City | 492D | Marlena Jones |
| 176 | 2124 White Oak Drive | 14105223 DPV | Harris | City | $493 B$ | Zeeba Paksima |
| 177 | 4515 Yale Street | 14100528 DPV | Harris | City | $452 M$ | Dunstan Marshall |

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 128

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Braeswood partial replat no 2 (DEF 1)
Applicant: Bates development Consultants


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 128

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Braeswood partial replat no 2 (DEF 1)
Applicant: Bates development Consultants

BELLEFONTAINE STREET
(PLATTED AS BELFONTAINE BOULEVARD)
( $60^{\prime}$ R.O.W.)
(Vol. 7 Pg 35 H.C.M.R.)


## C - Public Hearings

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 128

## Planning and Development Department

Subdivision Name: Braeswood partial replat no 2 (DEF 1)
Applicant: Bates development Consultants


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 129

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Carolina Place partial replat no 1
Applicant: Owens Managment Systems, LLC


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 129

Planning and Development Department

## Meeting Date: 10/16/2014

Subdivision Name: Carolina Place partial replat no 1

## Applicant: Owens Managment Systems, LLC



## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 129

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Carolina Place partial replat no 1
Applicant: Owens Managment Systems, LLC


C - Public Hearings
Aerial

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 130

## Planning and Development Department

Subdivision Name: Hyde Park Court Addition partial replat no 1
Applicant: ICMC Group Inc


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 130

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Hyde Park Court Addition partial replat no 1
Applicant: ICMC Group Inc


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 130

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Hyde Park Court Addition partial replat no 1
Applicant: ICMC Group Inc


C - Public Hearings
Aerial

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 131

## Planning and Development Department

Subdivision Name: Interfield Business Park

## Applicant: The Interfield Group



## C - Public Hearings

Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 131
Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Interfield Business Park
Applicant: The Interfield Group


## Houston Planning Commission

Subdivision Name: Interfield Business Park
Applicant: The Interfield Group


C - Public Hearings

# Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 132 

## Planning and Development Department

Subdivision Name: Little White Oak Park

## Applicant: Civil-Surv Land Surveying, L.C.



## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 132

Planning and Development Department

## Meeting Date: 10/16/2014

Subdivision Name: Little White Oak Park
Applicant: Civil-Surv Land Surveying, L.C.


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 132

## Planning and Development Department

Meeting Date: 10/16/2014
Subdivision Name: Little White Oak Park
Applicant: Civil-Surv Land Surveying, L.C.


NORTH
C - Public Hearings

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 133

Subdivision Name: Melody Oaks partial replat no 12 (DEF 1)
Applicant: TKE Development Services, Ltd.


## C - Public Hearings with Variance Site Location

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 133

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Melody Oaks partial replat no 12 (DEF 1) Applicant: TKE Development Services, Ltd.

ISHOON P. SALAS
H.C.C.F. NO. L870957


## C - Public Hearings with Variance

Subdivision

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 133

Planning and Development Department
Meeting Date: 10/16/2014
Subdivision Name: Melody Oaks partial replat no 12 (DEF 1)
Applicant: TKE Development Services, Ltd.


C - Public Hearings with Variance
Aerial

PLANNING \&
development
Departinent

## VARIANCE <br> Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-1697
Plat Name: Melody Oaks partial replat no 12
Applicant: TKE Development Services, Ltd.
Date Submitted: 07/13/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:
To not provide compensating open space.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-182

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-182. Optional performance standards for the reduction in lot size- Compensating open space. A subdivision plat may contain a lot of less than minimum lot size required by subsection (a) of section 42-181 of this Code if compensating open space is provided within the boundaries of the subdivision plat

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
This site is off of Janak Drive between Antoine Drive and Wirt Road. Development is occurring in the Melody Oaks subdivision by taking the originally platted lots averaging $12,000 \mathrm{sq}$ foot in size and dividing them into smaller tracks for townhome construction. This replat will be the eleventh replat in the subdivision of Melody Oaks. The current owner is proposing to create three single family lots averaging 3985 sq feet each. Chapter 42 requires that the owner provide 300 sq ft per lot for compensating open space. The new requirements which would allow this parcel to be reviewed under city rules (the new rules) and not require the allocation of compensating open space will not become effective until May of 2015. Strict application of Chapter 42 would require providing two reserves for compensating open space each with a width of 13.5 ' fronting the right of way along Janak. This would not serve the purpose that was intended for the provision of compensating open space - an area to be used for the benefit of the owners and, in particular their children to enjoy. Two small 452 sq . ft. areas adjacent to a public street does not satisfy this intent. The new trend in development is to provide a larger lot size and move away from the compensating open space requirement, providing private open space on each individual lot. A COS reserve must be maintained by the homeowners association and in this instance would be considered a maintenance burden.

## (2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;

The circumstances supporting this granting of this variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant. Buyers prefer the $60 \%$ limited site coverage system available within the Loop and find small c.o.s. spaces in the small subdivisions to be a hardship. There is criteria in Chapter 42 to designate this area as urban. This new criteria has not yet been implemented.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

Among the purposes of Chapter 42 are the establishment of building setback lines appropriate to an area, recognizing the differences in the design framework of various areas and encouraging the efficiency of land development patterns. To not require compensating open space is consistent with these purposes.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The granting of this variance will not have any negative impact on public health, safety or welfare.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic hardship is not the sole justification for this variance. The justification for this variance is the creation of a development consistent with the new Prevailing Community Standards being established in the area. Open space will be provided on the individual lots, maintenance by each owner vs two 452 sq . ft. compensating open space reserves which
must be maintained by dues paid into a property owners association. These small COS reserves within this three lot subdivision adjacent to the public street would be regarded as a maintenance hardship by the owners.

# Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 134 

Planning and Development Department
Meeting Date: 10/16/2014

## Subdivision Name: Richmond Square

## Applicant: CAS Survey



C - Public Hearings

# Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 134 

Planning and Development Department

## Subdivision Name: Richmond Square

Applicant: CAS Survey



RICHMOND AVENUE


## C - Public Hearings

# Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 134 

## Planning and Development Department

Meeting Date: 10/16/2014

## Subdivision Name: Richmond Square

## Applicant: CAS Survey



C - Public Hearings

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 135

## Planning and Development Department

Subdivision Name: Shady Acres Extension no 3 partial replat no 1 Applicant: Windrose Land Services, Inc.


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 135

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Shady Acres Extension no 3 partial replat no 1 Applicant: Windrose Land Services, Inc.


C - Public Hearings

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 135

## Planning and Development Department

Meeting Date: 10/16/2014
Subdivision Name: Shady Acres Extension no 3 partial replat no 1 Applicant: Windrose Land Services, Inc.


## C - Public Hearings

Aerial

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 136

Subdivision Name: Whispering Pines Estates partial replat no 6 replat no 1

Applicant: Hovis Surveying Company Inc.


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 136

Subdivision Name: Whispering Pines Estates partial replat no 6 replat no 1

Applicant: Hovis Surveying Company Inc.


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 136

## Planning and Development Department

Meeting Date: 10/16/2014
Subdivision Name: Whispering Pines Estates partial replat no 6 replat no 1

Applicant: Hovis Surveying Company Inc.


## C - Public Hearings

## Houston Planning Commission

Subdivision Name: Aliana Sec 35 (DEF 2)
Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc.- (West Houston Office)


## Houston Planning CommissionITEM: 137 Planning and Development Department

Subdivision Name: Aliana Sec 35 (DEF 2)
Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc.- (West Houston Office)


## Houston Planning Commission

## Planning and Development Department

Subdivision Name: Aliana Sec 35 (DEF 2)
Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc.- (West Houston Office)


D - Variances
Aerial

Application Number: 2014-2030
Plat Name: Aliana Sec 35
Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc.- (West Houston Office)
Date Submitted: 08/11/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

To not require a street stub to be extended into the proposed plat. To allow excessive block length along southern boundary of plat.
Chapter 42 Section: 128

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-128. Intersections of local streets. (1) Each local street shall intersect with a street that meets the requirements of subsection (b) at least every 1400 feet;

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
Aliana Sections 34 and 35 are currently the southern most subdivisions in the master planned community. Aliana 35's northern boundary is a 200' drainage easement and to the south is Shiloh Lakes Estates Sec 2. This subdivision recorded in 1996 is next to the Houston Golf Club plat (golf course). The plat's southern boundary is 1204' in length and while it does not provide and southern stub it does have a north/south street (Benderloch) and a connection to the west through Section 35 being Galloway Forest Drive.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The golf course and Shiloh Lakes Estates Sec 2 has been there for many years. Aliana is self contained and providing a southern connection to that plat would not provide much north/south circulation as Shiloh Lakes Estates Section 1 and 2 does not have a north/south connection but simply connects to FM 1464.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent and general purposes of Chapter 42-128 block length will be preserved and maintained by providing a general plan that provides access points and also dedicates a network of streets that gives it good vehicular access while providing the amenities such as lakes, open space, and a recreation center. The area to the north of this plat is detention and therefore a north/south street would not be practical.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The granting of the variance will not be injurious to public health or safety as the network of streets provides the access that is necessary. The master planned community of Aliana provides several north/south streets within its boundaries. Benderloch is the north/south street that provides the vehicular circulation in the area but FM 1464, Hwy 99 and Westmoor are the main roads that provide north/south and are major thoroughfares.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The hardship is that the developer is trying to provide a general plan that makes sense, in providing the right balance of street connection and amenities. The general plan provides major thoroughfares throughout the subdivision and circulation is provided where it is necessary and makes sense.

# Houston Planning Commission 

Subdivision Name: Ansleigh Park (DEF 2)
Applicant: PROSURV
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## Subdivision Name: Ansleigh Park (DEF 2)

## Applicant: PROSURV



# Houston Planning Commission 

Subdivision Name: Ansleigh Park (DEF 2)
Applicant: PROSURV
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(1)ANSLEIGH PARK
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Application Number: 2014-1895
Plat Name: Ansleigh Park
Applicant: PROSURV
Date Submitted: 07/28/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:
To allow 30' Private Easement in lieu of 60' local street to access 2 Restricted Reserves.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-152

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-152. Building line requirement along major thoroughfares. (a) The portion of a lot or tract that is adjacent to a major thoroughfare shall have a building line requirement of 25 feet unless otherwise authorized by this chapter.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
There are several new developments along Blodgett that have been done and a variance granted to allow for a 15 foot building line along Blodgett. Blodgett is designated as a major thoroughfare but does not function as one. The developer seeks to create a pedestrian friendly environment consistent with the current redevelopment in the area.
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
No, the application for a variance is not due to a hardship created by the applicant. By granting the variance, this will allow this new development to be done similar to other approved projects and replats in the area
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

Yes, the applicant is intending to create a pedestrian friendly residence facing out to Blodgett and by allowing the 15 foot building line this project will be consistent with other Approved projects in the area
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

No, the variance will not be injurious to the public. The residence will be set back at 15 feet from the property line and over 37 feet from the curb at the edge of paving
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

No, economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance. The goal of the redevelopment of this property is to be consistent with new projects in the area which have also been allowed a 15 foot front setback along Blodgett.

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 139

## Planning and Development Department

## Subdivision Name: Briar Pointe GP (DEF 1)

Applicant: Jones \& Carter, Inc.
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Applicant: Jones \& Carter, Inc.
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## Planning and Development Department

## Subdivision Name: Briar Pointe GP (DEF 1)

Applicant: Jones \& Carter, Inc.
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## VARIANCE <br> Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2321
Plat Name: Briar Pointe GP
Applicant: Jones \& Carter, Inc. - The Woodlands
Date Submitted: 09/22/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:
To not extend a public street, creating an intersection spacing greater than 2,600' along State Highway 6
Chapter 42 Section: 127 (a)
Chapter 42 Reference:
A major thoroughfare shall intersect with a public local street, a collector street, or another major thoroughfare at least every 2,600 feet

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
The property is bounded along the north, east and south sides by existing single family development. Along the western side of the property and all along the frontage of State Highway 6 is the existing corporate headquarters and industrial manufacturing facility for Hoover Container Solutions. This has been a manufacturing site for nearly 40 years with multiple buildings and extensive parking, shipping and receiving areas, which prevents the extension of a street to the west to State Highway 6. Piping Rock Lane intersects with State Highway 6 only 800 feet south of the site, and there is no other east/west public street extension possible north of the site due to the development of Parkway Lakes, a large private street gated subdivision east of the proposed plat. Briarworth Drive was platted in 1974 as part of Briar Village Section Four, and is a dead end cul-de-sac street that cannot extend east beyond the boundary of the subdivision due to the development of Parkway Lakes. Strict application of the ordinance would require platting the extension Briarworth Drive west to State Highway 6 contrary to sound public policy due to the dis-similar land uses and the existing industrial uses located on the site along State Highway 6. A required public street extension would provide a direct connection between the industrial and commercial uses located on State Highway 6 and the existing single family uses. This would result in a hardship to the existing residents of Briar Village with increased traffic on neighborhood streets through the existing single family neighborhood.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are based on the physical characteristics that affect this property that have existed for the past 40 years.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent of the chapter is to provide reasonable connections to adjacent properties in order to ensure adequate traffic circulation within the general area. The site is located on State Highway 6 just north of Westheimer Road, these adjacent major thoroughfares and the existing street pattern in Briar Village has provided adequate circulation and mobility in the area for the past 40 years.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

Public welfare will not be affected because this property is surrounded by existing subdivisions that have established street patterns that have provided adequate circulation and mobility in the area for the past 40 years.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The justification for the variance is the physical circumstances of the property and to facilitate the development of single family residential uses adjacent to the existing single family neighborhood.
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## VARIANCE Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2321
Plat Name: Briar Pointe GP
Applicant: Jones \& Carter, Inc. - The Woodlands
Date Submitted: 09/22/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

To allow a second point of access to a subdivision containing more 207 lots from a 55' wide ingress/egress access easement.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-189

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Any subdivision that includes more than 150 lots shall have at least two points of access separated from each other by a distance of at least 250 feet to a public street outside the boundaries of the subdivision.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
The property is bounded along the north, east and south sides by existing single family development. Along the western side of the property and all along the frontage of State Highway 6 is the existing corporate headquarters and industrial manufacturing facility for Hoover Container Solutions. This has been a manufacturing site for nearly 40 years with multiple buildings and extensive parking, shipping and receiving areas, which prevents the extension of a public street to the west to State Highway 6. Whereas it is more desirable to develop residential lots on the site to buffer the industrial uses from the existing single family residential, (if the site were developed for more industrial uses, a second point of access and the requirement to extend Briarworth Drive and Briarview Drive would not be an issue). The only option to provide a second point of access is from an ingress/egress easement through the existing manufacturing site, since a type II pae can only serve residential lots.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are based on the physical characteristics that affect this property that have existed for the past 40 years.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent of the chapter is to provide reasonable connections to adjacent properties in order to ensure adequate traffic circulation within the general area. The site is located on State Highway 6 just north of Westheimer Road, these adjacent major thoroughfares and the existing street pattern in Briar Village has provided adequate circulation and mobility in the area for the past 40 years.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

In addition to providing adequate circulation, the proposed ingress/egress easement will allow for a second point of access for residents as well as police, fire, and emergency vehicles and will not pose any threat to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The justification for the variance is the physical circumstances of the property and to facilitate the development of single family residential uses adjacent to the existing single family neighborhood.
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## VARIANCE Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2321
Plat Name: Briar Pointe GP
Applicant: Jones \& Carter, Inc. - The Woodlands
Date Submitted: 09/22/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:
To not extend a public street that terminates at the boundary of a plat without means of a vehicular turnaround.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-135

## Chapter 42 Reference:

A public street that terminates at the boundary of a plat previously approved by the commission without means of a vehicular turnaround shall be extended into the adjacent property at the time the adjacent property is platted

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
Briarview Drive was platted in 1970 as part of Briar Village Section One. The extension of Briarview Drive to the north is not possible due to the location of the existing corporate headquarters and industrial manufacturing facility for Hoover Container Solutions. This has been a manufacturing site for nearly 40 years with multiple buildings and extensive parking, shipping and receiving areas, which prevents the extension of a street to the north. The extension is not required to meet intersection spacing requirements nor will it extend residential development. A variance would not be required, except that there are two lots as oppose to just one lot that faces the existing street stub.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are based on the physical characteristics that affect this property that have existed for the past 40 years.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent of the chapter is to provide reasonable connections to adjacent properties in order to ensure adequate traffic circulation within the general area. The site is located on State Highway 6 just north of Westheimer Road, these adjacent major thoroughfares and the existing street pattern in Briar Village has provided adequate circulation and mobility in the area for the past 40 years.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare as the existing conditions have been in place for over forty years.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The justification for the variance is the physical circumstances of the property and to facilitate the development of single family residential uses adjacent to the existing single family neighborhood.

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 140

## Planning and Development Department

## Subdivision Name: Cultural Collision Center

## Applicant: Civil-Surv Land Surveying, L.C.
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Subdivision Name: Cultural Collision Center
Applicant: Civil-Surv Land Surveying, L.C.
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## Houston Planning Commission

Subdivision Name: Cultural Collision Center
Applicant: Civil-Surv Land Surveying, L.C.
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Application Number: 2014-2442
Plat Name: Cultural Collision Center
Applicant: Civil-Surv Land Surveying, L.C.
Date Submitted: 10/06/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:
To allow a visibility triangles to exist over existing structures.
Chapter 42 Section: 161

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-161. Visibility triangles. The building line for property adjacent to two intersecting streets shall not encroach into any visibility triangle, the triangular area adjacent to the intersection of any street established by measuring a distance of 15 feet from the point of intersection of two streets along the right-of-way of each of the intersecting streets and connecting the ends of each measured distance, to assure adequate visibility sight lines for vehicular traffic approaching the intersection.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
The streets adjoining the buildings in question are all two way, four lane curbed asphalt streets, with the affected triangle being located at the intersection of Helena Street and Tuam Street. The current curb line for these two affected street lies approximately thirteen feet (to the Tuam curb) and twenty two feet (to the Helena curb) from the existing property lines. The property in question is within an older subdivision (Fairgrounds Addition) that had at the time of recordation no visibility requirements. As such, the building was built right up to the property lines, and to enforce visibility triangles now would render the building out of code for which there was no code at the time of their construction. The building was initially built in 1952.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The applicant did not create this hardship as the property was acquired with the building already in existence.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained as any new structures built in the future will conform to the newly established visibility triangles.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The granting of this variance will not be injurious to the public health or safety, as day to day operation will not change from its current, accepted state.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic Hardship is not the sole justification for the variance. This request if granted, will allow the continued, uninterrupted operation of an established business.
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## VARIANCE Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2442
Plat Name: Cultural Collision Center
Applicant: Civil-Surv Land Surveying, L.C.
Date Submitted: 10/06/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

To allow a zero building line for existing structures.
Chapter 42 Section: 155

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-155. Collector and local streets--Uses other than single-family residential. (a) The building line requirement for a tract used or to be used for other than single-family residential purposes adjacent to a street that is a collector street or local street that is not an alley shall be ten feet unless otherwise required or authorized by this chapter. (b) The building line requirement for property used or intended for to be used for other than single-family residential purposes adjacent to a street that is a collector street or local street and that is not an alley and across which street are located single-family residential lots having platted building lines greater than ten feet shall be the lesser of 25 feet or the greatest building line on the single-family residential lots directly across the street from the property.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
The property in question is within an older subdivision (Fairgrounds Addition) that had no building line requirements. As such, the building was built right up to the property lines, and to enforce a building line now would render the building out of code for which there was no code at the time of their construction. This building was initially built in 1952.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The applicant did not create this hardship as the property was acquired with the building already in existence.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained as any new structures built in the future will conform to the newly established building lines.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The granting of this variance will not be injurious to the public health or safety, as day to day operation will not change from its current, accepted state.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic Hardship is not the sole justification for the variance. This request if granted, will allow the continued, uninterrupted operation of an established business.

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 141

Subdivision Name: Dell Court Townhomes (DEF 1)
Applicant: RVi Planning + Landscape Architecture
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## VARIANCE Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2349
Plat Name: Dell Court Townhomes
Applicant: RVi Planning + Landscape Architecture
Date Submitted: 09/22/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:
To allow a 15' building line along Interstate 45
Chapter 42 Section: 150
Chapter 42 Reference:
42-150 Building Line Requirement Major Thoroughfares- In general-25 feet

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
The subject property was originally platted in 1923 as Lots 8,27 and 28 , Block 9 of Woodland Court. In 1958, the State Highway Commission purchased property for the construction of Interstate 45 which bisected the neighborhood of Woodland Court. As a result of this action by the State, portions of lots 8 and 27 were acquired leaving the lots smaller and irregularly shaped. At this location, the main lanes of Interstate 45 are depressed and the property abuts a three lane, one-way, south bound service road. The imposition of a 25 ' building line would render more than half of lots 8 and 27 unbuildable and therefore would create an undue hardship. Furthermore, because the main lanes of Interstate 45 are below ground level at this location, a 15' building setback is more appropriate.
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are based on the unique physical characteristics that affect the subject property.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The granting of the variance will allow for the reasonable development of this property while maintaining adequate traffic movement for convenient traffic circulation which is consistent with the intent and general purposes of Chapter 42.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

Because the main lanes of Interstate 45 are below ground level at this location, a 15 ' building setback is more appropriate. The existing street pattern will not change and provides for adequate vehicular circulation for police, fire and emergency vehicles.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The granting of the variance is based on the unique physical characteristics that affect the subject tract.

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 142

Planning and Development Department
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## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 142

Planning and Development Department
Meeting Date: 10/16/2014

## Subdivision Name: Eldridge Forty Six

Applicant: The Pinnell Group, LLC




URBAN CONSTRUCTION SOUTHWEST, Inc.

Application Number: 2014-2411
Plat Name: Eldridge Forty Six
Applicant: The Pinnell Group, LLC
Date Submitted: 10/03/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

We are seeking a variance to prohibit the extension of Mayard Road and Satsuma Drive through the subject property, in lieu of dedicating a cul-de-sac bulb on the property at the end of Satsuma Drive, and a cul-de-sac knuckle adjacent to the property at the end of Mayard Road along the westerly right-of-way line.

## Chapter 42 Section: 135

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-135. Street extension. (a) A public street that terminates at the boundary of a plat previously approved by the commission without means of a vehicular turnaround shall be extended into the adjacent property at the time the adjacent property is platted unless: (1) The existing stub street is a local street and is not designated as a collector or major thoroughfare on the major thoroughfare and freeway plan; (2) The existing stub street is not shown as a through street on a current general plan approved by the commission for the subdivision in which the existing street is located or the subdivision that is the subject of the application; (3) The existing stub street is only one lot in depth; (4) The proposed subdivision will not extend residential development; and (5) The extension of the street is not required to meet the intersection spacing requirements of this chapter. If each of these criteria is met, the stub street is not required to be extended.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
In our previous request for variance, in lieu of extending Mayard Road and Satsuma Drive through the property, we dedicated a street right-of-way on the subject property called Folmar Lane, which was situated northerly of and contiguous to the southerly boundary line of the subject property and connected Mayard Road to Satsuma Drive. This variance was granted and approved by the City of Houston Planning Commission and Harris County Public Infrastructure Department. We contacted West Harris County Regional Water Authority, who currently owns a 42" subsurface water line situated approximately 20 feet north of the southerly boundary line (where Folmar Lane was to be constructed), to acquire approval to build Folmar Lane. They objected to any road being constructed on top of their pipeline, but would allow a road crossing. A meeting was administered on April 17, 2013 at Harris County P.I.D. with the developer, engineer, plat applicant/surveyor, a representative of West Harris County Regional Water Authority, and representatives of Harris County P.I.D. to discuss an alternative solution. Everyone at the meeting concluded the best solution would be to provide a cul-de-sac bulb at the extension of Satsuma Drive, between the West Harris County Regional Water Authority easement and the Magnolia/Mobil Pipeline Company easement. And a cul-de-sac knuckle on the west side of Mayard Road, south of the subject property, on private property owned by Cypress-Fairbanks I.S.D. The owner has obtained and recorded an easement for road, road drainage and other related purposes where the cul-de-sac knuckle will be constructed on the west side of Mayard Road (See instrument 20140390429). The paving constructed on this cul-de-sac knuckle will be built to county standards at owner's expense.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The existence of the $42^{\prime \prime}$ water line will prohibit the construction of a loop road through the property connecting Mayard Road to Satsuma Drive.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The construction of cul-de-sac bulbs at the end of Mayard Road and Satsuma Drive is in compliance with Chapter 42 and will maintain positive traffic flow.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The construction of cul-de-sac bulbs, to city and county standards, will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

This request is not based on economic reasons. It is a matter of the prohibition of a loop road being built on top of the 42 " water line.

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 143

Planning and Development Department
Meeting Date: 10/16/2014
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## VARIANCE Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2426
Plat Name: Enclave at Cypress Run GP
Applicant: Windrose Land Services, Inc.
Date Submitted: 10/04/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

Terminate Cypress Run in place without extending south through the platted area
Chapter 42 Section: 42-135(a)

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-135. Street extension. (a) A public street that terminates at the boundary of a plat previously approved by the commission without means of a vehicular turnaround shall be extended into the adjacent property at the time the adjacent property is platted

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
The subject property is 5.1880 acres located on the north side of Kingsland Boulevard approximately 1,100 feet west of Barker Cypress Road. The site is bounded on the west by commercial uses, on the south by Kingsland, on the east by commercial uses, and on the north by a drainage reserve and unimproved right-of-way. The applicant has submitted a general plan on all commonly owned acreage to allow for the development of single-family residential housing. The applicant is requesting a variance to not extend Cypress Run as the unusual alignment and boulevard configuration of Cypress Run make it impossible and contrary to the public's welfare to extend the street southward. Cypress Run is currently configured as divided boulevard in a 90 -foot right-of-way. It's alignment heading into the north boundary of the applicant's site is due south, meaning that in order to intersect with Kingsland Boulevard at a 90-degree angle, the applicant would have to dedicate an inordinate amount of right-of-way to provide for the designed curve of the roadway. Additionally, the City would have to acquire additional right-of-way from the Credit Union development east of the applicant's land, which is currently built-out with off-street parking, drive aisle and driveway improvements. The Cypress Run extension would provide no additional mobility to the area, as the residential development north of the drainage reserve and the commercial office buildings in the vicinity have excellent east/west mobility via the Cypress ChaseBarker Cypress system.

## (2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;

The circumstances supporting the variance were not caused by the applicant and have been in place for many years. When Cypress Run and the associated commercial office buildings were constructed between 1984 and 1986, it established the unusual physical characteristics that form the justification of the applicant's variance request. The extension of the 90 -foot boulevard right-of-way southward poses an undue hardship on the applicant and the existing Credit Union as the engineering design required to intersect with Kingsland Boulevard at a safe and efficient angle would eat up so much property that the type of proposed single-family residential development would be infeasible. Also, the City would have to acquire a portion of the already development Credit Union property.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

Requiring the applicant to dedicate right-of-way for the extension of Cypress Run is not possible and would be contrary to the intent of the Chapter 42, as it would simultaneously force an undue burden on the applicant and the adjacent property owner. The existing street network, particularly Cypress Chase Drive, Barker Cypress Road and Kingsland Boulevard provide more than adequate traffic flow for all commercial, residential and emergency service vehicles. The variance request aligns with the intent of the ordinance as it avoids an undue hardship to existing land owners,
preserves the level of service of the surrounding roadways, and enables the developer to provide single-family housing in line with the highest and best use of the site.

## (4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare as adjacent, existing rights-of-way - Cypress Run, Cypress Chase Drive, Barker Cypress, and Park Cypress - provide adequate vehicular and emergency access to the surrounding area while the proposed development has direct access to Kingsland Boulevard and access to I-10 within 1 driving mile via Barker Cypress Road. Forcing the applicant to construct the north-south street and dedicate between 100 to 150 feet of meandering right-of-way is contrary to sound public policy as the existing system works and the extension would conflict with existing development.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The conditions supporting the variance are the unique physical characteristics of the site, particularly the limitations imposed by the built-out environment. Cypress Run cannot be extended to the south without having a tremendously and unduly negative affect of the applicant's property. Because of the width, boulevard system, and trajectory heading into Kingsland Boulevard there is no acceptable way to extend Cypress Run southward.
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Application Number: 2014-2272
Plat Name: Houston Heights Swift Replat
Applicant: Marsh Darcy Partners, Inc.
Date Submitted: 09/19/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

Request to reduce the required building setback line along West 6th Street from 25 feet to 10 feet from the intersection of West 6th Street and Waverly Street westward for a distance of 628.00 feet.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-152(a)

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-152. Building line requirement along major thoroughfares. (a) The portion of a lot or tract that is adjacent to a major thoroughfare shall have a building line requirement of 25 feet unless otherwise authorized by this chapter.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
West 6th Street, between Yale and Shepherd, has been indicated as a major thoroughfare since the earliest Major Thoroughfare Plan on record - 1942. In March of 2011, as a part of IH 10 improvements, TxDOT began construction on a major detention system designed to help alleviate storm water flooding along White Oak Bayou. The detention system contained approximately 550 linear feet of existing West 6th Street 70 -feet wide right-of-way but the street improvements indicated on the MTFP were not constructed. As a result, the connection of West 6th Street between Yale and Shepherd is no longer physically possible and, therefore, this section of West 6th Street can no longer be considered as a future major thoroughfare. It should also be noted that TxDOT did not request this section of West 6th Street be removed from the MTFP. The need for a standard 25 -foot building setback line along a major thoroughfare is no longer appropriate. This unusual physical condition, approximately 470 feet east of the proposed replat, has created, if the existing regulations remained in place, an impractical development and one contrary to sound public policy of promoting higher density development within the City of Houston.

## (2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;

Had TxDOT not created the 550-foot wide storm water detention pond that includes the existing West 6th Street right-ofway, this unusual physical condition would not exist. As a result of the condition created by others, there will not be a major thoroughfare in this location and, therefore, there is no need for a building setback line that relates to the construction of a major thoroughfare.

## (3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

Should the Planning Department request the section of West 6th Street between Yale and Shepherd to have the major thoroughfare designation removed from the MTFP as a part of the 2015 MTFP amendments that reflects the current physical conditions, West 6th Street will revert to a local street that would be required to provide a 10 -foot building setback line, as requested in this variance. As such, the intent and general purpose of this section relating to building setback lines for local streets will be preserved and maintained.

## (4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The logical, ultimate, de-classification of this section of West 6th Street will allow the physical conditions in the area to be reflected in the needed regulations with setback lines associated therewith. This will promote sound public policy which will support positive public health, safety, and welfare.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The justification for the variance is a reflection of existing physical conditions and sound public policy to support increased development intensity within the City of Houston. Economic hardship is not the sole justification for the variance.
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Application Number: 2014-2249
Plat Name: Live Oak Terrace
Applicant: Total Surveyors, Inc.
Date Submitted: 09/08/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

To allow a shared driveway to extend longer than 200 feet.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-145

## Chapter 42 Reference:

42-145 General layout and arrangement for all shared driveways- The total length of the shared driveway shall be 200 feet or less as measured along the centerline of the shared driveway starting from the intersection with the public street

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
This development is a standard 250 ' $\times 250$ ' block within the South Side of Buffalo Bayou. The site is surrounded by 480 ' wide public rights-of-way, Rusk Street to the north, Walker Street to the south, Live Oak Street on the West and Nagle Street on the east. Walker Street on the south side is unique in the fact that it has a hike and bike trail within its boundaries and does not contain and pavement section for vehicular traffic. A shared driveway system is proposed to run from Rusk Street, in two locations and connect to Nagle Street with a single shared driveway. This layout does create single run of an 18 ' shared driveway of 366 feet. This distance is created by a shared driveway of 188', from Rusk Street that intersects another leg of a shared driveway of 178', from Nagle Street. At no point is any home served by either leg of these two shared driveways, greater than 200 from its intersection with a public street. The same driveway drive that intersects Rusk Street continues past its intersection with above described shared driveway and continues for a total distance of 250 ' and intersects the Walker Street right-of-way. Walker Street only contains a hike and bike trail within its boundaries. At the point where the shared driveway continues past its intersection with another shared driveway, all of the houses being served on this shared driveway do front on Live Oak Street and any fire protection need for these homes can be provide from the public right-of-way. The shared driveway system takes access to from a public right-of-way in three separate locations and allows all homes to be either front on or be situated less than 200 feet from a public right-of-way. This does not create any access problems for fire protection or any other emergency services needed within this development. The fire department will be able to fight a fire from any of the three street right-of-ways and have plenty of distance for hose lay length for the interior lots. The creation of a shared driveway system will allow smooth traffic flow within the subdivision and allow the traffic to exit and enter the development at multiple locations in case of an emergency.

## (2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;

The limited right-of-way access to the south and the multiple right-of-way access points on the north and east side of the site are the basis for this variance. The applicant has not created any of the above hardships.

## (3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent and purposes of Chapter 42 include the creation of the shared driveway system and in this case by allowing the shared driveway to exceed the 200 foot length would help to alleviate any potential impact to the surrounding traffic system as well as allow the neighborhood to be connected and allow the smooth flow of traffic.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The variance will not be injurious to public health, safety or welfare. The vehicular access to the proposed homes will be from an internal shared driveway system, with multiple points of access. This will promote safe vehicular access to the surrounding streets and promote the safe fire protection for the entire neighborhood. At the same time keep the safe environment along the hike and bike trail for the public use.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The justification of this variance is to obtain approval through the planning commission of a desirable residential project consistent with the character and circumstances of its surroundings. The existing conditions and structures surrounding the property are the justification of the variance

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 146

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Saudi Arabia Royal Consulate (DEF 1)
Applicant: South Texas Surveying Associates, Inc.


# Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 146 

## Subdivision Name: Saudi Arabia Royal Consulate (DEF 1)

Applicant: South Texas Surveying Associates, Inc.


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 146

## Subdivision Name: Saudi Arabia Royal Consulate (DEF 1)

## Applicant: South Texas Surveying Associates, Inc.




June 16, 2014

## SAUDI ARABIA GENERAL CONSULATE OF HOUSTON

$100 \%$ DESIGN DEVELOPMENT
JUNE 16, 2014


Application Number: 2014-2129
Plat Name: Saudi Arabia Royal Consulate
Applicant: South Texas Surveying Associates, Inc.
Date Submitted: 08/25/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:
Variance request for a 5 ' reduced building line along a Major Thoroughfare
Chapter 42 Section: 150

## Chapter 42 Reference:

42-150 Building Line Requirement along a Major Thoroughfare

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
This property is located on Wilcrest Drive (100' ROW) North of Richmond Ave and South of Meadowglen outside the West Belt. We are asking permission to reduce the building line in order to construct to guard houses at the entrance of the Consulate to prevent the general public from entering the property without just cause for being on site. All other structures will comply with Chapter 42 . We request a 5 foot building line from the property's west boundary line running along Wilcrest for the purpose of the guard houses only. There is no bus stop at this site that would put the public in harms way. Please refer to the site plans attached.
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The property's hardship is based on location. The community's crime rate in the zip code is primarily Theft and Violence with the occasional fatality. The guard houses will prevent unauthorized public from being able to access the grounds. This request will protect the members of the consulate and prevent the Police from having to respond to incidences that are prevented by the guards.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent and general purpose of chapter 42 will be preserved and maintained. We understand the need for building line set backs on Major Thoroughfares for public safety but we believe this request will protect the public, the consulate, and the police from criminal activity and unnecessary police action that can be prevented.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

Granting this variance would not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare. We understand that Chapter 42's regulations are there for a purpose, but we believe the request for a reduced building line to fortify the safety of the consulate is not unreasonable.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic hardship is not a justification in this situation at all. The hardship is the location of the consulate and the crime rate in the area. We believe we can prevent an incident prior to the occurrence of a crime if we have the guard houses available at the check in and check out points as referenced on the site. We respectfully ask for the reduced building line of 5 foot on this project for guard houses. Thank you for your time and consideration.
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Application Number: 2014-2124
Plat Name: Southwest Wire Rope
Applicant: REKHA ENGINEERING, INC.
Date Submitted: 08/25/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

: In response to the 5 criteria referenced in Section 42-81 of the Ordinance, we request a variance not to extend 3 local streets across the proposed subdivision and not to provide a turn-around within the plat boundary.

## Chapter 42 Section: 135

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-135. Street extension. (a) A public street that terminates at the boundary of a plat previously approved by the commission without means of a vehicular turnaround shall be extended into the adjacent property at the time the adjacent property is platted.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
Strict application of this requirement would deny Owner reasonable use of the land. This is an existing manufacturing facility that was previously two lots out of South Houston Gardens. The existing building and parking lot is remaining on site are essential for the operation of the wire rope manufacturing that is currently on site. Extension of the three streets from the east would disrupt the current use of the property, even to the point that the extension of Conger Street, Edgebrook Drive and Dirby Street in Easthaven Subdivision would run through the existing buildings and parking lot which have been in operation since 1978
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
For the reasons stated above, it is obvious that the circumstances stated above which support the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the Owners of the Property, because the current facilities were in place since 1978

## (3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

With the granting of the variance, the intent and purposes of the rule will be preserved and maintained as 4 of the 5 criteria which would have exempted the Owner from extending the streets were met. They are: "(1) The existing stub street is a local street and is not designated as a collector or major thoroughfare on the major thoroughfare and freeway plan; (2) The existing stub street is not shown as a through street on a current general plan approved by the commission for the subdivision in which the existing street is located or the subdivision that is the subject of the application;" "(4) The proposed subdivision will not extend residential development; and (5) The extension of the street is not required to meet the intersection spacing requirements of this chapter."

## (4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare as the existing condition have been in place for over thirty years.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

While economic hardship is obviously not the sole justification for the variance, it is certainly an issue in this instance. The Owners would have to incur the costs of redesigning the architectural and create engineering plans in order to extend the streets across the existing improvements.
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Application Number: 2014-2488
Plat Name: Springwoods Village District Sec 2
Applicant: C.L. Davis \& Company
Date Submitted: 10/06/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

The specific variance is to Section 42-150 as to 0 ' building line for first floor canopy around entire building. The remaining structure will comply with 10' building line except for architectural elements.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-155a

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-155. Collector and local streets--Uses other than single-family residential. (a) The building line requirement for a tract used or to be used for other than single-family residential purposes adjacent to a street that is a collector street or local street that is not an alley shall be ten feet unless otherwise required or authorized by this chapter.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
Strict application of the exceptions to building line requirement will create an impractical and unsightly development, which is contrary to sound public policy. The proposed Springwoods Village District Sec 2 plat (the "Plat") is being filed for the development and subdivision of a 31.2203 acre tract of land into two Blocks, being Block 1 and Block 2 (collectively, the "Property"), separated by a future 80 ' wide right-of-way public street to be named North CityPlace Drive. Further, the Plat along with the subject Property will be completely bounded by the following open and public streets to serve the area along with the Property and create the following building set-back requirements (also see attached pdf): Springwoods Village Parkway: 130' right-of-way - major thoroughfare - 25 ' building line -- no variance East Mossy Oaks Road: 130' right-of-way - major collector - 10' building line -- aerial variance Lake Plaza Drive: 80' right-of-way - local street - 10' building line -- aerial variance Future Spring Pine Forest Drive: 100' right-of-way - local street - 10’ building line -- aerial variance The purposed of this variance is to request aerial cantilevered encroachments within the 10' building line along East Mossy Oaks Road, Lake Plaza Drive, future Spring Pine Forest Drive, and future North CityPlace Drive. All structures and buildings will meet the required 10' building line requirement. This variance is for aerial canopy and architectural elements only, which will be cantilevered within the 10' building line. There is no variance request for Springwoods Village Parkway. Perimeter Street Specifications and Widths: The development of the Property and overall Project will dedicate public streets with 80 ' to 100 ' wide rights-of-way on all perimeter streets instead of the minimum required width of 60 ' right-of-way streets. By dedicating the wider streets, this will provide safe walking areas and establish accommodating public streets for smooth traffic flows. This Project is dedicating more than is required by the Chapter for streets and rights-of-way in an effort to create a friendly and inviting area. The pavement width for main lanes on perimeter streets will be $35^{\prime}$ wide. All buildings will be $32.5^{\prime}$ from the back-of-curb, which provides for a distance of 22.5 ' between the property line and the back-of-curb. Certain perimeter streets will have pull-in or street parking.

## (2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;

The circumstances supporting the variance are to provide a more inviting, enjoyable, and attractive development of the Property, and are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant. The applicant is honoring all the building line requirements, and desires to add more beauty and architectural features to the aerial aspects of the development to serve the guests, residents and citizens of the City of Houston by creating attractive walking areas along the perimeter of the buildings and streets. The variance is not a hardship but rather an enhancement for the benefit of the invitees of the Property.

## (3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent and purpose of this chapter will be preserved and maintained despite this variance, as aerial encroachments are allowed and expected under this chapter. Further, this chapter has established certain areas with no building line requirements and specifically allows aerial cantilever encroachments. The intent and purpose of a building line is to provide adequate spacing between buildings and streets, unified alignment of building footprint, and to allow areas for utilities, walkways for pedestrians and landscaping. All these purposes are being honored by the applicant and the development of the Property. The proposed aerial encroachments are invited under Section 42-151, which the applicant is proposing to engage for a larger scale development and create a central business district area environment that invites walkers to casually walk around the premises and enjoy the elements.

## (4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The failure to grant this variance will be injurious to the public health, safety and welfare, as there will be no canopies and other aerial enhancements to protect the pedestrians from the weather and other elements encountered in the City of Houston. The weather in Houston is very hot and steamy at times, and shade is a premium during the summer months. The applicant is sensitive to the extreme weather elements encountered during the year, and is desirous of adding creative architectural features to protect the public health, while also providing safety from the heat and humidity with shade relief and shelter from the rain to the pedestrians.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic hardship is not the sole justification for the variance. Rather, the variance serves to promote walking areas along the streets and parking areas while adding protection to the pedestrians from the weather elements, as needed. The justification for the variance is based on allowing architectural enhancements and features to buildings that serve to create an inviting and beautiful environment both on the street level and aerially from a distance. The applicant desires to establish an area that promotes mixed uses and engagement from the community that invites walkers and viewing opportunities.
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## Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2499
Plat Name: Towne Lake Sec 35
Applicant: EHRA
Date Submitted: 10/06/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

To provide a reduced 10' front building line for lots with vehicular access to a private alley.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-156(d)

## Chapter 42 Reference:

When the plat contains a typical lot layout and notes that restrict vehicular access to an approved public alley, then no front building setback line shall be required, except for corner lots as provided herein.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
Section 42-156(d) allows for a reduced front building line for lots with vehicular access to a public alley and which are located in the suburban area. Towne Lake Section 35 is located in the suburban area outside the city limits and is subject to Harris County requirements which do not allow public alleys. Thus, this variance is to allow application of the same reduced building line rule but applied to a private alley configuration.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The hardship is due to the fact that the subdivision is located outside of the city limits where private alleys are required by the county instead of public alleys.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

A 10' front building line will be provided for all lots with vehicular access to the private alleys in this section. By rule, no front building is allowed with 10 ' building lines on corner lots. Thus, lots in this section exceed the minimum requirements of 42-156(d).
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

Granting of this variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare since there is no distinguishable performance difference between private or public alleys.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic hardship is not a factor in this instance. This is an issue of the property being located in an area which does not allow public alleys, therefore a private alley must be created.

Application Number: 2014-2499
Plat Name: Towne Lake Sec 35
Applicant: EHRA
Date Submitted: 10/06/2014
(Sec. 42-48 and Sec. 42-82)
Specific requirement for which the special exception is being sought:
Special Exception to allow a 1,610' long block length.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-128 (a)(1)

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Each local street shall intersect with a street that meets the requirements of subsection (b) at least every 1,400 feet.

## Statement of Facts

(1) Special circumstances exist that are unique to the land or the proposed subdivision or development and that are not generally applicable to all other land, subdivision for development in the city or its extraterritorial jurisdiction that justify modification of the standards that would otherwise apply;
Dew Meadows Court, a private street within Towne Lake section 35, contains 16 single family lots averaging approximately 12,500 square feet each. The lots are located on only one side of the private street and face a landscape reserve adjacent to Greenhouse Road. This design has been used repeatedly within Towne Lake, most recently sections 27 and 30 , and creates a small premier development pod within a larger platted section.
(2) The proposed special exception will achieve a result contemplated by the standard in article III of Chapter 42 (Planning Standards);
The private street cul-de-sac, Dew Meadows Court, contains only 16 lots, versus the 35 lots allowed, due to the large lot frontage.
(3) The modification of the standard requested is not disproportionate to the requirement of the standard; The 1,610 ' requested block length is only 210 ' longer than the standard which represents a $15 \%$ deviation.
(4) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

As this design contains only 16 lots, the slightly longer cul-de-sac does not alter the general purposes of Chapter 42.
(5) The granting of the special exception will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare.

Vehicle trips on this cul-de-sac are nearly half of the allowable standard and thus have no negative impact on public health, safety, or welfare.
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## VARIANCE <br> Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2394
Plat Name: Woodmill Creek Sec 1
Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc - (Woodlands Office)
Date Submitted: 09/22/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:
To allow 0 ' front building lines for private alley served lots
Chapter 42 Section: 158

## Chapter 42 Reference:

The building line requirement for habitable structures along the right-of-way of a private street or type 2 permanent access easement shall be five feet.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
The subject property is located in Montgomery County, within the ETJ of the City of Houston. This property is being planned as a "new urban neighborhood" in the mixed used development of Woodland Creek, a master planned community. This neighborhood is adjacent to townhomes, apartments, and mixed use office \& commercial and is designed to connect the homes to the mixed-use commercial with streets and sidewalks within a 5 minute walk. One of the primary goals of this neighborhood is to provide an "urban", pedestrian-friendly environment. As such, Woodmill Creek Section 1 is creating a pedestrian-friendly setting through enhanced sidewalks, street trees and landscape treatments throughout the neighborhood. To achieve this goal, along this block in Woodmill Creek, a small urban park is proposed with lots facing onto the park. The block has incorporated an internal alley system into the proposed design to allow vehicular access to the back of the lots. The 30' private alley will function like a Type 2 Permanent Access Easement (P.A.E.), but due to Montgomery County rules it must be platted as a "Private Alley". We are seeking a variance to allow the Private Alley to substitute for a Type 2 P.A.E. allowing the lots to face onto the park rather than a public right of way. An important part of creating the pedestrian-friendly environment is to eliminate as many driveways as possible from the primary pedestrian routes. To achieve this goal, the development is proposing many homes that incorporated an internal alley system into the proposed design to allow vehicular access to the back of the lots. By providing the alleys and vehicular access to the rear of the lots, pedestrian interaction with vehicular traffic will be minimized. In an effort to further enhance the pedestrian feel of the development and to create the streetscape/scene of authentic period architecture, we are requesting the front building line of the alley served lots along Carrollton Mill Place, Philip Mill Lane, \& Carlson Mill Way be reduced to 0 -feet. Reducing the building line will create a tighter, more "urban" pattern that responds to the streetscape of the development and to that of the Woodland Creek Development.
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;

## (2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;

The overall development plan for the subject property is designed to enhance the pedestrian district by creating an inviting and safe place to walk. Providing a reduced building line will move homes closer to the enhanced pedestrian walks. The closer proximity of the homes to the pedestrian ways combined with walkways with enhanced landscaping and street trees creates a more attractive and safer walking environment. While this development plan is self imposed, it is designed to create a safer and more inviting place to live and walk.

## (3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The aforementioned design elements of reducing building lines and providing alleys and enhanced streetscapes are in keeping with widely accepted planning standards when trying to create more urban pedestrian friendly environments. Consequently, the City of Houston's Chapter 42 ordinance has accepted and incorporated certain aspects of these concepts. Section 42-158 (c) allows a 0 -foot front building line when access is provided via a public alley. Our proposal meets this requirement with the exception that the alleys proposed herein are private alleys rather than public alleys. Montgomery County will not allow public alleys, so we are proposing to use private alleys that will be maintained by the Homeowners Association. Thus, this proposal is in keeping with the intent and general purposes of Chapter 42.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

Granting of the herein requested variance will not be injurious to the public health or safety. By providing reduced building lines, enhanced sidewalks and street landscaping, a safer, more appealing pedestrian environment will be created. Thus, the public safety and welfare will be enhanced by providing the herein requested variance.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic hardship is not the justification for this variance. The hardship is due to different rules in Chapter 42 and Harris County regulations regarding public vs. private alleys.

PLANNING \&
DEVELOPMENT
VARIANCE
DEPARTMENT

## Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2394
Plat Name: Woodmill Creek Sec 1
Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc - (Woodlands Office)
Date Submitted: 09/22/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:
To allow a less than 75 ' intersection spacing on a local street
Chapter 42 Section: 128

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Intersections along local streets shall be spaced a minimum of 75' apart.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
This neighborhood is adjacent to townhomes, apartments, and mixed use office \& commercial and is designed to connect the homes to the mixed-use commercial with streets and sidewalks within a 5 minute walk. One of the primary goals of this neighborhood is to provide an "urban", pedestrian-friendly environment. As such, Woodmill Creek Section 1 is creating a pedestrian-friendly setting through enhanced sidewalks, street trees and landscape treatments throughout the neighborhood. To achieve this goal, along this block in Woodmill Creek, a small urban park is proposed with lots facing onto the park. The spacing of the streets adjoining the urban park is less than $75^{\prime}$. From right of way to right of way along the short side of the urban park it measures 61.15 . From pavement edge to pavement edge the distance is 88'.
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;

## (2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;

The overall development plan for the subject property is designed to enhance the pedestrian district by creating an inviting and safe place to walk. The Urban Park will be the central feature along the primary pedestrian corridor within the neighborhood, sidewalks through the neighborhood will connect to this corridor. The pedestrian corridor connects to a natural area along Panther Branch with trails that lead to the mixed use zone, as well as a connection to a central pedestrian link along Clear River Court The neighborhood is being designed as a single entry neighborhood without through traffic; the streets are narrowed to 24 ' to slow traffic down, with a design speed of 25 MPH. The slower design speed gives reasonable opportunity for drivers to deal with the tighter spacing of the streets along the short side of the urban park. While this development plan is self imposed, it is designed to create a safer and more inviting place to live and walk.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The neighborhood design elements of reducing building lines and providing alleys and enhanced streetscapes are in keeping with widely accepted planning standards when trying to create more urban pedestrian friendly environments. Consequently, the City of Houston's Chapter 42 ordinance has accepted and incorporated certain aspects of these concepts.

## (4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

Granting of the herein requested variance will not be injurious to the public health or safety. By providing an enhanced pedestrian corridor with sidewalks and street landscaping, a safer, more appealing pedestrian environment will be created. Thus, the public safety and welfare will be enhanced by providing the herein requested variance.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic hardship is not the justification for this variance.

# Houston Planning Commission 

Subdivision Name: Reserves at Fm529 and Kentwick (DEF2)
Applicant: Terra Associates, Inc.


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 151

Planning and Development Department
Meeting Date: 10/16/2014
Subdivision Name: Reserves at Fm529 and Kentwick (DEF2)
Applicant: Terra Associates, Inc.


## Houston Planning Commission <br> ITEM : 151

## Planning and Development Department

Meeting Date: 10/16/2014
Subdivision Name: Reserves at Fm529 and Kentwick (DEF2)
Applicant: Terra Associates, Inc.


## E - Special Exceptions

## SPECIAL EXCEPTION Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2219
Plat Name: Reserves at FM 529 and Kentwick
Applicant: Terra Associates, Inc.
Date Submitted: 09/08/2014
(Sec. 42-48 and Sec. 42-82)

## Specific requirement for which the special exception is being sought:

To allow a public street to intersect a major thoroughfare less than 600-ft from an existing intersection.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-127b

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-127. Intersections of major thoroughfares. (b) Intersections along a major thoroughfare shall be spaced a minimum of 600 feet apart.

## Statement of Facts

(1) Special circumstances exist that are unique to the land or the proposed subdivision or development and that are not generally applicable to all other land, subdivision for development in the city or its extraterritorial jurisdiction that justify modification of the standards that would otherwise apply;
FM 529 is a TxDOT roadway. We verbally coordinated with TxDOT on the placement of the curb cut for the proposed Kentwick Drive based on the existing conditions of the surrounding area. The proposed location of Kentwick Drive is approximately 425 -ft west of the intersection of FM 529 and Glen Chase Drive.
(2) The proposed special exception will achieve a result contemplated by the standard in article III of Chapter 42 (Planning Standards);
By allowing an intersection spacing of $425-\mathrm{ft}$ between Kentwick Drive and Glen Chase Drive, the true intent of Chapter 42 will remain intact. The 600 ft spacing is in place to allow for safe traffic flow and turning for the vehicles. Considering the location of existing driveways, the speed limit along FM 529 ( 45 MPH ), and the existing roadway configuration it is clear the intent of Chapter 42 is intact.
(3) The modification of the standard requested is not disproportionate to the requirement of the standard;

The proposed location of Kentwick Drive is 425 feet west of the nearest intersection along FM 529, which is only a deviation of $28 \%$ from the requirement of the standard.
(4) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent of this chapter is to provide development standards that promote the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the city and the safe, orderly and healthful development of the city. Granting this exception will preserve and maintain the intent of the chapter.
(5) The granting of the special exception will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare.

The granting of this special exception will not be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare. It will however improve traffic mobility and access to and from FM 529.

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 152

## Planning and Development Department

## Subdivision Name: Alden Woods Sec 1

Applicant: GBI Partners, LP


NORTH

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 152

Subdivision Name: Alden Woods Sec 1
Applicant: GBI Partners, LP


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 152

Planning and Development Department
Meeting Date: 10/16/2014
Subdivision Name: Alden Woods Sec 1
Applicant: GBI Partners, LP


NORTH

## F- Reconsideration of Requirements

Aerial

| Application No: | 2014-2523 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Plat Name: | Alden Woods Sec 1 |
| Applicant: | GBI Partners, LP |
| Date Submitted: | $10 / 06 / 2014$ |

(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific requirement or condition being sought:
To allow a Reserve restricted to "Landscape/ Open Space/ Cemetery" to: 1) be less than 5,000 s.f. 2) front on a Private Street 3) front on a 50' PAE/PUE 4) have 50' of frontage
Chapter 42 Section: 190

## Chapter 42 Reference:

42-190 (c): TYPE OF RESERVE MINIMUM SIZE TYPE OF STREET OR SHARED DRIVEWAY MINIMUM STREET OR SHARED DRIVEWAY WIDTH MINIMUM STREET OR SHARED DRIVEWAY FRONTAGE Restricted reserve-All other 5,000 sq. ft. public street 60 feet ( 50 feet in a street width exception area) 60 feet

If this request requires a variance or special exception, the applicant must comply with the Plat Submittal Requirements and provide a completed Variance Request Information Form or Special Exception Information Form.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS:

See attached Variance Request.

Application Number: 2014-2523
Plat Name: Alden Woods Sec 1
Applicant: GBI Partners, LP
Date Submitted: 10/06/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

To allow a Reserve restricted to "Landscape/ Open Space/ Cemetery" to: 1) be less than 5,000 s.f. 2) front on a Private Street 3) front on a 50' PAE/PUE 4) have 50' of frontage
Chapter 42 Section: 190

## Chapter 42 Reference:

42-190 (c): TYPE OF RESERVE MINIMUM SIZE-Restricted reserve—All other-5,000 sq. ft. public street- 60 feet (50 feet in a street width exception area) 60 feet

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
Alden Woods is a $\pm 73$-acre, private street, single family development located on Huffmeister Road southeast of Kluge Rd. The Alden Woods General Plan (2013-1608) was approved by the Houston Planning Commission on May 23, 2013. The Alden Woods Sec. 1 preliminary plat (2013-1610) was approved on May 23, 2013 and the final plat (2013-2681) was approved on November 14, 2013. The property contains a small cemetery site dating back to the mid 1800's. In 2008 the then property owner, Mr. Marvy Finger, commissioned Dr. Roger G. Moore, Ph.D., RPA, President of Moore Archeological Consulting, Inc. to investigate the subject site. The findings and determination are described in an Affidavit dated October 29, 2008 and filed for record in Harris County Clerk's File No. (HCCF No)20080553637. Based on the study the cemetery site was determined and marked (by subsurface monumentation only) to be a 40' x 40' site as shown on the survey dated July 29, 2008 and attached to the Affidavit. Then on October 25, 2013 the Harris County Attorney's Office, at the behest of the Harris County Historical Commission, contacted the current property owner and requested access to the cemetery site to document, survey and mark the cemetery area. Also on October 25, 2013 Assistant County Attorney Mr. Glen Van Slyke executed a Notice of Existence of Cemetery which was subsequently filed for record in HCCF No. 20130547014. The property owner agreed to the updated study of the site which began on November 13, 2013 with a limited subsurface investigation and was concluded in early December 2013. The updated study concluded the original 40' x 40' site needed to be expanded by 10' to the southeast only; as evidenced by an email from Mr. Glen Van Slyke to the property owner representative, Steve Sellers, dated December 12, 2013. In modifying the reserve dimensions, an ever so slight right-of-way modification was required to accommodate the expansion. As this site has been studied and identified by multiple parties over the past 6 years as a cemetery site, state law (specifically Health and Safety Code Section 711.035) does not allow the site to be used for any other uses other than a cemetery. Plus the original purpose of the minimum non-standard reserve requirements was to provide enough public street frontage, 60 -feet, and sufficient area, 5,000 s.f., to accommodate a possible future street extension through the reserve if the reserve was redeveloped in the future. Since this res
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
As previously stated the cemetery site dates back to the mid 1800's and was not created by the applicant.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

Given the facts that the existing cemetery site has been studied and its limits identified; the cemetery will be located within a reserve restricted to landscape/ open space/ cemetery with 50 ' of frontage on a Type 1 PAE/PUE and is
protected by state law from any other use; the intent and general purposes of this chapter have been preserved and maintained.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The cemetery is protected by state law and the reserve will not be used for any other use therefore the granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The justification of the variance is that the cemetery reserve cannot be used for any other use and cannot be redeveloped in the future; not an economic hardship.

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 153

## Planning and Development Department

## Meeting Date: 10/16/2014

Subdivision Name: Aliana Sec 38 (DEF1)
Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc- (West Houston Office)
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Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Aliana Sec 38 (DEF1)
Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc- (West Houston Office)


## Houston Planning Commission

## Planning and Development Department

## Subdivision Name: Aliana Sec 38 (DEF1)

Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc- (West Houston Office)


PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT department

## RECONSIDERATION OF REQUIREMENT <br> Request Information Form

```
Application No: 2014-2392
Plat Name: Aliana Sec 38
Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc.- (West Houston Office)
Date Submitted: 09/22/2014
```

(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific requirement or condition being sought:
Reconsideration of requiring a stub street on the southern end needed for block length
Chapter 42 Section: 42-128
Chapter 42 Reference:
42-128

If this request requires a variance or special exception, the applicant must comply with the Plat Submittal Requirements and provide a completed Variance Request Information Form or Special Exception Information Form.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS:

Please see variance request

PLANNING \&
development department

## VARIANCE Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2392
Plat Name: Aliana Sec 38
Applicant: LJA Engineering, Inc.- (West Houston Office)
Date Submitted: 09/22/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:
Allow excessive block length along southern boundary of plat
Chapter 42 Section: 42-128

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-128. Intersections of local streets. (a) Each class III plat and each general plan that shows local streets shall provide for internal circulation by meeting either of the following requirements: (1) Each local street shall intersect with a street that meets the requirements of subsection (b) at least every 1400 feet;

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
Aliana Sec 38 is bordered entirely by a drainage easement that is more than 200' wide. There is already north/south streets that intersect this plat. A southern stub would not go anywhere.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The circumstances supporting the variance is the physical characteristics of the area.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

Aliana is a masterplanned community that has good vehicle circulation throughout the project. It provides for recreational amenities and also accounts for drainage which is why a southern stub in this plat does not make sense.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The granting of the varince will not be injurious to the public health and safety of the community because there is good vehicle circulation in the area.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The justification of the variance is that we have already provided north/south streets within the subdivision

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 154

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Houston Kenswick Trade Center (DEF1)
Applicant: Edminster Hinshaw Russ \& Associates


## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 154

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Houston Kenswick Trade Center (DEF1)
Applicant: Edminster Hinshaw Russ \& Associates


# Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 154 

## Planning and Development Department

Meeting Date: 10/16/2014
Subdivision Name: Houston Kenswick Trade Center (DEF1)
Applicant: Edminster Hinshaw Russ \& Associates


F - Reconsideration of Requirement
Aerial



## SPECIAL EXCEPTION Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2246
Plat Name: Houston Kenswick Trade Center
Applicant: EHRA
Date Submitted: 09/08/2014
(Sec. 42-48 and Sec. 42-82)
Specific requirement for which the special exception is being sought:
Special Exception to allow a 1,527' long block length.
Chapter 42 Section: 42-128

## Chapter 42 Reference:

42-128 (a) Each class III plat and each general plan that shows local streets shall provide for internal circulation by meeting either of the following requirements: (1) Each local street shall intersect with a street that meets the requirements of subsection (b) at least every 1,400 feet.

## Statement of Facts

(1) Special circumstances exist that are unique to the land or the proposed subdivision or development and that are not generally applicable to all other land, subdivision for development in the city or its extraterritorial jurisdiction that justify modification of the standards that would otherwise apply;
Kenswick Trade Center Reserve is located west of Kenswick Drive and north of Will Clayton Parkway, just east of George Bush Intercontinental Airport. The 21.504 acre site is proposed to be a 150,000 square foot warehouse and distribution center which is consistent with the land use in the area. Meeting the 1,400' block length requirement is impractical due to existing development and public infrastructure constraints. A 190' wide Harris County Flood Control drainage facility exists along the north boundary of the subject property as well as a 5.8 acre existing detention pond. Immediately south of the subject property is another 4.9 acre detention pond while further to the south is an existing Ramada Hotel and a distribution facility with two buildings totaling over 200,000 square feet.
(2) The proposed special exception will achieve a result contemplated by the standard in article III of Chapter 42 (Planning Standards);
Kenswick Drive is an existing 4-lane divided major collector which adequately serves the traffic in the area. There is neither the need for nor ability to construct a north/south street through the subject property in this area.
(3) The modification of the standard requested is not disproportionate to the requirement of the standard; The subject tract measures 1,527 ' at its widest point. This equates to only a $9 \%$ deviation from the standard 1,400 ' block length requirement.
(4) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

Local north/south circulation is adequately served by Kenswick Drive which crosses the existing flood control drainage ditch to the north and intersects with Will Clayton Parkway to the south.
(5) The granting of the special exception will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare.

Public health, safety and welfare are not negatively impacted by granting this special exception since local circulation will not be affected and an unnecessary crossing of a flood control drainage ditch will be avoided.

Application Number: 2014-2246
Plat Name: Houston Kenswick Trade Center
Applicant: EHRA
Date Submitted: 09/08/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

Variance to not provide an east/west public street through the subject tract.
Chapter 42 Section: 128

## Chapter 42 Reference:

42-128 (a) Each class III plat and each general plan that shows local streets shall provide for internal circulation by meeting either of the following requirements: (1) Each local street shall intersect with a street that meets the requirements of subsection (b) at least every 1,400 feet.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
Houston Kenswick Trade Center Reserve is located west of Kenswick Drive (a major collector) and north of Will Clayton Parkway (a major thoroughfare), just east of George Bush Intercontinental Airport (IAH). The 21.504 acre site is proposed to be a 150,000 square foot warehouse and distribution center which is consistent with the land use in the area. The tract is approximately $1,930^{\prime}$ north of Will Clayton Parkway. Meeting the 1,400 ' block length requirement is impractical due to existing development on Lee Road and especially the location of IAH.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
Existing distribution centers on the east side of Lee Road include an internal private street system (Standifer Road). This is the only nearby street connection to Lee Road. However, an east/west public street through Houston Kenswick Trade Center would not be able to connect to Standifer Road since it is a private street. Further east/west circulation west of Lee Road is impossible due to the location of IAH.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The primary land use in the area is distribution centers and light industrial uses related to IAH. Such uses require larger tracts because of large square foot buildings and truck loading areas. The 1,400' block length requirement for local streets often interferes with such uses. However, major thoroughfares Will Clayton Parkway, Kenswick Drive, and Humble Westfield/F.M. 1960 provide adequate mobility in the area.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

Public health, safety and welfare are not negatively impacted by granting this variance since local circulation, which is primarily large truck traffic, is adequately handled by existing public streets.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The hardship for this variance is the inability to provide a meaningful east/west street connection through the tract since IAH and an existing private street prohibit such a connection.

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 155

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Jackrabbit Office LLC GP (Def1)
Applicant: The Pinnell Group, LLC.


# Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 156 

Planning and Development Department

## Subdivision Name: Jackrabbit Office LLC Sec 1 (Def1)

Applicant: The Pinnell Group, LLC.
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## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 156

Planning and Development Department
Subdivision Name: Jackrabbit Office LLC Sec 1 (Def1)
Applicant: The Pinnell Group, LLC.


F - Reconsideration of Requirement

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 156

Planning and Development Department
Meeting Date: 10/02/2014
Subdivision Name: Jackrabbit Office LLC Sec 1 (Def1)
Applicant: The Pinnell Group, LLC.
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F- Reconsideration of Requirements
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## RECONSIDERATION OF REQUIREMENT

| Application No: | 2014-2300 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Plat Name: | Manors on Oakley Street |
| Applicant: | ICMC GROUP INC |
| Date Submitted: | $09 / 21 / 2014$ |

(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific requirement or condition being sought:
Not to dedicate 5'of right-of-way widening for Oakley Street, which does not have a right-of-way width of 40.00 '. Rather than the required 50.00'
Chapter 42 Section: 122

## Chapter 42 Reference:

The minimum right-of-way required for each of the following types of streets or public alleys shall be as follows, subject only to the street width exception areas established pursuant to Chapter 42 Reference 42-122

If this request requires a variance or special exception, the applicant must comply with the Plat Submittal Requirements and provide a completed Variance Request Information Form or Special Exception Information Form.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS:

N/A

Application Number: 2014-2300
Plat Name: Manors on Oakley Street
Applicant: ICMC GROUP INC
Date Submitted: 09/21/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

Not to dedicate 5'of right-of-way widening for Oakley Street, which does not have a right-ofway width of 40.00 '.Rather than the required 50.00'
Chapter 42 Section: 122

## Chapter 42 Reference:

The minimum right-of-way required for each of the following types of streets or public alleys shall be as follows, subject only to the street width exception areas established pursuant to section 42-123 of this Code: Local streets (1) 50 feet if adjacent to exclusively single-family residential lots;

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
Oakley street is a 40 R.O.W. street Oakley Street was platted as a part of C.S. Fitze Homestead Subdivision in 1910 under the Old Rules and Regulations. Due to no Restrictions there has been some redevelopment in This subdivision, but none of the replats have dedicated any land for R.O.W. Widening Purposes. Across the Street from subject property Single family development called Oakley court Terrace was recorded in 2005. This Subdivision did not dedicate any land for R.O.W widening purposes. Oakley Terrace Court is a Replat of Lot 7 Block 2 of C.S. Fitze Homstead, which consist of all these lots have their front doors facing Oakley Street. Daily traffic volumes in this subdivision is very low. Being a residential streets discouraging significant amounts of traffic. There has been a lot of redevelopment in the area in the last decade; street widening has not been required because of the proximity of the existing substantial structures and the low traffic volumes. There is already a 4.00 ' wide Sidewalk existing in front of the property, As per New City Ordinance 5.00 ' Sidewalk may be required, Developer is Willing to Offer a Sidewalk easement inside the property if required
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
Both streets were dedicated in Subdivision called C.S. Fitze Homestead before there were any city regulations, and has existed in its current form for many years ago, prior to this owner acquiring the property.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

CurrentlyThis property has access on both streets. From Oakley Street and Jack Street. There is very little traffic on these streets and the residents who take access from the street have adequate maneuvering ability within the existing Right of Way
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The proposed plat will not alter the street pattern that currently exists.

## (5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

It is contrary to sound public policy to require one property owner to dedicate land to the public for which the City has no realistic need or use.

## Houston Planning Commission ITEM : 158

## Planning and Development Department

## Subdivision Name: Samantha Fitness Center

## Applicant: Advanced Surveying



NORTH
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NORTH



## RECONSIDERATION OF REQUIREMENT

| Application No: | 2014-2472 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Plat Name: | Samantha Fitness Center |
| Applicant: | Advance Surveying, Inc. |
| Date Submitted: | $10 / 06 / 2014$ |

(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)
Specific requirement or condition being sought:
The developer is requesting a variance to reduce the building line along Chimney Rock Rd. to 10-foot instead of the required 25 -foot setback as required by Ch. 42-152
Chapter 42 Section: 152

## Chapter 42 Reference:

42-152

If this request requires a variance or special exception, the applicant must comply with the Plat Submittal Requirements and provide a completed Variance Request Information Form or Special Exception Information Form.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS:

Granting this request will allow the developer to build a multi-level garage.

PLANNING \&
Development

## Request Information Form

Application Number: 2014-2472
Plat Name: Samantha Fitness Center
Applicant: Advance Surveying, Inc.
Date Submitted: 10/06/2014
(Sec. 42-47 and Sec. 42-81)

## Specific Variance is being sought and extent of variance:

Sec. 42-152 (Building line requirement along major thoroughfares) requires that the portion of a lot or tract that is adjacent to a major thoroughfare shall have a building line requirement of 25 feet feet unless otherwise authorized by Chapter 42. This requirement applies to West Bellfort Ave which runs east/west along the southern boundary of the proposed property. We are requesting a variance from providing a 25 foot building line along the Chimney Rock, a major thoroughfare, along the western boundary of the proposed property.
Chapter 42 Section: 152

## Chapter 42 Reference:

Sec. 42-152. Building line requirement along major thoroughfares. (a) The portion of a lot or tract that is adjacent to a major thoroughfare shall have a building line requirement of 25 feet unless otherwise authorized by this chapter.

## Statement of Facts

(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; OR
(1b) Strict application would make this project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
The developer is intending to build a multi-level garage along western boundary which aligns Chimney Rock Rd with a 10 -foot building line. The requirement of placing the garage back to the 25 -foot setback would result in the loss of parking on the plat of Samantha Fitness. We are requesting a variance to reduce the building line along Chimney Rock Rd to 10-foot instead of the required 25-foot setback as required by Ch 42-152
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The granting of the variance is not a result of a hardship created by the applicant.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The reduced building line along Chimney Rock Rd. will enable multi-garage
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

Granting the variance request would not be harmful to the public health, safety or welfare in any way.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic hardship is not the sole justification for this variance request. As mentioned above, The developer is intending to build a multi-level garage along western boundary which aligns Chimney Rock Rd. with a 10-foot building line.

Planning Commission
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| Applicant: ChARLES BULL Contact Person: Charles Bull |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | File No. | Zip | Lamb. No. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Key } \\ & \text { Map } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { City/ } \\ & \text { ETJ } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 14-1029 | 77365 | 5572 | 295-E | ETJ |

Address: 24606 Butterfly Lane
Acreage:
Legal description:
Lot 118, in Block 1, of Summer Hills Sec 1, a subdivision in Montgomery County, Texas, according to the map or plat thereof recorded in Cabinet ‘C", Sheet 118A of the Map Records of Montgomery County, Texas.

PURPOSE OF REQUEST: Mobile Home

## STAFF REPORT

Staff Recommendation:

Basis Of Recommendation:
Additional Information :

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Planning Commission

Applicant: Alvin SNOW
Contact Person: Alvin Snow

| Location | File <br> No. | Zip | Lamb. <br> No. | Key <br> Map | City/ <br> ETJ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WEST OF: US 59 South OF: FM 1485 | $14-1030$ | 77357 | 5674 | $256-\mathrm{P}$ | ETJ |

AdDress: 21695 Dogwood Drive
Acreage: 0.720
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lot Sixty (60), Post Oak Estates, Section Three (3), J.H. Stewart Survey, A-668, Montgomery County, Texas.

PURPOSE OF REQUEST: Mobile Home

## STAFF REPORT

## Staff Recommendation:

Basis Of Recommendation:
Additional Information :

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

## Houston Planning Commission

## VARIANCE REQUEST APPLICATION

An applicant seeking a variance and/or special exception to the Planning Standards of Chapter 42 of the City of Houston's Code of Ordinances must complete the following application and submit an electronic copy of the Microsoft Word document to planning.variances@houstontx.gov prior to 11:00am on the submittal dates adopted by the Houston Planning Commission. For complete submittal requirements, please visit the City of Houston Planning \& Development Department website at www.houstonplanning.com.


```
Existing Structure(s) [TYPE; SQ. FT.]: Single Family Residence (1,267 SF)
Proposed Structure(s) [TYPe; SQ. fT.]: Single Family Residence (3,800 SF)
```

Purpose of Variance Request:
To request a $5^{\prime}$ building line for the south half of the property with a $15^{\prime}$ building line for the north half on the Windsor ROW in order to preserve a 100+ year old tree. We are a corner lot with garage access through an alley in the rear of the property.

Chapter 42 Reference(s): Sec. 42-156 (b) Except as otherwise required or authorized by this chapter, the building line requirement for a lot restricted to single-family residential use along a local street that is not an alley shall be: 20 feet along the front of a lot and ten feet along the back and side of a lot adjacent to a local street.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAT VARIANCE

## APPLICANT'S STATEMENT OF FACTS


#### Abstract

Summary of Variance Conditions (be as complete as possible): We are requesting a staggered building line of 5 ' and 15 ' instead of a 10 ' as described in Chapter 42 simply to preserve the $100+$ year old tree that has provided shade and character to the neighborhood.


The applicant must clearly identify how the requested variance meets the criteria in either (1a) or (1b) and ALL items (2) through (5). The information provided will be used to evaluate the merits of the request. An electronic copy of any supporting documentation reference within the "Applicant's Statement of Facts" should be emailed to the Planning Department at planning.variances@houstontx.gov.
(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; or
(1b) Strict application of the requirements of this chapter would make a project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;

The property has a huge, wonderful 100+ year old tree and we would like to preserve it but also take advantage of the allowable buildable area for the residence by asking for a 5' and a 15' building line as opposed to a straight 10' building line allowed by Chapter 42.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
There is no hardship imposed or created by the applicant. We simply want to preserve a tree that has provided shade and character to the neighborhood for the past 100+ years.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained in that the variance we are requesting is a staggering of the building lines on Windsor so that we may take advantage of the buildable square footage allowed by Chapter 42 while not disturbing a $100+$ year old tree that provides shade and character to the neighborhood. Chapter 42 allows us a 10' building line on Windsor since we have an alley access for the garage and this is a corner lot, instead we are asking for a 5 ' and a 15' BL.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare on the contrary, it will be a benefit to the neighborhood in providing shade, character and preserving the tree for the following generations to enjoy, while allowing the land owner to take advantage of the maximum buildable area as described in Chapter 42 with a 10' building line.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance since the entire reason for the variance is to preserve a 100+ year old tree.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAT VARIANCE
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## Area Map
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Aerial Map
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Proposed Site Plan
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| ITEM: | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Meeting Date: | $10-16-14$ |

## Houston Planning Commission
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| ITEM: | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Meeting Date: | $10-16-14$ |

## Houston Planning Commission

Proposed $1^{\text {st }}$ Floor Plan
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| ITEM: | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Meeting Date: | $10-16-14$ |

## Houston Planning Commission

Proposed 2nd Floor Plan


DEVELOPMENT PLAT VARIANCE
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Proposed Elevation

(11)
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## VARIANCE REQUEST APPLICATION

An applicant seeking a variance and/or special exception to the Planning Standards of Chapter 42 of the City of Houston's Code of Ordinances must complete the following application and submit an electronic copy of the Microsoft Word document to planning.variances@houstontx.gov prior to 11:00am on the submittal dates adopted by the Houston Planning Commission. For complete submittal requirements, please visit the City of Houston Planning \& Development Department website at www.houstonplanning.com.


Existing Structure(s) [type; sQ. ft.]: Vacant
Proposed Structure(s) [TYpe; sq. ft.]: Single Family Residential (5,164 SQ. FT.)
Purpose of Variance Request: To allow a 5' building line along Dorothy Street
Chapter 42 Reference(s): $42-157$ The building line requirement for a subdivision or development in the city restricted to single-family residential use adjacent to a collector street or a local street that is not an alley shall be:
(1) Ten feet for the principal structure; and
(2) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, 17 feet for a garage or carport facing the street. A building above the garage or carport may overhang the building line up to seven feet.

## APPLICANT'S STATEMENT OF FACTS

Summary of Variance Conditions (be As complete as possible): We are requesting a variance to utilize the property in a more suitable manner. The 10' set back on Dorothy Street, does not allow the above mentioned proposed single family residence to utilize the corner lot in a suitable manner. This is a corner lot and the other street at this corner has a single digit set back and if we are granted this set back on Dorothy, to reduce from a 10' building line to a 5 ' building line - the proposed residence can sit evenly on both sides of the lot allowing it to make the neighborhood not only aligned but beautiful.

The applicant must clearly identify how the requested variance meets the criteria in either (1a) or (1b) and ALL items (2) through (5). The information provided will be used to evaluate the merits of the request. An electronic copy of any supporting documentation reference within the "Applicant's Statement of Facts" should be emailed to the Planning Department at planning.variances@houstontx.gov.
(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; or

We are requesting a variance to utilize the property in a more suitable manner. The 10' set back on Dorothy Street, does not allow the above mentioned proposed single family residence to utilize the corner lot in a suitable manner. This is a corner lot and the other street at this corner has a single digit set back and if we are granted this set back on Dorothy, to reduce from a 10' building line to a $5^{\prime}$ building line - the proposed residence can sit evenly on both sides of the lot allowing it to make the neighborhood not only aligned but beautiful.
(1b) Strict application of the requirements of this chapter would make a project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;

We chose to pursue this variance only to better myself and the neighborhood by building a new single family residence that will make the neighborhood a better place and plan to follow all of the regulations to make this variance possible. The planning standards of chapter 42 of The City of Houston Code of Ordinances - will all be followed by us from beginning to end, and we trust that the board will see that our request would only help the neighborhood.
(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent and purpose of Chapter 42 will be preserved and maintained because the residence will have a five foot (5') building set back.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAT VARIANCE

PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

Granting this variance will not affect visibility along Dorothy Street for vehicular or pedestrian traffic. Once constructed, the residence will be five feet (5') from the existing curb on Dorothy. Also, many nearby properties are located approximately ten feet ( $10^{\prime}$ ) from the right of way, so this variance for the residence will be consistent and harmonious with neighboring properties on $7^{\text {th }} 1 / 2$ and Dorothy Streets. Its proposed proximate location to the nearby park on $7^{\text {th }} 1 / 2$ and use of green space is consistent with the City of Houston's policy of promoting walkability and pedestrian friendly environments. Thus approval of this Variance will be consistent with sound public policy and conducive to health, safety and public welfare.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

The requested variance will satisfy the intent of Chapter 42, including Section 42-155 (as discussed above). Additionally, south of the proposed residence is bordered by other high end homes. Granting this variance for this residence would not cause any adverse impact on the City's ability to construct more luxury end residences on Dorothy Street in the future because that ability is significantly restricted by the factors mentioned above. To summarize, approving this variance for the residence is consistent with the City of Houston's evolving policies of promoting walkable, pedestrian friendly environments and projects with urbanistic building designs on smaller footprints. Permitting the residence to have a five foot ( $5^{\prime}$ ) setback is harmonious with neighboring residences along Dorothy Street and will not affect the City's ability to construct more beautiful homes in the neighborhood.
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## SITE MAP
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Site Plan
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Floor Plans - First Floor
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Front Elevation


Rear Elevation
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Left Elevation
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## VARIANCE REQUEST APPLICATION

An applicant seeking a variance and/or special exception to the Planning Standards of Chapter 42 of the City of Houston's Code of Ordinances must complete the following application and submit an electronic copy of the Microsoft Word document to planning.variances@houstontx.gov prior to 11:00am on the submittal dates adopted by the Houston Planning Commission. For complete submittal requirements, please visit the City of Houston Planning \& Development Department website at www.houstonplanning.com.

| Applicant Company Co | Contact Person | Phone Nu | Email Address |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baxter Construction \& Development Corporation | Parke Patterson | (713) 86 | parkepatterson@hotmail.com |  |  |
| Property Address Fil | File Number | Zip Code | Lambert | Key Map | District |
| 2124 White Oak Drive 14 | 14105223 | 77009 | 5358 | 493B | H |
| HCAD Account Number(s): | 0611900000011 |  |  |  |  |
| Property Legal Description: | Lot 11, Block 17 of Woodland Terrace |  |  |  |  |
| Property Owner of Record: | Baxter Construction Company, Inc. |  |  |  |  |
| Acreage (Square Feet): | . 1063 ac. (4,630 SF) |  |  |  |  |
| Width of Rights-of-Way: | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Paving Section(s): | 32 |  |  |  |  |
| Off-Street Parking Requirement | MENT: Project Complies |  |  |  |  |
| Landscaping Requirements: | Project Complies |  |  |  |  |

```
Existing Structure(s) [tyPe; sQ. FT.]: Vacant
Proposed Structure(s) [TYPE; SQ. ft.]: Single-Family Residence; 4,500 SF
```


## Purpose of Variance Request:

To build to the 17 ' setback line - same as the previous home and the existing homes which have established along White Oak Drive.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAT VARIANCE

# Houston Planning Commission 

## APPLICANT'S STATEMENT OF FACTS

## Summary of Variance Conditions (be as complete as possible):

To request a variance to the minimum building line requirements due to special conditions at the site and to match existing homes in the neighborhood.

The applicant must clearly identify how the requested variance meets the criteria in either (1a) or (1b) and ALL items (2) through (5). The information provided will be used to evaluate the merits of the request. An electronic copy of any supporting documentation reference within the "Applicant's Statement of Facts" should be emailed to the Planning Department at planning.variances@houstontx.gov.
(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; or
(1b) Strict application of the requirements of this chapter would make a project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;
The current code requirement which calls for a structure to be built 25 ' from the property line is infeasible due to the unique characteristic of the existing neighborhood and street. Although White Oak Drive is designated as a major thoroughfare, it is a two lane residential street. All of homes on the street on the block have a similar 17' front setback from the front property line. Additionally, the home is built on a hill approximately 6 feet above street level.

We are requesting a minor variance to allow for a 17' foot building setback line for the front porch. The front porch is open and the front wall of the home will have an additional 12' setback, thereby providing a 29 ' setback. The existing hill will remain, providing a visual and physical barrier.
The front wall of the home will be 53 ' from the street.
The granting of the variance is sound public policy in that it permits the integrity of the streetscape to be maintained and prevents a void in the symmetry of the building line along the entire street.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;

The granting of a variance will not impose any additional hardship on the existing neighborhood, but is instead an attempt to maintain the existing conformity with the surrounding homes which do not meet the current 25 foot front setback line requirement, all of which have been in place for approximately 90 years. Additionally numerous new structures along White Oak Drive have been built within the 25 foot setback line, but in conformity to the design and style of the street.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAT VARIANCE
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(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

Part of the intent and purpose of the code is to maintain uniformity within neighborhoods. The variance is needed in order to maintain a uniform streetscape. Numerous surrounding homes encroach into the City's setback line which was established long after the homes were built. This home is designed to maintain the character and uniformity of the neighborhood.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

Public health, safety and welfare will not be harmed by the granting of the variance. The granting of the variance would not cause any detriment to health, safety or welfare. The new home would exceed the existing deed restrictions setback by $2^{\prime}$.

Furthermore, the home is 6 feet above street level and will not be an impediment to oncoming traffic. The open front porch will be 41 ' from the street and the front wall of the home will be 53 ' from the street.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Economic hardship is not the reason for the variance. The setback variance request is an attempt to maintain the existing atmosphere, style and character of the neighborhood.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAT VARIANCE
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Meeting Date:

Site Location
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Aerial Map
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Meeting Date: $\quad 10-16-2014$
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3) FRONT ELEVATION
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## VARIANCE REQUEST APPLICATION

An applicant seeking a variance and/or special exception to the Planning Standards of Chapter 42 of the City of Houston's Code of Ordinances must complete the following application and submit an electronic copy of the Microsoft Word document to planning.variances@houstontx.gov prior to 11:00am on the submittal dates adopted by the Houston Planning Commission. For complete submittal requirements, please visit the City of Houston Planning \& Development Department website at www.houstonplanning.com.


Existing Structure(s) [TYPE; SQ. FT.]:
Proposed Structure(s) [TYPE; SQ. FT.]:

Purpose of Variance Request:
the required 25' Building line.
(2) To allow direct

## DEVELOPMENT PLAT VARIANCE

Sec. 42-189. - Lot access to streets.
(a) Each lot shall have access to a street that meets the requirements of this chapter and the design manual, subject to the limitations of this section.
(b) A single-family residential lot shall not have direct vehicular access to a major thoroughfare unless:
(1) The lot is greater than one acre in size; and
(2) (2) The subdivision plat contains a notation adjacent to the lot requiring a turnaround on the lot that prohibits vehicles from backing onto the major thoroughfares.

## APPLICANT'S STATEMENT OF FACTS

Summary of Variance Conditions (be as complete as possible): The conditions of the variance are to gain building space on a lot that the Owner purchased from the City of Houston. Setbacks on Yale Street are twenty five feet from the property line. In this case, this requirement would take half of the square footage of this property. The Owner is asking for a ten foot setback to be able to build a single family residence on the lot.

The applicant must clearly identify how the requested variance meets the criteria in either (1a) or (1b) and ALL items (2) through (5). The information provided will be used to evaluate the merits of the request. An electronic copy of any supporting documentation reference within the "Applicant's Statement of Facts" should be emailed to the Planning Department at planning.variances@houstontx.gov.
(1a) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this chapter would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant of the reasonable use of the land; or

The twenty-five feet set back deprives me of half of the buildable space. It would be impossible to do anything with the property with a twenty five foot setback. With the ten foot setback I would be able to make the proposed improvements proposed on the site plan.
(1b) Strict application of the requirements of this chapter would make a project infeasible due to the existence of unusual physical characteristics that affect the property in question, or would create an impractical development or one otherwise contrary to sound public policy;

The development is a practical single family dwelling that would create an improvement to the area. The proposed single family dwelling works perfect with this lot, nice yard space and substantial parking.
(2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship created or imposed by the applicant;
The granting of variance is only for building space and improvement of the land.
DEVELOPMENT PLAT VARIANCE
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(3) The intent and general purposes of this chapter will be preserved and maintained;

The intent and purposes are only to make and improvement within all the guideline.
(4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare;

The property is secured by cement structure across the front and rot iron fence, which provides safety. The elevation of the lot makes for additional safety.
(5) Economic hardship is not the sole justification of the variance.

Improvement of the land is the sole purpose of needing the variance.
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AERIAL MAP


## DEVELOPMENT PLAT VARIANCE

PROPOSED SITE PLAN
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SURVEY
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Proposed Floor Plans
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## VARIANCE REQUEST APPLICATION

An applicant seeking a variance to the Parking Standards of Chapter 26 of the City of Houston's Code of Ordinances must complete the following application and submit an electronic copy of the Microsoft Word document to planning.variances@houstontx.gov prior to 11:00am on the submittal dates adopted by the Houston Planning Commission. For complete submittal requirements, please visit the City of Houston Planning \& Development Department website at www.houstonplanning.com.


## Chapter 26 Reference(s):

26-490 - All required parking facilities shall conform to the following standards:

1) Parking facilities shall be:

## Houston Planning Commission

a. Available for use by employees, customers, and patrons; b. Maintained at all times the building or tract is in use or occupied; and c. Used exclusively for their intended purpose. A parking space shall be used exclusively for the temporary parking of passenger automobiles not exceeding one ton in capacity and a bicycle space shall be used exclusively for the temporary parking of bicycles;

## APPLICANT STATEMENT OF FACTS

## Summary of Variance Conditions (be as complete as possible):

In recent years, this building has been occupied by Interfaith Ministries. Since their departure from the neighborhood the building has been remodeled to accompany other uses that are more conducive to this inner-city area. The six on-street spaces that were constructed with the building in 1940 are in excess of the current parallel parking size requirements of 8 ft . x 20 ft . Each of the six spaces has the dimensions of 8 ft . $\times 22 \mathrm{ft}$. and are adjacent to the two northbound travel lanes along Montrose Boulevard.

## Applicant's Statement of Facts:

The applicant must clearly identify how the requested variance meets the criteria in ALL items (1) through (5); and, if applicable, the sixth (6) condition. The information provided will be used to evaluate the merits of the request. An electronic copy of any supporting documentation reference within the "Applicant's Statement of Facts" should be emailed to the Planning Department at planning.variances@houstontx.gov.
(1) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this article would deprive the owner or applicant of the property of reasonable use of the land or building;
Since this building was erected in 1940 this neighborhood and the surrounding areas have evolved. Innercity property such as this is now in greater demand. Adaptive reuse has been necessary in order to keep this building viable for new tenants. These six indented on-street parking spaces exist as a result of this previously being allowed by the city and were built to serve this building.

The street network surrounding this site is very conducive to walkability, which means that the one size fits all parking standards would not necessarily be applicable to a site in such a densely populated area of the city. The site is surrounded by a mix of uses including single and multifamily residential, which would further demonstrate other modes of transportation to the site such as walking and biking. The sidewalks surrounding the site also are especially favorable to pedestrians with most of them having landscape buffers between the street and the pedestrian realm. There are also large oak trees lining the majority of the surrounding street network that provide shade and safety from traffic for pedestrians. These six indented on-street parking spaces would also help separate the pedestrian realm from the street enhancing safety and comfort for pedestrians.
(2) That the circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship imposed or created by the applicant and that in granting the variance the general purposes of this article are being observed and maintained;

The building was constructed in 1940 \& the City Ordinance requiring off-street parking did not go into effect until 1989, 49 yrs later. Continued use of the building depends upon continued use of the parking built for it.

## Houston Planning Commission

(3) The intent of this article is preserved;

The intent of the article is to ensure that a particular land use has sufficient parking to meet the needs of that use. Considering the dense nature of this area of the city, the intent will be preserved with the applicant providing bike racks to reduce automobile parking. Because of the parking within the right-of-way there will also be sufficient parking for automobiles as well.
(4) The parking provided will be sufficient to serve the use for which it is intended;

The parking being provided meets the current requirements of Chapter 26.
(5) The granting of such a variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare; and

The public welfare is protected by preserving this old building and adaptively reusing the structure that has been a part of this neighborhood for many decades. This practice conserves natural resources and promotes sustainable development. The proposed bike racks will also encourage less automobile use and promote a more active lifestyle that will create a healthier environment for the area.
(6) For a development that is subject to the requirements of article VII, chapter 33, of this Code, the granting of the variance is necessary to accomplish the purposes of a certificate of appropriateness issued pursuant to article VII, chapter 33, of this Code.

Shared Parking Table as submitted by applicant

| Class | Type of Use | Typical Weekday |  |  |  | Typical Weekend |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Midnight to 7 AM | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 7: 00 \mathrm{AM} \\ \text { to } 5 \mathrm{PM} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 5:00 PM } \\ \text { to } 9 \mathrm{PM} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 9 PM to Midnight | Midnight to 7 AM | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 7: 00 \mathrm{AM} \\ \text { to } 5 \mathrm{PM} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 5:00 PM } \\ \text { to } 9 \mathrm{PM} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 9 PM to Midnight |
| Class 1. Office | Office | (1) $5 \%$ | (18) $100 \%$ | (5) 30\% | (1) $5 \%$ | (0) $0 \%$ | (2) $10 \%$ | (0) $0 \%$ | (0) $0 \%$ |
| Class 3. Health Care Facilities | Clinic (medical or dental) | (0) $0 \%$ | (14) $100 \%$ | (4) $25 \%$ | (0) $0 \%$ | (0) $0 \%$ | (4) $25 \%$ | (0) $0 \%$ | (0) $0 \%$ |
| Class 7. Food and Beverage | Neighborhood restaurant | (3) $10 \%$ | (16) 50\% | (24) 75\% | (13) 40\% | (5) 15\% | (24) 75\% | (32) $100 \%$ | (16) 50\% |

BIKE RACK REDUCTION
( -5 Spaces)

TOTAL SPACES NEEDED
$0 \quad 43$
$28 \quad 9$
90
25
27
11

Shared Parking Table requires 48 spaces between 7 a.m. -5 p.m. Bike rack reduction of $10 \%=43.2$ required parking spaces total

- 6,577 U.S.F. of Office Space $\times 2.75=18$ required spaces
- 3,500 S.F. of Restaurant $\times 9=31.5$ spaces/ 2 (only $50 \%$ needed between $7 \mathrm{am}-5 \mathrm{pm}$ ) $=16$ required spaces
- 4,000 S.F. of Medical Clinic x $3.5=14$ required spaces


## Houston Planning Commission

## STANDARDS FOR VARIANCES

(a) The commission is authorized to consider and grant variances from the provisions of this article by majority vote of those members present and voting, when the commission determines that the first five of the following conditions exist, and if applicable, the sixth condition, exists:
(1) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this article would deprive the owner or applicant of the property of reasonable use of the land or building;
(2) That the circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship imposed or created by the applicant and that in granting the variance the general purposes of this article are being observed and maintained;
(3) The intent of this article is preserved;
(4) The parking provided will be sufficient to serve the use for which it is intended;
(5) The granting of such a variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare; and
(6) For a development that is subject to the requirements of article VII, chapter 33, of this Code, the granting of the variance is necessary to accomplish the purposes of a certificate of appropriateness issued pursuant to article VII, chapter 33, of this Code.
(b) In addition, if the variance involves an off-site parking facility, the commission must determine that a proposed off-site parking facility will be located so that it will adequately serve the use for which it is intended. In making this determination, the following factors, among other things, shall be considered:
(1) The location of the proposed building and the proposed off-site parking facility.
(2) Existing and potential parking demand created by other occupancies in the vicinity.
(3) The characteristics of the occupancy, including employee and customer parking demand, hours of operation, and projected convenience and frequency of use of the off-site parking.
(4) Adequacy, convenience, and safety of pedestrian access between off-site parking and the occupancy.
(5) Traffic patterns on adjacent streets, and proposed access to the off-site parking.
(6) The report and recommendation of the director and the traffic engineer.

Any variance granted under the provisions of this section will apply only to the specific property and use upon which the commission was requested to grant a variance by the applicant and shall not constitute a change of this article or any part hereof. All variances as granted shall be in writing shall be signed by the secretary of the commission and maintained as a permanent record of the commission.
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## ITEM: IV

Meeting Date: 10-16-2014

## Houston Planning Commission

## VARIANCE REQUEST APPLICATION

An applicant seeking a variance to the Parking Standards of Chapter 26 of the City of Houston's Code of Ordinances must complete the following application and submit an electronic copy of the Microsoft Word document to planning.variances@houstontx.gov prior to 11:00am on the submittal dates adopted by the Houston Planning Commission. For complete submittal requirements, please visit the City of Houston Planning \& Development Department website at www.houstonplanning.com.

| Applicant Company | Contact Person | Phone Number | Email Address |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hutton | Adam Levitt | $423-771-4462$ | ALevitt@hutton.build |  |  |
| Property Address | File Number | Zip Code | Lambert | Key Map | District |
| 6804 MLK Jr. Blvd | 14092577 | 77033 |  | 534 S | 061 |
| 7209 Kassarine Pass |  | 77033 | 534 S | 061 |  |
| 7213 Kassarine Pass |  | 77033 | 534 S | 061 |  |

hCAD Account Number(s):
PROPERTY LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PROPERTY OWNER OF RECORD:
ACREAGE (SQUARE FEET):
WIDTH OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY:
EXISTING PAVING SECTION(S):
OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENT:
OFF-STREET PARKING PROVIDED:
LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS:

EXISTING STRUCTURE(S) [SQ. FT.]:
PROPOSED STRUCTURE(S) [SQ. FT.]:
Purpose of Variance Request:

0751900190006 ; 075100190004 ; 0751900190005
Lots 4-7, Block 19, South Park Section 2
Shafall Raj ; Thomas Rhonda
0.72 ACRES ( 31,358 S.F. $\pm$ )

MLK JR BLVD = 120'; KASSARINE PASS = 60'
6-LANE MEDIAN DIVIDED ROAD (ASPHALT) ; 2-LANE ROAD (ASPHALT)
33 Parking Spaces \& 1 bicycle space
21 Parking Spaces \& 1 bicycle space
Meets the Requirement

2,250 S.F. $\pm$ (2-RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES)
8,225 S.F. (COMMERCIAL)

Requesting a variance to reduce the required parking by 12 spaces to allow for 21 parking spaces in lieu of the required 33 parking spaces.

## OFF-STREET PARKING VARIANCE
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Chapter 26 Reference(s):
Sec. 26-492 Class 8. Retail Services: c. Retail Store 4.0 parking spaces for every 1,000 square feet of GFA.

## APPLICANT STATEMENT OF FACTS

Summary of Variance Conditions (be as complete as possible):
Requesting a variance to reduce the required number of parking space provided by 12, to allow for 21 vehicular parking spaces in lieu of the required 33 vehicular parking spaces.

## Applicant's Statement of Facts:

The applicant must clearly identify how the requested variance meets the criteria in ALL items (1) through (5); and, if applicable, the sixth (6) condition. The information provided will be used to evaluate the merits of the request. An electronic copy of any supporting documentation reference within the "Applicant's Statement of Facts" should be emailed to the Planning Department at planning.variances@cityofhouston.net.
(1) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this article would deprive the owner or applicant of the property of reasonable use of the land or building;
The 0.72 acre property located on the corner of MLK Jr. Blvd and Kassarine would be most appropriately a commercial use since the property was previously commercial and the properties along MLK Jr. Blvd frontage are primarily commercial. The proposed 8,225 s.f. Family Dollar is a relatively small commercial use with lower traffic demands than other small commercial uses such as restaurants or gas stations. The site layout is unable to provide the required parking and still me the COH requirements for setbacks, landscaping, as well as serve dumpster and delivery trucks.
(2) That the circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship imposed or created by the applicant and that in granting the variance the general purposes of this article are being observed and maintained;
The hardship is strictly related to the parcel size \& shape and the inability to provide for the required parking spaces within the property limits. This hardship was not created by the applicant.
(3) The intent of this article is preserved;

The purpose of parking requirements is to ensure commercial developments do no create a nuisance to adjacent properties. This would occur if the proposed development was unable to service customers with the on-site parking and customers overflowed to adjacent properties. Family Dollar stores are low volume generators with short duration trips by customers. See discussion under \#4 for details.

## OFF-STREET PARKING VARIANCE

## Houston Planning Commission

(4) The parking provided will be sufficient to serve the use for which it is intended;

Family Dollar has done parking studies of existing stores that showed a highest occupied parking rate of 1.8 spaces per 1,000 s.f.; which would result in a maximum of 15 spaces utilized for this store. The study showed their stores average 2,200 customers per week, with an average shop time of 15 minutes per customer. The low customer volumes and quick trips allow the stores to service customers with relatively few parking spaces being occupied simultaneously.
(5) The granting of such a variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare; and

With the stated belief that the provided parking is adequate to service the proposed use, there should be no impact to the public by providing the reduced number of parking spaces.
(6) For a development that is subject to the requirements of article VII, chapter 33, of this Code, the granting of the variance is necessary to accomplish the purposes of a certificate of appropriateness issued pursuant to article VII, chapter 33, of this Code.
N/A
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## STANDARDS FOR VARIANCES

(a) The commission is authorized to consider and grant variances from the provisions of this article by majority vote of those members present and voting, when the commission determines that the first five of the following conditions exist, and if applicable, the sixth condition, exists:
(1) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies and standards of this article would deprive the owner or applicant of the property of reasonable use of the land or building;
(2) That the circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship imposed or created by the applicant and that in granting the variance the general purposes of this article are being observed and maintained;
(3) The intent of this article is preserved;
(4) The parking provided will be sufficient to serve the use for which it is intended;
(5) The granting of such a variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare; and
(6) For a development that is subject to the requirements of article VII, chapter 33, of this Code, the granting of the variance is necessary to accomplish the purposes of a certificate of appropriateness issued pursuant to article VII, chapter 33, of this Code.
(b) In addition, if the variance involves an off-site parking facility, the commission must determine that a proposed off-site parking facility will be located so that it will adequately serve the use for which it is intended. In making this determination, the following factors, among other things, shall be considered:
(1) The location of the proposed building and the proposed off-site parking facility.
(2) Existing and potential parking demand created by other occupancies in the vicinity.
(3) The characteristics of the occupancy, including employee and customer parking demand, hours of operation, and projected convenience and frequency of use of the off-site parking.
(4) Adequacy, convenience, and safety of pedestrian access between off-site parking and the occupancy.
(5) Traffic patterns on adjacent streets, and proposed access to the off-site parking.
(6) The report and recommendation of the director and the traffic engineer.

Any variance granted under the provisions of this section will apply only to the specific property and use upon which the commission was requested to grant a variance by the applicant and shall not constitute a change of this article or any part hereof. All variances as granted shall be in writing shall be signed by the secretary of the commission and maintained as a permanent record of the commission.
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## OFF-STREET PARKING VARIANCE

| LOCATION |  | FILE |  | LAMB. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NO. |  |  |  |  |

PURPOSE OF REQUEST: To allow the proposed 117 unit hotel to be constructed taking primary access from a commercial private street.
BASIC OF REQUEST:

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

BASIS OF RECOMMENDATION:

## PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

## CITY OF HOUSTON <br> DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

## HOTEL/MOTEL VARIANCE FORM



Applicant:_Blue Moon Development Consultants $\qquad$ Phone: $\qquad$ 281-796-9996 $\qquad$
Address: 603 Lovett, Cleveland, Texas $\qquad$ Zip Code:_77327 $\qquad$

Site Address:__Katy Freeway @ Houston Chronicle Blvd__ Date Disapproved:
Statement of the specific provision of the article from which the variance is requested:
Sec. 28-202(a) It shall be unlawful for any person to construct any new hotel... unless the following conditions are met:
(1) The tract on which the hotel is to be located shall have direct frontage on and take primary access from:
b. A street or a portion thereof that is not a residential street, that is striped or otherwise actually allows for at least four lanes of moving traffic, and that connects to a major thoroughfare that is not a residential street

State of the extent of the variance sought and the specific facts and reasons that the applicant believes warrant the granting of the variance:

Please see attached

Signature of Applicant
Date
FOR DEPARTMENT USE ONLY
One copy of Hotel Motel Variance Form
Non-refundable fee of $\$ 200.00$

Blue Moon Development Consultants
603 Lovett
Cleveland, Texas 77327
281-796-9996
The proposed 117-unit Aloft hotel will comply with the requirements of the hotel/motel ordinance except that it takes access through a private commercial street rather than a public street. The pertinent ordinance section is:
Sec. 28-202(a) It shall be unlawful for any person to construct any new hotel... unless the following conditions are met:
(1) The tract on which the hotel is to be located shall have direct frontage on and take primary access from:
b. A street or a portion thereof that is not a residential street, that is striped or otherwise actually allows for at least four lanes of moving traffic, and that connects to a major thoroughfare that is not a residential street
*****

## More Basic Information:

The hotel is part of an over-all development planned and built to minimize driveways along the public streets in this office building area. Driveways exist to function like alleys in a 1920 s residential neighborhood but are constructed at public street width. This minimizes driveway connections to the public streets and promotes safe traffic flow. The intent of the driveways predates the hotel/motel ordinance and is not intended to circumvent the intent of the ordinance.

## The Variance Requests:

We, respectfully, request a variance from Houston Planning Commission to allow the proposed 120 unit Marriott hotel to be constructed taking primary access from the commercial private street. The ordinance authorizes the commission to grant a variance using the criteria italicized in the following arguments.

1) The imposition of the terms, rules, conditions, policies, and standards of this article would create an undue hardship by depriving the applicant or owner of the property of reasonable use of the land; and
The driveway arrangement is a feature of the over-all development of this office park area. The hotel does own half of the driveway through which it will take access. The ordinance requires the hotel provide a $24^{\prime}$ wide driveway for access to a public street with four lanes for moving traffic. The hotel has such access but does not own the entire driveway. Widening the existing adequate (more than $24^{\prime}$ wide) driveway simply
so the hotel would own a $24^{\prime}$ wide driveway to Houston Chronicle Blvd seems ridiculous and just as subject to being thought an attempt to circumvent the ordinance.
2) The circumstances supporting the granting of the variance are not the result of a hardship imposed or created by the applicant; and
The applicant bought into the problem. The applicant believes that this variance is required solely to assure the City of Houston that the application is not an attempt to circumvent the ordinance.
3) The intent and general purposes of this article will be preserved and maintained; and
The requirement for direct access and abutment to a public street was included in the ordinance to preclude circumventing the ordinance by building hotels without public street access in locations that do not meet the residential and sensitive use protections of the ordinance. This hotel does not violate those protections because of its room count.
4) The granting of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare.
The proposed hotel has access and abutment to a street that meets the demands of the ordinance. The room count is such that the ordinance does not see an adverse impact on sensitive uses or residences. The hotel will not be injurious to the public health, safety and welfare.



## AGENDA: VI

SMLSA Application No. 384: Abstract 1 J Austin Schultz; Abstract 1 J Austin; Allen A C, Blocks 43, 44, 52-55, 61-63; Cristina Jamaux Estates, Block 1; Depenbrock Allen Section 62, Blocks 1-6; Depenbrock Section 2, Blocks 1 \& 2; Hogan Street Addition, Block 1; Hogan Street Section 2, Block 1; Quitman Estates, Block 1; Quitman T/H, Block 1; Quitman Terrace, Block 1; Richter; Schultz; Tract 7c and Wrightwood

## BACKGROUND:

The Planning and Development Department received an application for the establishment of a Special Minimum Lot Size Area (SMLSA) for Abstract 1 J Austin Schultz; Abstract 1 J Austin; Allen A C, Blocks 43, 44, 52-55, 61-63; Cristina Jamaux Estates, Block 1; Depenbrock Allen Section 62, Blocks 1-6; Depenbrock Section 2, Blocks 1 \& 2; Hogan Street Addition, Block 1; Hogan Street Section 2, Block 1; Quitman Estates, Block 1; Quitman T/H, Block 1; Quitman Terrace, Block 1; Richter; Schultz; Tract 7c and Wrightwood. Analysis shows that a minimum lot size of $4,500 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ exists for the area. A petition was signed by the owners of $18 \%$ of the property within the proposed SMLSA. An application was filed and the Director has referred the application to the Planning Commission in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 42-204. This report provides the Commission with a synopsis of procedures and appropriate application criteria.

## PROCEDURES:

Following acceptance of an initially complete application, the Planning Director notifies all owners of property within the proposed SMLSA. Any property owner who wishes to vote for or against the creation of the minimum lot size area may return the response form within thirty days. The Director shall forward a complete application to Planning Commission for public hearing and consideration upon finding that the application complies with all of the following:

- meets all criteria required for Planning Commission approval (listed in next paragraph);
- shows evidence of support from owners of at least $55 \%$ of the property within the proposed SMLSA
After close of a public hearing the Planning Commission shall consider the following:
- the boundaries of the proposed SMLSA shall contain no less than five block faces, composed of 5 lots or more on each blockface;
- at least $80 \%$ of the lots to be included within the proposed SMLSA, exclusive of land used for a park, library, place of religious assembly or a public or private elementary, middle, junior high or high school, is developed with or are restricted to not more than two singlefamily units per lot;
- the proposed SMLSA does not include a significant area developed as or restricted to a use that is not single family residential and;
- does not include a significant area that does not share a lot size character with the rest of the proposed area
- that the applicant has demonstrated sufficient support of $55 \%$ for the establishment of the proposed SMLSA;
- that the establishment of the SMLSA will further the goal of preserving the lot size character of the area; and
- that the proposed SMLSA has a lot size character that can be preserved by the establishment of a minimum lot size, taking into account the age of the neighborhood, the age of structures in the neighborhood, existing evidence of a common plan and scheme of


## City of Houston

development, and such other factors that the director, commission or city council, respectively as appropriate, may determine relevant to the area.
Should the Commission find that the application meets these requirements; the Commission must forward the application to City Council for consideration. City Council approval of the SMLSA is enforceable for forty (40) years from the effective date of the ordinance.

## STAFF ANALYSIS:

This application includes three hundred and eighty-two (382) properties in Abstract 1 J Austin Schultz; Abstract 1 J Austin; Allen A C, Blocks 43, 44, 52-55, 61-63; Cristina Jamaux Estates, Block 1; Depenbrock Allen Section 62, Blocks 1-6; Depenbrock Section 2, Blocks 1 \& 2; Hogan Street Addition, Block 1; Hogan Street Section 2, Block 1; Quitman Estates, Block 1; Quitman T/H, Block 1; Quitman Terrace, Block 1; Richter; Schultz; Tract 7c and Wrightwood.

Analysis of the application resulted in the following findings:

- The boundaries of the proposed SMLSA must contain not less than five (5) blockfaces composed of five (5) lots or more on each blockface;
The application contains seventy (70) blockfaces with at least 5 lots on 5 blockfaces
- At least $80 \%$ of the lots to be included within the proposed SMLSA, exclusive of land used for a park, library, place of religious assembly or a public or private elementary, middle, junior high or high school, must be developed with, or restricted to, not more than two single-family units per lot; For any lot or tract that was not vacant and was in use for other than single family residential purposes, the subdivision plat, development plat, or building permit may provide for any use permitted by law or, if applicable, deed restrictions. Land use of the properties consists of three hundred (300) single-family residential properties representing $80 \%$ of the total lots.
- The applicant has demonstrated sufficient support for the SMLSA;

The applicant obtained 59\% support from property owners in the proposed SMLSA

- Establishment of the SMLSA will further the goal of preserving the area lot size character;

A minimum lot size of $4,500 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ exists on two hundred sixty-three (263) of three hundred eighty-two (382) lots in the area.

- The proposed SMLSA has a lot size character that can be preserved by the establishment of a special minimum lot size, taking into account the age of the neighborhood, the age and architectural features of structures in the neighborhood, existing evidence of a common plan or scheme of development, and such other factors that the director, commission or city council, respectively as appropriate, may determine relevant to the area.
There is no subdivision plat on file and the houses were constructed primarily in the 1910s, 1920s and 1930s. The establishment of a $4,500 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ minimum lot size will preserve the lot size character of the area.
- The minimum lot size for this application was determined by finding the current lot size that represents a minimum standard for $70 \%$ of the application area.
Two hundred twenty (220) out of three hundred eighty-two (382) lots representing 70\% of the application area is at least 4,500 square feet in size.

Public notice of the public hearing was transmitted to all property owners in the area.
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## SPECIAL MINIMUM LOT SIZE AREA Allen AC

| Address | Lot size (sq. ft.) | \% by Area | Cumulative \% by Area | Response Form | Signed Petition | Land Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 HOGAN | 55,121 | 2.90\% | 2.90\% |  |  | VAC |
| 1917 THOMAS | 46,874 | 2.46\% | 5.36\% | NO |  | VAC |
| 2513 IDEAL ST | 20,358 | 1.07\% | 6.43\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2503 IDEAL ST | 16,636 | 0.87\% | 7.31\% | YES |  | SF |
| 0 IDEAL ST | 15,882 | 0.84\% | 8.14\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2509 IDEAL ST | 13,050 | 0.69\% | 8.83\% |  |  | SF |
| 0 GARGAN | 12,623 | 0.66\% | 9.49\% |  |  | VAC |
| 109 MARIE ST | 11,300 | 0.59\% | 10.09\% |  |  | VAC |
| 1907 FLETCHER ST | 11,250 | 0.59\% | 10.68\% | NO |  | SF |
| 2501 IDEAL ST | 11,217 | 0.59\% | 11.27\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2212 SOUTH ST | 11,200 | 0.59\% | 11.86\% | YES |  | SF |
| 115 MARIE ST | 10,898 | 0.57\% | 12.43\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 121 MARIE ST | 10,310 | 0.54\% | 12.97\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2512 IDEAL ST | 10,200 | 0.54\% | 13.51\% | YES |  | SF |
| 219 HENRY ST | 9,975 | 0.52\% | 14.03\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2511 FLETCHER ST | 9,100 | 0.48\% | 14.51\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2500 THOMAS ST | 9,000 | 0.47\% | 14.99\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2508 THOMAS ST | 9,000 | 0.47\% | 15.46\% | YES |  | SF |
| 205 PASCHALL ST | 8,820 | 0.46\% | 15.92\% | YES |  | VAC |
| 2515 IDEAL ST | 8,694 | 0.46\% | 16.38\% |  |  | SF |
| 2202 SOUTH ST | 7,823 | 0.41\% | 16.79\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2508 IDEAL ST | 7,800 | 0.41\% | 17.20\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2516 IDEAL ST | 7,800 | 0.41\% | 17.61\% |  |  | SF |
| 0 HOGAN ST | 7,750 | 0.41\% | 18.02\% |  |  | VAC |
| 211 HOGAN ST | 7,750 | 0.41\% | 18.43\% | NO |  | VAC |
| 214 QUITMAN ST | 7,700 | 0.40\% | 18.83\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2405 KEENE ST | 7,500 | 0.39\% | 19.23\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2407 KEENE ST \# 4 | 7,500 | 0.39\% | 19.62\% |  |  | SF |
| 307 HOGAN ST | 7,500 | 0.39\% | 20.01\% |  |  | SF |
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| 202 MARIE ST | 7,380 | $0.39 \%$ | $20.40 \%$ |  |  | SF |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 216 QUITMAN ST | 7,370 | $0.39 \%$ | $20.79 \%$ | NO |  | SF |
| 402 BOUNDARY ST | 7,118 | $0.37 \%$ | $21.16 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 2518 FLETCHER ST | 6,888 | $0.36 \%$ | $21.53 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 2103 THOMAS ST | 6,750 | $0.35 \%$ | $21.88 \%$ | NO |  | SF |
| 2109 THOMAS ST | 6,750 | $0.35 \%$ | $22.24 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 409 QUITMAN ST | 6,700 | $0.35 \%$ | $22.59 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 2418 SOUTH ST | 6,300 | $0.33 \%$ | $22.92 \%$ | YES |  | VAC |
| 213 HENRY ST | 6,240 | $0.33 \%$ | $23.25 \%$ | YES |  | MF |
| 213 HOGAN ST | 6,200 | $0.33 \%$ | $23.57 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 217 HOGAN ST | 6,200 | $0.33 \%$ | $23.90 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 219 HOGAN ST | 6,200 | $0.33 \%$ | $24.55 \%$ |  | YES | SF |
| 221 HOGAN ST | 6,020 | $0.32 \%$ | $24.87 \%$ | NO |  | SF |
| 2324 SOUTH ST | 6,000 | $0.32 \%$ | $25.18 \%$ |  |  | SF |
| 2517 FLETCHER ST | 6,000 | $0.32 \%$ | $25.50 \%$ |  |  | SF |
| 2519 FLETCHER ST | 6,000 | $0.32 \%$ | $25.82 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 2521 FLETCHER ST | 5,800 | $0.30 \%$ | $26.12 \%$ | NO |  | SF |
| 2324 SOUTH ST | 5,800 | $0.30 \%$ | $26.42 \%$ | NO |  | SF |
| 2324 SOUTH ST | 5,783 | $0.30 \%$ | $26.73 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 201 MARIE ST | 5,700 | $0.30 \%$ | $27.03 \%$ | YES | YES | SF |
| 305 MORRIS ST | 5,675 | $0.30 \%$ | $27.33 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 2209 THOMAS ST | 5,500 | $0.29 \%$ | $27.62 \%$ | YES | YES | SF |
| 2319 FLETCHER ST | 5,500 | $0.29 \%$ | $27.91 \%$ |  |  | VAC |
| 2406 THOMAS ST | 5,500 | $0.29 \%$ | $28.19 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 305 CARL ST | 5,500 | $0.29 \%$ | $28.48 \%$ | NO |  | MF |
| 314 MORRIS ST | 5,490 | $0.29 \%$ | $28.77 \%$ | YES | YES | SF |
| 2108 FLETCHER ST | 5,400 | $0.28 \%$ | $29.06 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 2020 KEENE ST | 5,400 | $0.28 \%$ | $29.34 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 2204 KEENE ST | 5,400 | $0.28 \%$ | $29.62 \%$ | NO |  | SF |
| 2216 SOUTH ST | 5,400 | $0.28 \%$ | $29.91 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 2504 IDEAL ST | 5,400 | $0.28 \%$ | $30.19 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 2510 IDEAL ST | 5,400 | $0.28 \%$ | $30.48 \%$ |  |  | SF |
| 2514 IDEAL ST | 5,400 | $0.28 \%$ | $30.76 \%$ | YES |  | SF |
| 401 PASCHALL ST | 5,400 | $0.28 \%$ | $31.04 \%$ |  |  | SF |
| 506 HENRY ST | 5,317 | $0.28 \%$ | $31.32 \%$ | YES |  | VAC |
| 211 QUITMAN ST | 5,300 | $0.28 \%$ | $31.60 \%$ |  |  | VAC |
| 2518 IDEAL ST | 5,200 | $0.27 \%$ | $31.88 \%$ |  |  | VAC |
| 113 MORRIS ST | $0.27 \%$ | $32.15 \%$ | YES | YES | SF |  |
| 207 CARL ST | 0 THOTH | 3200 | $32.68 \%$ | NO |  | VAC |
|  | $32.95 \%$ |  |  | VAC |  |  |
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| 110 CARL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 33.21\% | YES |  | SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200 CARL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 33.47\% | YES |  | SF |
| 200 MORRIS ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 33.74\% | YES |  | SF |
| 202 MORRIS ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 34.00\% | YES |  | SF |
| 206 CARL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 34.26\% | YES |  | SF |
| 207 QUITMAN ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 34.52\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2203 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 34.79\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2205 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 35.05\% | NO |  | SF |
| 2207 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 35.31\% |  |  | SF |
| 2208 SOUTH ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 35.58\% |  |  | SF |
| 2209 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 35.84\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2209 KEENE ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 36.10\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2218 SOUTH ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 36.36\% |  |  | SF |
| 2220 SOUTH ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 36.63\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2305 CHURCHILL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 36.89\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2307 KEENE ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 37.15\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2312 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 37.42\% |  | YES | SF |
| 2313 CHURCHILL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 37.68\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2313 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 37.94\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2314 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 38.21\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2315 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 38.47\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2401 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 38.73\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2403 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 38.99\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2403 KEENE ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 39.26\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2404 SOUTH ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 39.52\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2405 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 39.78\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2406 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 40.05\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2406 SOUTH ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 40.31\% | NO |  | SF |
| 2407 CHURCHILL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 40.57\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2407 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 40.83\% |  |  | SF |
| 2408 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 41.10\% |  |  | SF |
| 2408 THOMAS ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 41.36\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2409 CHURCHILL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 41.62\% |  |  | SF |
| 2409 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 41.89\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2411 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 42.15\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2413 THOMAS ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 42.41\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2415 THOMAS ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 42.67\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2419 THOMAS ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 42.94\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2503 CHURCHILL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 43.20\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2503 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 43.46\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2505 CHURCHILL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 43.73\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2509 CHURCHILL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 43.99\% |  |  | SF |
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| 2512 FLETCHER ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 44.25\% | YES |  | SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2515 CHURCHILL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 44.51\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2517 KEENE ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 44.78\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2519 KEENE ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 45.04\% | YES |  | SF |
| 300 CARL ST \# 4 | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 45.30\% |  |  | MF |
| 302 MORRIS ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 45.57\% | YES |  | SF |
| 303 HENRY ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 45.83\% | YES |  | SF |
| 304 WINNIE ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 46.09\% | YES |  | SF |
| 305 HENRY ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 46.36\% | YES |  | SF |
| 305 QUITMAN ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 46.62\% |  |  | VAC |
| 306 MORRIS ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 46.88\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 308 CARL ST \# 5 | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 47.14\% |  |  | MF |
| 309 MORRIS ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 47.41\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 311 QUITMAN ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 47.67\% | YES |  | SF |
| 312 CARL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 47.93\% |  |  | VAC |
| 312 CARL ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 48.20\% |  |  | VAC |
| 317 MORRIS ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 48.46\% |  |  | EXC |
| 400 QUITMAN ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 48.72\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 404 QUITMAN ST \# 4 | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 48.98\% |  |  | MF |
| 406 QUITMAN ST \# 4 | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 49.25\% |  |  | MF |
| 411 HOGAN ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 49.51\% | YES |  | SF |
| 415 QUITMAN ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 49.77\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 417 HOGAN ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 50.04\% | YES |  | SF |
| 419 HOGAN | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 50.30\% | NO |  | SF |
| 419 HOGAN ST | 5,000 | 0.26\% | 50.56\% |  |  | SF |
| 2516 FLETCHER ST | 4,960 | 0.26\% | 50.82\% |  |  | SF |
| 0 KEENE ST | 4,950 | 0.26\% | 51.08\% |  |  | COM |
| 2206 KEENE ST | 4,950 | 0.26\% | 51.34\% | YES |  | SF |
| 308 JAMES ST | 4,950 | 0.26\% | 51.60\% | YES |  | SF |
| 501 MARIE ST | 4,950 | 0.26\% | 51.86\% |  |  | MF |
| 502 QUITMAN ST | 4,950 | 0.26\% | 52.12\% |  |  | VAC |
| 503 WINNIE ST | 4,950 | 0.26\% | 52.38\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2113 KEENE ST | 4,860 | 0.26\% | 52.64\% |  |  | SF |
| 401 BOUNDARY ST | 4,860 | 0.26\% | 52.90\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 115 MORRIS ST | 4,800 | 0.25\% | 53.15\% | YES |  | SF |
| 218 JAMES ST | 4,770 | 0.25\% | 53.40\% | YES |  | SF |
| 215 HOGAN ST | 4,650 | 0.24\% | 53.64\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 310 QUITMAN ST | 4,568 | 0.24\% | 53.88\% | NO |  | SF |
| 2404 CHURCHILL ST | 4,528 | 0.24\% | 54.12\% | YES |  | SF |
| 301 WINNIE ST | 4,516 | 0.24\% | 54.36\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 0 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 54.60\% |  |  | VAC |
| 0 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 54.83\% |  |  | VAC |
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| 0 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 55.07\% |  |  | VAC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 121 MARIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 55.31\% | YES |  | SF |
| 1901 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 55.54\% |  |  | EXC |
| 1901 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 55.78\% |  |  | EXC |
| 1911 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 56.02\% | YES |  | SF |
| 1915 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 56.25\% |  |  | EXC |
| 1919 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 56.49\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2003 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 56.73\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2005 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 56.96\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2008 FLETCHER ST \# 10 | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 57.20\% |  |  | MF |
| 2009 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 57.44\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2011 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 57.67\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2018 FLETCHER ST \# 1 | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 57.91\% |  |  | MF |
| 2020 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 58.14\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2021 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 58.38\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2021 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 58.62\% | YES |  | MF |
| 205 MARIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 58.85\% | YES |  | SF |
| 206 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 59.09\% | NO |  | VAC |
| 207 MARIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 59.33\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2110 THOMAS ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 59.56\% | NO |  | SF |
| 2113 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 59.80\% |  |  | SF |
| 2119 THOMAS ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 60.04\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2119 THOMAS ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 60.27\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2121 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 60.51\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2123 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 60.75\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2204 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 60.98\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2211 THOMAS ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 61.22\% | NO |  | SF |
| 2213 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 61.46\% |  |  | SF |
| 2215 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 61.69\% |  |  | SF |
| 2217 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 61.93\% |  |  | SF |
| 2219 KEENE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 62.17\% |  |  | EXC |
| 2307 THOMAS ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 62.40\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2315 THOMAS ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 62.64\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2319 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 62.88\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2324 SOUTH ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 63.11\% | NO |  | SF |
| 2406 THOMAS ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 63.35\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2514 FLETCHER ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 63.59\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2519 CHURCHILL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 63.82\% | YES | YES | VAC |
| 301 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 64.06\% |  |  | SF |
| 303 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 64.30\% | YES |  | VAC |
| 303 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 64.53\% | YES |  | SF |
| 303 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 64.77\% | YES |  | SF |
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| 303 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 65.01\% | YES |  | SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 303 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 65.24\% | YES |  | SF |
| 305 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 65.48\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 305 CARL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 65.72\% | YES |  | SF |
| 306 WINNIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 65.95\% |  |  | VAC |
| 307 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 66.19\% |  |  | SF |
| 307 GARGAN ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 66.43\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 307 MARIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 66.66\% | YES |  | MF |
| 309 GARGAN ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 66.90\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 314 MORRIS ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 67.14\% | NO |  | SF |
| 401 BOUNDARY ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 67.37\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 401 GARGAN ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 67.61\% |  |  | SF |
| 401 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 67.85\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 402 GARGAN ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 68.08\% | YES |  | SF |
| 402 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 68.32\% | YES |  | SF |
| 402 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 68.56\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 402 WINNIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 68.79\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 404 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 69.03\% | YES |  | MF |
| 404 WINNIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 69.27\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 405 GARGAN ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 69.50\% | YES |  | VAC |
| 405 HENRY ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 69.74\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 405 HENRY ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 69.98\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 405 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 70.21\% | YES |  | SF |
| 406 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 70.45\% |  |  | SF |
| 406 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 70.69\% | NO |  | VAC |
| 406 WINNIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 70.92\% |  |  | SF |
| 407 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 71.16\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 407 GARGAN ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 71.40\% |  |  | SF |
| 407 MARIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 71.63\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 407 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 71.87\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 407 WINNIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 72.11\% |  |  | SF |
| 408 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 72.34\% | YES |  | SF |
| 408 WINNIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 72.58\% | YES |  | SF |
| 409 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 72.82\% | YES | YES | COM |
| 409 GARGAN ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 73.05\% | YES |  | SF |
| 409 WINNIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 73.29\% |  |  | SF |
| 410 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 73.53\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 410 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 73.76\% | YES |  | SF |
| 410 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 74.00\% | YES |  | SF |
| 411 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 74.23\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 411 GARGAN ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 74.47\% | YES |  | SF |
| 411 HENRY ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 74.71\% | YES | YES | SF |
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| 411 JAMES | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 74.94\% | YES |  | SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 411 MARIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 75.18\% | YES |  | SF |
| 411 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 75.42\% | NO |  | SF |
| 412 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 75.65\% |  |  | SF |
| 412 HENRY ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 75.89\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 412 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 76.13\% | YES |  | SF |
| 413 MARIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 76.36\% | YES |  | SF |
| 414 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 76.60\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 415 HENRY ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 76.84\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 415 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 77.07\% | YES |  | VAC |
| 415 MARIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 77.31\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 416 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 77.55\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 417 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 77.78\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 417 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 78.02\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 417 HENRY ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 78.26\% | YES |  | SF |
| 417 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 78.49\% | YES |  | SF |
| 417 MARIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 78.73\% | YES |  | SF |
| 418 BISHOP ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 78.97\% | YES |  | SF |
| 419 HENRY ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 79.20\% | YES |  | SF |
| 419 JAMES ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 79.44\% | YES |  | MF |
| 419 MARIE ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 79.68\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 421 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 79.91\% | YES |  | SF |
| 421 PASCHALL ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 80.15\% | YES |  | SF |
| 506 HENRY ST | 4,500 | 0.24\% | 80.39\% |  |  | SF |
| 403 CARL ST | 4,320 | 0.23\% | 80.61\% | NO |  | COM |
| 403 CARL ST | 4,315 | 0.23\% | 80.84\% | NO |  | COM |
| 403 CARL ST | 4,315 | 0.23\% | 81.07\% | NO |  | COM |
| 307 MORRIS ST | 4,300 | 0.23\% | 81.29\% | NO |  | SF |
| 405 QUITMAN ST | 4,300 | 0.23\% | 81.52\% |  |  | SF |
| 304 QUITMAN ST | 4,269 | 0.22\% | 81.74\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 405 WINNIE ST | 4,260 | 0.22\% | 81.97\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 309 WINNIE ST | 4,256 | 0.22\% | 82.19\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 408 JAMES ST | 4,230 | 0.22\% | 82.41\% |  |  | SF |
| 306 QUITMAN ST | 4,225 | 0.22\% | 82.64\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2319 THOMAS ST | 4,200 | 0.22\% | 82.86\% | YES |  | MF |
| 220 QUITMAN ST | 4,147 | 0.22\% | 83.08\% | YES |  | SF |
| 410 MARIE ST | 4,140 | 0.22\% | 83.29\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 412 MARIE ST | 4,140 | 0.22\% | 83.51\% | YES |  | SF |
| 208 HENRY ST | 4,117 | 0.22\% | 83.73\% | YES |  | SF |
| 1913 FLETCHER ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 83.94\% |  |  | EXC |
| 210 JAMES ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 84.15\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2105 FLETCHER ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 84.37\% | YES |  | SF |
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| 2107 FLETCHER ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 84.58\% | YES | YES | SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2108 THOMAS ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 84.79\% | NO |  | SF |
| 2109 FLETCHER ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 85.01\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2115 FLETCHER ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 85.22\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2117 FLETCHER ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 85.43\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2118 THOMAS ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 85.64\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2119 FLETCHER ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 85.86\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 214 JAMES ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 86.07\% | YES |  | SF |
| 302 JAMES ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 86.28\% | YES |  | SF |
| 303 PASCHALL ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 86.50\% | YES |  | SF |
| 305 PASCHALL ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 86.71\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 306 HENRY ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 86.92\% | YES |  | SF |
| 311 MARIE ST | 4,050 | 0.21\% | 87.14\% | YES |  | SF |
| 307 WINNIE ST | 4,003 | 0.21\% | 87.35\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 0 GARGAN | 4,000 | 0.21\% | 87.56\% |  |  | VAC |
| 111 CARL ST | 4,000 | 0.21\% | 87.77\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2207 KEENE ST | 4,000 | 0.21\% | 87.98\% | YES |  | SF |
| 401 QUITMAN ST | 4,000 | 0.21\% | 88.19\% |  |  | SF |
| 401 WINNIE ST | 4,000 | 0.21\% | 88.40\% | YES |  | SF |
| 403 WINNIE ST | 4,000 | 0.21\% | 88.61\% |  |  | SF |
| 408 GARGAN ST | 4,000 | 0.21\% | 88.82\% |  |  | SF |
| 410 GARGAN ST | 4,000 | 0.21\% | 89.03\% | YES |  | SF |
| 412 GARGAN ST | 4,000 | 0.21\% | 89.24\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2514 FLETCHER ST | 3,900 | 0.21\% | 89.44\% | YES |  | SF |
| 209 PASCHALL ST | 3,780 | 0.20\% | 89.64\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2311 THOMAS ST | 3,780 | 0.20\% | 89.84\% | YES |  | SF |
| 408 QUITMAN ST | 3,780 | 0.20\% | 90.04\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 410 QUITMAN ST | 3,780 | 0.20\% | 90.24\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 412 QUITMAN ST | 3,780 | 0.20\% | 90.44\% | YES |  | SF |
| 414 MARIE ST | 3,780 | 0.20\% | 90.64\% |  |  | SF |
| 305 WINNIE ST | 3,615 | 0.19\% | 90.83\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 308 QUITMAN ST | 3,615 | 0.19\% | 91.02\% | YES |  | SF |
| 107 CARL ST | 3,602 | 0.19\% | 91.21\% | YES |  | VAC |
| 307 MARIE ST | 3,600 | 0.19\% | 91.40\% | YES |  | SF |
| 409 PASCHALL ST | 3,600 | 0.19\% | 91.58\% |  |  | SF |
| 511 BISHOP ST | 3,600 | 0.19\% | 91.77\% | NO | YES | SF |
| 2118 SOUTH ST | 3,505 | 0.18\% | 91.96\% |  |  | VAC |
| 402 GARGAN ST | 3,500 | 0.18\% | 92.14\% | YES |  | SF |
| 303 WINNIE ST | 3,463 | 0.18\% | 92.32\% | NO |  | SF |
| 205 QUITMAN ST | 3,431 | 0.18\% | 92.50\% | NO |  | VAC |
| 2308 THOMAS ST | 3,334 | 0.18\% | 92.68\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2304 THOMAS ST | 3,333 | 0.18\% | 92.86\% | YES |  | SF |
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| 2306 THOMAS ST | 3,333 | 0.18\% | 93.03\% | YES |  | SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 404 HENRY ST | 3,307 | 0.17\% | 93.20\% | YES |  | SF |
| 406 HENRY ST | 3,307 | 0.17\% | 93.38\% |  |  | SF |
| 408 HENRY ST | 3,307 | 0.17\% | 93.55\% |  |  | SF |
| 410 HENRY ST | 3,307 | 0.17\% | 93.73\% | YES |  | SF |
| 307 QUITMAN ST | 3,300 | 0.17\% | 93.90\% |  |  | VAC |
| 0 CARL ST | 3,200 | 0.17\% | 94.07\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2409 KEENE ST | 3,200 | 0.17\% | 94.24\% | YES |  | SF |
| 201 QUITMAN ST | 3,180 | 0.17\% | 94.40\% | NO |  | SF |
| 0 HENRY ST | 3,033 | 0.16\% | 94.56\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2521 CHURCHILL ST | 3,025 | 0.16\% | 94.72\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2319 KEENE ST | 3,000 | 0.16\% | 94.88\% |  |  | SF |
| 2402 SOUTH ST | 3,000 | 0.16\% | 95.04\% | YES |  | VAC |
| 0 MORRIS ST | 2,950 | 0.16\% | 95.19\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2514 CHURCHILL ST | 2,750 | 0.14\% | 95.34\% |  |  | SF |
| 2515 KEENE ST | 2,750 | 0.14\% | 95.48\% |  |  | SF |
| 0 CARL ST | 2,736 | 0.14\% | 95.63\% |  |  | OTH |
| 319 HOGAN ST | 2,713 | 0.14\% | 95.77\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2211 THOMAS ST | 2,600 | 0.14\% | 95.90\% | NO |  | SF |
| 2401 KEENE ST | 2,522 | 0.13\% | 96.04\% |  |  | SF |
| 2315 KEENE ST | 2,500 | 0.13\% | 96.17\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2316 CHURCHILL ST | 2,500 | 0.13\% | 96.30\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2317 KEENE ST | 2,500 | 0.13\% | 96.43\% | YES |  | SF |
| 2320 CHURCHILL ST | 2,500 | 0.13\% | 96.56\% | YES | YES | SF |
| 2330 CHURCHILL ST | 2,500 | 0.13\% | 96.69\% | NO |  | COM |
| 0 KEENE ST | 2,405 | 0.13\% | 96.82\% |  |  | VAC |
| 2301 KEENE ST | 2,405 | 0.13\% | 96.95\% |  |  | VAC |
| 1901 FLETCHER ST | 2,404 | 0.13\% | 97.07\% |  |  | SF |
| 1903 FLETCHER ST | 2,404 | 0.13\% | 97.20\% |  |  | SF |
| 1905 FLETCHER ST | 2,404 | 0.13\% | 97.33\% |  |  | SF |
| 1907 FLETCHER ST | 2,404 | 0.13\% | 97.45\% |  |  | SF |
| 1907 FLETCHER ST \# A | 2,404 | 0.13\% | 97.58\% | NO |  | SF |
| 309 HOGAN ST | 2,404 | 0.13\% | 97.71\% | NO |  | SF |
| 311 HOGAN ST | 2,404 | 0.13\% | 97.83\% |  |  | SF |
| 313 HOGAN ST | 2,404 | 0.13\% | 97.96\% | NO |  | SF |
| 315 HOGAN ST | 2,404 | 0.13\% | 98.09\% |  |  | SF |
| 317 HOGAN ST | 2,404 | 0.13\% | 98.21\% |  |  | SF |
| 307 PASCHALL ST | 2,250 | 0.12\% | 98.33\% | YES |  | SF |
| 309 PASCHALL ST | 2,250 | 0.12\% | 98.45\% | YES |  | SF |
| 111 MORRIS ST | 2,000 | 0.11\% | 98.55\% | YES |  | SF |
| 400 CARL ST \# 13 | 1,800 | 0.09\% | 98.65\% |  |  | SF |
| 1902 FLETCHER ST | 1,784 | 0.09\% | 98.74\% | NO |  | SF |
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| 403 HOGAN ST | 1,784 | $0.09 \%$ | $98.84 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 309 QUITMAN ST \# C | 1,780 | $0.09 \%$ | $98.93 \%$ | NO |  |
| 307 QUITMAN ST | 1,700 | $0.09 \%$ | $99.02 \%$ |  |  |
| 1910 FLETCHER ST | 1,692 | $0.09 \%$ | $99.11 \%$ | NO |  |
| 407 HOGAN ST | 1,692 | $0.09 \%$ | $99.20 \%$ |  |  |
| 309 QUITMAN ST | 1,690 | $0.09 \%$ | $99.29 \%$ |  | VAC |
| 0 KEENE ST | 1,665 | $0.09 \%$ | $99.37 \%$ |  | SF |
| 0 KEENE ST | 1,665 | $0.09 \%$ | $99.46 \%$ |  |  |
| 309 QUITMAN ST \# B | 1,530 | $0.08 \%$ | $99.54 \%$ | YES |  |
| 1906 FLETCHER ST | 1,525 | $0.08 \%$ | $99.62 \%$ | NO |  |
| 405 HOGAN ST | 1,525 | $0.08 \%$ | $99.70 \%$ |  |  |
| 2304 CHURCHILL ST | 1,430 | $0.08 \%$ | $99.78 \%$ | YES | YES |
| 2305 KEENE ST | 1,430 | $0.08 \%$ | $99.85 \%$ | NO |  |
| 0 QUITMAN ST | 1,260 | $0.07 \%$ | $99.92 \%$ |  | SF |
| 0 CARL ST | 949 | $0.05 \%$ | $99.97 \%$ | YES |  |
| 2514 FLETCHER ST | 350 | $0.02 \%$ | $99.99 \%$ | YES |  |
| 0 THOMAS | 260 | $0.01 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |  | SF |


| This application qualifies for a Special Minimum Lot Size of: | 4,500 sq ft |
| :---: | :---: |
| Response forms received in support of the SMLSA: | 225 |
| Response forms received in opposition of the SMLSA: | 39 |
| Percentage of property owners in support of the SMLSA boundary: (must be at least 55\%) | 59\% |
| Percentage of property owners signed the petition for the SMLSA application: (must be at least 10\%) | 18\% |
| \# of developed or restricted to no more than two SFR Units | 300 |
| \# of Multifamily lots | 14 |
| \# of Commercial lots | 6 |
| \# of Vacant Lots | 54 |
| \# of Excluded Lots | 8 |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF LOTS | 382 |
| Percentage of lots developed or restricted to no more than two SFR units per lot: (must be at least 80\%) | 80\% |






## Special Minimum Lot Size Area Application

According to
Section 42-197 of Chapter 42 of the Code of Ordinances


PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Please complete entire application form

1. Location:


Example: Blocks 15-19, Lots 1-37, in Cocker Spaniel Subdivision

## 2. Contacts:



## 3. Project Information (Staff Use Only-Do Not Fill In):

| File \# Key Map\# |
| :--- |
| Lambert \# <br> City Council District <br> 4. Submittal Requirements: <br> Completed application form (this page) <br> Signed petition signed by the applicant (page 4) <br> Signed petition of support signed by 10\% of lot owners within the boundary area (page 5) <br> Signed deed restriction statement (page 6) <br> Three (3) recommended locations for a community meeting (page 7) <br> Sample of Notification Sign (page 9) <br> Copy of deed restrictions, if applicable <br> Map or sketch showing the address, land use and the size of all lots within boundary area |



## AGENDA: VII

SMLSA Application No. 393: Glen Cove Section 2, Block 2, Lots 18-27, Block 3, Lots 3-18; Westcott Terrace Subdivision; Glen Cove Section 3, Blocks 1-5

## BACKGROUND:

The Planning and Development Department received an application for the establishment of a special minimum lot size area for Glen Cove Subdivision Sections 2 and 3 and Westcott Terrace Subdivision. Analysis shows that a minimum lot size of $6,600 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ exists for the area. A petition was signed by the owners of $13 \%$ of the property within the proposed Special Minimum Lot Size Area (SMLSA). An application was filed and the Director has referred the application to the Planning Commission in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 42-204. This report provides the Commission with a synopsis of procedures and appropriate application criteria.

## PROCEDURES:

Following acceptance of an initially complete application, the Planning Director notifies all owners of property within the proposed SMLSA. Any property owner who wishes to vote for or against the creation of the minimum lot size area may return the response form within thirty days. The Director shall forward a complete application to Planning Commission for public hearing and consideration upon finding that the application complies with all of the following:

- meets all criteria required for Planning Commission approval (listed in next paragraph);
- shows evidence of support from owners of at least $55 \%$ of the property within the proposed SMLSA
After close of a public hearing the Planning Commission shall consider the following:
- the boundaries of the proposed SMLSA shall contain no less than five block faces, composed of 5 lots or more on each blockface;
- at least $80 \%$ of the lots to be included within the proposed SMLSA, exclusive of land used for a park, library, place of religious assembly or a public or private elementary, middle, junior high or high school, is developed with or are restricted to not more than two singlefamily units per lot;
- the proposed SMLSA does not include a significant area developed as or restricted to a use that is not single family residential and;
- does not include a significant area that does not share a lot size character with the rest of the proposed area
- that the applicant has demonstrated sufficient support of $55 \%$ for the establishment of the proposed SMLSA;
- that the establishment of the SMLSA will further the goal of preserving the lot size character of the area; and
- that the proposed SMLSA has a lot size character that can be preserved by the establishment of a minimum lot size, taking into account the age of the neighborhood, the age of structures in the neighborhood, existing evidence of a common plan and scheme of development, and such other factors that the director, commission or city council, respectively as appropriate, may determine relevant to the area.
Should the Commission find that the application meets these requirements; the Commission must forward the application to City Council for consideration. City Council approval of the SMLSA is enforceable for forty (40) years from the effective date of the ordinance.


## STAFF ANALYSIS:

This application includes one hundred and ten (110) properties in Glen Cove Section 2, Block 2, Lots 18-27, Block 3, Lots 3-18; Westcott Terrace Subdivision; Glen Cove Section 3, Blocks 1-5

Analysis of the application resulted in the following findings:

- The boundaries of the proposed SMLSA must contain not less than five (5) blockfaces composed of five (5) lots or more on each blockface;
The application contains eleven (11) blockfaces with at least 5 lots on 5 blockfaces
- At least $80 \%$ of the lots to be included within the proposed SMLSA, exclusive of land used for a park, library, place of religious assembly or a public or private elementary, middle, junior high or high school, must be developed with, or restricted to, not more than two single-family units per lot; For any lot or tract that was not vacant and was in use for other than single family residential purposes, the subdivision plat, development plat, or building permit may provide for any use permitted by law or, if applicable, deed restrictions. Land use of the properties consists of one hundred and seven (107) single-family residential properties representing $97 \%$ of the total lots.
- The applicant has demonstrated sufficient support for the SMLSA;

The applicant obtained $70 \%$ support from property owners in the proposed SMLSA

- Establishment of the SMLSA will further the goal of preserving the area lot size character;

A minimum lot size of $6,600 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ exists on seventy two (72) of one hundred and ten (110) lots in the area.

- The proposed SMLSA has a lot size character that can be preserved by the establishment of a special minimum lot size, taking into account the age of the neighborhood, the age and architectural features of structures in the neighborhood, existing evidence of a common plan or scheme of development, and such other factors that the director, commission or city council, respectively as appropriate, may determine relevant to the area.
The subdivision was platted in 1941, and some of the houses were constructed in the 1940s. The establishment of a $6,600 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ minimum lot size will preserve the lot size character of the area.
- The minimum lot size for this application was determined by finding the current lot size that represents a minimum standard for $70 \%$ of the application area.
Seventy two (72) out of one hundred and ten (110) lots (representing 70\% of the application area) are at least 6,600 square feet in size.

Public notice of the public hearing was transmitted to all property owners in the area.

## ATTACHMENTS:

1. Staff Analysis Summary Page
2. Map of Proposed Special Minimum Lot Size Block
3. Map of Support
4. Application
5. Location Map
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SPECIAL MINIMUM LOT SIZE AREA-
GLEN COVE SECTION 2 \& 3

| ADDRESS | Lot size (in sq ft) | \% by <br> Area | Cumulative \% by Area | Response Form | Signed Petition | Land Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 505 WESTCOTT ST | 26,066 | 3.32\% | 3.32\% | N |  | MF |
| 403 TERRACE DR | 10,710 | 1.37\% | 4.69\% | Y |  | SF |
| 407 TERRACE DR | 10,369 | 1.32\% | 6.01\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6010 ROSE ST | 9,470 | 1.21\% | 7.22\% | Y |  | SF |
| 411 TERRACE DR | 9,141 | 1.17\% | 8.38\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6019 CAMELLIA ST | 8,936 | 1.14\% | 9.52\% |  |  | SF |
| 415 TERRACE DR | 8,840 | 1.13\% | 10.65\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6019 FEAGAN ST | 8,800 | 1.12\% | 11.77\% | Y |  | SF |
| 0 TERRACE DR | 8,370 | 1.07\% | 12.84\% | N |  | SF |
| 419 TERRACE DR | 8,370 | 1.07\% | 13.90\% |  |  | SF |
| 423 TERRACE DR | 8,246 | 1.05\% | 14.95\% | Y |  | SF |
| 427 TERRACE DR | 8,122 | 1.04\% | 15.99\% | Y |  | SF |
| 431 TERRACE DR | 7,998 | 1.02\% | 17.01\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6023 ROSE ST | 7,980 | 1.02\% | 18.03\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6014 FLOYD ST | 7,920 | 1.01\% | 19.04\% |  |  | SF |
| 6023 CAMELLIA ST | 7,910 | 1.01\% | 20.04\% |  |  | SF |
| 6027 ROSE ST | 7,884 | 1.00\% | 21.05\% | Y |  | SF |
| 503 TERRACE DR | 7,874 | 1.00\% | 22.05\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6018 ROSE ST | 7,840 | 1.00\% | 23.05\% | Y |  | SF |
| 507 TERRACE DR | 7,750 | 0.99\% | 24.04\% |  |  | SF |
| 6035 BLOSSOM ST | 7,700 | 0.98\% | 25.02\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6031 BLOSSOM ST | 7,700 | 0.98\% | 26.00\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6027 BLOSSOM ST | 7,700 | 0.98\% | 26.99\% | Y |  | SF |
| 511 TERRACE DR | 7,626 | 0.97\% | 27.96\% |  |  | SF |
| 515 TERRACE DR | 7,500 | 0.96\% | 28.91\% | Y |  | SF |
| 330 TERRACE DR | 7,480 | 0.95\% | 29.87\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6020 FEAGAN ST | 7,480 | 0.95\% | 30.82\% | Y |  | SF |
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| ADDRESS | Lot size <br> (in sq ft) | \% by <br> Area | Cumulative \% by Area | Response Form | Signed Petition | Land Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6036 FEAGAN ST | 7,480 | 0.95\% | 31.77\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 519 TERRACE DR | 7,378 | 0.94\% | 32.71\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6019 FLOYD ST | 7,330 | 0.93\% | 33.65\% |  |  | SF |
| 6002 FLOYD ST | 7,280 | 0.93\% | 34.58\% |  |  | SF |
| 523 TERRACE DR | 7,192 | 0.92\% | 35.49\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 6009 FEAGAN ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 36.40\% |  |  | SF |
| 6015 FEAGAN ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 37.32\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6008 FEAGAN ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 38.23\% | N |  | SF |
| 6012 FEAGAN ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 39.14\% | $Y$ |  | SF |
| 344 TERRACE DR | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 40.05\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 6023 BLOSSOM ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 40.96\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6022 BLOSSOM ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 41.87\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6031 ROSE ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 42.78\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6011 ROSE ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 43.70\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6006 FLOYD ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 44.61\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6010 FLOYD ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 45.52\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6018 FLOYD ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 46.43\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6014 ROSE ST | 7,150 | 0.91\% | 47.34\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6024 FEAGAN ST | 6,930 | 0.88\% | 48.23\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6028 FEAGAN ST | 6,930 | 0.88\% | 49.11\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6032 FEAGAN ST | 6,930 | 0.88\% | 49.99\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6016 FEAGAN ST | 6,820 | 0.87\% | 50.86\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6047 FLOYD ST | 6,760 | 0.86\% | 51.72\% |  |  | SF |
| 400 WESTCOTT ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 52.56\% | N |  | COM |
| 400 WESTCOTT ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 53.41\% | N |  | COM |
| 6023 FEAGAN ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 54.25\% |  |  | SF |
| 6027 FEAGAN ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 55.09\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6031 FEAGAN ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 55.93\% | Y | Y | SF |
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| ADDRESS | Lot size <br> (in sq ft) | \% by <br> Area | Cumulative \% by Area | Response Form | Signed Petition | Land Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6035 FEAGAN ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 56.77\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6015 BLOSSOM ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 57.61\% |  |  | SF |
| 6009 BLOSSOM ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 58.45\% |  |  | SF |
| 6023 FLOYD ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 59.29\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6002 BLOSSOM ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 60.14\% |  |  | SF |
| 434 TERRACE DR | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 60.98\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6043 ROSE ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 61.82\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 6039 ROSE ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 62.66\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6035 ROSE ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 63.50\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6019 ROSE ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 64.34\% |  |  | SF |
| 6015 ROSE ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 65.18\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6027 CAMELLIA ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 66.03\% |  |  | SF |
| 6022 ROSE ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 66.87\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 6030 ROSE ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 67.71\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6034 ROSE ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 68.55\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 6038 ROSE ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 69.39\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6042 ROSE ST | 6,600 | 0.84\% | 70.23\% | Y |  | SF |
| 527 TERRACE DR | 6,550 | 0.83\% | 71.07\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6026 BLOSSOM ST | 6,540 | 0.83\% | 71.90\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6030 BLOSSOM ST | 6,540 | 0.83\% | 72.73\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6034 BLOSSOM ST | 6,540 | 0.83\% | 73.57\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6038 BLOSSOM ST | 6,540 | 0.83\% | 74.40\% |  |  | SF |
| 6003 FLOYD ST | 6,380 | 0.81\% | 75.21\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6015 FLOYD ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 76.01\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6011 FLOYD ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 76.81\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6006 BLOSSOM ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 77.61\% |  |  | SF |
| 6010 BLOSSOM ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 78.41\% |  |  | SF |
| 6014 BLOSSOM ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 79.21\% | Y | Y | SF |
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| ADDRESS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lot size } \\ & \text { (in sq ft) } \end{aligned}$ | \% by <br> Area | Cumulative \% by Area | Response Form | Signed Petition | Land Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6018 BLOSSOM ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 80.01\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 6047 CAMELLIA ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 80.81\% |  |  | SF |
| 6043 CAMELLIA ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 81.61\% |  |  | SF |
| 6039 CAMELLIA ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 82.41\% |  | Y | SF |
| 6035 CAMELLIA ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 83.21\% |  |  | SF |
| 6031 CAMELLIA ST | 6,270 | 0.80\% | 84.01\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6019 BLOSSOM ST | 6,260 | 0.80\% | 84.80\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6018 CAMELLIA ST | 6,175 | 0.79\% | 85.59\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6022 CAMELLIA ST | 6,060 | 0.77\% | 86.36\% |  |  | SF |
| 6038 CAMELLIA ST ( Lot 1) | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 87.13\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 6038 CAMELLIA ST ( Lot 2) | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 87.91\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 6043 FLOYD ST | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 88.68\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6039 FLOYD ST | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 89.45\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6035 FLOYD ST | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 90.22\% |  |  | SF |
| 6031 FLOYD ST | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 90.99\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6027 FLOYD ST | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 91.76\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6022 FLOYD ST | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 92.53\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6026 FLOYD ST | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 93.30\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6030 FLOYD ST | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 94.08\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6034 FLOYD ST | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 94.85\% |  |  | SF |
| 6038 FLOYD ST | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 95.62\% |  |  | SF |
| 430 TERRACE DR | 6,050 | 0.77\% | 96.39\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 6034 CAMELLIA ST | 5,885 | 0.75\% | 97.14\% | Y | Y | SF |
| 6030 CAMELLIA ST | 5,775 | 0.74\% | 97.88\% | Y |  | SF |
| 6026 CAMELLIA ST | 5,665 | 0.72\% | 98.60\% |  |  | SF |
| 6007 FLOYD ST | 5,500 | 0.70\% | 99.30\% |  |  | SF |
| 6026 ROSE ST | 5,500 | 0.70\% | 100.00\% | Y |  | SF |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This application qualifies for a Special Minimum Lot Size $\quad \mathbf{6 , 6 0 0} \mathbf{s q ~ f t}$

| Response forms received in <br> support of MLSA |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Response forms received in <br> opposition of MLSA | 5 |
| Percentage of boundary area in <br> favor of the MLSA (must be at <br> least 55\%) | $\mathbf{7 0 \%}$ |
| Signed Petition in Support | 14 |
| Property owners signing in <br> support of the petition <br> (must be at least 10\%) | $13 \%$ |


| \# of developed or restricted to <br> no more than two SFR Units | 107 |
| :--- | :--- |
| \# of Multifamily lots | 1 |
| \# of Commercial lots | 2 |
| \# of Vacant Lots | 0 |
| \# of Excluded Lots | 0 |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF LOTS | 110 |
| Percentage of lots developed or <br> restricted to no more than two <br> SFR units per lot <br> (must be at least 80\%): |  |
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Glen Cove Sections 2 \& 3 Subdivision 6,600 square feet

Source: Harris County Appraisal District Date: September 11, 2014 Reference: MLSA393
This map is made malatie for reference parpum oniy wad showid not be suesthuned bor a surve product. The CEy of Hoaston wil hot accept labilty of amy knd in conjunction with its use.

PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

## 1. Location:

# Blocks 1-5 in Glencuve III Subdivision 

Block 3 in Glencove II Subdivision

- 6000 block of Feagan, south block face

> Example: Blocks 15-19, Lots 1-37, in Cocker Spaniel Subdivision

## 2. Contacts:
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houston Planning Commission
Planning \& Development Department

Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design for Michael Bastian, owner Property Address: 1201 Rutland Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District West

## Project Summary:

The project at 1201 Rutland Street is a proposal to construct a two-story single-family residence on a corner lot in the Houston Heights Historic District West. At their September 25, 2014 meeting, the Houston Archaeological and Historical Commission (HAHC) reviewed the applicant's request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and found that the overall height and brick porch stairs proposed for the new construction were not compatible for the district and did not satisfy criterion 2 and 3 found in Chapter 33 Section 242. Otherwise, the proposal was found to be appropriate. The HAHC voted 6-1 to grant the COA with the conditions that the max roof ridge height be reduced to 33 ', and that the porch stairs be constructed of wood or composite decking.

In accordance with Chapter 33 Section 33-253, the applicant is appealing this decision to Planning Commission.

## Charge to the Planning Commission:

New residential construction in a historic district must meet 4 criteria for approval found in Chapter 33 Section 33242. The HAHC found that as proposed, the design did not meet criterion 2 and 3 , but approved the COA with the conditions that would satisfy the criteria. The applicant has the burden of proof to demonstrate that the project meets criterion 2 and 3 as proposed.

The Planning Commission may find in favor of the applicant, and overturn the HAHC decision, if it finds that the applicant has proven the project satisfies the criteria without the approved conditions. If the Planning Commission upholds the HAHC decision, the applicant may construct the proposed residence per the approved conditional COA. Or, the applicant may return to HAHC with a new or revised application.

## Project Description:

1201 Rutland is a portion of a larger property located at the corner of Rutland and W 12th that formally contained non-contributing commercial structures used as a chicken processing plant. The applicant has demolished the plant and plans to replat the 22,000 square feet property to construct three new single-family residences. The applicant was granted COAs in March and April for two new residences on two interior 6,600 square foot lots.

The subject of this appeal is the proposal for a new residence two-story residence at the corner lot, 1201 Rutland. The proposal is to construct a new two-story, 4,360 square foot single-family residence. The residence measures 43 ' wide; 56 ' deep at the W 12th side; 96 ' deep at the north side; and 36 ' -6 " tall. The residence features a doublegallery porch and an $8 / 12$ pitch gable on hip roof.

## Project Review Timeline:

At the January 16, 2014 HAHC meeting, the applicant presented an initial design concept for the residence that measured approximately 38 ' wide, 70 ' deep and 33.5 tall with a 44.5 tall tower element. The purpose of the presentation was to allow the applicant the opportunity to receive feedback from the HAHC while still in the conceptual design phase. In review of the conceptual design, staff recommended that the design be revised to fit within compatible dimensional ranges established by field measurements of all contributing two-story residences in
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the district. The HAHC expressed that compatibility did not mean matching the largest historic residential conditions, and that designs should be under not over the largest dimensions found in the district to fit in with the context of the historic homes. The HAHC expressed excitement for residential redevelopment of the property from its prior industrial use and encouraged the applicant to continue to work with staff. See Attachment A - January 2014 Design Review Report.

At the June 19, 2014 HAHC meeting, the applicant proposed a new design for a two-story, 4,750 square foot single-family residence for the corner lot that measured 49' wide; 64' deep at the W 12th side; 98' deep at the north side; and 38 ' tall. The proportions of the design were greater than those proposed in January. The HAHC voted 6-0 to deny the COA for the two-story residence for not satisfying criteria 1, 2, 3 and 4. See Attachment B - June 2014 HAHC Action Report.

At the September 25, 2014 HAHC meeting, the applicant submitted revisions to the June proposal. The revised two-story, 4,360 square foot residence measured $43^{\prime}$ wide; $56^{\prime}$ deep at the $W$ 12th side; 96 ' deep at the north side; and $36.5^{\prime}$ tall. The revisions included increased setbacks on both Rutland and West 12th; reduced maximum and front widths; reduced ridge and eave heights; and revised window and porch column details. See Attachment C, the September 2014 HAHC Action Report, for complete project details.

## Basis for the Houston Archaeological and Historic Commission's decision:

New construction within city historic districts must be approved by HAHC. New construction is reviewed according to the criteria found in Chapter 33 Section 33-242 of the Code of Ordinances, which are included on pages 3-4 of this report. In order to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, the HAHC must find that all criteria are met.

The HAHC is required by ordinance to use only the relevant criteria in evaluating new construction in historic districts. In applying these criteria, the HAHC is to look at existing contributing buildings within the same historic district for compatibility, as the historic structures define the neighborhood character that is to be preserved. The HAHC is not to consider new or noncontributing buildings as evidence of what is appropriate for new construction in historic districts, nor do previously approved projects set precedent.

In general, new construction should be compatible in scale, proportions, materials, and architectural features with existing contributing structures in the historic district. Key aspects for compatibility are the scale and proportions of the new construction. Building width, roof shape and pitch have an impact on overall proportions and should be similar to existing contributing structures. Proportion is the relation of multiple dimensional elements. It is not typical for contributing residences to be both very wide, and very tall as defined by the proportions that relate to their architectural style. For example, Queen Anne residences are taller, have steeper roof pitches, and are narrower in width; and Colonial Revival residences are wider with lower roof pitches and ridge heights.

In reviewing two-story residence proposals, staff compares the design with the contributing two-story residences in the district. In the Houston Heights West Historic District, 30 of the 340 contributing structures are two-story residences. The majority of the structures in the district are single-story residences. The key for compatibility of a proposed new two-story residence is for it to be of a scale similar to typical two-story homes in the district. Matching or exceeding the size of the largest homes in the district is not compatible with the neighborhood and does not preserve the district character.

In review of the September 2014 revised new construction application for 1201 Rutland, staff found that the proposed residence did not satisfy criteria 2 and 3 of the criteria for new construction, but simple revisions would make the proposal acceptable.
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Criterion 3 states that "the proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district". The proposed overall scale, as a result of multiple dimensions at or above typical, was found not to be compatible with the district.

Criterion 2 states that "exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district". Brick stairs are not an original historic feature found in the district on contributing structures.

Staff recommended approval of the COA with the condition that the ridge height of the residence be reduced from 35.5 ' to 33 '. The reduced height may be easily achieved with a reduction to the roof pitch from $8 / 12$ to $6 / 12$, or, by a combination of reductions to the pitch, plate height, foundation height, and/or width. Staff found that the increased setbacks on both street facing elevations helped to mitigate the overall large scale of the residence. The setback conditions, in combination with a reduction of the height, would allow staff to accept the 43 ' width of the residence, which is wider than all contributing residences in the district.

Staff recommended approval with the conditions that the max height not exceed 33 ', and that the porch stairs be wood or a composite material. Per staff's recommendation, the HAHC voted 6-1 to approve the COA for 1201 Rutland with the stated conditions.

The appeal is to reverse the conditions applied to the approved COA.

## Approval Criteria: New Construction in a Historic District

Sec. 33-242: HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria:
S D NA S - satisfies D-does not satisfy NA - not applicable

(1) The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district
(2) The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district
Does not satisfy - Brick porch stairs are not typical to the district. Wood, or a composite decking resembling wood, would be a more appropriate porch stair material.
(3) The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district
Does not satisfy - Proposal has multiple proportions at or above the maximum range resulting in an overall scale that is not compatible with typical historic proportions that define the district character. The max width, front width, and ridge height are above the typical proportions of the district. The roof pitch is at the maximum of those typical to the district.
The proposed residence is on an 8,800 s.f. corner lot, and the proposed setbacks have been increased to 22' on Rutland and 20' on W 12th. These factors, in combination with the recommended 33' max height condition, would allow staff to accept the width of the house that is above typical. The 33' ridge height may be achieved by a reduction in roof pitch, plate height, foundation height, width, or a combination thereof.
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(4) The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district; and.

(5) The height of new construction intended for use for commercial purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the existing structures used for commercial purposes in the historic district.

## Applicant's Grounds for Appeal:

See Attachment E - Applicant Appeal Materials, for the applicant's grounds for appeal and supplements.

## Basis for Applicant's Appeal:

Sec. 33-253. Appeal.
(a) An applicant aggrieved by a decision of the HAHC with respect to any certificate of appropriateness may appeal to the planning commission by filing a written notice of appeal, stating the grounds for the appeal, with the director within ten days following the date the HAHC renders its decision.
(b) The planning commission shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which required notice can be given. The commission shall consider the application, the findings of the HAHC and any evidence presented at the meeting at which the appeal is considered. The planning commission shall reverse or affirm the decision of the HAHC based upon the criteria applicable to the certificate of appropriateness. The decision of the commission shall be final. If the commission does not make a decision on the appeal within 30 days following the commission's hearing on the appeal, the decision of the HAHC with respect to the application for the certificate of appropriateness shall be deemed affirmed.
(c) An applicant aggrieved by the decision of the planning commission on an appeal from a decision of the HAHC may appeal to the city council. The city council shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which the required notice can be given. The city council shall consider the appeal under the provisions of Rule 12 of Section 2-2 of this code. At the conclusion of the city council's review of the matter, the city council shall reverse or affirm the decision of the planning commission. The decision of the city council shall be final and exhaust the applicant's administrative remedies.
(d) The director shall provide the applicant with notice of the time and place of the meeting at which the appeal will be considered by mail no less than ten days before the date of the meeting.

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)

Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design

## SITE INFORMATION:

Lots 14 and 15 ( 1215 Rutland, $100^{\prime} \times 132^{\prime}$ ) and Lots 16, 17 and 18 (1205 Rutland, 66.67'x132'), Block 183, Houston Heights Subdivision, City of Houston, Harris County, Texas. The site includes four non-contributing commercial structures situated on 22,000 square feet of land formerly used as a chicken processing plant.

## PRE-COA APPLICATION PROJECT:

## Project Details:

The applicant proposes to demolish the noncontributing commercial structures on site and redevelop the property for residential use. The applicant has started the conceptual design phase and has requested a preliminary presentation and discussion with the HAHC prior finalizing the designs for the houses and preparing detailed drawings for a complete COA application.
The applicant is considering three separate concepts for the subject property, in order of preference:

1. Divide the property into three lots - one $67^{\prime} \times 132^{\prime}\left(8,800 \mathrm{sq}\right.$. ft.) corner lot and two $50^{\prime} \times 132^{\prime}(6,600 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.) interior lots. Construct three single family houses of approximately 4300, 4000, and 3700 sq . ft. from corner lot inward. See pp. 3-8 for illustrations.
2. Divide the property into five lots - each $33^{\prime} \times 132^{\prime}$ ( $4,356 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.) - and construct five new 2,600 sq. ft. residences. See p. 9 for an illustration.
3. Convert the existing building into apartments or demolish and construct new apartments. No further information provided by applicant.
In review of COA applications for new residential construction, projects must meet four applicable approval criteria. The criteria requires new residential construction to reference existing contributing structures in the historic district and match typical setbacks; have compatible exterior features; have compatible general proportions; and have eave heights not taller than typical.

The goal of these criteria are to insure that new construction complements and supports the character of the district while preserving the district's historic integrity by not detracting from, or visually competing with, the existing contributing historic structures.

## HISTORY AND SIGNIFICANCE:

## Subject Property:

At the time of the Houston Heights Historic District West inventory survey, the commercial properties constructed between1969-1998, were classified as non-contributing to the district. According to historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, the properties were originally divided into three properties and contained single-family residences.

## 1200 Rutland Block and Adjacent Corner Properties:

The 1200 block of Rutland contains 21 properties listed in the district inventory, including the two addresses subject to this proposal. Fifteen of the properties are classified as contributing to the district. Of the fifteen contributing properties, 11 are one-story, one is 1.5 stories, and three are two stories. In addition to the subject properties, the block contains 4 , non-contributing non-historic residences.
The subject property is situated on the southwest corner of the block, with a side property line facing $\mathrm{W} 12^{\text {th }}$ Street. The three other corner properties at Rutland and W $12^{\text {th }}$ are contributing structures; consisting of one 2 story ( 1202 Rutland), one single story ( 1148 Rutland), and one 1.5 story residence ( 1147 Rutland). Neighboring

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)

## AGENDA ITEM: III

## HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

the subject property to the west on $\mathrm{W} 12^{\text {th }}$ Street are three properties facing $\mathrm{W} 12^{\text {th }}$ Street. One of the three (417 W $12^{\text {th }}$ ) is a contributing single story residence, the other two were classified as noncontributing and the applicant of this proposal was granted a COA to construct a new residence at $415 \mathrm{~W} 12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. (as well as around the corner at 1204 and 1206 Tulane Street).

## Heights Historic District West:

The Houston Heights Historic District West includes 13 full blocks and 14 partial blocks of mostly single-family residential buildings. The historic strength of Houston Heights rests in its wide array of essentially vernacular, middle-class, and domestic architecture constructed in the 1890s through the 1940s. Houston Heights West was designated as a historic district by Houston City Council on December 19th of 2007.

## NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVAL CRITERIA:

The HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new residential construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies all four of the following criteria [Section 33-242(a)].

1. The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district
2. The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district
3. The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district, and
4. The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district

## PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW:

The applicant has provided sketches illustrating the first and second concepts. Staff feels of the three conceptual proposals, the first approach - three lots - is the most appropriate. Staff has researched the property, block, and district and has prepared data to assist in compatible design development in accordance to the criteria and context.

## Applicant Provided Exhibits:

Site Plan (Concept \#1) p. 3
Roof Plans \& Front Elevations (Concept \#1) p. 4
Front \& Side Elevation Corner Lot A (Concept \#1) pp. 5-6
Front Elevations Interior Lot B \& C (Concept \#1) pp. 7-8
Front Elevations (Concept \#2)
pp. 9
Staff Supplemental Review Materials:
Houston Heights Historic District West Map p. 10
Current Photographs of 1205 \& 1215 Rutland p. 11
Criteria 1 - Compatible Setback \& Recommendation p. 12
Criteria 2 - Compatible Features \& Recommendation p. 13-14
Criteria 3 - Compatible Proportions
p. 15

Massing Scale Comparison \& Recommendation p. 16
Typical Details Date - Houston Heights West p. 17
Criteria 4 - Compatible Eave Heights \& Recommendation p. 18
Eave Height Comparison \& Recommendation p. 19
1200 Block of Rutland \& W $12^{\text {th }}$ St Corner Photos p. 20-23
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## PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)

Concept \#1 - Proposed Roof Plans \& Front Elevations Facing Rutland

A
B
C

## PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW
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## Concept \#1 - Proposed Front Elevation (facing Rutland) - Corner Lot A



## PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)

## Concept \#1 - Proposed Side Elevation (facing W 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ ) - Corner Lot A
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Concept \#1 - Proposed Front Elevation (facing Rutland) - Interior Lot B


## PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW
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## Concept \#1 - Proposed Front Elevation (facing Rutland) - Interior Lot C



## PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW
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Concept \#2 - Proposed Front Elevations (facing Rutland)
All lots are $33^{\prime}$ wide.
Proposed structures have eave heights of 23'-6".


## PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently) HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

## Houston Heights Historic District West Map
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Current Photographs - Noncontributing Structures at 1205 \& 1215 Rutland
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## Approval Criteria \#1

New construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the district.
As stated in the Historic Preservation Manual, the best practice to achieve a compatible front setback is to match the prevailing setback of contributing historic structures on the containing blockface. The typical range for the Houston Heights Historic District West is between 15'-20'. Corner lots typically have a 20' or greater side setback. Contributing structures on the 1200 block of Rutland have a prevailing front setback of approximately $20^{\prime}$. The prevailing front setback on $\mathrm{W} 20^{\text {th }}$ (and approved front setback for the new residence at $415 \mathrm{~W} .12^{\text {th }}$ ) is $13^{\prime}$.

Staff's Recommendation: A front setback of at least 20' for all three properties and a side setback of at least 13' on the corner lot at $\mathrm{W} 20^{\text {th }}$.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Map \& Prevailing Setbacks of Contributing Structures


PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW
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## Approval Criteria \#2

## Exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district

The defining architectural styles and elements in a district contribute to the district's character. A new structure should be identifiable as being of its own period of construction, but it should not be so differentiated that it detracts from, or competes with, the contributing historic structures. Traditional materials and features found in the district may be incorporated into new residential design; however, mixing elements from various styles found within a district on a single structure is discouraged.

The Historic Preservation Manual contains a "Defining Features" section with a chart listing compatible and incompatible features for foundations, porches, roofs, exterior wall cladding, front doors, and windows.

Staff's Recommendation: Reference the Historic Preservation Manual Defining Features section (provided on the following pages) and utilize listed compatible features and avoid listed incompatible features. Minimize the quantity of applied architectural details. Allow a single architectural feature to define the character of the new structure to avoid distracting from the neighboring historic properties.

Historic Preservation Manual - Houston Heights West Compatible / Incompatible Chart

| Compatible |  | Incompatible <br> - Parking pads in front of the building |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Driveways | - Located to the side of the house on interior lots <br> - Connected to the side street on corner lots |  |
| Garages and Carports | - Located in rear half of the lot; often fully or partially obscured visually by house in front <br> - Second-story garage apartment | - Attached to the building <br> - In front of the house |
| Height | - One or two stories <br> - Finished attic space with dormers | - Three or more stories |
| Front setback | - Match prevailing setback of contributing historic structures on the containing blockface (best practice) <br> - $15^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ from the front property line is the typical range (east/west numbered streets may have a smaller front setback) <br> - $20^{\prime}$ or greater side setbacks on large corner lots | - Setback inconsistent with the typical front setback of contributing structures. |
| Foundation <br> - Raised pier and beam <br> - First floor typically 4-5 steps above ground level (height approximately $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ to $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ <br> - Piers clad in brick or ashlar block <br> - Foundation skirted by wood lattice or lap siding <br> - Slab on grade <br> - Slab on grade (slab is okay if disguised and designed to appear like pier and beam) <br> - First floor heights above $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ <br> - Brick foundation skirting between piers |  |  |

## PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)
AGENDA ITEM: III HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

## Historic Preservation Manual - Houston Heights West Compatible / Incompatible Chart (cont.)

|  | Compatible | Incompatible |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Porch | - Front porch, usually single story <br> - $50 \%$ of building width to full-width <br> - Two-story stacked half-width porches <br> - At least 5 feet deep <br> - May wrap around house on a single side <br> - Turned porch supports (Queen Anne) <br> - Squared/tapered porch supports (Craftsman) <br> - Brick porch support bases (Craftsman) | - No porch or small porch <br> - Two-story full-width porches <br> - Wrap around on both sides <br> - Fluted classical columns <br> - Ionic or Corinthian capitals <br> - Wrought iron railings or balusters |
| Roof | - Gable, hip, or hybrid roof shapes <br> - Low pitch (Craftsman) <br> - Steep pitch (Queen Anne) <br> - Gable ornamentation <br> - Boxed, or, open eave overhang with exposed rafter tails <br> - Wide eaves (bungalows) <br> - Dormers <br> - Composition shingles | - Shed, flat, gambrel or mansard roof shapes Multiple pitches <br> - Dentils or classical eave moldings <br> Cupolas or towers <br> - Slate or tile roof <br> Complex roof shapes |


| Exterior <br> Wall <br> Cladding | - Horizontal lapped, bevel, or drop wood siding for residential structures <br> - Patterned or plain rectilinear wood shingles (at gable ends or small detail areas) <br> - Brick, stucco or horizontal lap siding for commercial structures | - Vertical siding <br> - Corrugated metal <br> - Flat modular panels <br> - Half-timbering <br> - Stucco (other than alterations to isolated historic examples of stucco contributing structures) <br> - Brick (for alterations to isolated historic examples of brick contributing structures) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Front Door | - Single door facing street (except at inset partial-width porches) <br> - Recessed panels <br> - Glass lights <br> - Sidelights <br> - Rectilinear transom | - Main entry door facing side property line <br> - Double doors <br> - Round fanlights <br> - Pediments <br> - Masonry arches <br> - Pilasters |
| Windows | - Large, vertically proportioned <br> - Double-hung, single-hung, or casement <br> - Wood or wood clad <br> - Group (ribbon) of two or three windows in a row <br> - One-over-one lights (Craftsman) <br> - Two-over-two lights (Queen Anne) | - Horizontally proportioned windows <br> - Aluminum <br> - Masonry arches <br> - Large plate glass <br> - Fanlights <br> - Transoms over windows <br> - Pediments above windows |

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)
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## Approval Criteria \#3

Proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district

Size and scale (or massing) play a significant role in defining the character of a historic district. Most historic districts have a specific aesthetic rhythm corresponding to lot size, massing, siting, and height. The size of a new residence must be compatible with the typical size of the existing contributing residences. Building width, roof shape and pitch have an impact on overall proportions and should be similar to existing contributing structures in the district. Proportions of exterior elements, such as window patterns, reliefs in facades, or foundation heights, should also take influence from the contributing historic structures. The various components of the new construction should not divert from the typical proportions of existing contributing structures in the district.

Staff's Recommendation: Based on the Historic Preservation Manual and Typical Details Database for Heights West (see p. 18), the following proportions are recommended:

|  | MAX WIDTH | RIDGE HEIGHT | FRONT WALL | ROOF PITCH | EAVE OVER HANG | PORCH WIDTH | PORCH DEPTH | FINISHED FLOOR HEIGHT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recommended Ranges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Story | 25'-30' | 20'-28' | 23'-28' | 5/12-8/12 | $1^{\prime}-2{ }^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-28$ | 6'-8' | 18"-36" |
| 1.5 Story | 25'-32' | 20'-28' | 23'-28' | 5/12-8/12 | $1^{\prime}-2{ }^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-28$ | 6'-8' | 18"-36" |
| 2 Story | 24'-34' | 28'-32' | 20'32' | 5/12-8/12 | $1^{\prime}-2{ }^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-32^{\prime}$ | 6'-8' | $18^{\prime \prime}-36^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Proposed Structures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 38' | $\begin{gathered} 33^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime} \\ \left(44^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}\right. \text { tower) } \end{gathered}$ | $32^{\prime}$ | - | - | $32^{\prime}$ | - | 30" |
| Interior 2 Story Residence 1 | $36^{\prime}$ | 39' | $36^{\prime}$ | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approx. } \\ & { }_{16} \end{aligned}$ | - | $30^{\prime \prime}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Interior } \\ 1.5 \text { Story } \\ \text { Residence } 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $34^{\prime}$ | $34^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$ | $34^{\prime}$ | - | - | $34^{\prime}$ | - | $30^{\prime \prime}$ |

(See the scale comparison to typical historic footprints on next page for further details).

## PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)
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## Massing Scale Comparison with Typical Contributing Structures

The scale comparison below shows the proposed residences (blue) with typical contributing footprints overlaid (red) and the existing prevailing historic setbacks for the block (red dashed) - 20 ' facing Rutland and 13 ' facing W $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$.

Staff's Recommendation: Reduce the width of the proposed structures to be more compatible with the typical widths of historic structures found in the district. Square footage lost in width can be made up in depth, as increased depth does not have as much of an impact on the historic character from the public right-of-way. The garages on the interior lots may be attached if desired, as the connection will not be perceivable from the public r.o.w. The garage at the corner lot should remain detached to be compatible with the $\mathrm{W} 12^{\text {th }}$ Street proportions.
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Typical Details Database - Houston Heights West

|  |  | MAX WIDTH | RIDGE HEIGHT | FRONT WALL | ROOF <br> PITCH | EAVE HEIGHT | EAVE OVER HANG | PORCH WIDTH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PORCH } \\ & \text { DEPTH } \end{aligned}$ | PORCH EAVE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Story | Range | 20'6"-36'4" | 16'6"-29'5" | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 11^{\prime 2} 2^{\prime \prime}- \\ & 35^{\prime 11 "} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5 / 12- \\ & 11 / 12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 9'4"-13'11" | 2"-2'6" | 5'11"-29'6" | 4'-9'2" | 8'3"-11'6" |
|  | Average | 27 '8" | 20'9" | 18' | 8/12 | 10'9" | $1{ }^{\prime} 6$ | 18'2" | 6'9" | 10'3" |
|  | Median | 27 '8" | 20'4" | $14^{\prime \prime} \mathbf{" ' ~}^{\prime}$ | 8/12 | $10 ' 7$ " | 1'7' | 17'9" | $6^{\prime \prime 11 "}$ | 10'4" |
| 1.5 Story | Range | 26'3"-36'8" | 20'1"-28'1" | 26'1"-29'4" | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7 / 12- \\ & 13 / 12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 9'7"-14'3" | 8"-2'2" | 15'9"-36'8" | 6'2"-9'11" | 8'11"-12'1" |
|  | Average | $30^{\prime} 10$ " | $24{ }^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 27'9" | 9/12 | $11^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $17^{\prime \prime}$ | 26'2" | 7'11" | 10'4" |
|  | Median | 29'9" | $24{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $27^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 9/12 | $11^{\prime 2}$ | 1'9" | $26^{\prime}$ | 7'9' | $10^{\prime}$ |
| 2 Story | Range | 21-40'4" | $\begin{aligned} & 22^{\prime \prime} 4^{\prime \prime}- \\ & 3510 " \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 13'7"-30'5" | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6 / 12- \\ & 13 / 12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 16'4"-24'8" | 5"-3'4" | 9'7"-39'4" | 5'11" | 8'7"-22'3" |
|  | Average | 29'7" | 29'9" | 23'11" | 8/12 | 20'11" | 1'4" | 24'3" | 7'8' | $13^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
|  | Median | $30^{\prime}$ | 29'4" | $25^{\prime}$ | 7/12 | 21'2" | $1{ }^{\prime} 2$ | $24^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 7'5" | $11^{\prime \prime} 1$ |

Typical Details Database - 1200 Block of Rutland


| ST \# | STREET | STORIES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1202 | Rutland | 2 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 2 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 2 |
| 1219 | Rutland | 1.5 |
| 1220 | Rutland | 1 |
| 1222 | Rutland | 1 |
| 1224 | Rutland | 1 |
| 1223 | Rutland | 1 |
| 1233 | Rutland | 1 |
| 1235 | Rutland | 1 |
| 1226 | Rutland | 1 |
| 1228 | Rutland | 1 |
| 1230 | Rutland | 1 |
| 1234 | Rutland | 1 |



## PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW

SITE LOCATION: $1205 \& 1215$ Rutland (currently)
AGENDA ITEM: III HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

## Approval Criteria \#4

The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district

The height of contributing structures also defines the character of a Historic District. Houston Heights West has single-story, 1.5 story, and two-story residences. By matching, and not exceeding, the typical eave height of a district, a new structure will be compatible with its neighbors.

Staff's Recommendation: Using the Typical Details Database for the district, the following eave heights are recommended:

|  | EAVE <br> HEIGHT | PORCH <br> EAVE <br> HEIGHT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Story <br> Recommended | $9^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}-10^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-11^{\prime}$ |
| 1.5 Story <br> Recommended | $9^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}-11^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-11^{\prime}$ |
| 2 Story <br> Recommended | $18^{\prime}-22^{\prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-12^{\prime}$ |
| A - Corner <br> 2 Story Residence | (not including tower) | unknown |
| B - Interior 2 Story <br> Residence 1 | $24^{\prime}$ | unknown |
| C - Interior 1.5 Story <br> Residence 2 | $14^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$ | $14^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$ |


| Heights West Eave Heights 2-Story Contributing Residences |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ADDRESS | EAVE HT |
| 201 W 16 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ | 24' 8' |
| $201 \mathrm{~W} 15^{\text {TH }}$ | 24' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 327 W 16 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ | 24' 5" |
| Proposed Corner Residence | $24^{\prime}$ |
| Proposed Interior Residence 1 | 24 |
| $209 \mathrm{~W} 16^{\text {TH }}$ | 23' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1245 Yale | 22' 7" |
| 1531 Allston | 22' 7 " |
| 1537 Tulane | 22' 7" |
| 1429 Rutland | 22' 3' |
| 1443 Allston | 22' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1246 Allston | 22' 1" |
| $509 \mathrm{~W} 15^{\text {TH }}$ | $22^{\prime}$ |
| 1343 Rutland | 21'11" |
| 1237 Rutland | 21'10" |
| 1541 Tulane | 21'9" |
| 1541 Ashland | 21' 5" |
| 1447 Tulane | 20' 10" |
| 1509 Allston | 20' 10" |
| 1235 Yale | 20' 5" |
| 1400 Allston | 19' 11" |
| 1236 Rutland | 19' 11" |
| 1147 Allston | 19' 9" |
| 1535 Allston | 19'7" |
| 1439 Rutland | 19' 4" |
| 1202 Rutland | 19' 4' |
| 1535 Rutland | 19' |
| 1232 Tulane | 18' 4" |
| 1427 Tulane | 18' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1341 Allston | 18' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 611 W 15 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ | 17 |
| 1109 Rutland | $16^{\prime} 4^{\prime \prime}$ |

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)

## Eave Height Comparison with Typical Contributing Structures

The scale comparisons below show the proposed residences and typical contributing structures.
Staff's Recommendation: Reduce the overall eave heights, porch eave heights to be more compatible with the typical eave heights of historic structures found in the district.

Proposed elevations and 1.5 story neighboring contributing residence at 1219 Rutland:

1.5 story neighboring contributing residence ( 1219 Rutland) overlaid on proposed 1.5 story new residence C :


Proposed elevations and 1.5 story neighboring contributing residences at 1219, 1237 and 1236 Rutland:
Red: 22' - a typical eave height for contributing 2 story residences
Blue: 9'10" - a typical eave height for contributing 1.5 story residences \& porches


# PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW 

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)
AGENDA ITEM: III HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

Current Photographs - 1200 Block of Rutland \& Corner of W 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$


PRELIMINARY COA PROJECT CONCEPT REVIEW

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)
AGENDA ITEM: III HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

Current Photographs - 1200 Block of Rutland \& Corner of W 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ (cont.)


1233 Rutland - Contributing


1237 Rutland - Contributing


1220 Rutland - Contributing


1235 Rutland - Contributing


1202 Rutland - Contributing


1222 Rutland - Contributing

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)
AGENDA ITEM: III HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

Current Photographs - 1200 Block of Rutland \& Corner of W 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ (cont.)


1224 Rutland - Contributing


1228 Rutland - Contributing


1232 Rutland - NonContributing


1226 Rutland - Contributing


1230 Rutland - Contributing


1234 Rutland - Contributing

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)
AGENDA ITEM: III HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

Current Photographs - 1200 Block of Rutland \& Corner of W 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ (cont.)


1236 Rutland - Contributing


1148 Rutland - Contributing


1147 Rutland - Contributing


417 W 12th - Contributing

## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

## Application Date: May 28, 2014

Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design for Michael Bastian, owner
Property: 1201 Rutland (currently 1205 Rutland), lot 17 and 18, block 183, Houston Heights Subdivision. The 8,800 square foot ( 66.66 x 132') corner lot contains non-contributing commercial structures formerly used as a chicken processing plant that are to be demolished.

Significance: The property is located in the Houston Heights Historic District West.
Proposal: New Construction - On a corner lot, construct a two-story, 4,750 square feet single-family residence that is 49' wide; 64' deep at the south (W $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. side); 98 ' deep at the north side; and 38' tall.
At the January 16, 2014 HAHC meeting the applicant presented an initial concept design for a residence on the corner lot that was 4,300 square feet and measured 38 ' wide, approximately 70' deep, $33^{\prime}-6 "$ tall at the main ridge, and $44{ }^{\prime}-6 "$ tall to the top of the tower. The applicant was provided with recommendations to comply with criteria by staff which included:

- Insure the final design was within recommended dimensional ranges as established by field measurements of all contributing two-story residences of the district (see p.14)
- Minimize the quantity of applied architectural details and use the Historic Preservation Manual to identify compatible/incompatible features
Further recommendations were provided by staff to the owner at a meeting on January 30, 2014:
- Eave height should not exceed 23' and ridge height should not exceed 32'-6"
- Partial width double gallery porch was compatible as long as it was simple
- Towers were not appropriate for the district
- Proposed widths (32' front and $38^{\prime}$ max width) and $20^{\prime}$ setbacks on Rutland and $W 12^{\text {th }}$ were compatible
See enclosed application materials and detailed project description on p. 5-18 for further details.
Public Comment: No public comment received.
Civic Association: No public comment received.


## Recommendation: Denial - does not satisfy criteria

HAHC Action: Denied

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## NEW CONSTRUCTION IN A HISTORIC DISTRICT

Sec. 33-242: HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria:

## S D NA <br> S-satisfies <br> D - does not satisfy <br> NA - not applicable

(1) The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district
$2 \mathbf{2 0}^{\prime}$ or greater side setbacks are appropriate on large corner lots. The initial January design conformed to this setback, however, the current design has a setback of $12^{\prime}-8$ " on the side facing W 12th St.
(2) The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district
Traditional shapes and elements found in the district may be incorporated into new structures; however, mixing elements from various styles is not appropriate. Applying many architectural details is also not appropriate as the historic homes of the district are not highly decorative. New construction should be identifiable as being of its own time, but should not be so differentiated that it detracts from, or competes with, the contributing historic structures.
Thick fluted round columns are not typical to the district or compatible with a residence dominantly featuring Queen Anne details. A simple square or round column would be more appropriate (an 8"x8" column similar to that found at the proposed rear porch would be an appropriate replacement for the front porch columns). Diamond shape windows are a fenestration shape not typical or appropriate for the district.
(3) The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district
Multiple proportions at or above the maximum range results in an overall scale that is not compatible with typical historic proportions that define the district character. The max width, front width, ridge height, and eaves are above the typical proportions of the district. The roof pitch is at the maximum of those typical to the district. The proportions of the proposed residence are not compatible with the typical historic proportions of the district. See p. 14 for further details.
(4) The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district; and
The main roof eave and the front porch eave heights are above typical for the district. An appropriate max eave height is $23^{\prime}$ and max porch eave height is $12^{\prime}$ to be compatible with the existing contributing structures in the district.
(5) The height of new construction intended for use for commercial purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the existing structures used for commercial purposes in the historic district.
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## CURRENT PHOTOGRAPH <br> CORNER OF RUTLAND \& W 12TH
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## NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES



1223 Rutland - Contributing


1219 Rutland - Contributing


1148 Rutland - Contributing (corner)

## NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES



1202 Rutland - Contributing (corner)


1222 Rutland - Contributing (across street)


1226 Rutland - Contributing (across street)


1220 Rutland - Contributing (across street)


1224 Rutland - Contributing (across street)


1228 Rutland - Contributing (across street)

## EAST ELEVATION - FRONT FACING RUTLAND

## HAHC DESIGN REVIEW - 1/16/14



PROPOSED


## SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION - FACING W 12TH

HAHC DESIGN REVIEW - 1/16/14


## PROPOSED
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## NORTH SIDE ELEVATION <br> PROPOSED



## WEST (REAR) ELEVATION <br> PROPOSED
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SITE PLAN
HAHC DESIGN REVIEW - 1/16/14


PROPOSED


WEST 12th STREET

Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM II.dd
June 19, 2014
1201 Rutland Street
HPO File No. 120630 Houston Heights West


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM II.dd
June 19, 2014
HPO File No. 120630
1201 Rutland Street Houston Heights West


## SECOND FLOOR PLAN



## WINDOW / DOOR SCHEDULE \& AREA CALCULATIONS

| WINDOW SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| MARK | TTY | WIDTH | HEIGHT | DESCRIPTION |
| \|A | 24 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| (A1 | 4 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| B | 4 | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $4^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| B1 | 2 | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $4^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| C | 2 | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| D | 4 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| D1 | 2 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS TEMPERED |
| E | 2 | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS TEMPERED |
| \|F | 2 | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS (HANG AT 45') |


| SQUARE FOOTAGE |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1ST. FLOOR PLAN | 2,374 |
| 2ND. FLOOR PLAN | 1,880 |
| TOTAL | 4,254 |
|  | 495 |
| GAME ROOM | 4,749 |
|  |  |
| TOTAL LIVING | 510 |
|  | 228 |
| GARAGE | 237 |
| FRONT PORCH-1 | 232 |
| SIDE PORCH-1 | 228 |
| REAR PORCH | 237 |
| FRONT PORCH-2 | 1,672 |
| SIDE PORCH-2 |  |
|  | 6,421 |
| TOTAL UNHEATED |  |
| TOTAL COVERED |  |


| DOOR SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline D O O R \\ \text { NO. } \end{gathered}$ | QTY. | WIDTH | HEIGHT | DESCRIPTION |
| 1 | 1 | 3'-0" | 8'-0" | EXTERIOR FRONT DOOR |
| 2 | 1 | 2'-8" | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |
| 3 | 1 | (2) $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |
| $3 a$ | 2 | (2) $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR FIXED (UNIT) |
| 4 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | 20 MIN. FIRE RATED DOOR W/ CLOSER |
| 5 | 2 | 2'-6" | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 6 | 1 | 2'-6" | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR POCKET DOOR |
| 7 | 2 | (2) $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |
| 8 | 1 | (2) $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |
| 9 | 1 | 2'-6" |  | INTERIOR DOOR (CUT TO FIT) |
| 10 | 1 | $18^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | OVERHEAD DOOR AT GARAGE |
| 11 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |
| 12 | 1 | 2'-8" | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |
| 13 | 4 | 2'-8" | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 14 | 7 | 2'-6" | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 15 | 2 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 16 | 1 | 2'-6" | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR POCKET DOOR |
| 17 | 2 | (2) $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |

## CONTRIBUTING 2-STORY RESIDENCES IN DISTRICT

## TYPICAL DISTRICT DETAILS \& PROPOSED RESIDENCE

| (dimensions in ft) | MAX <br> WIDTH | FRONT <br> WIDTH | RIDGE <br> HEIGHT | EAVE <br> HEIGHT | PORCH <br> EAVE <br> HEIGHT | FINISHED <br> FLOOR <br> HEIGHT | ROOF <br> PITCH | PORCH <br> WIDTH | PORCH <br> DEPTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical* 2-Story <br> Contributing Houses | $24-34$ | $20-32$ | $28-33$ | $18-23$ | $8-12$ | $1.5-3$ | $5-8 / 12$ | $6-32$ | $6-10^{* *}$ |
| January Proposal | $38-42^{* * * *}$ | 32 | $33.5^{* * *}$ | 24 | unknown | unknown | unknown | unknown | unknown |
| Compatibility | +8 | at max | +0.5 | +1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Current Proposal | 49 | 38 | 38 | 24 | 13 | 2.5 | $8 / 12$ | 31 | 9 |
| Compatibility | +15 | +6 | +5 | +1 | +1 | compatible | at max | near max | compatible |

* determined by removing a-typical outliers found in the district to provide a compatible range
** previously max was suggested at 8', subsequent information has validated increase of range to 10'
*** height of proposed main roof; not including previously proposed tower which had a max height of 44'-6"
**** width dimensions conflict on front elevation (38') and site plan (42') provided in January

| $\underset{24-34}{\text { MAX WIDTH }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1201 | Rutland | 49 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 40 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 35 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 209 | W 16th | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 30 |
| 201 | W 15th | 28 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 611 | W 15th | 28 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1531 | Allston | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1202 | Rutland |  |
| 509 | W 15th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |


| FRONT WIDTH |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $20-32$ |  |  |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1201 | Rutland | 38 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1400 Allston | 31 |  |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 25 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1531 | Allston | 24 |
| 201 | W 15th | 22 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1509 | Allston | 18 |
| 209 | W 16th | 14 |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 509 | W 15th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |


| $\underset{24-33}{\text { RIDGE HT }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1201 | Rutland | 38 |
| 209 | W 16th | 36 |
| 201 | W 15th | 35 |
| 1246 | Allston | 34 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 33 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 33 |
| 201 | W 16th | 33 |
| 327 | W 16th | 33 |
| 1443 | Allston | 32 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 32 |
| 1245 | Yale | 32 |
| 1531 | Allston | 31 |
| 1202 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 30 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1400 | Allston | 29 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 29 |
| 1235 | Yale | 29 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1509 | Allston | 28 |
| 1535 | Allston | 28 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 27 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 27 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 27 |
| 509 | W 15th | 27 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 22 |


| EAVE HT |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | $18-23$ |  |  |
| 201 | W 15 th | 25 |  |
| 201 | W 16 th | 25 |  |
| 1201 | Rutland | 24 |  |
| 327 | W 16th | 24 |  |
| 1531 | Allston | 23 |  |
| 1537 | Tulane | 23 |  |
| 209 | W 16th | 23 |  |
| 1245 | Yale | 23 |  |
| 1246 | Allston | 22 |  |
| 1443 | Allston | 22 |  |
| 1237 | Rutland | 22 |  |
| 1343 | Rutland | 22 |  |
| 1429 | Rutland | 22 |  |
| 1541 | Tulane | 22 |  |
| 509 | W 15th | 22 |  |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 |  |
| 1541 | Ashland | 21 |  |
| 1202 | Rutland | 21 |  |
| 1447 | Tulane | 21 |  |
| 1147 | Allston | 20 |  |
| 1400 | Allston | 20 |  |
| 1535 | Allston | 20 |  |
| 1236 | Rutland | 20 |  |
| 1235 | Yale | 20 |  |
| 1439 | Rutland | 19 |  |
| 1535 | Rutland | 19 |  |
| 1341 | Allston | 18 |  |
| 1232 | Tulane | 18 |  |
| 1427 | Tulane | 18 |  |
| 611 | W 15th | 17 |  |
| 1109 | Rutland | 16 |  |


| PORCH EAVE HT 8-12 |  |  | $\underset{5 / 12-8 / 12}{\text { ROOF PITCH }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1201 | Rutland | 13 | 1443 | Allston | 13/12 |
| 201 | W 15th | 13 | 1236 | Rutland | 12/12 |
| 201 | W 16th | 13 | 1232 | Tulane | 10/12 |
| 1443 | Allston | 12 | 201 | W 15th | 10/12 |
| 1531 | Allston | 12 | 209 | W 16th | 10/12 |
| 1245 | Yale | 12 | 1201 | Rutland | $8 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Allston | 11 | 1246 | Allston | 8/12 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 11 | 1531 | Allston | 8/12 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 11 | 1535 | Allston | 8/12 |
| 509 | W 15th | 11 | 1237 | Rutland | 8/12 |
| 1147 | Allston | 10 | 1447 | Tulane | $8 / 12$ |
| 1400 | Allston | 10 | 1541 | Tulane | 8/12 |
| 1509 | Allston | 10 | 327 | W 16th | $8 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Rutland | 10 | 1235 | Yale | 8/12 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 10 | 1341 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1235 | Yale | 10 | 1509 | Allston | 7/12 |
| 1439 | Rutland | - | 1109 | Rutland | 7/12 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 9 | 1429 | Rutland | $7 / 12$ |
| 1246 | Allston | - | 1537 | Tulane | $7 / 12$ |
| 1429 | Rutland | - | 611 | W 15th | $7 / 12$ |
| 1541 | Ashland | - | 201 | W 16th | 7/12 |
| 1237 | Rutland | - | 1147 | Allston | 6/12 |
| 1202 | Rutland | - | 1400 | Allston | 6/12 |
| 1236 | Rutland | - | 1541 | Ashland | 6/12 |
| 1341 | Allston | - | 1439 | Rutland | 6/12 |
| 1232 | Tulane | - | 1535 | Rutland | 6/12 |
| 1537 | Tulane | - | 1427 | Tulane | 6/12 |
| 1541 | Tulane | - | 1245 | Yale | 6/12 |
| 611 | W 15th | - | 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 209 | W 16th | - | 1343 | Rutland | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - | 509 | W 15th | - |

Proposed: red, bold
Measurement unavailable: -
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## SAMPLE OF LARGEST 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES IN DISTRICT



## 1147 Allston

front width: 28
max width: 28
ridge ht: 28
eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2
residence s.f.: 2,450 lot s.f: 9,900 lot on block: corner

## 1400 Allston

front width: 31 max width: 31 ridge ht: 29 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 residence s.f.: 2,460 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: corner

## 1109 Rutland

front width: 31
max width: 31 ridge ht: 30 eave ht: 16 porch eave ht: 11 porch floor ht: 2 residence s.f.: 2,160 lot s.f: 6,900 lot on block: interior

## 1237 Rutland

front width: 26 max width: 30 ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 residence s.f.: 2,260 lot s.f: 8,710 lot on block: corner


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
June 19, 2014
HPO File No. 120630

ITEM II.dd
1201 Rutland Street Houston Heights West

| $\begin{aligned} & 1343 \text { Rutland } \\ & \text { front width: } 32 \\ & \text { max width: } 32 \\ & \text { ridge ht: } 29 \\ & \text { eave ht: } 22 \\ & \text { porch eave ht: } 11 \\ & \text { porch floor ht: } 2 \\ & \text { residence s.f.: } 2,290 \\ & \text { lot s.f: } 4,880 \\ & \text { lot on block: corner } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 1439 \text { Rutland } \\ \text { front width: } 28 \\ \text { max width: } 35 \\ \text { ridge ht: } 27 \\ \text { eave ht: } 19 \\ \text { porch eave ht: } 9 \\ \text { porch floor ht: } 2 \\ \text { residence s.f.: } 2,530 \\ \text { lot s.f: } 8,880 \\ \text { lot on block: interior } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1232 Tulane <br> front width: 30 max width: 40 ridge ht: 27 eave ht: 18 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 residence s.f.: 2,140 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior |  | 1541 Tulane <br> front width: 28 max width: 28 ridge ht: 33 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 1 residence s.f.: 3,030 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 201 W 15 } \\ \text { front width: } 28 \\ \text { max width: } 22 \\ \text { ridge ht: } 35 \\ \text { eave ht: } 25 \\ \text { porch eave ht: } 13 \\ \text { porch floor ht: } 3 \\ \text { residence s.f.: } 2,530 \\ \text { lot s.f: } 12,300 \\ \text { lot on block: corner } \end{gathered}$ |  | 201 W 16th <br> front width: 28 max width: 28 ridge ht: 33 eave ht: 25 porch eave ht: 13 porch floor ht: 3 residence s.f.: 2,630 lot s.f: 6,800 lot on block: corner |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1245 \text { Yale } \\ & \text { front width: } 33 \\ & \text { max width: } 33 \\ & \text { ridge ht: } 32 \\ & \text { eave ht: } 23 \\ & \text { porch eave ht: } 12 \\ & \text { porch floor ht: } 3 \\ & \text { residence s.f.: } 2,700 \\ & \text { lot s.f: } 7,980 \\ & \text { lot on block: corner } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 209 \text { W 16th } \\ & \text { front width: } 14 \text { (bay) } \\ & \text { max width: } 31 \\ & \text { ridge ht: } 36 \\ & \text { eave ht: } 23 \\ & \text { porch eave ht: - } \\ & \text { porch floor ht: } 2 \\ & \text { residence s.f.: } 2,770 \\ & \text { lot s.f: } 9,800 \\ & \text { lot on block: interior } \end{aligned}$ |  |



## DETAILS

Shape/Mass: Two-story residence measuring 38 ' wide at the front, comprised of a northern 16 ' wide bay and an inset 22 ' wide south bay with porch. 23' behind the front wall at the porch, the residence extends out at the south side 11', giving the residence an overall width of 49'. The residence will total 98 '4 " deep at the north side and 64 ' deep at the south side (measured from front most wall to rear porch). The residence will feature an eave height of $24^{\prime}$ and a ridge height of $38^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$. The front porch will wrap around the southern side at both the first and second levels, with a 12'-10" eave height at the first level. The ceiling heights will be 10' at the first level and 9 ' at the second level.

Setbacks: The residence will be setback $20^{\prime}$ from the front (east) property line; $12^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ from the south side property line; $5^{\prime}$ from the north side property line; and $13^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ at the rear (west) property line.

Foundation: The residence will feature a brick-clad pier and beam foundation with wood trellis. The finished floor height will be 2'-6".

Windows/Doors: The residence will feature wood 1-over-1 single-hung and single-lite fixed windows.
Exterior Materials: The house will feature smooth horizontal lap cementitious siding. The front facing gable will feature fish scale decorative siding. The side facing gable will feature horizontal siding.

Roof: The residence will feature an $8 / 12$ gable-on-hip roof (both the front and south side elevations feature sections with a front gable). The front porch will have a $3 / 12$ shed roof. The rear porch and one-story connector will have a $6 / 12$ pitch roof. The garage will have an $8 / 12$ hip roof.

Front Elevation: The front elevation features three bays as defined by a projecting section with a front gable at the
(East) north side, a central inset front wall, and a wrap-around double-gallery porch. The north side bay features a projecting tri-part bay at the first level which has a pair of one-over-one windows at the front section and a single one-over-one window at each angled side. The second level of the north bay features a pair of one-over-one windows and fish scale siding in the gable and decorative pane window. The central bay features a Craftsman style front door, a diamond shaped window, and one one-over-one window at the first level. The second level of the central bay features a divided light door, a diamond shaped window, and a one-over-one window. The wrap-around double-gallery porch features fluted columns and spindlework balustrade. The south side of the house has a projecting volume with a side gable. The front facing wall of this volume features a divided lite door at both the first and second levels.

Side Elevation: From front to back, the first and second level features one-over-one windows, one centered in (South) each bay of the double-gallery porch. The projecting side gable wing features a brick chimney with a one-over-one window on either side at both levels. A one-story rear porch connects to the projecting side gable wing and an inset single story section of the residence that connects to the two-story garage. The single story portion of the residence features a set of three one-over-one windows. The garage features a pair of one-over-one windows at the second level.

Side Elevation: From front to back, the first level will feature two one-over-one windows and three sets of two one-
(North) over-one windows. The second level will feature three single lite fixed windows. The garage will feature a pair of one-over-one windows at the second level.

Rear Elevation: From north to south, the alley loading garage will feature a double vehicular overhead garage
(West) door and two one-over-one windows at the level above. The rear porch will feature simple stick balustrade and $8^{\prime} x 8$ ' square columns. The rear wall features three pairs of divided lite french doors, one set will be functional the other two will be fixed. The second level will feature five single lite fixed windows. See elevation drawings for further details for all elevations.

## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

## Application Date: September 3, 2014

Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design for Michael Bastian, owner
Property: 1201 Rutland, lot 17 and 18, block 183, Houston Heights Subdivision. The property is an 8,800 square foot ( $66.66^{\prime} \times 132$ ) vacant corner lot.

Significance: The property is located in the Houston Heights Historic District West.
Proposal: New Construction - On a corner lot, construct a two-story, 4,360 square foot single-family residence that is $43^{\prime}$ wide; $56^{\prime}$ deep at the $W$ 12th side; 96 ' deep at the north side; and $36^{\prime}-6$ " tall. At the January 16, 2014 HAHC meeting the applicants presented an initial design concept for the residence that measured approximately $38^{\prime}$ wide, $70^{\prime}$ deep, and $33^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ tall. Staff provided recommendations to revise the design to comply with criteria including typical dimensional ranges established by field measurements of all contributing two-story residences in the district.
At the June 19, 2014 HAHC meeting the applicant was denied a COA for a new two-story residence on the basis that the proposal did not satisfying criteria $1,2,3$ and 4 . Staff met with the applicants on several occasions to discuss compatible design options. The applicant has submitted a revised application which includes the following changes:

- Reduce the maximum width from 49 ' to $43^{\prime}$
- Reduce the front width from $38^{\prime}$ to $36^{\prime}$
- Increase the W 12th side setback from $122^{\prime}-8$ " to $199^{\prime}-8{ }^{\prime \prime}$
- Increase the Rutland front setback from $20^{\prime}$ to $22^{\prime}$
- Reduce the ridge height from $38^{\prime}$ to $36^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime \prime}$
- Reduce the main eave height from $24^{\prime}$ to $23^{\prime}$
- Reduce the porch eave height from $13^{\prime}$ to 12'
- Change diamond shape windows at front elevation to rectangular
- Change fluted round porch columns to smooth round columns

See enclosed application materials and detailed project description on p. 13-22 for further details.
Public Comment: No public comment received.
Civic Association: No comment received.
Recommendation: Approval with conditions:

- Max ridge height of the hip roof to not exceed 33', achieved by a reduction in roof pitch, plate height, foundation height, width, or a combination thereof
- Porch stairs be wood or composite decking instead of brick

HAHC Action: Approved with Conditions:

- Max ridge height of the hip roof to not exceed 33', achieved by a reduction in roof pitch, plate height, foundation height, width, or a combination thereof
- Porch stairs be wood or composite decking instead of brick


## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Basis for Issuance: HAHC Approval<br>Effective: September 25, 2014

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## NEW CONSTRUCTION IN A HISTORIC DISTRICT

Sec. 33-242: HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria:
S D NA
S-satisfies
D - does not satisfy
NA - not applicable

(1) The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district
Satisfies - Previously, the residence was proposed at a12'-8" setback on the side facing W 12th St. The setback has been revised to $19^{\prime}-8$ " which is compatible with corner lots.
(2) The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district
Does not satisfy - Brick porch stairs are not typical to the district. Wood, or a composite decking resembling wood, would be a more appropriate porch stair material.

(3) The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district
Does not satisfy - Proposal has multiple proportions at or above the maximum range resulting in an overall scale that is not compatible with typical historic proportions that define the district character. The max width, front width, and ridge height are above the typical proportions of the district. The roof pitch is at the maximum of those typical to the district.
The proposed residence is on an 8,800 s.f. corner lot, and the proposed setbacks have been increased to $22^{\prime}$ on Rutland and $20^{\prime}$ on $W$ 12th. These factors, in combination with the recommended 33' max height condition, would allow staff to accept the width of the house that is above typical. The 33' ridge height may be achieved by a reduction in roof pitch, plate height, foundation height, width, or a combination thereof.

(4) The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district; and
Satisfies - Previously, a 24' main eave and 13' porch eave were proposed, which have been reduced to 23 ' and 12 ' respectfully.
(5) The height of new construction intended for use for commercial purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the existing structures used for commercial purposes in the historic district.

## CONTRIBUTING 2-STORY RESIDENCES IN DISTRICT

## TYPICAL DISTRICT DETAILS \& PROPOSED RESIDENCE

| (dimensions in ff) | MAX <br> WIDTH | FRONT <br> WIDTH | RIDGE <br> HEIGHT | EAVE <br> HEIGHT | PORCH <br> EAVE <br> HEIGHT | FINISHED <br> FLOOR <br> HEIGHT | ROOF <br> PITCH | PORCH <br> WIDTH | PORCH <br> DEPTH |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical Contributing <br> 2-Story Residences | $24-34$ | $20-32$ | $28-33$ | $18-23$ | $8-12$ | $1.5-3$ | $5-8 / 12$ | $6-32$ | $6-10$ |
| DESIGN CONCEPT - 1/16/14 | $38-42$ | 32 | 33.5 | 24 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Compatibility | +8 | at max | +0.5 | +1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| DENIED -6/19/14 | 49 | 38 | 38 | 24 | 13 | 2.5 | $8 / 12$ | 31 | 9 |
| Compatibility | +15 | +6 | +5 | +1 | +1 | compatible | at max | compatible | compatible |
| CURRENT | 43 | 36 | 36.5 | 23 | 12 | 2.5 | $8 / 12$ | 29 | 7 |
| Compatibility | +9 | +4 | +3.5 | compatible | compatible | compatible | at max | compatible | compatible |

* determined by removing a-typical outliers found in the district to provide a compatible range

| MAX WIDTH |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typ. Range: 24-34 |  |  |
| 1201 | Rutland | 43 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 40 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 35 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 209 | W 16th | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 30 |
| 201 | W 15th | 28 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 611 | W 15th | 28 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1531 | Allston | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1202 | Rutland |  |
| 509 | W 15th |  |
| 327 | W 16th |  |


| FRONT WIDTH |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Typ. Range: 20 | -32 |  |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1201 | Rutland | 36 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 25 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1531 | Allston | 24 |
| 201 | W 15th | 22 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1509 | Allston | 18 |
| 209 | W 16th | 14 |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 509 | W 15th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |


| RIDGE HT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typ. |  |  |
| Range: | 24 | $\mathbf{3 3}$ |
| 1201 | Rutland | 36.5 |
| 209 | W 16th | 36 |
| 201 | W 15th | 35 |
| 1246 | Allston | 34 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 33 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 33 |
| 201 | W 16th | 33 |
| 327 | W 16th | 33 |
| 1443 | Allston | 32 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 32 |
| 124 | Yale | 32 |
| 1531 | Allston | 31 |
| 1202 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 30 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1430 | Allston | 29 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 29 |
| 1235 | Yale | 29 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1509 | Allston | 28 |
| 1535 | Allston | 28 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 27 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 27 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 27 |
| 509 | W 15 th | 27 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 22 |


| EAVE HT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typ. Range: 18-23 |  |  |
| 201 | W 15th | 25 |
| 201 | W 16th | 25 |
| 327 | W 16th | 24 |
| 1201 | Rutland | 23 |
| 1531 | Allston | 23 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 23 |
| 209 | W 16th | 23 |
| 1245 | Yale | 23 |
| 1246 | Allston | 22 |
| 1443 | Allston | 22 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 22 |
| 509 | W 15th | 22 |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 21 |
| 1202 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 21 |
| 1147 | Allston | 20 |
| 1400 | Allston | 20 |
| 1535 | Allston | 20 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 20 |
| 1235 | Yale | 20 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 19 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 19 |
| 1341 | Allston | 18 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 18 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 18 |
| 611 | W 15th | 17 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 16 |


| PORCH EAVE HT |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Typ. | Range: | - |
| 2012 |  |  |
| 201 | W 15th | 13 |
| 201 | W 16th | 13 |
| 1201 | Rutland | 12 |
| 1443 | Allston | 12 |
| 1531 | Allston | 12 |
| 1245 | Yale | 12 |
| 1535 | Allston | 11 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 11 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 11 |
| 509 | W 15th | 11 |
| 1147 | Allston | 10 |
| 1400 | Allston | 10 |
| 1509 | Allston | 10 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 10 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 10 |
| 1235 | Yale | 10 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 9 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 9 |
| 1246 | Allston | - |
| 1429 | Rutland | - |
| 1541 | Ashland | - |
| 1237 | Rutland | - |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 1236 | Rutland | - |
| 1341 | Allston | - |
| 1232 | Tulane | - |
| 1537 | Tulane | - |
| 1541 | Tulane | - |
| 611 | W 15th | - |
| 209 | W 16th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |


| ROOF PITCH |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typ. Range: 5/12-8/12 |  |  |
| 1443 | Allston | 13/12 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 12/12 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 10/12 |
| 201 | W 15th | 10/12 |
| 209 | W 16th | 10/12 |
| 1201 | Rutland | 8/12 |
| 1246 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1531 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1237 | Rutland | $8 / 12$ |
| 1447 | Tulane | $8 / 12$ |
| 1541 | Tulane | 8/12 |
| 327 | W 16th | $8 / 12$ |
| 1235 | Yale | 8/12 |
| 1341 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1509 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1109 | Rutland | $7 / 12$ |
| 1429 | Rutland | 7/12 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 7/12 |
| 611 | W 15th | 7/12 |
| 201 | W 16th | 7/12 |
| 1147 | Allston | 6/12 |
| 1400 | Allston | $6 / 12$ |
| 1541 | Ashland | 6/12 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 6/12 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 6/12 |
| 1427 | Tulane | $6 / 12$ |
| 1245 | Yale | 6/12 |
| 1202 | Rutland |  |
| 1343 | Rutland | - |
|  | W 15th |  |

- indicates measurement unavailable; grey highlights typical range
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## CURRENT PHOTO



Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM B. 25
September 25, 2014
HPO File No. 140925

## NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES
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## NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES
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## ALL 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES IN DISTRICT (30)



1246 Allston - Contrib. c. 1910 Classic Revival front width: 32 max width: 32 ridge ht: 34 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$
residence s.f.: 1,980 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: corner


1341 Allston - Contrib. 1928 Colonial Revival
front width: 28 max width: 28 ridge ht: 27 eave ht: 18 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: $7 / 12$
residence s.f.: 2,240 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


1443 Allston - Contrib. c. 1910 Dutch Colonial front width: 24 max width: 24 ridge ht: 32 eave ht: 32 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 13/12 residence s.f.: 1,868 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


1531 Allston - Contrib. c. 1925 Am Foursquare
front width: 24
max width: 28 ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 8/12 residence s.f.: 2,030
lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


1535 Allston - Contrib. c. 1925 Am Foursquare
front width: 21
max width: 21 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 11 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 8/12
residence s.f.: 1,764
lot s.f: 6,600
lot on block: interior
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2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES CONT.


1202 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1920 Craftsman
front width: -
max width: -
ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 21 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: residence s.f.: 3,023 lot s.f: 4,250
lot location: corner


1236 Rutland - Contrib. 1907 Queen Anne
front width: 39
max width: 39 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 12/12 residence s.f.: 2,280 lot s.f: 7,470 lot location: interior

1237 Rutland - Contrib. 1911 Queen Anne
front width: 26
max width: 30 ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 2,260 lot s.f: 8,710 lot location: corner


1429 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1930 Colonial Revival
front width: 25
max width: 28 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 7/12 residence s.f.: 1,793 lot s.f: 7,920 lot location: interior


1439 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1930 Colonial Revival
front width: 28
max width: 35
ridge ht: 27
eave ht: 19
porch eave ht: 9
porch floor ht: 2
pitch: 6/12
residence s.f.: 2,530
lot s.f: 8,880
lot location: interior
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## 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES CONT.



1427 Tulane - Contrib. 1927 Craftsman Apt
front width: 28
max width: 28 ridge ht: 25 eave ht: 18 porch eave ht: 9 porch floor ht: 1 pitch: 6/12 residence s.f.: 2,186 lot s.f: 5,799 lot location: corner

1537 Tulane - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival
front width: 31
max width: 31 ridge ht: 32 eave ht: 33 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 7/12 residence s.f.: 2,348 lot s.f: 7,250
lot location: corner


201 W 15th - Contrib. 1902 Queen Anne
front width: 28
max width: 22 ridge ht: 35 eave ht: 25 porch eave ht: 13 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 10/12 residence s.f.: 2,530 lot s.f: 12,300 lot location: corner


509 W 15th - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival
front width: -
max width: -
ridge ht: 27
eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: 11 porch floor ht: 2
pitch: -
residence s.f.: 1,056
lot s.f: 1,782
lot location: corner
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## 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES CONT. \& PROPOSED



209 W 16th - Contrib. c. 10
front width: 14 (bay)
max width: 31 ridge ht: 36 eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 10/12 residence s.f.: 2,770 lot s.f: 9,800 lot location: interior


1235 Yale - Contrib. c. 1915 - American Foursquare
front width: 25 max width: 25 ridge ht: 29 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 1,392 lot s.f: 6,600 lot location: interior


201 W 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ - Contrib. c. 1910 Queen Anne
front width: 28 max width: 28 ridge ht: 33 eave ht: 25 porch eave ht: 13 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 7/12
residence s.f.: 2,630 lot s.f: 6,800 lot location: corner


327 W 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ - Contrib. c. 1910 - Queen Anne
front width: -
max width: -
ridge ht: 33 eave ht: 24 porch eave ht: -
porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$
residence s.f.: 1,480 lot s.f: -
lot location: interior


1245 Yale - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival
front width: 33
max width: 33
ridge ht: 32
eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 6/12 residence s.f.: 2,700 lot s.f: 7,980 lot location: corner


1201 Rutland - PROPOSED
front width: 43
max width: 36
ridge ht: 36.5 eave ht: 23
porch eave ht: 12
porch floor ht: 2.5
pitch: $8 / 12$
residence s.f.: 4,360 lot s.f: 8,800
lot on block: corner
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PROPOSED RESIDENCE \& 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES ON BLOCK


1201 RUTLAND
(denied 6/19/14)
1201 RUTLAND
(proposed)
1236 RUTLAND
(widest contrib.
house in HD)
1237 RUTLAND
(typical 2-story
cont. house)


RUTLAND BLOCKFACE COMPARISON
(1201, 1205 \& 1207 AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED)


# EAST ELEVATION - FRONT FACING RUTLAND <br> DENIED - 6/19/14 


front width: 38 max width: 49
ridge ht: 38
eave ht: 24
porch eave ht: 23
porch floor ht: 2.5
pitch: 8/12
front width: 36
max width: 43
ridge ht: 36.6
eave ht: 23
porch eave ht: 23
porch floor ht: 2.5
pitch: 8/12

Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM B. 25
September 25, 2014
HPO File No. 140925

## SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION - FACING W 12TH <br> DENIED - 6/19/14



PROPOSED


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM B. 25
September 25, 2014
HPO File No. 140925

## NORTH SIDE ELEVATION <br> DENIED - 6/19/14



## PROPOSED



Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
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## WEST (REAR) ELEVATION <br> DENIED - 6/19/14



PROPOSED


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM B. 25
September 25, 2014
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## SITE PLAN

DENIED - 6/19/14


WEST 12th STREET
PROPOSED


WEST 12th STREET

Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
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September 25, 2014
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ROOF PLAN

DENIED - 6/19/14


PROPOSED


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
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September 25, 2014
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1201 Rutland Street Houston Heights West
$\stackrel{N}{N}$
FIRST FLOOR PLAN
DENIED - 6/19/14


PROPOSED


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
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September 25, 2014
HPO File No. 140925
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$\stackrel{i}{\mathrm{~N}}$

## SECOND FLOOR PLAN <br> DENIED - 6/19/14



## WINDOW / DOOR SCHEDULE

| WINDOW SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MARK | QTY | WIDTH | HEIGHT | DESCRIPTION |
| (A) | 31 | 2'-8" | 6'-0" | SINGLE HUNG |
| (B) | 4 | 2'-0" | $4^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| (C) | 2 | 2'-0" | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| (D) | 6 | 2'-8" | 2'-0" | FIXED GLASS |
| (1) | 2 | 2'-8" | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS TEMPERED |
| (E) | 2 | 2'-0" | 2'-0" | FIXED GLASS TEMPERED |
| (F) | 2 | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| (G) | 1 | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |


| DOOR SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOOR | QTY. | WIDTH | HEIGHT | DESCRIPTION |
| 1 | 1 | 3'-0" | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRONT DOOR |
| 2 | 1 | 2'-8" | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |
| 3 | 1 | (2) $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |
| 30 | 2 | (2) $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR FIXED (UNIT) |
| 4 | 1 | 3'-0" | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | 20 MIN. FIRE RATED DOOR W/ CLOSER |
| 5 | 2 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 6 | 1 | 2'-6" | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR POCKET DOOR |
| 7 | 2 | (2) $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |
| 8 | 1 | (2) $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |
| 9 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ |  | INTERIOR DOOR (CUT TO FIT) |
| 10 | 1 | $18^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | OVERHEAD DOOR AT GARAGE |
| 11 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |
| 12 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |
| 13 | 4 | 2'-8" | $6^{\prime \prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 14 | 7 | 2'-6" | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 15 | 2 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime \prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 16 | 1 | 2'-6" | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR POCKET DOOR |
| 17 | 2 | (2) $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |

## PROJECT DETAILS

Shape/Mass: The two-story residence will measure 36' wide at the front, comprised of a northern 14 ' wide bay and an inset 22 ' wide south bay with porch. $23^{\prime}$ behind the front wall at the porch, the residence extends out at the south side $7^{\prime}$, giving the residence an overall width of $43^{\prime}$. The residence will be a total $93^{\prime}-4$ " deep at the north side, and 62 deep at the south side (measured from front most wall to rear porch). The residence will feature an eave height of $23^{\prime}$ and a ridge height of $36^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime \prime}$. The front porch will wrap around the southern side at both levels, with a 12' eave height at the first level. The ceiling heights will be 10 'at the first level and 9 'at the second level.

Setbacks: The residence will be setback $22^{\prime}$ from the front (east) property line; 19'-8" from the south side property line; $4^{\prime}$ from the north side property line; and $13^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ at the rear (west) property line.

Foundation: The residence will feature a brick-clad pier and beam foundation with wood trellis. The finished floor height will be 2'-6".

Windows/Doors: The residence will feature wood 1-over-1 single-hung and single-lite fixed windows.
Exterior Materials: The house will feature smooth horizontal lap cementitious siding. The front facing gable will feature fish scale decorative siding. The side facing gable will feature horizontal siding.

Roof: The residence will feature an $8 / 12$ main hipped roof with $8 / 12$ gables at both the front and south side elevations. The front porch will have a $3 / 12$ shed roof. The rear porch and one-story connector will have a $6 / 12$ pitch roof. The garage will have an $8 / 12$ hip roof.

Front Elevation: Facing Rutland, the front elevation features three bays as defined by a projecting section with a
(East) front gable at the north side, a central inset front wall, and a wrap-around double-gallery porch. The north side features a projecting tri-part bay with four 1 -over-1 windows at the first level. The second level of the north bay features a pair of 1 -over-1 windows and fish scale siding in the gable and decorative lite window. The central bay features a wood paneled front door, a fixed rectangular window, and one 1 -over- 1 window at the first level. The second level of the central bay features a divided light door, a fixed rectangular window, and a 1 -over- 1 window. The wraparound double-gallery porch features smooth round columns and spindlework balustrade. The south side of the house has a projecting volume with a side gable. The front facing wall of this volume features a divided lite door at both the first and second levels.

Side Elevation: Facing W 12th, from front to back, the first and second level features 1 -over-1 windows, one (South) centered in each bay of the double-gallery porch. The projecting side gable wing features a brick chimney with a 1 -over-1 window on either side at both levels. A one-story rear porch connects to the projecting side gable wing and an inset single story section of the residence to the two-story garage. The single story portion of the residence features a set of three 1 -over- 1 windows. The garage features a pair of 1 -over- 1 windows at the second level.

Side Elevation: From front to back, the first level will feature two 1 -over-1 windows, two sets of two 1 -over-1
(North) windows, and one set of three 1 -over-1 windows. The second level features a 1 -over-1 windows, and three single lite fixed windows. The garage will feature a pair of 1 -over-1 windows at the second level.

Rear Elevation: From north to south, the alley loading garage will feature a double vehicular overhead garage
(West) door and two 1 -over- 1 windows at the level above. The rear porch will feature simple stick balustrade and $8^{\prime} \times 8$ ' square columns. The rear wall features three pairs of divided lite french doors, one set will be functional and two will be fixed. The second level will feature five single lite fixed windows. See elevation drawings for further details for all elevations.

# Transcription of Item B. 25 - 1201 Rutland Street - HAHC September 25, 2014 <br> (Unofficial transcript, prepared by Planning staff from audio of meeting for informational purposes) 

Staff - Good afternoon Mr. Chair, members of the Commission. My name is Delaney Harris-Finch and I submit for your consideration Item B-25: 1201 Rutland. At the January HAHC meeting, the applicant presented an initial design concept for the residence that measured 38 ' wide 70 (inaudible) deep and $33.5^{\prime}$ tall. Staff provided recommendations to revised the design and comply with criteria, including typical dimensional ranges established by field measurements of all contributing two story residences found within the district.

At the June $19^{\text {th }}$ HAHC meeting, the applicant proposed a new design, and was denied a COA for the residence. The proposal was found to not meet criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4.

The applicant has submitted revisions to the design, which include the following: An increase to the West $12^{\text {th }}$ (Street) setback from $13^{\prime}$ to $20^{\prime}$, and the Rutland front setback from 20 to $22^{\prime}$. Reduction of the max width from $49^{\prime}$ to 43 and front width from $38^{\prime}$ to 36 . Reduction of the ridge height from $38^{\prime}$ to $36^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$. Reduction of the eave height from 24 ' to 23 and porch eave height from 13 to 12. And an installation of rectangular windows in place of previously proposed diamond shaped windows. And installation of smooth round columns instead of fluted.

The revisions to the setbacks, eave heights, windows, and columns are compatible. The overall scale and proportions are still not compatible. In reviewing two story residence proposals, staff compares the design with two story contributing residences within the district, which account for 30 of the 340 contributing structures. The majority of structures within the district are single story residences. For new two story residences, being of a scale similar to typical two story homes in the district is key to compatibility.

Matching or exceeding the size of the largest homes within the district is not compatible with the neighborhood, and does not preserve the district's character. Staff has expressed on numerous occasions that being at or above the recommended dimensional ranges results in an over scaled residence that is not appropriate.

The proposed residence has a max width, front width, ridge height, and roof pitch that are at or above typical. However, the proposed residence is on an 8,800 square foot corner lot, and the proposed setbacks have been increased on the street facing sides. These factors in combination with a 33' max height condition, would allow staff to accept the width of the house that is above typical. A 33 ' ridge height may be easily achieved with a reduction of the roof pitch to $6: 12$, of by a combination of reductions to the pitch, plate height, foundation height, and/or width.

Staff finds that the proposed residence does not satisfy criteria 2 and 3 for criteria for new construction, but specific revisions would make the proposal acceptable. Staff is recommending approval with the following conditions: The max ridge height of the hipped roof shall not exceed 33 ', and the porch stairs consist of wood or composite decking instead of brick.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay, we do have a couple of speakers signed up. Mr. Michael Bastian. I'm sorry. Mr. Kirwin.

Timothy Kirwin - My name is Timothy Kirwin. I represent the owner an applicant of this property today. 1201 Rutland. Staff has recommended partial approval. They have two issues with us: The first is the porch stairs; they would like it to be wood or composite. However, brick steps are in this district, at 1232 Tulane, 1509 Allston, 1537 Tulane, 1236 Rutland, 1201 West $16^{\text {th }}$ Street, and this commission has approved brick steps at 1210 Tulane for new construction. This is a feature of this district. And I am only quoting to you the two story residences, contributing residences that have brick steps. That should not be an issue for this commission.

The second that we are being denied on is that staff would like us to lower the ridge height to $33^{\prime}$ from $36^{\prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$. However, $36^{\prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$ is compatible, per your ordinance, with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures. Now, staff has provided this... in the packet, and this is going to go to all three of our applications. This one, 1205, and 1207 Rutland. Can everybody please refer to this in your packet [places page 3 of staff report on projector]. Now... Mr. Walsh, I have a question for you. All of this data here, were these particular data points taken on the pieces of property or were these data points taken from the right of way? Mr. Walsh?

Director Patrick Walsh - I am going to ask my staff to help clarify that.
Timothy Kirwin - If you will look at the data sheet, while we are waiting for that. (103:53) Under the roof pitch, it says the typical roof pitch is $5: 12$ to $8: 12$. However, if you look at your sheet, there is not one, single, solitary structure within this district with a $5: 12$ roof pitch... then how is that typical. If you move to the next one, under porch eave height, it is between 8 and 12 feet. There is not one structure with an eave height of 8 '. How is that a typical eave height... for the porch? The next one for the ridge height, 24 to 33 '. However, if you look at the sheet here, there is not a single one that is $24^{\prime}$ on this sheet. How is that a typical ridge height? If you look at the front width, the front width is between 20 and 32'. Again, there is not one single structure that has a 20' front width. And finally, under the max width, 24 to 34 ', there is not one structure with 34 '. You are being asked, this commission is being asked to determine if we're too big, if we're too tall, if we're too wide, based on erroneous data.

And I will refer to staff to answer the question of how this data was collected. The question is, were these data points taken from the right of way or were they taken on the properties themselves?

Staff 2 - All measurements were taken from the right of way.
Timothy Kirwin - And what equipment was used to determine these heights?

Staff 2 - We used a Leica Disto laser surveying tool.
Timothy Kirwin - And did you use two points or three points to do that?
Staff 2 - We used three points.
Timothy Kirwin - And was staff the one doing all of these measurements?
Staff 2 - I believe so. Yes we had various members of staff.
Timothy Kirwin - Were there any interns that were doing these measurements?
Staff 2 - We had an unpaid intern. And I actually served as a graduate intern. I did primarily recording of the measurements as well as training on the tool.

Timothy Kirwin - So interns did do some of these measurements, is that correct?
Staff 2 - I did some of these measurements, yes.
Timothy Kirwin - I will let this commission know that I did an open records request asking for information on this and I received a response back from the department that said interns did not do the measurements. Staff did all of the measurements. That is untrue, and I have document if this commission would like to see that today. So what we have here is that we have interns, who are measuring from a distance, quite far away, to determine what is, and what is not appropriate height, and what is not appropriate width. These numbers don't mean anything. And so l'm going to ask this commission to grant us a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - That's your time Mr. Kirwin. Thank you. Alright Mr. Bastian.

Michael Bastian - l've just realized that I'm handing something out for the next... So ignore what you are being handed right now until we hit 1205 Rutland.

But I would like to comment on the use of an indirect measurement, using Pythagorean Theorem to actually come up with the measurements of heights. I talked in depth with both Bosch and Leica today, with actual product development engineers, who are the technical experts. And, basically, they said the data you collect is as bad as the person using it. Using indirect measurements, if you do not have a tripod that is on level ground, and is not leveled through a means, if you do not maintain a reference point in using the three point technique that you can be off by several feet. And what we're arguing about here now, or what we're discussing or asking for approval of, is the difference of a couple of feet over a distance of 80 or 90 feet from the right of way. I believe that the data that we are using is not direct measurements, and it's erroneous to use this stuff. If we were talking about being way out of whack on what is typical or what is actually in the district for this particular architectural style and this house, then I would agree. However, we're not. You know the fact that there is brick on numerous houses and the fact that this commission has approved brick steps on other houses in this particular district... again l'm just at a loss for words. I am going to save the rest of mine for when we talk about 1205 and 1207. I'd like to see this house approved.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Thank you. Could staff come and restate their recommendation please?
Staff - Staff is recommending approval with conditions: That the max ridge height of the hipped roof not to exceed 33 ' and porch stairs to be wood or composite instead of brick.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Do we have any discussion?
Commissioner Anna Mod - Could you repeat the width? You are comfortable with the proposed width which is 43?

Staff -The proposed front width is 36 and the max width is 43 . With the reduced condition of the max ridge height, we'd be comfortable with an atypical width.

Commissioner Ana Mod - I did have questions about the brick steps. Typically when I drive around the Heights, the brick steps on the new houses really jump out as something solid and heavy in the front, and I think it's because mostly because those houses are higher than the older historic houses, and I think it does soften... if you are going to build a big house, to have a wood porch, it fits in better. It's less imposing. I mean, we're going to have this big house lets... And am I right that the elevation would be higher than the neighbors? Typically the perimeter grade beam that's three, four above... So there's more steps to get to the porch than a traditional house.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Do we have any more questions for staff? Discussion? Okay do I hear a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness per staff's conditions as stated in the recommendation? Okay Commissioner Mod moves that we grant a Certificate of Appropriateness per staff's conditions. Do I have a second? Commissioner Bucek seconds. All those in favor please raise your hands. That's six. Any opposed? One opposed. Okay that item has been granted a Certificate of Appropriateness per staff's conditions as stated in the application.

| From: | Timothy Kirwin [Tim@jgradyrandlepc.com](mailto:Tim@jgradyrandlepc.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, September 26, 2014 11:26 AM |
| To: | Walsh, Patrick - PD |
| Cc: | DuCroz, Diana - PD; Izfar, Omar - LGL; Harris-Finch, Delaney - PD; 'mbastian@bastianbuilders.com'; "Sam Gianukos' |
|  | (sam@creoledesign.com)' |
| Subject: | Notice of Appeal to Planning Commission for 1201, 1205, and 1207 Rutland |

Mr. Walsh: Pursuant to Section 33-253 of the City of Houston Code of Ordinances, please consider this written correspondence as the Applicants and Owner of 1201 Rutland, 1205 Rutland, and 1207 Rutland in the Houston Heights Historic District West's Notice of Appeal to the Houston Planning Commission from the denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness (1205 Rutland) and a partial denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness (1201 and 1207 Rutland) by the Houston Archeological and Historical Commission.

Grounds for the Appeal: The City misapplied the law and should have included certain structures when determining the proper proportions and heights. Moreover, brick steps are a feature of the district and the HAHC previously approved proposed siding.

We look forward to appearing before the Planning Commission at its October $16^{\text {th }}$ meeting.
If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at the number below.
Please confirm receipt of this Notice of Appeal.
Thank you, Tim
Timothy B. Kirwin
Randle Law Office Ltd., L.L.P.
Memorial Plaza II
820 Gessner, Suite 1570
Houston, Texas 77024
(281) 657-2000- Telephone
(832) 476-9554- Facsimile

Email | Profile | Website | V-Card

## R A N D L E

LAW OFFICE LTD., L.L.P.

## CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE
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## 1201 Rutland Street

## Heights Historic District West

## Appeal Supplement

Applicant: Sam Gianukos
Owner: Michael Bastian
Submitted by: Timothy Kirwin
Date: 10/9/14
Basis for appeal to Houston Planning Commission:

Item 1: Brick porch stairs are typical to the District.

The following two story, contributing structures have brick porch stairs:

1. 1232 Tulane
2. 1509 Allston
3. 1537 Tulane
4. 1236 Rutland
5. 201 West. $16^{\text {th }}$

Therefore, nearly $20 \%$ of the two story, contributing structures in the District have brick porch stairs. This figure does not include the one story, contributing structures in the District which are built with brick porch stairs.

In fact, the one story, contributing structure across the street has brick porch stairs at:

## -1224 Rutland (see attachments)

The HAHC approved brick porch stairs at 1210 Tulane (new construction)

Item 2: Ridge height is typical for the District.
The HAHC approved the submitted plans with the condition that the max ridge height of the hip roof not exceed 33 '.
-HAHC approved max width of 43 feet and front width of 36 feet.
-The proposed home sits on an 8,800 square foot lot, which is the $3^{\text {rd }}$ largest corner lot in the District as compared to contributing structure lots.
-Staff provided a chart showing the typical widths and heights of the contributing, two story structures in the District. (see attachment)
-The tallest two story, contributing structure's ridge height in the District is 36 feet. Applicant and Owner propose a ridge height of $361 / 2$ feet, which would make the house's ridge height only 6 inches taller than the Queen Anne style house at 209 W. $16^{\text {th }}$ Street.

## CONTRIBUTING 2-STORY RESIDENCES IN DISTRICT

## TYPICAL DISTRICT DETAILS \& PROPOSED RESIDENCE

| (dimensions in ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { MAX } \\ \text { WIDTH } \end{gathered}$ | FRONT WIDTH | RIDGE HEIGHT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EAVE } \\ & \text { HEIGHT } \end{aligned}$ | PORCH EAVE HEIGHT | FINISHED FLOOR HEIGHT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROOF } \\ & \text { PITCH } \end{aligned}$ | PORCH WIDTH | PORCH DEPTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical Contributing <br> 2-Story Residences* | 24-34 | 20-32 | 28-33 | 18-23 | 8-12 | 1.5-3 | 5-8/12 | 6-32 | 6-10 |
| DESIGN CONCEPT - 1/16/14 | 38-42 | 32 | 33.5 | 24 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Compatibility | + 8 | at max | +0.5 | +1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| DENIED - 6/19/14 | 49 | 38 | 38 | 24 | 13 | 2.5 | 8/12 | 31 | 9 |
| Compatibility | + 15 | + 6 | + 5 | +1 | + 1 | compatible | at max | compatible | compatible |
| CURRENT | 43 | 36 | 36.5 | 23 | 12 | 2.5 | 8/12 | 29 | 7 |
| Compatibility | +9 | +4 | +3.5 | compatible | compatible | compatible | at max | compatible | compatible |

* determined by removing a-typical outliers found in the district to provide a compatible range

| MAX WIDTH |  |  | FRONT WIDTH |  |  | RIDGE HT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typ. Range: 24-34 |  |  | Typ. Range: 20-32 |  |  | Typ. Range: 24-33 |  |  |
| 1201 | Rutland | 43 | 1236 | Rutland | 39 | 1201 | Rutland | 36.5 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 40 | 1201 | Rutland | 36 | 209 | W 16th | 36 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 | 1245 | Yale | 33 | 201 | W 15th | 35 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 35 | 1246 | Allston | 32 | 1246 | Allston | 34 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 | 1343 | Rutland | 32 | 1541 | Ashland | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 | 1400 | Allston | 31 | 1541 | Tulane | 33 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 | 1541 | Ashland | 31 | 201 | W 16th | 33 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 | 1109 | Rutland | 31 | 327 | W 16th | 33 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 | 1537 | Tulane | 31 | 1443 | Allston | 32 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 | 1232 | Tulane | 30 | 1537 | Tulane | 32 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 | 1147 | Allston | 28 | 1245 | Yale | 32 |
| 209 | W 16th | 31 | 1341 | Allston | 28 | 1531 | Allston | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 30 | 1439 | Rutland | 28 | 1202 | Rutland | 31 |
| 201 | W 15th | 28 | 1427 | Tulane | 28 | 1237 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 | 1541 | Tulane | 28 | 1109 | Rutland | 30 |
| 611 | W 15th | 28 | 201 | W 16th | 28 | 1447 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 | 1447 | Tulane | 27 | 1400 | Allston | 29 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 | 1237 | Rutland | 26 | 1343 | Rutland | 29 |
| 1531 | Allston | 28 | 1429 | Rutland | 25 | 1235 | Yale | 29 |
|  | Tulane | 28 | 611 | W 15th | 25 | 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 | 1235 | Yale | 25 | 1509 | Allston | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 | 1443 | Allston | 24 | 1535 | Allston | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 | 1531 | Allston | 24 | 1236 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 | 201 | W 15th | 22 | 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 | 1535 | Allston | 21 | 1341 | Allston | 27 |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 | 1535 | Rutland | 21 | 1439 | Rutland | 27 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 | 1509 | Allston | 18 | 1232 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 | 209 | W 16th | 14 | 509 | W 15th | 27 |
| 1202 | Rutland | - | 1202 | Rutland | . | 1535 | Rutland | 26 |
| 509 | W 15th | - | 509 | W 15th | - | 1427 | Tulane | 25 |
| 327 | W 16th | - | 327 | W 16th | - | 611 | W 15th | 22 |

- indicates measurement unavailable; grey highlights typical range


## NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES
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## ALL 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES IN DISTRICT (30)

1147 Allston - Contrib. c. 1920 Prairie
front width: 28
max width: 28 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $6 / 12$ residence s.f.: 2,450
lot s.f: 9,900 lot on block: corner


1246 Allston - Contrib. c. 1910 Classic Revival front width: 32 max width: 32 ridge ht: 34 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 8/12 residence s.f.: 1,980 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: corner


1400 Allston - Contrib. c. 1920 Am Foursq/Prairie
front width: 31
max width: 31 ridge ht: 29 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 6/12 residence s.f.: 2,460 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: corner


1509 Allston - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival front width: 18 max width: 21 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 21 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $7 / 12$ residence s.f.: 1,320 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


1535 Allston - Contrib. c. 1925 Am Foursquare front width: 21 max width: 21 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 11 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 1,764 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
September 25, 2014
HPO File No. 140925

ITEM B. 25
1201 Rutland Street Houston Heights West

2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES CONT.


1202 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1920 Craftsman
front width: -
max width: ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 21 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: residence s.f.: 3,023 lot s.f: 4,250 lot location: corner


1237 Rutland - Contrib. 1911 Queen Anne
front width: 26
max width: 30
ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 2,260 lot s.f: 8,710 lot location: corner


1429 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1930 Colonial Revival
front width: 25
max width: 28 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: $7 / 12$
residence s.f.: 1,793 lot s.f: 7,920
lot location: interior


1236 Rutland - Contrib. 1907 Queen Anne
front width: 39
max width: 39 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $12 / 12$ residence s.f.: 2,280 lot s.f: 7,470 lot location: interior


1343 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1925 Colonial Revival
1109 Rutland - Contrib. 1928 Col Revival
front width: 31
max width: 31
ridge ht: 30 eave ht: 16 porch eave ht: 11 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 7/12 residence s.f.: 2,160 lot s.f: 6,900 lot location: interior

lotocation. inter
front width: 32
max width: 32 ridge ht: 29 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: 11 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 6/12
residence s.f.: 2,290
lot s.f: 4,880
lot location: corner


1439 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1930 Colonial Revival
front width: 28
max width: 35 ridge ht: 27 eave ht: 19 porch eave ht: 9
porch floor ht: 2
pitch: 6/12
residence s.f.: 2,530
lot s.f: 8,880
lot location: interior


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
September 25, 2014
ITEM B. 25
1201 Rutland Street
HPO File No. 140925 Houston Heights West

## 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES CONT.

| 1535 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1920 Folk Victorian <br> front width: 21 <br> max width: 21 <br> ridge ht: 26 <br> eave ht: 19 <br> porch eave ht: 10 <br> porch floor ht: 2 <br> pitch: $6 / 12$ <br> residence s.f.: 2,744 <br> lot s.f: 8,712 <br> lot location: corner | 1232 Tulane - Contrib. c. 1925 Craftsman <br> front width: 30 <br> max width: 40 <br> ridge ht: 27 <br> eave ht: 18 <br> porch eave ht: - <br> porch floor ht: 2 <br> pitch: 10/12 <br> residence s.f.: 2,140 <br> lot s.f: 6,600 <br> lot location: interior |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1427 Tulane - Contrib. 1927 Craftsman Apt | 1447 Tulane - Contrib. c. 1915 Craftsman |
| 1537 Tulane - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival <br> front width: 31 <br> max width: 31 <br> ridge ht: 32 <br> eave ht: 33 <br> porch eave ht: - <br> porch floor ht: 2 <br> pitch: 7/12 <br> residence s.f.: 2,348 <br> lot s.f: 7,250 <br> lot location: corner | 1541 Tulane - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival <br> front width: 28 <br> max width: 28 <br> ridge ht: 33 <br> eave ht: 22 <br> porch eave ht: - <br> porch floor ht: 1 <br> pitch: $8 / 12$ <br> residence s.f.: 3,030 <br> lot s.f: 6,600 <br> lot location: interior |
| 201 W 15th - Contrib. 1902 Queen Anne | 509 W 15th - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival |

## 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES CONT. \& PROPOSED



209 W 16th - Contrib. c. 1910 Queen Anne
front width: 14 (bay)
max width: 31 ridge ht: 36 eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 10/12 residence s.f.: 2,770 lot s.f: 9,800 lot location: interior


1235 Yale - Contrib. c. 1915 - American Foursquare
front width: 25
max width: 25 ridge ht: 29 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 1,392 lot s.f: 6,600 lot location: interior


201 W 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ - Contrib. c. 1910 Queen Anne
front width: 28 max width: 28 ridge ht: 33 eave ht: 25 porch eave ht: 13 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 7/12 residence s.f.: 2,630 lot s.f: 6,800 lot location: corner

327 W 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ - Contrib. c. 1910 - Queen Anne
front width: -
max width: -
ridge ht: 33
eave ht: 24 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 1,480 lot s.f: lot location: interior


1245 Yale - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival
front width: 33
max width: 33 ridge ht: 32 eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 3
pitch: 6/12
residence s.f.: 2,700
lot s.f: 7,980
lot location: corner


1201 Rutland - PROPOSED
front width: 43
max width: 36
ridge ht: 36.5 eave ht: 23
porch eave ht: 12
porch floor ht: 2.5
pitch: $8 / 12$
residence s.f.: 4,360
lot s.f: 8,800
lot on block: corner

houston Planning Commission
Planning \& Development Department

Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design for Michael Bastian, owner Property Address: 1205 Rutland Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District West

## Project Summary:

The project at 1205 Rutland Street (also known as 1215-B Rutland) is a proposal to construct a two-story singlefamily residence on an interior lot in the Houston Heights Historic District West. At their September 25, 2014 meeting, the Houston Archaeological and Historical Commission (HAHC) reviewed the applicant's request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a revision to a previously approved CO, and found that the overall height and vertical siding proposed for the new construction were not compatible for the district and did not satisfy criterion 2 and 3 found in Chapter 33 Section 242. The HAHC voted 6-1 to deny the COA.

In accordance with Chapter 33 Section 33-253, the applicant is appealing this decision to Planning Commission.

## Charge to the Planning Commission:

New residential construction in a historic district must meet 4 criteria for approval found in Chapter 33 Section 33242. The HAHC found that as proposed, the design did not meet criterion 2 and 3 . The applicant has the burden of proof to demonstrate that the project meets criterion 2 and 3 as proposed.
The Planning Commission may find in favor of the applicant, and overturn the HAHC decision, if it finds that the applicant has proven the project satisfies the criteria. If the Planning Commission upholds the HAHC decision, the applicant may construct the proposed residence per the approved COA received on April 24, 2014. Or, the applicant may return to HAHC with a new or revised application.

## Project Description:

1205 Rutland is a portion of a larger property located at the corner of Rutland and W 12th that formally contained non-contributing commercial structures used as a chicken processing plant. The applicant has demolished the plant and plans to replat the 22,000 square feet property to construct three new single-family residences. The applicant was granted COAs in March and April and September for construction of three residences on the property.

The subject of this appeal is the proposal for a new residence two-story residence at the center of the combined property. The proposal is to construct a new two-story, 4,840 square foot single-family residence with attached alley loading garage that measures $37^{\prime}-6 "$ wide, 103 ' deep, and $34.5^{\prime}$ tall. The revisions proposed to the residence from the work approved in the April 2014 COA included:

- Changing the main roof shape from hipped to a front gable
- Increasing the roof pitch from 6/12 to 8/12
- Increasing the ridge height from $33^{\prime}$ to $34.5^{\prime}$
- Decreasing the eave height from $23^{\prime}$ to $22^{\prime}$, and
- Decreasing the ceiling heights from $11^{\prime}$ to $10^{\prime}$ at the first level, and from $10^{\prime}$ to 9 ' at the second level.


## Project Review Timeline:

[^1]
# CITY OF HOUSTON 

Houston Planning Commission
Planning \& Development Department

Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design for Michael Bastian, owner Property Address: 1201 Rutland Street<br>Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District West

At the March 27, 2014 HAHC meeting, the application for the new residence at 1205 Rutland was deferred to allow the applicant further time to develop the proposal with staff to satisfy the approval criteria. At the time, the residence did not satisfy criteria 2 and 3 for approval, due in part to incompatible width, height, and eave proportions. See Attachment A - March 2014 HAHC Action Report.

At the April 24, 2014 HAHC meeting, a revised application was submitted and staff recommended approval with the conditions that the maximum ridge height be reduced to 32 from 34', and the shutters be eliminated from the residence. The HAHC approved the residence with the condition that the maximum ridge height be reduced to 33 ', and that the shutters be eliminated from the residence. See Attachment B - March 2014 HAHC Action Report.

## Basis for the Houston Archaeological and Historic Commission's decision:

New construction within city historic districts must be approved by HAHC. New construction is reviewed according to the criteria found in Chapter 33 Section 33-242 of the Code of Ordinances, which are included on page 3 of this report. In order to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, the HAHC must find that all criteria are met.

The HAHC is required by ordinance to use only the relevant criteria in evaluating new construction in historic districts. In applying these criteria, the HAHC is to look at existing contributing buildings within the same historic district for compatibility, as the historic structures define the neighborhood character that is to be preserved. The HAHC is not to consider new or noncontributing buildings as evidence of what is appropriate for new construction in historic districts, nor do previously approved projects set precedent.

In general, new construction should be compatible in scale, proportions, materials, and architectural features with existing contributing structures in the historic district. Key aspects for compatibility are the scale and proportions of the new construction. Building width, roof shape and pitch have an impact on overall proportions and should be similar to existing contributing structures. Proportion is the relation of multiple dimensional elements. It is not typical for contributing residences to be both very wide, and very tall as defined by the proportions that relate to their architectural style. For example, Queen Anne residences are taller, have steeper roof pitches, and are narrower in width; and Colonial Revival residences are wider with lower roof pitches and ridge heights.

In reviewing two-story residence proposals, staff compares the design with the contributing two-story residences in the district. In the Houston Heights West Historic District, 30 of the 340 contributing structures are two-story residences. The majority of the structures in the district are single-story residences. The key for compatibility of a proposed new two-story residence is for it to be of a scale similar to typical two-story homes in the district. Matching or exceeding the size of the largest homes in the district is not compatible with the neighborhood and does not preserve the district character.

In review of the September 2014 revised new construction application for 1205 Rutland, staff found that the proposed revisions were not compatible with contributing structures in the district. Two-story contributing residences with large widths typically have hipped roofs with moderate pitches. A front gable roof is not appropriate on a two-story structure of the proposed width, nor is the increased roof pitch. The vertical board and batten siding in the proposed gable is not compatible with contributing structure features.

The April 2014 approved proposal had a hipped roof. Hipped roofs recede, placing the peak height deeper into the lot, creating less impact at street view. The proposed max width, ridge height and roof pitch are at or above the typical range, which results in a house that is over-scaled and not compatible with typical historic proportions that define the district character.

Houston Planning Commission
Planning \& Development Department

Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design for Michael Bastian, owner
Property Address: 1201 Rutland Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District West
The HAHC approved a COA for the proposal in April with a condition that the hipped roof ridge not exceed 33 ' verses the previously, and currently proposed 34 '. Staff maintained that is the appropriate maximum height for the proposed residence. Staff recommended denial of the COA. See Attachment C - September 2014 HAHC Action Report.

The HAHC voted 6-1 to deny the COA for 1205 Rutland.

## Approval Criteria: New Construction in a Historic District

Sec. 33-242: HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria:
S D NA S - satisfies D - does not satisfy NA - not applicable
(1) The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district
(2) The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district
Does not satisfy - Vertical board and batten siding is not compatible with the exterior features of the existing contributing structures in the district.
(3) The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district
Does not satisfy - Two-story contributing residences with large widths typically have hipped roofs with moderate pitches. A front gable roof is not appropriate on a two-story structure of the proposed width, nor is the increased roof pitch. Hipped roofs recede, placing the peak height deeper into the lot, creating less impact at street view. The proposed max width, ridge height and roof pitch are at or above the typical range, which results in a house that is overscaled and not compatible with typical historic proportions that define the district character.
The HAHC approved a COA for the proposal in April with a condition that the hipped roof ridge not exceed 33 ' (applicant had proposed 34 '); staff maintains that this is the appropriate maximum height for the proposed residence.
If a steeper pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to maintain the approved 33' max ridge height by reducing the plate height, foundation height, width, or a combination thereof.
$\boxtimes \square \square \quad$ (4) The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district; and.
(5) The height of new construction intended for use for commercial purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the existing structures used for commercial purposes in the historic district.

## Applicant's Grounds for Appeal:

See Attachment E - Applicant Appeal Materials, for the applicant's grounds for appeal and supplements.

# CITY OF HOUSTON 

Houston Planning Commission
Planning \& Development Department

Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design for Michael Bastian, owner
Property Address: 1201 Rutland Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District West

## Basis for Applicant's Appeal:

Sec. 33-253. Appeal.
(a) An applicant aggrieved by a decision of the HAHC with respect to any certificate of appropriateness may appeal to the planning commission by filing a written notice of appeal, stating the grounds for the appeal, with the director within ten days following the date the HAHC renders its decision.
(b) The planning commission shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which required notice can be given. The commission shall consider the application, the findings of the HAHC and any evidence presented at the meeting at which the appeal is considered. The planning commission shall reverse or affirm the decision of the HAHC based upon the criteria applicable to the certificate of appropriateness. The decision of the commission shall be final. If the commission does not make a decision on the appeal within 30 days following the commission's hearing on the appeal, the decision of the HAHC with respect to the application for the certificate of appropriateness shall be deemed affirmed.
(c) An applicant aggrieved by the decision of the planning commission on an appeal from a decision of the HAHC may appeal to the city council. The city council shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which the required notice can be given. The city council shall consider the appeal under the provisions of Rule 12 of Section 2-2 of this code. At the conclusion of the city council's review of the matter, the city council shall reverse or affirm the decision of the planning commission. The decision of the city council shall be final and exhaust the applicant's administrative remedies.
(d) The director shall provide the applicant with notice of the time and place of the meeting at which the appeal will be considered by mail no less than ten days before the date of the meeting.

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)

$$
\text { Property B - Lot } 16 \text { \& } 1 / 2 \text { of Lot } 15
$$

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

## AGENDA ITEM: II.ee

HPO File No. 140330

Owner: Michael Bastian, Bastian Builders
Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design
Date Application Accepted: 3/7/2014
90-day Waiver: N/A

## SITE INFORMATION:

Currently: Lots 14 and 15 (1215 Rutland) and Lot 16 (1205 Rutland), Block 183, Houston Heights Subdivision, City of Houston, Harris County, Texas. The site includes non-contributing commercial structures formerly used as a chicken processing plant.
The combined properties are under common ownership and will be divided into three lots for single-family use. For the purpose of this report, the lots have been identified as $A, B$ and $C$, starting at the corner and moving north:
A. Corner lot - Lots 17 and 18; 8,800 sf (66.67'x132')
B. Interior lot - Lot 16 and southern 16.67' of lot 15; 6,600 sf (50'x132').
C. Interior lot - Lot 14 and northern 16.67' of lot 15 6,600 sf (50'x132').


## PUBLIC COMMENT:

Staff received written public comment regarding the projects, 5 in favor and 2 opposed. See Attachment A.

## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

## HAHC ACTION: Deferral

SITE LOCATION: $1205 \& 1215$ Rutland (currently)

Property B - Lot 16 \& $1 / 2$ of Lot 15
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

AGENDA ITEM: II.ee
HPO File No. 140330

## Houston Heights Historic District West Map



CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

SITE LOCATION: $1205 \& 1215$ Rutland (currently) Property B - Lot 16 \& $1 / 2$ of Lot 15
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

AGENDA ITEM: II.ee
HPO File No. 140330

Current Photographs - Noncontributing Structures at 1205 \& 1215 Rutland


CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently) Property B - Lot 16 \& $1 / 2$ of Lot 15
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

AGENDA ITEM: II.ee
HPO File No. 140330

Context Photographs - Rutland Neighbors \& Corner of W 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$


1219 Rutland - Contributing (Prop. C neighbor)


1220 Rutland - Contributing (across street)


1148 Rutland - Contributing (corner)


1223 Rutland - Contributing


1222 Rutland - Contributing (across street)


1147 Rutland - Contributing (corner)

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)

Property B - Lot 16 \& $1 / 2$ of Lot 15
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

AGENDA ITEM: II.ee
HPO File No. 140330

Houston Heights West Typical Details \& Proposed Structures

| (dimensions in feet) | MAX <br> WIDTH | FRONT <br> WALL <br> WIDTH | RIDGE <br> HEIGHT | EAVE <br> HEIGHT | ROOF <br> PITCH | PORCH <br> WIDTH | PORCH <br> EAVE <br> HEIGHT | PORCH <br> DEPTH | FINISHED <br> FLOOR <br> HEIGHT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical 2-Story <br> Contributing Houses | $24-34$ | $20-32$ | $28-32.5$ | $18-23$ | $5 / 82-$ <br> $8 / 12$ | $6-32$ | $8-12$ | $6-8$ | $1.5-3$ |
| January Proposal | 36 | 36 | 39 | 24 | - | - | 11 | - | 2.5 |
| Property B | 40 | 32.5 | 35 | 23 | $6 / 12$ | 19 | 13 | $\mathbf{8}$ | 2.5 |
| Compared to Typical | +6 | +0.5 | +2.5 | complies | complies | complies | +1 | complies | complies |

## Approval Criteria

## PROPERTY B - Lot 16 \& $1 / 2$ of Lot 15

Sec. 33-242. NEW CONSTRUCTION IN HISTORIC DISTRICT
(a) HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria:

| D NA |  | S - satisfies D-does not satisfy NA - not applicable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (1) | The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district |
| $\square \boxtimes \square$ | (2) | The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district |
|  |  | Full brick cladding with oval vents at the foundation and window shutters are not compatible with contributing structures in the district. |
| $\square \boxtimes \square$ | (3) | The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district |
|  |  | The max width, front wall width, ridge height and porch eave height is not compatible with the typical proportions of the district; see chart above. Also, being at the maximum ranges for all proportions is not compatible with typical proportions. |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (4) | The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district; and |
| $\square \boxtimes$ | (5) | The height of new construction intended for use for commercial purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the existing structures used for commercial purposes in the historic district. |

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral of the application for a COA

Staff is recommending deferral of the residential proposal for Property B to allow the applicant more time to develop the proposal to comply with the criteria and further discuss the recommendations as provided in January. A decrease in the front width; further setback of the max width; decrease in the ridge and porch eave heights; and removal of non-compatible decorative elements (noted above) would increase the likely hood of compliance with the criteria.

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently) HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

## TYPE OF APPROVAL REQUESTED: New Construction - Two story residence with attached garage

The applicant proposes to construct a 5,145 square foot two-story residence with an attached alley loading garage on a 6,600 square foot ( $50^{\prime} \times 132^{\prime}$ ) lot.

## Project Details:

- Shape / Mass: The residence will measure $36^{\prime}-4$ " wide at the front wall and $40^{\prime}$ wide overall starting $16^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ behind the front wall (widening at the north side). The residence will be 103' deep and will feature an eave height of 23 ' and a ridge height of $35^{\prime}$. The residence will feature a half width front porch with a 13 ' eave height.
- Setbacks: The house will be set back $20^{\prime}$ from the west (front), $4^{\prime}$ from the south, and $6^{\prime}$ from the north.
- Roof: The house will feature a $6 / 12$ hipped roof with a 14 ' wide $6 / 12$ front facing gable.
- Exterior Materials: The house will feature smooth horizontal lap cementitious siding. The front facing gable will feature cementitious board and batten siding.
- Window / Doors: The house will feature a series of wood 1 over 1 single hung windows as well as single lite fixed windows. Window specifications can be found on the attached window schedule and corresponding floor plans.
- Foundation: The house will feature a brick pier and beam foundation with wood trellis. The front elevation of the house will feature brick skirting with oval shaped vents. The finished floor height will be 2' 6 "


## Elevation Details:

- West Elevation (front facing Rutland Street): The house measure 33' wide at the front setback and will increase in width to 40 ' beyond the front $16^{\prime}$ 'of depth. The front of the house will feature a 3 bay configuration with a $1 / 2$ width porch over the southern half of the proposed façade, and a 13 ' wide bump out over the northern half. The porch will feature a pair of square columns and wood hand railings. The Viewing left to right, the first floor will feature a window, central doorway, and a pair of windows. The second floor will feature a single window in the first two bays and a pair of windows in the third. The setback portion of the front elevation will feature a pair of fixed shutters on each floor.
- South Elevation (facing side property line): The front 52' of the proposed house will consist of a two story rectangular mass with an $18^{\prime}$ deep one story portion, followed by a $25^{\prime}$ deep two story attached garage. From the front of the house to the rear: the first floor will feature two 1 over 1 windows, a set of 3 fixed windows with transoms, flowed by another pair of 1 over 1 windows. The second floor will feature three 1 over 1 windows followed by a single lite fixed window, and a matching window at the second floor above the garage.
- North Elevation (facing side property line): The front 16' of the house will be set back 13 ' from the north setback and the remaining $43^{\prime}$ of the main house will be set back $6^{\prime}$. Viewing from front to back: the first floor will feature two 1 over 1 windows, a pair of 1 over 1 windows, followed by two more 1 over 1 windows. Beyond this point, the house will feature a two-story rear facing porch with columns and railings matching the front. The one story portion connecting the main house to the garage will feature three 1 over 1 windows. The second floor will feature a pair of 1 over 1 windows, a single lite fixed window, followed by two pairs of 1 over 1 windows. The two story garage will feature a pair of 1 over 1 windows.
- East Elevation (facing rear property line): The house will feature an alley loading garage and a two story rear porch. The porch will be accessible by a set of double doors on each floor.

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently) HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

## Site / Roof Plan



Previously Proposed - January 2013

Currently Proposed


SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently) HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

## East Elevation (front facing Tulane)

Previously Proposed - January 2013


Currently Proposed


## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

SITE LOCATION: $1205 \& 1215$ Rutland (currently) HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

## AGENDA ITEM: II.ee

HPO File No. 140330

## South Elevation



North Elevation


## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently) HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

## East Elevation (facing rear property line)



Window / Door Schedule

| WINDOW SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MARK | QTY | WIDTH | HE/GHT | DESCRIPTION |
| (A) | 28 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| (A1) | 6 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| B | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $5^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| (B1) | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $5^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| C) | 2 | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS TEMPERED |
| D | 2 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $4^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| E | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $4^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| (F) | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| F1) | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $7^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| G | 2 | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| G1) | 2 | $1^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $7^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| H | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS (TEMPERED PANEL ABOVE) |


| DOOR SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline 000 R \\ \mathrm{NO} \end{gathered}$ | QTY. | WIDTH | HE/GHT | DESCRIPTION |
| 1 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRONT DOOR |
| 2 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |
| 3 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |
| 4 | 1 | (2) $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERYOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |
| 40 | 1 | (2) $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |
| 5 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 50 | 2 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 6 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | 20 MIN. FIRE RATED DOOR W/ CLOSER |
| 7 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 70 | 3 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 8 | 3 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 80 | 9 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 9 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR POCKET DOOR |
| 10 | 2 | (2) $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR UNIT |
| 11 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ |  | GLASS DOOR AT SHOWER ENCLOSURE |
| 12 | 1 | 16'-0" | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | OVERHEAD DOOR AT GARAGE |
| 13 | 1 | (2) $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR UNIT |

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently) HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

AGENDA ITEM: II.ee
HPO File No. 140330

First Floor Plan


Second Floor Plan


## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION SUMMARY

Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design for Michael Bastian, owner
Property: 1215 Rutland - B (currently), lot 16 and southern 16.67' of lot 15, block183, Houston Heights Subdivision, 6,600 square foot ( 50 'x132') interior lot.

Significance: Located within the Houston Heights Historic District West, the site includes non-contributing commercial structures formerly used as a chicken processing plant that are to be demolished.

Proposal: New Construction - Construct a two-story 4,840 square foot single family residence with attached alley loading garage. Residence measures $37^{\prime}-6$ " wide, $103^{\prime}$ deep, and $34^{\prime}$ tall.
The application was deferred by the HAHC at the March 27, 2014 meeting. The project has been revised and resubmitted for review. See enclosed application materials and detailed project description on pp. 7-15 for further details.

Public Comment: This month one comment in favor was provided. Last month 5 comments in favor and 2 opposed were received. See Attachment A.

Civic Association: No comment received.

## Recommendation: Approval with the following conditions:

- Shutters be eliminated from the residence
- Maximum ridge height be reduced to 32 '

HAHC Action: Approved with Conditions:

- Shutters be eliminated from the residence
- Maximum ridge height be reduced to 33 '


# CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS <br> Basis for Issuance: HAHC Approval <br> Effective: April 24, 2014 <br> 90-day Waiver: n/a 

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## NEW CONSTRUCTION IN A HISTORIC DISTRICT

Sec. 33-242: HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria:
S D NA
S-satisfies
D - does not satisfy
NA - not applicable

(1) The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district

(2) The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district
Window shutters are not a compatible exterior feature with contributing district structures. Of the 343 contributing structures in Heights West, 11 were found to have shutters, the majority of which are a later alteration and not an original architectural feature of the residence.
$\square \boxtimes \square$
(3) The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district
Multiple proportions at or above the maximum range results in an overall scale that is not compatible with typical historic proportions that define the district character. The max width and ridge height are above the typical proportions of the district. The front wall width, eave height and porch eave height are at or near the maximum typical proportions. The proportions of the proposed house are not compatible with the typical historic proportions of the district.

(4) The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district; and
(5) The height of new construction intended for use for commercial purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the existing structures used for commercial purposes in the historic district.

HOUSTON HEIGHTS WEST TYPICAL DETAILS \& PROPOSED RESIDENCE

| (dimensions in ft) | MAX <br> WIDTH | FRONT <br> WALL <br> WIDTH | RIDGE <br> HEIGHT | EAVE <br> HEIGHT | PORCH <br> EAVE <br> HEIGHT | FINISHED <br> FLOOR <br> HEIGHT | ROOF <br> PITCH | PORCH <br> WIDTH | PORCH <br> DEPTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical 2-Story <br> Contributing Houses | $24-34$ | $20-32$ | $28-32.5$ | $18-23$ | $8-12$ | $1.5-3$ | $5-8 / 12$ | $6-32$ | $6-8$ |
| January Proposal | 36 | 36 | 39 | 24 | 12 | 2.5 | $10 / 12$ | 20 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +2 | +4 | +6.5 | +1 | at max | compatible | +2 | compatible | compatible |
| March Proposal | 40 | 32.5 | 35 | 23 | 13 | 2.5 | $6 / 12$ | 19 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +6 | +0.5 | +2.5 | at max | +1 | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible |
| Current Proposal | 37.5 | 31 | 34 | 23 | 12 | 2.5 | $6 / 12$ | 17.5 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +3.5 | near max | +1.5 | at max | at max | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible |

Building Classification


## PROPERTY LOCATION

HOUSTON HEIGHT HISTORIC DISTRICT WEST


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission April 24, 2014

ITEM II.y
1215 Rutland Street - B Houston Heights Historic District West

CURRENT PHOTOGRAPHS


## NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES



1219 Rutland - Contributing (Prop. C neighbor)


1220 Rutland - Contributing (across street)

1148 Rutland - Contributing (corner)



1223 Rutland - Contributing


1222 Rutland - Contributing (across street)


1147 Rutland - Contributing (corner)

## COMPARISON WITH HEIGHTS WEST 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING HOMES



1215 Rutland - B (6,600 sf interior lot) ridge ht: 34' front width: 31' eave ht: 23' max width: 37.5' porch eave ht:12' porch floor ht: 2.5'


1400 Allston (6,660 sf corner lot)


1237 Rutland (8,700 sf corner lot)


1535 Rutland (8,800 sf interior lot)



1246 Allston (6,660 sf corner lot) $\begin{array}{cc}\text { ridge } h t: 3 \mathbf{3}^{\prime} & \text { front width: } 32^{\prime} \\ \text { eave ht: } 22^{\prime} & \text { max width: } 32^{\prime} \\ \text { porch eave ht:- } & \text { porch floor ht: } 2^{\prime}\end{array}$


1531 Allston (6,600 sf interior lot)
 porch eave ht: 11' porch floor ht: 3'


1439 Rutland (8,700 sf corner lot)
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { ridge ht: 27' } & \text { front width: } \mathbf{2 8}^{\prime} \\ \text { eave ht: } 19^{\prime} & \text { max width: } 35^{\prime}\end{array}$
eave ht: 19' max width: 35'
porch eave ht: 9' porch floor ht: 2'


1541 Tulane (7,250 sf corner lot)

> ridge ht: 33'
> eave ht: 21 '
porch eave ht: -
front width: 27'
max width: 27'
porch floor ht: 1.5'


1341 Allston (6,600 sf interior lot) ridge ht: 27' front width: 28' eave ht: 18' max width: 28' porch eave ht: - porch floor ht: 3'


1541 Ashland (6,600 sf interior lot)
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { ridge ht: 32' } & \text { front width: 30' } \\ \text { eave ht: 21' } & \text { max width: 30' }\end{array}$ max width: 30' porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2'


1535 Rutland (8,800 sf interior lot)


201 W 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ (6,800 sf corner lot)

> ridge ht: 32' front width: 28' max width: 28' porch eave ht: 13' porch floor ht: 3'

## EAST ELEVATION - FRONT FACING RUTLAND <br> DEFERRED - 3/27/14



PROPOSED


## SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION

DEFERRED - 3/27/14


## NORTH SIDE ELEVATION

DEFERRED - 3/27/14


## EAST (REAR) ELEVATION

DEFERRED - 3/27/14


।
PROPOSED


## SITE / ROOF PLAN

DEFERRED - 3/27/14




## WINDOW I DOOR SCHEDULE

| WINDOW SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MARK | QTY | WIDTH | HEIGHT | DESCRIPTION |
| (A) | 28 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| (A1) | 2 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| (B) | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $5^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| (B1) | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $5^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| (C) | 2 | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS TEMPERED |
| (D) | 2 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $4^{*}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| (E) | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $4^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| (F) | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| (F1) | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| <G) | 2 | $r^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| (G1) | 2 | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| (H) | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS (TEMPERED PANEL ABOVE) |
| (1) | 4 | $7^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HIJNG TEMPERED |


| DOOR $^{\|c\|}$ SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| DOOR <br> NO. | QTY. | $W^{\prime}$ IDTH | HEIGHT | DESCRIPTION |
| 1 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRONT DOOR |
| 2 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |
| 3 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |
| 4 | 1 | $(2) 2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |
| $4 a$ | 1 | $(2) 2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |
| 5 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 50 | 2 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 6 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | 20 MIN. FIRE RATED DOOR W/ CLOSER |
| 7 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| $7 a$ | 3 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 8 | 3 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 80 | 9 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |
| 9 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR POCKET DOOR |
| 10 | 2 | $(2) 1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR UNIT |
| 11 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ |  | GLASS DOOR AT SHOWER ENCLOSURE |
| 12 | 1 | $16^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | OVERHEAD DOOR AT GARAGE |
| 13 | 1 | $(2) 2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ |  |  |
| $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR UNIT |  |  |  |

## PROJECT DETAILS

Shape/Mass: The two-story residence will measure $31^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ wide at the front of the residence (previously proposed at $36^{\prime}-4{ }^{\prime \prime}$ ). At $16^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ behind the front wall, the residence extends out at the north side and the overall width of the structure will measure $37^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime \prime}$ wide (previously proposed at $40^{\prime}$ '). The residence will be $103^{\prime}$ deep and will feature an eave height of $23^{\prime}-2$ " and a ridge height of 34 ' (previously proposed at $35^{\prime}$ ). The residence will feature an inset partial width front porch with a $12^{\prime}-2$ " eave height (previously proposed at 13 '). The interior ceiling heights will be 11 ' at the first level and 10' at the second level.

Setbacks: The residence will be setback $20^{\prime}$ from the front (west) property line; $4^{\prime}-4$ from the south side property line; and $8^{\prime}-33^{\prime \prime}$ from the north side property line (previously proposed at $5^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ ).

Foundation: The residence will feature a brick pier and beam foundation with wood trellis. The finished floor height will be 2'-6".

Windows/Doors: The residence will feature wood 1 -over-1 single-hung and single-lite fixed windows. Window specifications can be found on the attached window schedule and corresponding floor plans.

Exterior Materials: The house will feature smooth horizontal lap cementitious siding. The front facing gable will feature cementitious board and batten siding and eave brackets.

Roof: The residence will feature a $6 / 12$ hipped roof with a 17 ' wide $6 / 12$ front gable over the north projecting front bay. The porch will have a $4 / 12$ hipped roof.

Front Elevation The residence will feature a south bay inset 8 ' from the north bay. The south bay has a 18 ' wide
(West): front porch with a 1 -over-1 window and wood door with divided lights. The porch roof will be supported by two 10 square columns, a simple stick balustrade, and stair rail. The second level of the south bay will feature two 1 -over- 1 windows. The north bay will feature a centered pair of 1-over-1 windows at both the first and second level. 16 '-4" behind the front wall at the north side, the residence will extend $6^{\prime}-3$ " towards the side property line. The front facing wall of the projection will feature a centered faux window with fixed shutters at both the first and second levels.

Side Elevation The front $52^{\prime}$ of the south side of the residence will be a two-story rectangular mass with an 18'
(South): deep one-story section, followed by a $25^{\prime}$ deep two story attached garage. From the front of the house to the rear: the first level will feature two 1 -over-1 windows; a set of 3 fixed windows with transoms; and two 1 -over-1 windows. The second floor will feature three 1 -over-1 windows followed by a single-lite fixed window. The second level above the garage will feature a single-lite fixed window.

Side Elevation The front 16 ' of the north side of the residence will be set back $14^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime}$ from the north property line
(North): and the remaining $43^{\prime}$ of the residence will be set back $8^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$. . From the front of the house to the rear: the first level will feature two 1 -over- 1 windows, a pair of 1 -over- 1 windows, and two 1 -over- 1 windows. Beyond this point, the house will feature a two-story rear facing porch with square wood columns and railings. The remaining north facing walls are set into the property beyond visibility from the public right-of-way; see elevation drawing for further details.

Rear Elevation The rear of the residence will feature an alley loading two-story garage and a two story rear porch.
(East): The porch will have a set of double doors with side lites at both levels. Elevation will not be visible from the public right-of-way; see elevation drawing for further details.

## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Application Date: September 3, 2014
Applicant: Sam Gianukos, Creole Design for Michael Bastian, owner
Property: 1205 Rutland (aka 1215 Rutland - B), lot 16 and southern 16.67' of lot 15, block183, Houston Heights Subdivision, 6,600 square foot ( 50 'x132') interior lot.

Significance: The property is located in the Houston Heights Historic District West.
Proposal: New Construction - Revision to an approved two-story 4,840 square foot single-family residence with attached alley loading garage that measures $377^{\prime}-6$ " wide, 103' deep, and 34 ' tall.
At the March 27, 2014 HAHC meeting, the application was deferred to allow the applicant further time to develop the proposal to satisfy the approval criteria. At the time, the residence did not satisfy criteria 2 and 3 for approval, due in part to incompatible width, height, and eave proportions.
At the April 24, 2014 HAHC meeting, a revised application was submitted and staff recommended approval with the conditions that the maximum ridge height be reduced to 32 ' from 34 ', and the shutters be eliminated from the residence. The HAHC approved the residence with the condition that the maximum ridge height be 33 ', and that the shutters be eliminated from the residence.
The approved project has been submitted for review with the following revisions:

- Change main roof shape from hipped to a front gable
- Increase of the roof pitch from $6 / 12$ to $8 / 12$
- Increase of the ridge height from $33^{\prime}$ to $34^{\prime}-5{ }^{\prime \prime}$
- Decrease the eave height from $23^{\prime}$ to $22^{\prime}$
- Decrease of the ceiling heights from 11' to $10^{\prime}$ at the first level, and from 10 to 9 ' at the second level.
See enclosed application materials and detailed project description on p. 13-22 for further details.
Public Comment: No public comment received.
Civic Association: No comment received.
Recommendation: Denial - does not satisfy criteria 2 or 3
HAHC Action: Denied


## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## NEW CONSTRUCTION IN A HISTORIC DISTRICT

Sec. 33-242: HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria:
S D NA
S-satisfies
D - does not satisfy
NA - not applicable

(1) The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district
(2) The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district
Vertical board and batten siding is not compatible with the exterior features of the existing contributing structures in the district.
(3) The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district
Two-story contributing residences with large widths typically have hipped roofs with moderate pitches. A front gable roof is not appropriate on a two-story structure of the proposed width, nor is the increased roof pitch. Hipped roofs recede, placing the peak height deeper into the lot, creating less impact at street view. The proposed max width, ridge height and roof pitch are at or above the typical range, which results in a house that is over-scaled and not compatible with typical historic proportions that define the district character.
The HAHC approved a COA for the proposal in April with a condition that the hipped roof ridge not exceed $33^{\prime}$ (applicant had proposed $34^{\prime}$ ); staff maintains that this is the appropriate maximum height for the proposed residence.
If a steeper pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to maintain the approved 33' max ridge height by reducing the plate height, foundation height, width, or a combination thereof.

(4) The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district; and
(5) The height of new construction intended for use for commercial purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the existing structures used for commercial purposes in the historic district.

## TYPICAL DISTRICT DETAILS \& PROPOSED RESIDENCE

| (dimensions in ft) | MAX <br> WIDTH | FRONT <br> WIDTH | RIDGE <br> HEIGHT | EAVE <br> HEIGHT | PORCH <br> EAVE <br> HEIGHT | FINISHED <br> FLOOR <br> HEIGHT | ROOF <br> PITCH | PORCH <br> WIDTH | PORCH <br> DEPTH |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical Contributing <br> 2-Story Residences* | $24-34$ | $20-32$ | $28-33$ | $18-23$ | $8-12$ | $1.5-3$ | $5-8 / 12$ | $6-32$ | $6-10$ |
| DESIGN CONCEPT - 1/16/14 | 36 | 36 | 39 | 24 | 12 | 2.5 | $10 / 12$ | 20 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +2 | +4 | +6 | +1 | at max | compatible | +2 | compatible | compatible |
| DEFERRED - 3/27/14 | 40 | 32.5 | 35 | 23 | 13 | 2.5 | $6 / 12$ | 19 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +6 | +0.5 | +2 | at max | +1 | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible |
| APPROVED COND. - 4/24/14 | 37.5 | 31 | 34 | 23 | 12 | 2.5 | $6 / 12$ | 17.5 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +3.5 | compatible | +1 | at max | at max | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible |
| CURRENT | 37.5 | 31 | 34.5 | 22 | 12 | 2.5 | $8 / 12$ | 17.5 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +3.5 | compatible | +1.5 | compatible | at max | compatible | at max | compatible | compatible |

* determined by removing a-typical outliers found in the district to provide a compatible range

| MAX WIDTH <br> Typ. Range: 24-34 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1232 | Tulane | 40 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1207 | Rutland | 37.5 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 35 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 209 | W 16th | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 30 |
| 201 | W 15th | 28 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 611 | W 15th | 28 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1531 | Allston | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 509 | W 15th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |


| FRONT WIDTH |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Typ. | Range: 20 | -32 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1205 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 25 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1531 | Allston | 24 |
| 201 | W 15th | 22 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1509 | Allston | 18 |
| 209 | W 16th | 14 |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 509 | W 15 th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |


| RIDGE HT |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Typ. | Range: 24 | -33 |
| 209 | W 16th | 36 |
| 201 | W 15th | 35 |
| 1205 | Rutland | 34.5 |
| 1246 | Allston | 34 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 33 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 33 |
| 201 | W 16th | 33 |
| 327 | W 16th | 33 |
| 1443 | Allston | 32 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 32 |
| 1245 | Yale | 32 |
| 1531 | Allston | 31 |
| 1202 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 30 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1400 | Allston | 29 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 29 |
| 1235 | Yale | 29 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1509 | Allston | 28 |
| 1535 | Allston | 28 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 27 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 27 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 27 |
| 509 | W 15th | 27 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 22 |


| EAVE HT |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Typ. Range: 18 | $\mathbf{- 2 3}$ |  |
| 201 | W 15 th | 25 |
| 201 | W 16th | 25 |
| 327 | W 16th | 24 |
| 1531 | Allston | 23 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 23 |
| 209 | W 16th | 23 |
| 1245 | Yale | 23 |
| 1205 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1246 | Allston | 22 |
| 1443 | Allston | 22 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 22 |
| 509 | W 15th | 22 |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 21 |
| 1202 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 21 |
| 1147 | Allston | 20 |
| 1400 | Allston | 20 |
| 1535 | Allston | 20 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 20 |
| 1235 | Yale | 20 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 19 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 19 |
| 1341 | Allston | 18 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 18 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 18 |
| 611 | W 15th | 17 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 16 |
|  |  |  |


| PORCH EAVE HT <br> Typ. Range: 8-12 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 201 | W 15th | 13 |
| 201 | W 16th | 13 |
| 1205 | Rutland | 12 |
| 1443 | Allston | 12 |
| 1531 | Allston | 12 |
| 1245 | Yale | 12 |
| 1535 | Allston | 11 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 11 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 11 |
| 509 | W 15th | 11 |
| 1147 | Allston | 10 |
| 1400 | Allston | 10 |
| 1509 | Allston | 10 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 10 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 10 |
| 1235 | Yale | 10 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 9 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 9 |
| 1246 | Allston |  |
| 1429 | Rutland | - |
| 1541 | Ashland | - |
| 1237 | Rutland | - |
| 1202 | Rutland |  |
| 1236 | Rutland | - |
| 1341 | Allston | - |
| 1232 | Tulane | - |
| 1537 | Tulane |  |
| 1541 | Tulane | - |
| 611 | W 15th | - |
| 209 | W 16th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |


| ROOF PITCH |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Typ. Range: | $5 / 12$ | $-8 / 12$ |
| 1443 | Allston | $13 / 12$ |
| 1236 | Rutland | $12 / 12$ |
| 1232 | Tulane | $10 / 12$ |
| 201 | W 15th | $10 / 12$ |
| 209 | W 16th | $10 / 12$ |
| 1205 | Rutland | $8 / 12$ |
| 1246 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1531 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1237 | Rutland | $8 / 12$ |
| 1447 | Tulane | $8 / 12$ |
| 1541 | Tulane | $8 / 12$ |
| 327 | W 16th | $8 / 12$ |
| 1235 | Yale | $8 / 12$ |
| 1341 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1509 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1109 | Rutland | $7 / 12$ |
| 1429 | Rutland | $7 / 12$ |
| 1537 | Tulane | $7 / 12$ |
| 611 | W 15th | $7 / 12$ |
| 201 | W 16th | $7 / 12$ |
| 1147 | Allston | $6 / 12$ |
| 1400 | Allston | $6 / 12$ |
| 1541 | Ashland | $6 / 12$ |
| 1439 | Rutland | $6 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Rutland | $6 / 12$ |
| 1427 | Tulane | $6 / 12$ |
| 1245 | Yale | $6 / 12$ |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 1343 | Rutland | - |
| 509 | W 15th | - |
|  |  |  |
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## TWO-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES IN DISTRICT

 (30 OF APPROXIMATELY 340 CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES)

1246 Allston - Contrib. c. 1910 Classic Revival front width: 32 max width: 32 ridge ht: 34 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 1,980 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: corner


1341 Allston - Contrib. 1928 Colonial Revival
front width: 28
max width: 28 ridge ht: 27 eave ht: 18 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 7/12
residence s.f.: 2,240
lot s.f: 6,600
lot on block: interior


1443 Allston - Contrib. c. 1910 Dutch Colonial front width: 24
max width: 24 ridge ht: 32 eave ht: 32 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 13/12 residence s.f.: 1,868 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


1531 Allston - Contrib. c. 1925 Am Foursquare
front width: 24
max width: 28 ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 2,030 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


1400 Allston - Contrib. c. 1920 Am Foursq/Prairie
front width: 31
max width: 31 ridge ht: 29 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 6/12
residence s.f.: 2,460
lot s.f: 6,600
lot on block: corner


1509 Allston - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival
front width: 18
max width: 21 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 21 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 7/12
residence s.f.: 1,320 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


1535 Allston - Contrib. c. 1925 Am Foursquare
front width: 21
max width: 21 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 11 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 1,764 lot s.f: 6,600
lot on block: interior
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1202 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1920 Craftsman
front width: -
max width: -
ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 21 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: residence s.f.: 3,023 lot s.f: 4,250
lot location: corner


1236 Rutland - Contrib. 1907 Queen Anne
front width: 39
max width: 39 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 12/12 residence s.f.: 2,280 lot s.f: 7,470 lot location: interior

1237 Rutland - Contrib. 1911 Queen Anne
front width: 26
max width: 30 ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 2,260 lot s.f: 8,710 lot location: corner


1429 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1930 Colonial Revival
front width: 25
max width: 28 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 7/12 residence s.f.: 1,793 lot s.f: 7,920 lot location: interior


1439 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1930 Colonial Revival
front width: 28
max width: 35
ridge ht: 27
eave ht: 19
porch eave ht: 9
porch floor ht: 2
pitch: 6/12
residence s.f.: 2,530
lot s.f: 8,880
lot location: interior
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## 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES CONT.



1427 Tulane - Contrib. 1927 Craftsman Apt
front width: 28
max width: 28 ridge ht: 25 eave ht: 18 porch eave ht: 9 porch floor ht: 1 pitch: 6/12 residence s.f.: 2,186 lot s.f: 5,799 lot location: corner

1537 Tulane - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival
front width: 31
max width: 31 ridge ht: 32 eave ht: 33 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 7/12 residence s.f.: 2,348 lot s.f: 7,250
lot location: corner


201 W 15th - Contrib. 1902 Queen Anne
front width: 28
max width: 22 ridge ht: 35 eave ht: 25 porch eave ht: 13 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 10/12 residence s.f.: 2,530 lot s.f: 12,300 lot location: corner


509 W 15th - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival
front width: -
max width: -
ridge ht: 27
eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: 11 porch floor ht: 2
pitch: -
residence s.f.: 1,056
lot s.f: 1,782
lot location: corner
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209 W 16th - Contrib. c. 19
front width: 14 (bay)
max width: 31 ridge ht: 36 eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 10/12 residence s.f.: 2,770 lot s.f: 9,800 lot location: interior


1235 Yale - Contrib. c. 1915 - American Foursquare
front width: 25
max width: 25 ridge ht: 29 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 1,392 lot s.f: 6,600 lot location: interior


201 W 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ - Contrib. c. 1910 Queen Anne
front width: 28 max width: 28 ridge ht: 33 eave ht: 25 porch eave ht: 13 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 7/12
residence s.f.: 2,630 lot s.f: 6,800 lot location: corner


327 W 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ - Contrib. c. 1910 - Queen Anne
front width: -
max width: -
ridge ht: 33
eave ht: 24
porch eave ht: -
porch floor ht: 2
pitch: $8 / 12$
residence s.f.: 1,480
lot s.f: -
lot location: interior


1245 Yale - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival
front width: 33
max width: 33
ridge ht: 32
eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: $6 / 12$ residence s.f.: 2,700 lot s.f: 7,980 lot location: corner


## RUTLAND BLOCKFACE COMPARISON

(1201, 1205 \& 1207 AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED)


## EAST ELEVATION - FRONT FACING RUTLAND

DEFERRED - 3/27/14

front width: 32.5 max width: 40 ridge ht: 35 eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: 13 porch floor ht: 2.5 pitch: 6/12

APPROVED w/ CONDITIONS - 4/24/14

front width: 31
max width: 37.5
ridge ht: 34 (approved at 33) eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 2.5 pitch:: 6/12

PROPOSED

front width: 31
max width: 37.5
ridge ht: 34.5
eave ht: 22.5
porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 2.5 pitch: 8/12
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## SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION

DEFERRED - 3/27/14


## APPROVED w/ CONDITIONS - 4/24/14
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## NORTH SIDE ELEVATION <br> DEFERRED - 3/27/14



APPROVED w/ CONDITIONS - 4/24/14


PROPOSED


## WEST (REAR) ELEVATION

DEFERRED - 3/27/14


## APPROVED w/ CONDITIONS - 4/24/14



PROPOSED

$\stackrel{N}{N}$

## SITE PLAN

DEFERRED - 3/27/14


APPROVED w/ CONDITIONS - 4/24/14


PROPOSED
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ROOF PLAN
DEFERRED - 3/27/14


APPROVED w/ CONDITIONS - 4/24/14


PROPOSED
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FIRST LEVEL FLOOR PLAN
DEFERRED - 3/27/14


APPROVED w/ CONDITIONS - 4/24/14


PROPOSED
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SECOND LEVEL FLOOR PLAN
DEFERRED - 3/27/14


APPROVED w/ CONDITIONS - 4/24/14


PROPOSED


## WINDOW / DOOR SCHEDULE

## PROPOSED

| WINDOW SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MARK | QTY | WIDTH | HEIGHT | DESCRIPTION |
| $\langle$ A | 27 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| $\langle$ A1 | 4 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| B | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $5^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| B1 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $5^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| C $\rangle$ | 2 | $2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS TEMPERED |
| D | 2 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $4^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| E $\rangle$ | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $4^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG |
| F $\rangle$ | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| G1 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| G $\rangle$ | 2 | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| G1 | 2 | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | FIXED GLASS |
| H | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |
| I $\rangle$ | 4 | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SINGLE HUNG TEMPERED |


| DOOR SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOOR <br> NO. | QTY. | $W^{\prime}$ IDTH | HEIGHT | DESCRIPTION |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRONT DOOR |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 1 | $(2) 2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |  |  |  |  |
| $4 a$ | 1 | $(2) 2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | EXTERIOR FRENCH DOOR (UNIT) |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |  |  |  |  |
| $5 a$ | 2 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 1 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | 20 MIN. FIRE RATED DOOR W/ CLOSER |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |  |  |  |  |
| $7 a$ | 3 | $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 3 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |  |  |  |  |
| $8 a$ | 9 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR DOOR |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  | NOT USED <br> 10 2 |  |  |  | $(2) 1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR UNIT |
| 11 | 1 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ |  | GLASS DOOR AT SHOWER ENCLOSURE |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 1 | $16^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | OVERHEAD DOOR AT GARAGE |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | 1 | $(2) 2^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ | INTERIOR FRENCH DOOR UNIT |  |  |  |  |

## PROJECT DETAILS

Shape/Mass: The two-story residence measures 31 ' wide at the front of the residence; at 16 ' -4 " behind the front wall, the residence extends out at the north side to an overall width of 37 '-6". The residence will be 103' deep and will feature an eave height of $22^{\prime}-4$ " (previously approved at $23^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ ) and a ridge height of $34^{\prime}-5{ }^{\prime \prime}$ (previously approved at $33^{\prime}$ ). The residence will feature an inset partial width front porch with a 12'-2" eave height. The interior ceiling heights will be 10' at the first level and 9 ' at the second level (previously approved at 11' and 10' respectively).

Setbacks: $20^{\prime}$ from the front (east) property line; $4^{\prime}-4 "$ from the south side property line; and $8^{\prime}-3 "$ from the north side property line; and $9^{\prime}-4{ }^{\prime \prime}$ at the rear (west) property line.

Foundation: Pier and beam foundation; piers will be clad in brick, and wood trellis will span between. Finished floor height will be 2'-6".

Windows/Doors: Wood 1-over-1 single-hung and single-lite fixed windows with wood or cementitious trim. See elevations, plans and window schedule for further window details.

Exterior Materials: Smooth horizontal lap cementitious siding with $1 \times 6$ trim. Gables feature cementitious vertical board and batten siding and eave brackets.

Roof: $8 / 12$ front-gable roof with a 16 ' wide $8 / 12$ gable at the north bay (previously approved with a $6 / 12$ hipped roof with a 16 ' wide $6 / 12$ gable at the north bay). The porch will have a $4 / 12$ hipped roof. The connecting section between the residence and attached garage will have a $5 / 12$ gable roof. The garage will have an $8 / 12$ hipped roof. Closed roof eave overhangs will be 1 '-6".

Front Elevation From south to north (left to right): the residence will feature a17'-8" wide by 8 ' inset section with an
(West): inset front porch. The bay features a 1 -over-1 window and wood door with divided lights. The porch will feature two 10" square columns, a simple stick balustrade and stair rail, and wood porch stairs. The second level of the south bay will feature two 1 -over-1 windows. The north bay will feature a centered pair of 1 -over-1 windows at both the first and second level. 16'-4" behind the front wall at the north side, the residence will extend $6^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime \prime}$ towards the north side property line. The front facing wall of the projection will feature no fenestration details.

Side Elevation From front to back: the two story portion of the residence will extend 59'; followed by a single story
(South): 18'-6" section; followed by an attached $25^{\prime}$ deep two-story garage. The first level (front to back) will feature two 1 -over-1 windows; a set of 3 fixed windows with transoms; and two 1 -over-1 windows. The second floor will feature three 1 -over-1 windows. The second level above the garage will feature a single-lite fixed window.

Side Elevation From front to back: the front setback portion of the residence will feature two 1 -over-1 windows at
(North): both the first and second level. The north projecting portion of the residence will feature a pair of 1 -over-1 windows and two 1 -over-1 windows at the first level. At the second level, the section will feature a single fixed lite window followed by two sets of two 1-over-1 windows. Beyond this point, the house will feature a two-story rear facing porch with square wood columns and railings, and a wood door with divided glass lites. The one story connecting section of the residence will feature two 1 -over-1 windows. The garage will feature a 1 -over-1 window and pedestrian door at the first level and a two sets of two 1 -over- 1 windows at the second level.

Rear Elevation The rear of the residence will feature an alley loading two-story garage and a two story rear porch.
(East): The porch will have a set of double doors with side lites at both levels. Elevation will not be visible from the public right-of-way; see elevation drawing for further details.

## Transcription of Item B. 26 - 1205 Rutland Street - HAHC September 25, 2014 <br> (Unofficial transcript, prepared by Planning staff from audio of meeting for informational purposes)

Staff - B26 1205 Rutland. New construction of a residence with attached garage in Houston Heights West. At the March $27^{\text {th }}$ HAHC meeting, the applicants proposal was deferred to allow the applicant further time to develop the proposal to satisfy the approval criteria. At the time, the proposal did not satisfy criteria 2 and 3 due in part to an incompatible width, height, and eave proportions. At the April $24^{\text {th }}$ HAHC meeting, a revised application was submitted and staff recommended approval, with the condition that the maximum ridge height be reduced to 32 ' from 34 '. The HAHC approved the residence with a condition of a maximum ridge height of $33^{\prime}$.

The approved project has been resubmitted with the following revisions: Change the main roof shape from hipped to front gable, increase the roof pitch from 6:12 to 8:12, increase the ridge height from 33 to $34^{\prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$, decrease the eave height from 23 to 22', decrease the ceiling heights from 11' to 10 at level one and 10 to 9 at level two.

Proposed revisions are not compatible with contributing structures found within the district. Two story contributing residences with large widths typically have hipped roofs with moderate pitches. A front gable roof is not appropriate for a two story structure of the proposed width, nor is the increased roof pitch. The vertical board and batten siding within the proposed gable is not compatible with contributing features of the district. The previous approved proposal had a hipped roof. Hipped roofs recede, placing the peak height deeper into the lot, creating less of an impact at street level. The proposed max ridge height, width, and roof pitch are at or above typical ranges, which results in a house that is over scaled and not compatible with the typical historic portions that define the character of the district.

The HAHC approved the proposal in April with the condition that the hipped roof not exceed 33' versus the previously and currently proposed 34 '. Staff maintains that this is the appropriate maximum height for the proposed residence. We find that the revisions do not satisfy criteria 2 or 3 for new construction, and we are recommending denial of the COA.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay, thank you. We do have two speakers signed up, Mr. Kirwin.
Timothy Kirwin - This commission has already approved the board and batten siding at the last commission meeting. I don't understand why that would be a problem today. We are going to ask that you approve it again. You've already done it in the past.

As to the other criteria, again I will focus the commission's attention on this [puts page 3 of the staff report on the projector]. The roof pitch is in range. Look at this chart. See that grey box there? That is what staff says is in the range. 8:12 is in the range. Now if you look at ridge height, what staff has done is that they have excluded two other Queen Anne style houses, and that is what we are building, Queen Anne style. Because they have excluded those, they say that we are too tall in our ridge height. Does everybody have a copy of this sheet in front of you? Okay perfect. When you look at ridge height here, the 209 West $16^{\text {th }}$ Street is a Queen Anne. The 201 West $15^{\text {th }}$ Street is a Queen Anne. We are at 34.5 '. All of these heights, they are in the district. That means they are all typical to be found in the district. The fact that staff has arbitrarily decided that they're willing to put certain things in a grey box, and certain things not in a grey box, that isn't what your law says.

And when you look at the roof pitch here, $8: 12$ is in their grey box. So, they're telling us that we can't do an $8: 12$ pitch, there're telling us that we have to be lower, but there are two structures that are taller than us. This doesn't make any sense, ladies and gentlemen. Now I have watched this commission for the past two hours, as I sat here last month, and l've watch the vote go about four to three. What's interesting when you look at these structures and you look at the votes being taken today... and if we lose, we will appeal to Planning Commission, and if we lose there, we will appeal to City Council. We will do what we have to do with these structures. But I want everyone on this commission to take this job seriously and make staff do their job! They cannot simply excise out two structures that they say is not typical. They are typical. They're in the district right now. Thank you.

Commissioner Maverick Welsh - Okay, Mr. Bastian.
Michael Bastian - Now, the thing I handed out earlier is pertinent to this house. And l'd like to refer you to that paper. I believe that the proposed plan does meet all four criteria set forth by the ordinance, and it should be approved for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Section 33-242 I copied in the middle of this page. You are probably all familiar with that. But I want to specifically point out the very last sentence of 33-242: Nothing in the foregoing shall be construed to require or impose a single architectural style in any historic district. When the staff interprets criteria 3 on what I believe is faulty data from eight different architectural styles, they are in fact imposing an architectural style on our submittal, contrary to the law, as stated in 33-242.

The second page, just from simple Wikipedia, An architectural style is characterized by the features and proportions that make a building or other structure notable and historically identifiable. To follow the letter of the law, this house should be judged using data from this historic district in the same architectural style. Otherwise, you are imposing a new, unnamed architectural style that has been conflated by combining measurements from eight different architectural styles on this historic district and on my submittal. Using data found in the staff's report for 1205 Rutland, that you have copies of, for the thirty Contributing two story structures within the Heights West Historic District, for Queen Anne style houses, we find that our submittal falls within the middle of the range on all measurements the staff is using to recommend denial of our COA request. I'm asking that you consider the fact that the law says that you will not impose an architectural style. But by using measurements from foursquare, from folk Victorian, from colonial revival, from Dutch revival, and using those measurements to impose on another architectural style, is creating a new architectural style.

I would be fine with removing the second gable and doing a hipped roof with an $8: 12$, we've lowered the plate heights on both the first and second story. We're talking about a one foot difference. Why is that important to me? Because I don't want to be someone that puts a house on the ground, that twenty or thirty years from now someone would go "Who in the world built that thing? It is out of proportion." We need to be historically accurate with the proportions that exist on specific architectural styles. I ask that you approve this Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Thank you. Could staff restate their recommendation?
Staff - Sure. May I make a comment about styles? I agree. Proportionately it is common for Queen Annes to have a different proportion than craftsman. It is common for wider houses to be lower and to have lower pitches. For narrower houses, Queen Annes to have a steeper pitch. The two projects that Mr. Kirwin pointed out, 209 West $16^{\text {th }}$ with a ridge height of 36 and 201 West $15^{\text {th }}$ with a ridge height of 35 that are Queen Annes. If you compare that to their max width, their max width is 31 and 28. A smaller width. The proposed project is at 37.5 ' width. So, to get into proportion, we are kind of
compromising and saying that as long as you are not completely at the top or above, you're going to be within a proportional range that is compatible and does not distract from the contributing structures. If we were to hold him straight to a Queen Anne, we would be asking for a width probably in the low 30s.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay do we have any other questions of staff? (121:35) Mr. Kirwin I'm sorry your time has expired.

Timothy Kirwin - I have rebuttal time, do I not?
Chairman Maverick Welsh - There was nobody speaking that was opposed to...
Timothy Kirwin - She was just...
Chairman Maverick Welsh - She's staff. That doesn't apply to staff. Thank you Mr. Kirwin. Do you have any discussion or questions for staff?

Commissioner David Bucek - I have a question for staff. If the hipped roof returned to the project, as the client stated he was willing to do, what effect would staff have for that? For shortening the perspective and decrease of overall perception of the roof, because of the shortening that would occur, how would that be interpreted by staff? Because that's not on any of the drawings we're looking at, but I can see it from the previously submitted application.

Staff - We're asserting that the previously approved 33 ' hipped roof was appropriate. The 33 ' is really a max that we're going with all construction within this district as a maximum height. However the applicant did propose that in a meeting about a week ago and we said that we would take a look if he could provide a drawing but we haven't seen a drawing to be able to put it in context. I think without seeing it in context, it's hard to make a recommendation.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay do we have any other questions for staff?
Commissioner Anna Mod - I have a comment. I appreciate your explanation of the Queen Anne, typically has a higher eave height, higher ridge height, and narrower. It's like these are proposing taking the max of many different things and that's not really what we're trying to do. We're trying to compatibly scale these and when you drive down a street in the Heights, the new buildings jump out because the scale is so different. It's so much larger. And I think it disrupts the street pattern, the feeling of it being in a historic district, and it dwarfs the original, the smaller houses. And typical to me means an average. Just because there is one that's taller, that doesn't mean that it's within the grey, and I think the grey boxed charts on those reports are the average. Which to me is the, kind of typical feeling and scale of the neighborhood.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Any other questions for staff?
Commissioner Jorge Garcia-Herreros - I don't have a question but just a comment. I agree with Commissioner Mod. One of the main points here is that, just looking at this, that we are going to talk about typical and what not. But if you're looking at the blockface comparison, the existing homes, the existing homes is what we are really talking about for typical, the homes are not typical for just that street. Again, they stand out as new construction, so much bigger an all of that... Again, Commissioner Mod said it throughout the entire meeting about size. And I think we come down to, again, the concept of size. As a builder, I completely understand. You want to maximize it. That way you can sell it for
more money. But in reality, it's about protecting the visual integrity of the neighborhood, particularly this street. Again, if you could scale things down, it would get approved quicker.

Chairman Maverick Welsh (124:59) Any other discussion? Could staff restate their recommendation?

Staff- We are recommending denial because the application does not satisfy criteria two or three for new construction.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay, staff is recommending denial. Do I hear a motion to deny?
Commissioner Blacklock-Sloan - So moved.
Chairman Maverick Welsh - Commissioner Blacklock-Sloan moves. Do I hear a second?
Commissioner Mod seconds. All of those in favor please raise your hands. That's six. Any opposed? Okay, that item has been denied a Certificate of Appropriateness.

## Transcription of Item B. 27 - 1207 Rutland Street - HAHC September 25, 2014 (Unofficial transcript, prepared by Planning staff from audio of meeting for informational purposes)

Staff - B27, 1207 Rutland. At the March $27^{\text {th }}$ HAHC meeting, the applicant was granted a COA to construct a two story 4,276 square foot single family residence that measures approximately 38 ' wide, 76 ' deep. The hipped roof had a combination of $6: 12$ and 7:12 pitches to achieve a 32.5 ' tall ridge height.

The approved project has been submitted with the following revisions: At the residence, increase the roof pitch from 6:12 and 7:12 to a consistent 8:12. Increase the ridge height from 32 ' 6 " to 35 ' 4 ". Decrease the eave height from 22' $7^{\prime \prime}$ to 21' $7^{\prime \prime}$. Decrease the first floor ceiling height from 11' to 10 . Center the front door with the porch stairs, and add a side lite and transom to the door. And reduce the number of front porch columns from four to three. At the garage, they proposed to increase the roof pitch from 6:12 to 8:12, which increases the ridge height from $24^{\prime}$ to $26^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$.

The March proposal was approved with a width larger than typical because the combined conditions of the considerably set back max width and a front width ridge height and eave height within the typical ranges resulted in compatible proportions. The proposed revisions bring the ridge height and roof pitch above the typical range, which in tandem with the large width results in a house that is over scaled and not compatible with the historic proportions that define the district character. Two story contributing residences with large widths typically have hipped roofs with moderate pitches. If a consistent roof pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to reduce the $7: 12$ pitch at the front to a $6: 12$ to match the main roof. If an $8: 12$ pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to reduce the plate height, foundation height, width, or a combination thereof, to maintain the approved 32 ' 6 " max ridge height, and overall compatible proportions within the recommended ranges. Staff maintains that the previously approved proportions are appropriate for the proposed residence and finds that the proposed revisions do not satisfy criteria 3 for new construction.

Staff is recommending partial approval, which includes denial of the roof pitch and ridge height revisions to the residence, approval of the front door and porch column revisions, and approval of the detached garage revisions.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Thank you. Okay, we do have speakers signed up, Mr. Kirwin.
Timothy Kirwin - Criteria 4 and 5 of your ordinance under new construction deals with maximum height, for both a residential and commercial structure. Please pay attention, and direct your attention to criteria 3. Criteria number 3 does not have a maximum. It does not have a threshold. Staff has now determined that criteria 3 should have a maximum. Even though under ridge height, we are not the tallest structure in the district. There is a structure that is going to be taller than us. They are misinterpreting the ordinance. They are applying... they are taking out structures that should be included in the analysis, and they are not including these structures in determining whether or not our height is appropriate. In fact, the structure that they are disallowing is a Queen Anne structure. (142:57) Doesn't say it. Look at criteria number 4 and look at the language of criteria number 5. Specifically, they use the word 'maximum.' They do not say that under criteria number 3.

And here's my other question: Why did staff allow us to have a conditional approval on this one - We'll take it - and they wouldn't give us a conditional approval on 1205? Why's that? Let's see if they can answer that for you. Thank you.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Thank you. We do have Mr. Bastian signed up.
Michael Bastian - I handed out another sheet which basically has the same data on it. I contend that you have to use the same architectural style. The argument that staff gave... We in fact, if you look at the numbers on both 1205 and 1207, we're not the tallest on any one of those items. We're not the biggest on any one of those items. We fall within the range of the architectural style that we are trying to build. They're larger lots. This is on a corner that was the infamous chicken factory. The comment on the blockface by Mr. Herreros is incorrect because all four corner houses, on the four corners of the 1200 block of Rutland, are all large two story houses. This fits in perfectly with what's on the blockface. You know, pretty soon I'm just going to be appealing this stuff to City Council on financial criteria because you guys are bleeding me dry, and I think that's the intent of some of the staff! Thanks.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Aright, thank you for coming down Mr. Bastian. Could staff come and please restate their recommendation?

Staff - We are recommending partial approval, which is denial of the roof pitch and ridge height revisions, and approval of the front door, porch column revisions, and the detached garage revisions.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay, staff is recommending a partial approval. Do we have any questions for staff or discussion? Okay, do I hear a motion to grant a partial approval per staff's recommendation?

Commissioner Rob Hellyer - So moved.
Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay, Commissioner Hellyer moves that we accept staff's recommendation to grant a partial approval per the conditions stated in the application. Do I have a second on that item? Okay, Commissioner Bucek seconds. All of those in favor please raise your hands. Six. Any opposed? Okay that's one opposed. So that item has been granted a Certificate of Appropriateness per staff's conditions as stated in the application.

| From: | Timothy Kirwin [Tim@jgradyrandlepc.com](mailto:Tim@jgradyrandlepc.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, October 09, 2014 3:39 PM |
| To: | Walsh, Patrick-PD; DuCroz, Diana - PD; Harris-Finch, Delaney - PD; Wallace Brown, Margaret - PD; Izfar, Omar - LGL; |
| Subject: | 'mbastian@bastianbuilders.com'; "Sam Gianukos' (sam@creoledesign.com)' |
| Attachments: | 1201, 1205, and 1207 Rutland Street Appeal materials |
|  | 1201 Rutland.pdf; 1205 Rutland.pdf; 1207 Rutland.pdf |
| Importance: | High |

Mr. Walsh: Please find attached Appeal supplemental materials for 1201 Rutland Street, 1205 Rutland Street, and 1207 Rutland Street for the City of Houston Planning Commission's October 16, 2014, meeting from the Houston Archeological and Historical Commission's denial or partial denials of certificates of appropriateness.

My last name has been misspelled by staff on several of the previous appeals. If that can be corrected for this appeal, I would appreciate it.

Thank you, Tim
Timothy B. Kirwin
Randle Law Office Ltd., L.L.P.
Memorial Plaza II
820 Gessner, Suite 1570
Houston, Texas 77024
(281) 657-2000- Telephone
(832) 476-9554- Facsimile

Email | Profile | Website | V-Card
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## 1205 Rutland Street

## Heights Historic District West

## Appeal Supplement

Applicant: Sam Gianukos
Owner: Michael Bastian
Submitted by: Timothy Kirwin
Date: 10/9/14
Basis for appeal:
Item 1: HAHC approved board and batten siding for this very property.

Item 2: Ridge height is typical in the District.
-Applicant and Owner propose a ridge height of $341 / 2$ feet.
-There are 2 two story, contributing structures in the District with a taller ridge height at $209 \mathrm{~W} .16^{\text {th }}$ Street ( 36 feet) and at 201 W. $15^{\text {th }}$ Street ( 35 feet). Moreover, 1246 Allston has a ridge height of 34 feet. (see attachment)
-Applicant and Owner have designed a Queen Anne style home.
$-209 \mathrm{~W} .16^{\text {th }}$ Street and $201 \mathrm{~W} .15^{\text {th }}$ Street are both Queen Anne style homes. Item 3: Width is typical in the District.

Applicant and Owner propose a width of $371 / 2$ feet.
-There are 2 two story, contributing structures in the District that have widths greater than our proposed structure. 1232 Tulane has a width of 40 feet. 1236 Rutland has a width of 39 feet.

Contributing structures in the Queen Anne Architectural Style in Heights West HD

|  | 1236 <br> Rutland | 1237 <br> Rutland | 201 W. <br> 15 th | 201 W. <br> 16 th | 209 W. <br> 16 th | 327 W. <br> 16 th | 1205 <br> Rutland |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Width | 39 | 30 | 28 | 28 | 31 | $?$ | 37.5 | COMPATIBLE |
| ridge ht | 28 | 31 | 35 | 33 | 36 | 33 | 34.5 | COMPATIBLE |
| roof pitch | $12 / 12$ | $8 / 12$ | $10 / 12$ | $7 / 12$ | $10 / 12$ | $8 / 12$ | $8 / 12$ | COMPATIBI |

# TYPICAL DISTRICT DETAILS \& PROPOSED RESIDENCE 

| (dimensions in ft) | MAX <br> WIDTH | FRONT <br> WIDTH | RIDGE <br> HEIGHT | EAVE <br> HEIGHT | PORCH <br> EAVE <br> HEIGHT | FINISHED <br> FLOOR <br> HEIGHT | ROOF <br> PITCH | PORCH <br> WIDTH | PORCH <br> DEPTH |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical Contributing <br> 2-Story Residences | $24-34$ | $20-32$ | $28-33$ | $18-23$ | $8-12$ | $1.5-3$ | $5-8 / 12$ | $6-32$ | $6-10$ |
| DESIGN CONCEPT - 1/16/14 | 36 | 36 | 39 | 24 | 12 | 2.5 | $10 / 12$ | 20 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +2 | +4 | +6 | +1 | at max | compatible | +2 | compatible | compatible |
| DEFERRED - 3/27/14 | 40 | 32.5 | 35 | 23 | 13 | 2.5 | $6 / 12$ | 19 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +6 | +0.5 | +2 | at max | +1 | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible |
| APPROVED COND. $-4 / 24 / 14$ | 37.5 | 31 | 34 | 23 | 12 | 2.5 | $6 / 12$ | 17.5 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +3.5 | compatible | +1 | at max | at max | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible |
| CURRENT | 37.5 | 31 | 34.5 | 22 | 12 | 2.5 | $8 / 12$ | 17.5 | 8 |
| Compatibility | +3.5 | compatible | +1.5 | compatible | at max | compatible | at max | compatible | compatible |

* determined by removing a-typical outliers found in the district to provide a compatible range

| MAX WIDTH <br> Typ. Range: 24-34 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1232 | Tulane | 40 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1207 | Rutland | 37.5 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 35 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 209 | W 16th | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 30 |
| 201 | W 15th | 28 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 611 | W 15th | 28 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1531 | Allston | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1202 | Rutland |  |
| 509 | W 15th |  |
| 327 | W 16th |  |


| FRONT WIDTH |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Typ. | Range: | 20 |
| 32 |  |  |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1205 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 25 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1531 | Allston | 24 |
| 201 | W 15 th | 22 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1509 | Allston | 18 |
| 209 | W 16 th | 14 |
| 1202 | Rutland |  |
| 509 | W 15 th |  |
| 327 | W 16in |  |


| RIDGE HT |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Typ. | Range: | 24 |
| 33 |  |  |
| 209 | W 16 th | 36 |
| 201 | W 15 th | 35 |
| 1205 | Rutland | 34.5 |
| 1246 | Allston | 34 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 33 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 33 |
| 201 | W 16th | 33 |
| 327 | W 16th | 33 |
| 1443 | Allston | 32 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 32 |
| 1245 | Yale | 32 |
| 1531 | Allston | 31 |
| 1202 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 30 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1400 | Allston | 29 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 29 |
| 1235 | Yale | 29 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1509 | Allston | 28 |
| 1535 | Allston | 28 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 27 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 27 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 27 |
| 509 | W 15 th | 27 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 22 |


| EAVE HT |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Typ. Range: 18 | 18 | 23 |
| 201 | W 15 th | 25 |
| 201 | W 16th | 25 |
| 327 | W 16th | 24 |
| 1531 | Allston | 23 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 23 |
| 209 | W 16th | 23 |
| 1245 | Yale | 23 |
| 1205 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1246 | Allston | 22 |
| 1443 | Allston | 22 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 22 |
| 509 | W 15th | 22 |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 21 |
| 1202 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 21 |
| 1147 | Allston | 20 |
| 1400 | Allston | 20 |
| 1535 | Allston | 20 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 20 |
| 1235 | Yale | 20 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 19 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 19 |
| 1341 | Allston | 18 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 18 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 18 |
| 611 | W 15th | 17 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 16 |


| PORCH EAVE HT <br> Typ. Range: 8-12 |  |  | ROOF PITCH <br> Typ. Range: 5/12-8/12 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 201 | W 15th | 13 | 1443 | Allston | 13/12 |
| 201 | W 16th | 13 | 1236 | Rutland | $12 / 12$ |
| 1205 | Rutland | 12 | 1232 | Tulane | $10 / 12$ |
| 1443 | Allston | 12 | 201 | W 15th | $10 / 12$ |
| 1531 | Allston | 12 | 209 | W 16th | 10/12 |
| 1245 | Yale | 12 | 1205 | Rutland | $8 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Allston | 11 | 1246 | Allston | 8/12 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 11 | 1531 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1343 | Rutland | 11 | 1535 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 509 | W 15th | 11 | 1237 | Rutland | $8 / 12$ |
| 1147 | Allston | 10 | 1447 | Tulane | $8 / 12$ |
| 1400 | Allston | 10 | 1541 | Tulane | $8 / 12$ |
| 1509 | Allston | 10 | 327 | W 16th | $8 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Rutland | 10 | 1235 | Yale | $8 / 12$ |
| 1447 | Tulane | 10 | 1341 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1235 | Yale | 10 | 1509 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1439 | Rutland | 9 | 1109 | Rutland | $7 / 12$ |
| 1427 | Tulane | 9 | 1429 | Rutland | $7 / 12$ |
| 1246 | Allston |  | 1537 | Tulane | 7/12 |
| 1429 | Rutland |  | 611 | W 15th | 7/12 |
| 1541 | Ashland |  | 201 | W 16th | 7/12 |
| 1237 | Rutland |  | 1147 | Allston | 6/12 |
| 1202 | Rutland |  | 1400 | Allston | 6/12 |
| 1236 | Rutland |  | 1541 | Ashland | 6/12 |
| 1341 | Aliston |  | 1439 | Rutland | 6/12 |
| 1232 | Tulane |  | 1535 | Rutland | 6/12 |
| 1537 | Tulane |  | 1427 | Tulane | 6/12 |
| 1541 | Tulane |  | 1245 | Yale | 6/12 |
| 611 | W 15th |  | 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 209 | W 16 th |  | 1343 | Rutland |  |
| 327 | W 16ith |  | 509 | W 15th |  |

Dash (-) indicates measurement unavailable; grey highlights typical range
Arrows indicate proposed revisions to previously approved conditions
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Applicant: Guillermo G. Avalos, GAD Commercial \& Residential for Michael Bastian, owner Property Address: 1207 Rutland Street Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District West

## Project Summary:

The project at 1207 Rutland Street (also known as 1215-C Rutland) is a proposal to construct a two-story singlefamily residence on an interior lot in the Houston Heights Historic District West. At their September 25, 2014 meeting, the Houston Archaeological and Historical Commission (HAHC) reviewed the applicant's request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a revision to a previously approved COA, and found that some of the proposed revisions to the front porch, door and detached garage were appropriate; and that the proposed revisions to the roof pitch and ridge height were not compatible for the district and did not satisfy criterion 3 found in Chapter 33 Section 242. The HAHC voted 6-1 to partially approve the COA - granting approval for the appropriate proposed work and denial for the inappropriate proposed work.

In accordance with Chapter 33 Section 33-253, the applicant is appealing this decision to Planning Commission.

## Charge to the Planning Commission:

New residential construction in a historic district must meet 4 criteria for approval found in Chapter 33 Section 33242. The HAHC found that as proposed, portions of the design did not meet criterion 3. The applicant has the burden of proof to demonstrate that the project meets criterion 3 as proposed.

The Planning Commission may find in favor of the applicant, and overturn the HAHC decision, if it finds that the applicant has proven the project satisfies the criteria. If the Planning Commission upholds the HAHC decision, the applicant may construct the proposed residence per the approved COA received on March 27, 2014. Or, the applicant may return to HAHC with a new or revised application.

## Project Description:

1207 Rutland is a portion of a larger property located at the corner of Rutland and W 12th that formally contained non-contributing commercial structures used as a chicken processing plant. The applicant has demolished the plant and plans to replat the 22,000 square feet property to construct three new single-family residences. The applicant was granted COAs in March and April and September for construction of three residences on the property.

The subject of this appeal is the proposal for a new residence two-story residence at the inner most lot of the combined property. The proposal is to construct a new two-story 4,276 square foot single family residence that measures 28 ' in width at the front 18 ' deep section; 37 ' -9 " at its maximum width, 76 ' -4 " deep; and 32 ' -6 " tall. The revisions proposed to the residence from the work approved in the March 2014 COA included:

## At the residence -

- Increase roof pitch from 6/12 and 7/12 to 8/12
- Increase ridge height from 32'-6" to 35'-4"
- Decrease the eave height from 22'-7" to 21'-7"
- Decrease the first floor ceiling height from 11' to 10 '
- Center front door with the porch stairs and porch gable roof
- Add sidelights and transom to the front door
- Reduce number of front porch columns from 4 to 3
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Applicant: Guillermo G. Avalos, GAD Commercial \& Residential for Michael Bastian, owner Property Address: 1207 Rutland Street<br>Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District West

And at the garage -

- Increase roof pitch from 6/12 to 8/12
- Increase ridge height from $24^{\prime}$ to $26^{\prime}-10$ "


## Project Review Timeline:

At the March 27th HAHC meeting, the applicant was granted a COA to construct a two-story 4,276 square foot single family residence that was approximately 38 feet wide, 76 feet deep. The hipped roof had a combination of 6/12 and 7/12 pitches to achieve a 32 and a half feet tall ridge height. See Attachment A - March 2014 HAHC Action Report.

## Basis for the Houston Archaeological and Historic Commission's decision:

New construction within city historic districts must be approved by HAHC. New construction is reviewed according to the criteria found in Chapter 33 Section 33-242 of the Code of Ordinances, which are included on page 3 of this report. In order to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, the HAHC must find that all criteria are met.

The HAHC is required by ordinance to use only the relevant criteria in evaluating new construction in historic districts. In applying these criteria, the HAHC is to look at existing contributing buildings within the same historic district for compatibility, as the historic structures define the neighborhood character that is to be preserved. The HAHC is not to consider new or noncontributing buildings as evidence of what is appropriate for new construction in historic districts, nor do previously approved projects set precedent.
In general, new construction should be compatible in scale, proportions, materials, and architectural features with existing contributing structures in the historic district. Key aspects for compatibility are the scale and proportions of the new construction. Building width, roof shape and pitch have an impact on overall proportions and should be similar to existing contributing structures. Proportion is the relation of multiple dimensional elements. It is not typical for contributing residences to be both very wide, and very tall as defined by the proportions that relate to their architectural style. For example, Queen Anne residences are taller, have steeper roof pitches, and are narrower in width; and Colonial Revival residences are wider with lower roof pitches and ridge heights.

In reviewing two-story residence proposals, staff compares the design with the contributing two-story residences in the district. In the Houston Heights West Historic District, 30 of the 340 contributing structures are two-story residences. The majority of the structures in the district are single-story residences. The key for compatibility of a proposed new two-story residence is for it to be of a scale similar to typical two-story homes in the district. Matching or exceeding the size of the largest homes in the district is not compatible with the neighborhood and does not preserve the district character.

In review of the September 2014 revised new construction application for 1207 Rutland, staff found that some of the proposed revisions were not compatible with contributing structures in the district. The March proposal was approved with a width larger than typical because the combined conditions of the considerably setback max width, and a front width, ridge height, and eave height within the typical ranges resulted in compatible proportions. The proposed revisions bring the ridge height and roof pitch above the typical range, which in tandem with the large width, results in a house that is over-scaled and not compatible with typical historic proportions that define the district character. Two-story contributing residences with large widths typically have hipped roofs with moderate pitches.

If a consistent roof pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to reduce the $7 / 12$ pitch at the front to $6 / 12$ to match the main roof. If an $8 / 12$ pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to reduce the plate height, foundation height, width, or
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a combination thereof to maintain the approved $32^{\prime}-6$ " max ridge height and overall compatible proportions. See Attachment B - September 2014 HAHC Action Report.

Staff maintained that the previously approved proportions were appropriate for the proposed residence, and found that some of the proposed revisions did not satisfy criterion 3 for new construction. Staff recommended:

- Denial of the roof pitch and ridge height revisions to the residence
- Approval of the front door and porch column revisions
- And approval of the detached garage revisions

The HAHC voted 6-1 to partially approve the COA for 1207 Rutland per staff's recommendation.

## Approval Criteria: New Construction in a Historic District

Sec. 33-242: HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria:
S D NA S - satisfies D-does not satisfy NA-not applicable

(1) The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district
(2) The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district
(3) The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district
The proposed max width, ridge height and roof pitch are at or above the typical range, which results in a house that is over-scaled and not compatible with typical historic proportions that define the district character. Two-story contributing residences with large widths typically have hipped roofs with moderate pitches.

The HAHC approved a COA for the proposal in March with a width larger than typical because the max width was not overbearing due to the combined conditions of a front setback (20'), max ridge height (32'-6"), eave height (22'-6"), and front width (28') that were within the typical ranges. Staff maintains that the previously approved proportions are appropriate for the proposed residence.

If a consistent roof pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to reduce the $7 / 12$ pitch at the front to $6 / 12$ to match the main roof. If an $8 / 12$ pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to reduce the plate height, foundation height, width, or a combination thereof to maintain the approved 32'-6" max ridge height and overall compatible proportions within typical range.

(4) The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district; and.
(5) The height of new construction intended for use for commercial purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the existing structures used for commercial purposes in the historic district.

Houston Planning Commission
Planning \& Development Department

Applicant: Guillermo G. Avalos, GAD Commercial \& Residential for Michael Bastian, owner Property Address: 1207 Rutland Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District West

## Applicant's Grounds for Appeal:

See Attachment D - Applicant Appeal Materials, for the applicant's grounds for appeal and supplements.

## Basis for Applicant's Appeal:

## Sec. 33-253. Appeal.

(a) An applicant aggrieved by a decision of the HAHC with respect to any certificate of appropriateness may appeal to the planning commission by filing a written notice of appeal, stating the grounds for the appeal, with the director within ten days following the date the HAHC renders its decision.
(b) The planning commission shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which required notice can be given. The commission shall consider the application, the findings of the HAHC and any evidence presented at the meeting at which the appeal is considered. The planning commission shall reverse or affirm the decision of the HAHC based upon the criteria applicable to the certificate of appropriateness. The decision of the commission shall be final. If the commission does not make a decision on the appeal within 30 days following the commission's hearing on the appeal, the decision of the HAHC with respect to the application for the certificate of appropriateness shall be deemed affirmed.
(c) An applicant aggrieved by the decision of the planning commission on an appeal from a decision of the HAHC may appeal to the city council. The city council shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which the required notice can be given. The city council shall consider the appeal under the provisions of Rule 12 of Section 2-2 of this code. At the conclusion of the city council's review of the matter, the city council shall reverse or affirm the decision of the planning commission. The decision of the city council shall be final and exhaust the applicant's administrative remedies.
(d) The director shall provide the applicant with notice of the time and place of the meeting at which the appeal will be considered by mail no less than ten days before the date of the meeting.

SITE LOCATION: $1205 \& 1215$ Rutland (currently) Property C - Lot 14 \& $1 / 2$ of Lot 15
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

# AGENDA ITEM: II.ee 

HPO File No. 140330

Owner: Michael Bastian, Bastian Builders
Applicant: Guillermo G. Avalos, GAD Commercial \& Residential
Date Application Accepted: 3/7/2014
90-day Waiver: N/A

## SITE INFORMATION:

Currently: Lots 14 and 15 (1215 Rutland) and Lot 16 (1205 Rutland), Block 183, Houston Heights Subdivision, City of Houston, Harris County, Texas. The site includes non-contributing commercial structures formerly used as a chicken processing plant.
The combined properties are under common ownership and will be divided into three lots for single-family use. For the purpose of this report, the lots have been identified as $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ and C , starting at the corner and moving north:
A. Corner lot - Lots 17 and 18; 8,800 sf ( 66.67 'x132')
B. Interior lot - Lot 16 and southern 16.67 ' of lot $15 ; 6,600$ sf ( $50^{\prime} \times 132$ ').
C. Interior lot - Lot 14 and northern 16.67' of lot $156,600 \mathrm{sf}$ ( $50^{\prime} \times 132^{\prime}$ ).


## PUBLIC COMMENT:

Staff received written public comment regarding the projects, 5 in favor and 2 opposed. See Attachment A.

## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

HAHC ACTION: Approval
EFFECTIVE: March 27, 2014

| Planning Official |  | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| This Certificate of A This Certificate is in Your plans must be Any revisions to the | ss is valid for one year from its effective date. <br> any permits or approvals that are required by municipal, state and federal law. <br> Historic Preservation Office prior to permit submittal. Call 713-837-7963 for an appoin roject scope may require a new COA. |  |
| City of Houston | Planning and Development Department, Community Sustainability Division | page 1 of 12 |
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## Houston Heights Historic District West Map
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Current Photographs - Noncontributing Structures at 1205 \& 1215 Rutland
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SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)

Property C - Lot 14 \& $1 / 2$ of Lot 15

HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

AGENDA ITEM: II.ee
HPO File No. 140330

Houston Heights West Typical Details \& Proposed Structures

| (dimensions in feet) | MAX <br> WIDTH | FRONT <br> WALL <br> WIDTH | RIDGE <br> HEIGHT | EAVE <br> HEIGHT | ROOF <br> PITCH | PORCH <br> WIDTH | PORCH <br> EAVE <br> HEIGHT | PORCH <br> DEPTH | FINISHED <br> FLOOR <br> HEIGHT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical 2-Story <br> Contributing Houses | $24-34$ | $20-32$ | $28-32.5$ | $18-23$ | $5 / 12-$ <br> $8 / 12$ | $6-32$ | $8-12$ | $6-8$ | $1.5-3$ |
| Property C | 37.5 | 28 | 32.5 | 22.5 | $6 / 12$ | 28 | 11 | 6 | 2.5 |
| Compared to Typical | +3.5 | complies | complies | complies | complies | complies | complies | complies | complies |

## Approval Criteria

## PROPERTY C - Lot 14 \& $1 / 2$ of Lot 15

## Sec. 33-242. NEW CONSTRUCTION IN HISTORIC DISTRICT

(a) HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria:

| D N |  | S - satisfies D-does not satisfy NA - not applicable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 区 | (1) | The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (2) | The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (3) | The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district |
|  |  | Although the max width is larger than that typical to the district, the impact of the max width is not overbearing since it setback substantially from the public right of way; is distributed as smaller bumpouts on both sides of the residence; and the width of the front of the house is in the middle of the typical width range. |
| $\square$ | (4) | The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district; and |
| 囚 | (5) | The height of new construction intended for use for commercial purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the existing structures used for commercial purposes in the historic district. |

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the COA for Property C

SITE LOCATION:
1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently) Property C - Lot 14 \& $1 / 2$ of Lot 15
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

# AGENDA ITEM: II.ee 

HPO File No. 140330

## TYPE OF APPROVAL REQUESTED: New Construction - Two-story residence with detached garage

The applicant proposes to construct a new 4,276 square foot two-story residence with a detached alley loading garage on a 6,600 square foot ( 50 'x132') lot.

- Setbacks Shape / Mass: The residence will measure $28^{\prime}$ wide at the front wall and $37^{\prime}-9$ " wide overall starting $22^{\prime}$ behind the front wall (widening on both sides). The residence will be $76^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ deep (not including a 6 ' deep front porch), and have a ridge height of $32^{\prime}-66^{\prime \prime}$. The proposed two-story garage will be $24^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}$ wide, $21^{\prime}-11^{\prime \prime}$ deep, and $23^{\prime}-11^{\prime \prime}$ tall. See drawings for more detail.
- Setbacks: The house will have a front (east) setback of $20^{\prime}$; a north side setback of $6^{\prime}$ ' $2^{\prime \prime}$, a south side setback of $6^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$, and a rear (west) setback of approximately $30^{\prime}$. The proposed garage will have a north side setback of $3^{\prime}$; a south side setback of $22^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$; and a rear (west) setback of $5^{\prime}$. See drawings for more detail.
- Roof: The residence will have a composition shingle roof. The main roof will be hipped and have a pitch of $6: 12$. The front portion of the roof will be hipped, feature a gable, and have a pitch of $7: 12$. The gable on the porch will have a $7: 12$ pitch while the rest of the porch roof will have a pitch of $4: 12$. The rear one-story portion of the house will have a hipped roof with a pitch of $6: 12$. The house will have an eave height of $22^{\prime}-7^{\prime \prime}$. The porch will have an eave height of 11'. The garage will have a composition shingle side gable roof with a 6:12 pitch and an eave height of $18^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime}$. See drawings for more detail.
- Exterior Materials: The residence will be clad with smooth cementitious lap siding. The garage will be clad with smooth cementitious lap siding. The gables will feature a decorative fish scale design.
- Windows / Doors: The majority of the windows will be wood 1-over-1 double hung windows. Additionally, there will be several fixed, casement, and gliding windows. See window and door schedule for more detailed information.
- Foundation: The house will have a pier and beam foundation. The height of the finished floor will be 2'-7".


## Elevation Details:

- East Elevation (front facing Rutland Street): The front portion of the house will feature a one-story full width porch. The southern portion of the porch will feature a front gable above the porch entrance. The front door and a pair of 1 -over 1 wood windows are located behind the porch. The porch roof will be supported by several 12 " tapered round columns. The second story will feature a single window above the porch entrance. A pair of 1 -over- 1 windows will be located above the pair of windows on the first floor. A front gable will be located above the second story pair of windows. The gable will feature a small horizontally positioned window. Beyond the front portion of the house, the house extends approximately 5.5 to the south and approximately 4.5 ' to the north. The house will be topped by a hipped roof with a gable accent. See drawings for more detail.
- South Elevation (facing side property line): The south elevation features the side profile of the front porch. Beyond the front porch, three windows extended diagonally from the first floor to the second. Continuing westward, the first floor features an additional three windows (a single window followed by a pair of windows). The second story will feature thee windows as well (a single window followed by a pair of windows). A covered porch and one-story portion of the house will be located at the rear. This one story portion will have several windows and doors with transoms. See drawings for more detail.
- North Elevation (facing side property line): The north elevation will feature the profile of the front porch followed by three pairs of windows on the first story. The second story will feature two pairs of windows. The rear one story portion of the house will feature two additional windows. See drawings for more detail.

SITE LOCATION: 1205 \& 1215 Rutland (currently)
Property C - Lot 14 \& $1 / 2$ of Lot 15
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West

## AGENDA ITEM: II.ee

HPO File No. 140330

- West Elevation (facing rear property line): The first story of the rear features the one story portion, which features no fenestration, and the rear porch, with several windows and doors with transoms above. The second story features a single horizontally oriented window with no additional fenestration. See drawings for more detail.
- Garage: The front (east) façade of the garage will feature no fenestration on the first story and a centered pair of windows on the second story. An awning for a side door extends out from the south elevation. The north elevation features no fenestration; the south elevation features a single door topped by an awning. The rear (west) elevation will feature a single garage door on the first story and three windows on the second story. See drawings for more detail.
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Roof Plan
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East Elevation (front facing Rutland Street)
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## North Elevation (facing side property line)



## South Elevation (facing side property line)



SITE LOCATION: $1205 \& 1215$ Rutland (currently)
AGENDA ITEM: II.ee
HISTORIC DISTRICT: Houston Heights West
HPO File No. 140330

West Elevation (facing rear property line (alley))


Window \& Door Schedule
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## Second Floor Plan
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## Detached Garage Elevations



## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

## Application Date: September 3, 2014

Applicant: Guillermo G. Avalos, GAD Commercial \& Residential for Michael Bastian, owner
Property: 1207 Rutland (aka 1215 Rutland - C), lot 16 and northern 16.67' of lot 15, block183, Houston Heights Subdivision, 6,600 square foot ( 50 'x132') vacant interior lot.

Significance: The property is located in the Houston Heights Historic District West.
Proposal: New Construction - Revision to an approved two-story 4,276 square foot single family residence that measures $28^{\prime}$ in width at the front $18^{\prime}$ deep section; $37^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}$ at its maximum width, $76^{\prime}-4$ " deep; and $32^{\prime}-6$ " tall. The hipped roof has a combination of $6 / 12$ and $7 / 12$ pitches. The COA was granted on March 27, 2014.
The approved project has been submitted for review with the following revisions:
Residence

- Increase roof pitch from $6 / 12$ and $7 / 12$ to $8 / 12$
- Increase ridge height from $32^{\prime}-6$ " to $35^{\prime}-4$ "
- Decrease the eave height from $22^{\prime}-7{ }^{\prime \prime}$ to $21^{\prime}-7{ }^{\prime \prime}$
- Decrease the first floor ceiling height from 11' to 10 '
- Center front door with the porch stairs and porch gable roof
- Add sidelights and transom to the front door
- Reduce number of front porch columns from 4 to 3


## Garage

- Increase roof pitch from $6 / 12$ to $8 / 12$
- Increase ridge height from $24^{\prime}$ to $26^{\prime}-10 "$

See enclosed application materials and detailed project description on p. 13-24 for further details.
Public Comment: No comment received.
Civic Association: No comment received.

## Recommendation: Partial Approval:

- Denial of the roof pitch and ridge height revisions to the residence
- Approval of the residence front door and porch column revisions
- Approval of the detached garage roof pitch and ridge height revisions

HAHC Action: Partially Approved:

- Denied roof pitch and ridge height revisions to the residence
- Approved residence front door and porch column revisions
- Approved detached garage roof pitch and ridge height revisions


## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Basis for Issuance: HAHC Approval<br>Effective: September 25, 2014

PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## NEW CONSTRUCTION IN A HISTORIC DISTRICT

Sec. 33-242: HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for new construction in a historic district upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria:
(1) The new construction must match the typical setbacks of existing contributing structures in the historic district
(2) The exterior features of new construction must be compatible with the exterior features of existing contributing structures in the historic district
(3) The proportions of the new construction, including width and roofline, must be compatible with the typical proportions of existing contributing structures and objects in the historic district
The proposed max width, ridge height and roof pitch are at or above the typical range, which results in a house that is over-scaled and not compatible with typical historic proportions that define the district character. Two-story contributing residences with large widths typically have hipped roofs with moderate pitches.
The HAHC approved a COA for the proposal in March with a width larger than typical because the max width was not overbearing due to the combined conditions of a front setback ( $20^{\prime}$ ), max ridge height ( $32^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ ), eave height ( $22^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ ), and front width ( $28^{\prime}$ ) that were within the typical ranges. Staff maintains that the previously approved proportions are appropriate for the proposed residence.

If a consistent roof pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to reduce the $7 / 12$ pitch at the front to $6 / 12$ to match the main roof. If an $8 / 12$ pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to reduce the plate height, foundation height, width, or a combination thereof to maintain the approved $32^{\prime}-6$ " max ridge height and overall compatible proportions within typical range.
(4) The height of the eaves of a new construction intended for use for residential purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the eaves of existing contributing structures used for residential purposes in the historic district; and
(5) The height of new construction intended for use for commercial purposes must not be taller than the typical height of the existing structures used for commercial purposes in the historic district.

## TYPICAL DISTRICT DETAILS \& PROPOSED RESIDENCE

| (dimensions in ft) | MAX <br> WIDTH | FRONT <br> WIDTH | RIDGE <br> HEIGHT | EAVE <br> HEIGHT | PORCH <br> EAVE <br> HEIGHT | FINISHED <br> FLOOR <br> HEIGHT | ROOF <br> PITCH | PORCH <br> WIDTH | PORCH <br> DEPTH |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical Contributing <br> 2-Story Residences* | $24-34$ | $20-32$ | $28-33$ | $18-23$ | $8-12$ | $1.5-3$ | $5-8 / 12$ | $6-32$ | $6-10$ |
| APPROVED -3/27/14 | 37.5 | 28 | 32.5 | 22.5 | 11 | 2.5 | $6-7 / 12$ | 28 | 6 |
| Compatibility | +3.5 | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible |
| CURRENT | 37.5 | 28 | 35.5 | 21.5 | 11 | 2.5 | $8 / 12$ | 28 | 6 |
| Compatibility | +3.5 | compatible | +2.5 | compatible | compatible | compatible | at max | compatible | compatible |

* determined by removing a-typical outliers found in the district to provide a compatible range

| MAX WIDTH <br> Typ. Range: 24-34 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1232 | Tulane | 40 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1207 | Rutland | 37.5 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 35 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 209 | W 16th | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 30 |
| 201 | W 15th | 28 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 611 | W 15th | 28 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1531 | Allston | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 509 | W 15th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |


| FRONT WIDTH |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Typ. | Range: 20 | -32 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1207 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16 th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 25 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1531 | Allston | 24 |
| 201 | W 15 th | 22 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1509 | Allston | 18 |
| 209 | W 16 th | 14 |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 509 | W 15th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |


| RIDGE HT |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Typ. Range: 24 | -33 |  |
| 209 | W 16th | 36 |
| 1207 | Rutland | 35.5 |
| 201 | W 15th | 35 |
| 1246 | Allston | 34 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 33 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 33 |
| 201 | W 16th | 33 |
| 327 | W 16th | 33 |
| 1443 | Allston | 32 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 32 |
| 1245 | Yale | 32 |
| 1531 | Allston | 31 |
| 1202 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 30 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1400 | Allston | 29 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 29 |
| 1235 | Yale | 29 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1509 | Allston | 28 |
| 1535 | Allston | 28 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 27 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 27 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 27 |
| 509 | W 15th | 27 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 22 |


| EAVE HT |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Typ. Range: 18 | $\mathbf{2 3}$ |  |
| 201 | W 15 th | 25 |
| 201 | W 16 th | 25 |
| 327 | W 16th | 24 |
| 1531 | Allston | 23 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 23 |
| 209 | W 16th | 23 |
| 1245 | Yale | 23 |
| 1246 | Allston | 22 |
| 1443 | Allston | 22 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 22 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 22 |
| 509 | W 15 th | 22 |
| 1207 | Rutland | 21.5 |
| 1509 | Allston | 21 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 21 |
| 1202 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 21 |
| 1147 | Allston | 20 |
| 1400 | Allston | 20 |
| 1535 | Allston | 20 |
| 1236 | Rutland | 20 |
| 1235 | Yale | 20 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 19 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 19 |
| 1341 | Allston | 18 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 18 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 18 |
| 611 | W 15 th | 17 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 16 |


| PORCH EAVE HT |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Typ. Range: $\mathbf{8} \mathbf{- 1 2}$ |  |  |
| 201 | W 15th | 13 |
| 201 | W 16th | 13 |
| 1443 | Allston | 12 |
| 1531 | Allston | 12 |
| 1245 | Yale | 12 |
| 1207 | Rutland | 11 |
| 1535 | Allston | 11 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 11 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 11 |
| 509 | W 15th | 11 |
| 1147 | Allston | 10 |
| 1400 | Allston | 10 |
| 1509 | Allston | 10 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 10 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 10 |
| 1235 | Yale | 10 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 9 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 9 |
| 1246 | Allston | - |
| 1429 | Rutland | - |
| 1541 | Ashland | - |
| 1237 | Rutland | - |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 1236 | Rutland | - |
| 1341 | Allston | - |
| 1232 | Tulane | - |
| 1537 | Tulane | - |
| 1541 | Tulane | - |
| 611 | W 15th | - |
| 209 | W 16th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |


$|$| ROOF PITCH |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Typ. Range: $5 / 12$ | $-8 / 12$ |  |
| 1443 | Allston | $13 / 12$ |
| 1236 | Rutland | $12 / 12$ |
| 1232 | Tulane | $10 / 12$ |
| 201 | W 15th | $10 / 12$ |
| 209 | W 16th | $10 / 12$ |
| 1207 | Rutland | $8 / 12$ |
| 1246 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1531 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1237 | Rutland | $8 / 12$ |
| 1447 | Tulane | $8 / 12$ |
| 1541 | Tulane | $8 / 12$ |
| 327 | W 16th | $8 / 12$ |
| 1235 | Yale | $8 / 12$ |
| 1341 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1509 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1109 | Rutland | $7 / 12$ |
| 1429 | Rutland | $7 / 12$ |
| 1537 | Tulane | $7 / 12$ |
| 611 | W 15 th | $7 / 12$ |
| 201 | W 16th | $7 / 12$ |
| 1147 | Allston | $6 / 12$ |
| 1400 | Allston | $6 / 12$ |
| 1541 | Ashland | $6 / 12$ |
| 1439 | Rutland | $6 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Rutland | $6 / 12$ |
| 1427 | Tulane | $6 / 12$ |
| 1245 | Yale | $6 / 12$ |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 1343 | Rutland | - |
| 509 | W 15th | - |

[^4] Arrows indicate proposed revisions to previously approved conditions


Building Classification
$\square$ Contributing
$\square$ Non-Contributing
$\square$ Park
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## NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES
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## NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES
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## TWO-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES IN DISTRICT (30 OF APPROXIMATELY 340 CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES)



1246 Allston - Contrib. c. 1910 Classic Revival
front width: 32 max width: 32 ridge ht: 34 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 1,980 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: corner


1341 Allston - Contrib. 1928 Colonial Revival
front width: 28
max width: 28 ridge ht: 27 eave ht: 18 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 7/12
residence s.f.: 2,240
lot s.f: 6,600
lot on block: interior


1443 Allston - Contrib. c. 1910 Dutch Colonial front width: 24
max width: 24 ridge ht: 32 eave ht: 32 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 13/12 residence s.f.: 1,868 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


1531 Allston - Contrib. c. 1925 Am Foursquare
front width: 24
max width: 28 ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 2,030 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


1400 Allston - Contrib. c. 1920 Am Foursq/Prairie
front width: 31
max width: 31 ridge ht: 29 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 6/12
residence s.f.: 2,460
lot s.f: 6,600
lot on block: corner


1509 Allston - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival
front width: 18
max width: 21 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 21 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 7/12
residence s.f.: 1,320 lot s.f: 6,600 lot on block: interior


1535 Allston - Contrib. c. 1925 Am Foursquare
front width: 21
max width: 21 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 11 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: $8 / 12$
residence s.f.: 1,764 lot s.f: 6,600
lot on block: interior
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1202 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1920 Craftsman
front width: -
max width: -
ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 21 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: residence s.f.: 3,023 lot s.f: 4,250
lot location: corner


1236 Rutland - Contrib. 1907 Queen Anne
front width: 39
max width: 39 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 12/12 residence s.f.: 2,280 lot s.f: 7,470 lot location: interior

1237 Rutland - Contrib. 1911 Queen Anne
front width: 26
max width: 30 ridge ht: 31 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 2,260 lot s.f: 8,710 lot location: corner


1429 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1930 Colonial Revival
front width: 25
max width: 28 ridge ht: 28 eave ht: 22 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 7/12 residence s.f.: 1,793 lot s.f: 7,920 lot location: interior


1439 Rutland - Contrib. c. 1930 Colonial Revival
front width: 28
max width: 35
ridge ht: 27
eave ht: 19
porch eave ht: 9
porch floor ht: 2
pitch: 6/12
residence s.f.: 2,530
lot s.f: 8,880
lot location: interior
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## 2-STORY CONTRIBUTING RESIDENCES CONT.



201 W 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ - Contrib. c. 1910 Queen Anne

209 W 16th - Contrib. c. 1910 Queen Anne
front width: 14 (bay)
max width: 31 ridge ht: 36 eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: porch floor ht: 2 pitch: 10/12 residence s.f.: 2,770 lot s.f: 9,800 lot location: interior


1235 Yale - Contrib. c. 1915 - American Foursquare
front width: 25
max width: 25 ridge ht: 29 eave ht: 20 porch eave ht: 10 porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$ residence s.f.: 1,392 lot s.f: 6,600 lot location: interior

front width: 28 max width: 28 ridge ht: 33 eave ht: 25 porch eave ht: 13 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 7/12
residence s.f.: 2,630 lot s.f: 6,800 lot location: corner


327 W 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ - Contrib. c. 1910 - Queen Anne
front width: -
max width: -
ridge ht: 33 eave ht: 24 porch eave ht: -
porch floor ht: 2 pitch: $8 / 12$
residence s.f.: 1,480
lot s.f: -
lot location: interior


1245 Yale - Contrib. c. 1910 Colonial Revival
front width: 33
max width: 33
ridge ht: 32
eave ht: 23 porch eave ht: 12 porch floor ht: 3 pitch: 6/12 residence s.f.: 2,700 lot s.f: 7,980 lot location: corner


## RUTLAND BLOCKFACE COMPARISON

(1201, 1205 \& 1207 AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED)


## EAST ELEVATION - FRONT FACING RUTLAND

## APPROVED - 3/27/14


front width: 28
max width: 37.5
ridge ht: 32.5
eave ht: 22.5
porch eave ht: 11
porch floor ht: 2.5
pitch: 6/12-7/12
front width: 28

max width: 37.5
ridge ht: 35.5
eave ht: 21.5
porch eave ht: 11
porch floor ht: 2.5 pitch: 8/12

Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM B. 27
September 25, 2014
HPO File No. 120927

## SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION

## APPROVED - 3/27/14
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NORTH SIDE ELEVATION

## APPROVED - 3/27/14
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## WEST (REAR) ELEVATION

APPROVED - 3/27/14


SITE PLAN
APPROVED - 3/27/14


PROPOSED
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ROOF PLAN
APPROVED - 3/27/14


PROPOSED
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FIRST LEVEL FLOOR PLAN
APPROVED - 3/27/14


PROPOSED
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SECOND LEVEL FLOOR PLAN
APPROVED - 3/27/14
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## WINDOW / DOOR SCHEDULE



| WINDOW SCHEDUE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MARK | SIZE |  | TYPE | MAT | NOTES |
|  | WIDTH | HEIGHT |  |  |  |
| 1 | 3'-0" | 6'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 2 | 3'-0" | 6'-0" | SH | WOOD | - |
| 3 | 3'-0" | 6'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 4 | 3'-0" | 6'-0"' | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 5 | 3'-0" | 6'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 6 | 3'-0" | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 7 | $2^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | $5^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SH | WOOD | Tempered/translucent |
| 8 | $2^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | Tempered/translucent |
| 9 | 3'-0" | 6'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 10 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 11 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | 6'-0" | FX | WOOD | Fixed door slab / $16^{\prime \prime}$ transom |
| 12 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime \prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | FX | WOOD | Fixed door slab / 16" transom |
| 13 | 2'-6" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | Temp. / 16" Transom |
| 14 | 2'-6" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | Temp. / 16" Transom |
| 15 | $4^{\prime \prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | SH | WOOD | 16" Transom |
| 16 | $4^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | SH | WOOD | $16^{\prime \prime}$ Transom |
| 17 | 4'-0" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | 16" Transom |
| 18 | 2'-0"' | $4^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SH | WOOD | Tempered |
| 19 | 2'-0"' | 4'-0" | SH | WOOD | Tempered |
| 20 | 3'-0"' | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 21 | 3'-0" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 22 | 3'-0" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 23 | 3'-0" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 24 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 25 | 3'-0"' | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 26 | 3'-0" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 27 | 2'-0" | 3'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 28 | 2'-0" | 4'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 29 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | 4'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 30 | 4'-0" | $1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ | GL | ALUM | Provide thermal break |
| 31 | 3'-0" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 33 | 3'-0" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 34 | 3'-0" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 35 | 3'-0" | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 36 | $3^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $5^{\prime \prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 37 | 3'-0" | $5^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 38 | 3'-0"' | 5'-0" | SH | WOOD | -- |
| 40 | 3'-0" | $1^{\prime}-8{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | FX | WOOD | WINDOW @ GABLE END |
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## DETACHED GARAGE

APPROVED - 3/27/14

Front (East)


PROPOSED


## DETACHED GARAGE

APPROVED - 3/27/14


## PROJECT DETAILS

Shape/Mass: The two-story residence will measure $37^{\prime}-9$ " wide overall; $28^{\prime}$ wide at the front $18^{\prime}$ deep section; $80^{\prime}-9{ }^{\prime \prime}$ deep; $35^{\prime}-5{ }^{\prime \prime}$ tall (previously approved at $32^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime \prime}$ ). The residence will have an eave height of $21^{\prime}-7{ }^{\prime \prime}$ (previously approved at $22^{\prime}-77^{\prime \prime}$ ). The interior ceiling heights will be 10 ' at the first level and 9 ' at the second level (previously approved at 11' and 9' respectively).

Setbacks: Residence will be setback 20' from the front (east) property line to the front of the porch; $6^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ from the south side property line; and $6^{\prime}-2$ " from the north side property line; and $25^{\prime}-6$ " at the rear (west) property line.

Foundation: Pier and beam foundation; piers will be clad in brick. A cementitious trim casing with vertical battens and metal screen mesh will span between piers. Finished floor height will be $2^{\prime \prime}-7{ }^{\prime \prime}$.

Windows/Doors: Wood 1-over-1 single-hung and single-lite fixed windows with wood or cementitious trim. See elevations, plans and window schedule for further window details.

Exterior Materials: Smooth horizontal lap cementitious siding. Front gables to feature fish-scale shingles.
Roof: $8 / 12$ hipped main roof at the widest section; an $8 / 12$ hip at the front section; and $8 / 12$ north bay and porch gables (previously approved with a 6/12 hipped main roof at the widest section; a 7/12 hip at the front section; and $7 / 12$ front bay and porch gables). Closed eaves will overhang 1 '.

Front Elevation: The front portion of the house will feature a one-story full width porch. The southern portion of the
(West) porch will feature a front gable above the porch entrance. The porch features 12 smooth round columns, simple stick balustrade and stair rail, and wood porch stairs. The first level features a front door with sidelight and transom centered with the porch stair and gable, and a pair of 1-over1 windows to the side. The second story will feature a single window above the porch entrance and a pair of 1 -over- 1 windows. The north bay gable will feature a horizontally positioned window.

Side Elevation: The front section of the residence, behind the front porch, features three windows extending
(South) diagonally from the first level to the second. The section of the residence features a single 1 -over1 window and a pair of 1 -over-1 windows at both levels. The single level rear section of the residence features a rear porch with similar details as the front porch.

Side Elevation: The front section of the residence, behind the front porch, features a pair of 1 -over- 1 windows at
(North) the first level and no windows at the second level. The following section of the residence features two pairs of 1 -over- 1 windows at both levels. The single level rear section of the residence features two 1 -over- 1 windows.

Rear Elevation: The rear section of the residence is one-story and features a rear porch. The elevation is not
(East) visible from the public right-of-way. See elevation drawings for further details for all elevations.
Garage: Detached two-story garage is $24^{\prime}-10^{\prime \prime}$ wide, $21^{\prime}-11^{\prime \prime}$ deep, $26^{\prime}-10^{\prime \prime}$ tall (previously approved at $23^{\prime}-$ $11^{\prime \prime}$ ), and will have an $8 / 12$ hipped roof (previously approved at $6 / 12$ ). Garage will be on a slab foundation and will be setback 5 ' from the rear (west) property line and 3 ' from the north side property line. The front (east) façade features a centered pair of windows on the second story. An awning for a side door extends out from the south elevation. The north elevation features no fenestration; the south elevation features a single door topped by an awning. The rear (west) elevation will feature a garage door and three windows on the second story.

## Transcription of Item B. 27 - 1207 Rutland Street - HAHC September 25, 2014 <br> (Unofficial transcript, prepared by Planning staff from audio of meeting for informational purposes)

Staff - B27, 1207 Rutland. At the March $27^{\text {th }}$ HAHC meeting, the applicant was granted a COA to construct a two story 4,276 square foot single family residence that measures approximately 38 ' wide, 76 ' deep. The hipped roof had a combination of $6: 12$ and $7: 12$ pitches to achieve a $32.5^{\prime}$ tall ridge height.

The approved project has been submitted with the following revisions: At the residence, increase the roof pitch from 6:12 and 7:12 to a consistent 8:12. Increase the ridge height from 32 ' 6 " to $35^{\prime} 4$ ". Decrease the eave height from $22^{\prime} 7^{\prime \prime}$ to $21^{\prime} 7^{\prime \prime}$. Decrease the first floor ceiling height from $11^{\prime}$ to 10 . Center the front door with the porch stairs, and add a side lite and transom to the door. And reduce the number of front porch columns from four to three. At the garage, they proposed to increase the roof pitch from 6:12 to 8:12, which increases the ridge height from $24^{\prime}$ to $26^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$.

The March proposal was approved with a width larger than typical because the combined conditions of the considerably set back max width and a front width ridge height and eave height within the typical ranges resulted in compatible proportions. The proposed revisions bring the ridge height and roof pitch above the typical range, which in tandem with the large width results in a house that is over scaled and not compatible with the historic proportions that define the district character. Two story contributing residences with large widths typically have hipped roofs with moderate pitches. If a consistent roof pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to reduce the $7: 12$ pitch at the front to a $6: 12$ to match the main roof. If an $8: 12$ pitch is desired, it would be appropriate to reduce the plate height, foundation height, width, or a combination thereof, to maintain the approved 32 ' 6 " max ridge height, and overall compatible proportions within the recommended ranges. Staff maintains that the previously approved proportions are appropriate for the proposed residence and finds that the proposed revisions do not satisfy criteria 3 for new construction.

Staff is recommending partial approval, which includes denial of the roof pitch and ridge height revisions to the residence, approval of the front door and porch column revisions, and approval of the detached garage revisions.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Thank you. Okay, we do have speakers signed up, Mr. Kirwin.
Timothy Kirwin - Criteria 4 and 5 of your ordinance under new construction deals with maximum height, for both a residential and commercial structure. Please pay attention, and direct your attention to criteria 3. Criteria number 3 does not have a maximum. It does not have a threshold. Staff has now determined that criteria 3 should have a maximum. Even though under ridge height, we are not the tallest structure in the district. There is a structure that is going to be taller than us. They are misinterpreting the ordinance. They are applying... they are taking out structures that should be included in the analysis, and they are not including these structures in determining whether or not our height is appropriate. In fact, the structure that they are disallowing is a Queen Anne structure. (142:57) Doesn't say it. Look at criteria number 4 and look at the language of criteria number 5. Specifically, they use the word 'maximum.' They do not say that under criteria number 3.

And here's my other question: Why did staff allow us to have a conditional approval on this one - We'll take it - and they wouldn't give us a conditional approval on 1205? Why's that? Let's see if they can answer that for you. Thank you.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Thank you. We do have Mr. Bastian signed up.
Michael Bastian - I handed out another sheet which basically has the same data on it. I contend that you have to use the same architectural style. The argument that staff gave... We in fact, if you look at the numbers on both 1205 and 1207, we're not the tallest on any one of those items. We're not the biggest on any one of those items. We fall within the range of the architectural style that we are trying to build. They're larger lots. This is on a corner that was the infamous chicken factory. The comment on the blockface by Mr. Herreros is incorrect because all four corner houses, on the four corners of the 1200 block of Rutland, are all large two story houses. This fits in perfectly with what's on the blockface. You know, pretty soon I'm just going to be appealing this stuff to City Council on financial criteria because you guys are bleeding me dry, and I think that's the intent of some of the staff! Thanks.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Aright, thank you for coming down Mr. Bastian. Could staff come and please restate their recommendation?

Staff - We are recommending partial approval, which is denial of the roof pitch and ridge height revisions, and approval of the front door, porch column revisions, and the detached garage revisions.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay, staff is recommending a partial approval. Do we have any questions for staff or discussion? Okay, do I hear a motion to grant a partial approval per staff's recommendation?

Commissioner Rob Hellyer - So moved.
Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay, Commissioner Hellyer moves that we accept staff's recommendation to grant a partial approval per the conditions stated in the application. Do I have a second on that item? Okay, Commissioner Bucek seconds. All of those in favor please raise your hands. Six. Any opposed? Okay that's one opposed. So that item has been granted a Certificate of Appropriateness per staff's conditions as stated in the application.

| From: | Timothy Kirwin [Tim@jgradyrandlepc.com](mailto:Tim@jgradyrandlepc.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, October 09, 2014 3:39 PM |
| To: | Walsh, Patrick-PD; DuCroz, Diana-PD; Harris-Finch, Delaney - PD; Wallace Brown, Margaret - PD; Izfar, Omar - LGL; |
| Subject: | 'mbastian@bastianbuilders.com'; "Sam Gianukos' (sam@creoledesign.com)' |
| Attachments: | 1201, 1205, and 1207 Rutland Street Appeal materials |
|  | 1201 Rutland.pdf; 1205 Rutland.pdf; 1207 Rutland.pdf |
| Importance: | High |

Mr. Walsh: Please find attached Appeal supplemental materials for 1201 Rutland Street, 1205 Rutland Street, and 1207 Rutland Street for the City of Houston Planning Commission's October 16, 2014, meeting from the Houston Archeological and Historical Commission's denial or partial denials of certificates of appropriateness.

My last name has been misspelled by staff on several of the previous appeals. If that can be corrected for this appeal, I would appreciate it.

Thank you, Tim
Timothy B. Kirwin
Randle Law Office Ltd., L.L.P.
Memorial Plaza II
820 Gessner, Suite 1570
Houston, Texas 77024
(281) 657-2000- Telephone
(832) 476-9554- Facsimile

Email | Profile | Website | V-Card

## R A N D L E

LAW OFFICE LTD., L.L.P.

## CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email may be confidential or privileged or both. This email is intended to be reviewed by only the individual or organization named above. If you are not the intended recipient or an authorized representative of the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination or copying of this email and its attachment, if any, or the information contained herein is prohibited. If you received this email in error please immediately notify the sender by return email and delete this email from your system.

## CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE

The rules imposed by IRS Circular 230 require Randle Law Office Ltd., L.L.P. to inform you that, unless expressly stated above or in an attachment hereto, this communication including any attachments, is not intended or written to be used, and it cannot be used, by you or any person or entity for the purpose of avoiding any penalties that may or could be imposed under the United States Internal Revenue Code, nor for the promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or tax-related matter(s).

## 1207 Rutland Street

## Heights Historic District West

## Appeal Supplement

Applicant: Guillermo Avalos
Owner: Michael Bastian
Submitted by: Timothy Kirwin
Date: 10/9/14
Basis for appeal:
Item 1: Roof pitch is typical in the District.
-Applicant and Owner propose a roof pitch of $8 / 12$.
-Staff provided a chart detailing widths and heights for two story, contributing structures in the District. The chart shows that an $8 / 12$ roof pitch is typical in the District. (see attachment)
Item 2: Ridge height is typical in the District.
-Applicant and Owner propose a ridge height of $351 / 2$ feet.
-There is a taller two story, contributing structure in the District at 36 feet at 209 W . $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. Moreover, $201 \mathrm{~W} .15^{\text {th }}$ Street has a ridge height of 35 feet and 1246 Allston has a ridge height of 34 feet.
-Applicant and Owner have designed a Queen Anne style home.
$-209 \mathrm{~W} .16^{\text {th }}$ Street and $201 \mathrm{~W} .15^{\text {th }}$ Street are both Queen Anne style homes.

## Contributing structures in the Queen Anne Architectural Style in Heights West HD

|  | 1236 <br> Rutland | 1237 <br> Rutland | 201 W. <br> 15 th | 201 W. <br> 16 th | 209 W. <br> 16 th | 327 W. <br> 16 th | 1207 <br> Rutland |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ridge ht | 28 | 31 | 35 | 33 | 36 | 33 | 35.5 | COMPATIBLE |
| roof pitch | $12 / 12$ | $8 / 12$ | $10 / 12$ | $7 / 12$ | $10 / 12$ | $8 / 12$ | $8 / 12$ | COMPATIBLE |

# TYPICAL DISTRICT DETAILS \& PROPOSED RESIDENCE 

| (dimensions in ft) | MAX <br> WIDTH | FRONT <br> WIDTH | RIDGE <br> HEIGHT | EAVE <br> HEIGHT | PORCH <br> EAVE <br> HEIGHT | FINISHED <br> FLOOR <br> HEIGHT | ROOF <br> PITCH | PORCH <br> WIDTH | PORCH <br> DEPTH |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical Contributing <br> 2-Story Residences | $24-34$ | $20-32$ | $28-33$ | $18-23$ | $8-12$ | $1.5-3$ | $5-8 / 12$ | $6-32$ | $6-10$ |
| APPROVED -3/27/14 | 37.5 | 28 | 32.5 | 22.5 | 11 | 2.5 | $6-7 / 12$ | 28 | 6 |
| Compatibility | +3.5 | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible | compatible |
| CURRENT | 37.5 | 28 | 35.5 | 21.5 | 11 | 2.5 | $8 / 12$ | 28 | 6 |
| Compatibility | +3.5 | compatible | +2.5 | compatible | compatible | compatible | at max | compatible | compatible |

* determined by removing a-typical outliers found in the district to provide a compatible range

| MAX WIDTH |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Typ. | Range: | 24 | $\mathbf{- 3 4} 9$.


| FRONT WIDTH |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Typ. Range: 20 | -32 |  |
| 1236 | Rutland | 39 |
| 1245 | Yale | 33 |
| 1246 | Allston | 32 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 32 |
| 1400 | Allston | 31 |
| 1541 | Ashland | 31 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 31 |
| 1537 | Tulane | 31 |
| 1232 | Tulane | 30 |
| 1207 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1147 | Allston | 28 |
| 1341 | Allston | 28 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 28 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 28 |
| 1541 | Tulane | 28 |
| 201 | W 16th | 28 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 27 |
| 1237 | Rutland | 26 |
| 1429 | Rutland | 25 |
| 611 | W 15th | 25 |
| 1235 | Yale | 25 |
| 1443 | Allston | 24 |
| 1531 | Allston | 24 |
| 201 | W 15 th | 22 |
| 1535 | Allston | 21 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 21 |
| 1509 | Allston | 18 |
| 209 | W 16th | 14 |
| 1202 | Rutland | - |
| 509 | W 15 th | - |
| 327 | W 16th | - |



| PORCH EAVE HT <br> Typ. Range: 8-12 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 201 | W 15th | 13 |
| 201 | W 16th | 13 |
| 1443 | Allston | 12 |
| 1531 | Allston | 12 |
| 1245 | Yale | 12 |
| 1207 | Rutland | 11 |
| 1535 | Allston | 11 |
| 1109 | Rutland | 11 |
| 1343 | Rutland | 11 |
| 509 | W 15th | 11 |
| 1147 | Allston | 10 |
| 1400 | Allston | 10 |
| 1509 | Allston | 10 |
| 1535 | Rutland | 10 |
| 1447 | Tulane | 10 |
| 1235 | Yale | 10 |
| 1439 | Rutland | 9 |
| 1427 | Tulane | 9 |
| 1246 | Allston |  |
| 1429 | Rutland |  |
| 1541 | Ashland | - |
| 1237 | Rutland |  |
| 1202 | Rutland |  |
| 1236 | Rutland |  |
| 1341 | Alliston |  |
| 1232 | Tulane |  |
| 1537 | Tulane |  |
| 1541 | Tulane |  |
| 611 | W 15th |  |
| 209 | W 16th |  |
| 327 | W 16th |  |


| ROOF PITCH |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Typ. Range: $5 / 12$ | $-8 / 12$ |  |
| 1443 | Allston | $13 / 12$ |
| 1236 | Rutland | $12 / 12$ |
| 1232 | Tulane | $10 / 12$ |
| 201 | W 15th | $10 / 12$ |
| 209 | W 16th | $10 / 12$ |
| 1207 | Rutland | $8 / 12$ |
| 1246 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1531 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Allston | $8 / 12$ |
| 1237 | Rutland | $8 / 12$ |
| 1447 | Tulane | $8 / 12$ |
| 1541 | Tulane | $8 / 12$ |
| 327 | W 16 th | $8 / 12$ |
| 1235 | Yale | $8 / 12$ |
| 1341 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1509 | Allston | $7 / 12$ |
| 1109 | Rutland | $7 / 12$ |
| 1429 | Rutland | $7 / 12$ |
| 1537 | Tulane | $7 / 12$ |
| 611 | W 15th | $7 / 12$ |
| 201 | W 16th | $7 / 12$ |
| 1147 | Allston | $6 / 12$ |
| 1400 | Allston | $6 / 12$ |
| 1541 | Ashland | $6 / 12$ |
| 1439 | Rutland | $6 / 12$ |
| 1535 | Rutland | $6 / 12$ |
| 1427 | Tulane | $6 / 12$ |
| 1245 | Yale | $6 / 12$ |
| 1202 | Rutland |  |
| 1343 | Rutland |  |
| 509 | W 15 th |  |
|  |  |  |

Dash (-) indicates measurement unavailable; grey highlights typical range
Arrows indicate proposed revisions to previously approved conditions
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Planning \& Development Department

Applicant: Tina Han, owner
Property Address: 409 Harvard Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District South

## Project Summary:

The project at 409 Harvard Street is a proposal to construct a two-story addition and attached garage to a contributing one-story house in the Houston Heights Historic District South. At their September 2014 meeting, the Houston Archaeological and Historical Commission (HAHC) reviewed the applicant's request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and found that the addition was too large for the historic house, and therefore did not meet Criterion 4 for approval found in Chapter 33 Section 33-241(a). The HAHC voted $4-3$ to deny the COA.

In accordance with Chapter 33 Section 33-253, the applicant is appealing this decision to Planning Commission.

## Charge to the Planning Commission:

To be approved, an addition must meet 11 criteria for approval found in Chapter 33 Section 33-241(a). The HAHC denied the request because it found the project did not meet Criterion 44.

The applicant has the burden of proof to demonstrate that the project meets the applicable criteria for approval. Unless the Planning Commission finds that the project meets the criteria, it must uphold the decision of the HAHC.

If the Planning Commission upholds the HAHC decision, the applicant may return to HAHC with a new or revised application.

## Project Description:

The applicant purchased the house at 409 Harvard in September. On September 3, 2014, an application was submitted for approval to construct a 1,924 square foot two-story addition and attached garage to a contributing one-story 1,149 square foot house constructed circa 1920 . The addition will have a ridge height of $30^{\prime}-11^{\prime \prime}$ and an eave height of $22^{\prime}-5$ ". The existing concrete front porch floor will be replaced with wood. See Attachment A, the September 2014 HAHC Action Report, for complete project details.

## Basis for the Houston Archaeological and Historic Commission's decision:

- Within city historic districts, exterior changes visible from the right-of-way must be approved by HAHC.
- Alterations and additions to Contributing Structures are reviewed according to 11 criteria found in Chapter 33-241(a) of the Code of Ordinances. The criteria are included on pages 3-4 of this staff report. In order to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, the HAHC must find that all eleven criteria are met.
- In following the criteria, the HAHC is required by ordinance to use only the 11 criteria in evaluating proposed additions to contributing structures. In applying these criteria, the HAHC is to look at existing contributing buildings within the same historic district for compatibility, as the historic structures define the neighborhood character that is to be preserved. The HAHC is not to consider new construction as evidence of what is appropriate for additions to historic structures.
- Additions should be compatible with the size, scale, material and character of the historic house and neighborhood. The impact of the addition on the original structure should be minimized both physically and visually as much as possible. Where visible from the right-of-way, the addition should be designed to be

[^5]Houston Planning Commission

Applicant: Tina Han, owner
Property Address: 409 Harvard Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District South
visually subordinate to the original structure. To achieve this, additions should be designed with simple massing, simple roof shapes, and a clean and minimal connection to the existing structure. A clear delineation should be made between new and old so that the form the original structure is still obvious. The original exterior shape, materials and original physical presence from the public right-of-way should be retained as much as possible.

- A two-story addition to a one-story house may be appropriate but should be hidden from view as much as possible. Second story additions should be set back as far as possible from the front facade of the house and should not be taller than the typical height of structures within the historic district.
- The HAHC determined that the scale of the addition was too large and over-scaled for the historic house and therefore did not meet Criterion 4 for approval. They voted 4-3 to deny the COA.

Houston Planning Commission
Planning \＆Development Department

Applicant：Tina Han，owner
Property Address： 409 Harvard Street
Historic District：Houston Heights Historic District South

## Approval Criteria：Exterior Alteration，Rehabilitation，Restoration and Additions

Sec．33－241（a）：HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for the alteration，rehabilitation，restoration or addition of an exterior feature of（i）any landmark or protected landmark，（ii）any building，structure or object that is contributing to an historic district，or（iii）any building，structure or object that is part of an archaeological site，upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria，as applicable：
（1）The proposed activity must retain and preserve the historical character of the property；

（2）The proposed activity must contribute to the continued availability of the property for a contemporary use；3）The proposed activity must recognize the building，structure，object or site as a product of its own time and avoid alterations that seek to create an earlier or later appearance；
（4）The proposed activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities or character of the building，structure，object or site and its environment；

HAHC determined that the addition was too large and out of scale with the historic house．

（5）The proposed activity must maintain or replicate distinctive stylistic exterior features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize the building，structure，object or site；
（6）New materials to be used for any exterior feature excluding what is visible from public alleys must be visually compatible with，but not necessarily the same as，the materials being replaced in form， design，texture，dimension and scale；
（7）The proposed replacement of missing exterior features，if any，should be based on an accurate duplication of features，substantiated by available historical，physical or pictorial evidence，where that evidence is available，rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures；
（8）Proposed additions or alterations must be done in a manner that，if removed in the future，would leave unimpaired the essential form and integrity of the building，structure，object or site；

（9）The proposed design for any exterior alterations or addition must not destroy significant historical， architectural or cultural material and must be compatible with the size，scale，material and character of the property and the area in which it is located；

（10）The setback of any proposed construction or alteration must be compatible with existing setbacks along the blockface and facing blockface（s）；
（11）The proposed activity will comply with any applicable deed restrictions．

[^6]Applicant: Tina Han, owner
Property Address: 409 Harvard Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District South

## Applicant's Grounds for Appeal:

See Attachment C for the applicant's grounds for appeal and supplemental appeal documents.

## Basis for Applicant's Appeal:

## Sec. 33-253. Appeal.

a) An applicant aggrieved by a decision of the HAHC with respect to any certificate of appropriateness may appeal to the planning commission by filing a written notice of appeal, stating the grounds for the appeal, with the director within ten days following the date the HAHC renders its decision.
b) The planning commission shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which required notice can be given. The commission shall consider the application, the findings of the HAHC and any evidence presented at the meeting at which the appeal is considered. The planning commission shall reverse or affirm the decision of the HAHC based upon the criteria applicable to the certificate of appropriateness. The decision of the commission shall be final. If the commission does not make a decision on the appeal within 30 days following the commission's hearing on the appeal, the decision of the HAHC with respect to the application for the certificate of appropriateness shall be deemed affirmed.
c) An applicant aggrieved by the decision of the planning commission on an appeal from a decision of the HAHC may appeal to the city council. The city council shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which the required notice can be given. The city council shall consider the appeal under the provisions of Rule 12 of Section 2-2 of this code. At the conclusion of the city council's review of the matter, the city council shall reverse or affirm the decision of the planning commission. The decision of the city council shall be final and exhaust the applicant's administrative remedies.
d) The director shall provide the applicant with notice of the time and place of the meeting at which the appeal will be considered by mail no less than ten days before the date of the meeting.

[^7]
## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Application Date: September 3, 2014
Applicant: Gail Schorre, Morningside Architects for Tina Han, owner
Property: 409 Harvard Street, lot 10, block 301, Houston Heights Subdivision. The property includes a historic 1,149 square foot, one-story wood frame single-family residence and a detached garage situated on a 6,600 square foot ( 50 x 132') interior lot.

Significance: Contributing Queen Anne residence, constructed circa 1920, located in the Houston Heights Historic District South.

Proposal: Alteration - Construct a 1,924 square foot two-story rear addition and attached garage clad in bevel siding to a contributing 1,149 square foot one-story contributing residence. The addition will have a ridge height of $30^{\prime}-11^{\prime \prime}$ and an eave height of $22^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime}$. The existing concrete front porch floor will be replaced with wood.
See enclosed application materials and detailed project description on p. 6-16 for further details.
Public Comment: No public comment received.
Civic Association: No comment received.
Recommendation: Approval
HAHC Action: Denied - does not satisfy criterion 4

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## ALTERATIONS，REHABILITATIONS，RESTORATIONS AND ADDITIONS

Sec．33－241（a）：HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for the alteration，rehabilitation，restoration or addition of an exterior feature of（i）any landmark or protected landmark，（ii）any building，structure or object that is contributing to an historic district，or（iii）any building，structure or object that is part of an archaeological site， upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria，as applicable：

| NA |  | S－satisfies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | （1） | The propo |
| ® | （2） | The proposed activity must contribute to the continued availability of the property for a contemporary use； |
| 区 | （3） | The proposed activity must recognize the building，structure，object or site as a product of its own time and avoid alterations that seek to create an earlier or later appearance； |
| 区 | （4） | The proposed activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities or character of the building， structure，object or site and its environment； |
| 区 | （5） | The proposed activity must maintain or replicate distinctive stylistic exterior features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize the building，structure，object or site； |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | （6） | New materials to be used for any exterior feature excluding what is visible from public alleys must be visually compatible with，but not necessarily the same as，the materials being replaced in form，design，texture，dimension and scale； |
| $\otimes$ | （7） | The proposed replacement of missing exterior features，if any，should be based on an accurate duplication of features，substantiated by available historical，physical or pictorial evidence，where that evidence is available，rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures； |
| 区 | （8） | Proposed additions or alterations must be done in a manner that，if removed in the future， would leave unimpaired the essential form and integrity of the building，structure，object or site； |
| 区 | （9） | The proposed design for any exterior alterations or addition must not destroy significant historical，architectural or cultural material and must be compatible with the size，scale， material and character of the property and the area in which it is located； |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | （10） | The setback of any proposed construction or alteration must be compatible with existing setbacks along the blockface and facing blockface（s）； |
| $\square \square$ |  |  |
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PROPERTY LOCATION
HOUSTON HEIGHTS SOUTH HISTORIC DISTRICT
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## NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES



411 Harvard Street - Contributing - 1920 (neighbor)


415 Harvard Street - Contributing - 1920


416 Harvard Street - Noncontributing - 1999 (across street)


405 Harvard Street - Contributing - 1920 (neighbor)


408 Harvard Street - Contributing - 1920 (across street)


418 Harvard Street - Noncontributing - 1999 (across street)
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## 3D RENDERING - FRONT FACING HARVARD STREET PROPOSED
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## EAST ELEVATION - FRONT FACING HARVARD STREET

EXISTING
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## NORTH SIDE ELEVATION
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## SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION
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## WEST (REAR) ELEVATION <br> EXISTING
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409 Harvard Street Houston Heights South


ROOF PLAN
EXISTING


PROPOSED
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## WINDOW I DOOR SCHEDULE



DOOR TYPES


EXTERIOR DOOR SCHEDULE

| MARK | TYPE | DIMENSIONS | HARDWARE | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 | A | $2^{\prime} \cdot 8^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime} \cdot 8^{\prime}$ | ENTRY LATCH, DEADBOLT | EXISTING FRONT DOOR TO REMAIN, REPLACE GLASS \& HARDWARE |
| 101 | D | $3^{4 .} 0^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime} \cdot 8^{\prime \prime}$ | ENTRY LATCH, DEADBOLT | WEATHERSTRIP |
| 102 | D | $3^{4} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime}$ | ENTRY LATCH, DEADBOLT | WEATHERSTRIP |
| 103 | B | $3^{\prime} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime .}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | PRIVACY LOCK |  |
| 104 | C | $3^{\prime} .0^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\circ} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime}$ | ENTRY LATCH, DEADBOLT | WEATHERSTRIP |
| 105 | C | $3^{\prime} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime}$ | FDCD IN PLACE |  |
| 106 | C | $3^{4} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime} \times 8.0^{\prime \prime}$ | FDED IN PLACE |  |
| 107 | C | $3.00^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime}$ | FDED IN PLACE |  |
| 108 | C | $3^{\prime} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime}$ | FDCED IN PLACE |  |
| 109 | D | $3^{\prime} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime} \times 8.0^{\prime \prime}$ | ENTRY LATCH, DEADBOLT | WEATHERSTRIP |

Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
September 25, 2014
HPO File No. 140921

ITEM B. 21
409 Harvard Street
Houston Heights South

## PROJECT DETAILS

Shape/Mass: The existing structure measures $36^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime \prime}$ deep by $34^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ wide which includes a wraparound porch that extends $4^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}$ south of the main south wall. The existing ridge measures $22^{\prime}-7$ " and the eave measures $12^{\prime}-88^{\prime \prime}$. An existing enclosed rear porch measures $9^{\prime}$ deep by $24^{\prime}-11^{\prime \prime}$ and will be removed. The addition will start at the original rear wall and measure $44^{\prime}$ wide by $35^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime}$ deep with a $22^{\prime}-55^{\prime \prime}$ eave height and a $30^{\prime}-11^{\prime \prime}$ ridge. The addition will be inset $1^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ on the north side and extend the south wall $7^{\prime}-11^{\prime \prime}$ before extending $5^{\prime}-1$ " to the south. The garage door will be pushed back an additional $3^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ to be $66^{\prime}$ back from the front property line and be $12^{\prime}-6$ " wide.
Setbacks: The existing residence is set back $18^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime}$ from Harvard Street (east), $1^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ from the north side and $20^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ from the south. The addition will be set back $3^{\prime}$ from the north, $3^{\prime}$ from the south and $42^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ from the rear (west).
Foundation: The existing house features a pier and beam foundation with a finished floor height of 2'-1". One $8^{\prime \prime}$ foundation block will be added to raise the finished floor to $2^{\prime}-9$ ", and $3^{\prime \prime}$ of fill will be added to raise final grade for $2^{\prime}-6$ " finished floor height. The addition will feature a matching pier and beam foundation with a slab on grade for the garage.
Windows/Doors: The existing house features wood double hung $1 / 1$ windows and a non-original wood front door, all of which will be retained. The addition will feature wood double hung $1 / 1$ windows, wood and glass exterior doors and an overhead garage door.

Exterior Materials: The existing residence features 117 wood siding to be retained. The addition will feature cementitious horizontal lap siding with a 4" reveal. An existing non-original concrete porch deck will be replaced with wood decking and a wood balustrade will be installed. Existing wood columns will be retained and reinstalled.
Roof: The existing roof features a half hip terminating in a rear-facing gable with a $7 / 12$ pitch clad in composition shingles. A projecting gable covers the front wall and a partial hip covers the porch. The addition will feature a cross hip with a $7 / 12$ pitch clad in composition shingles.
Front Elevation: The existing structure features a projecting front wall with two windows under a gable with one
(East) window. The southern portion of the wall is inset under the porch roof and features one window and one door with a transom. The porch extends $4^{\prime}-10^{\prime \prime}$ south of the main body of the house and features non-original turned columns, a non-original concrete floor and concrete steps. A portion of the porch extending to the south has been screened in. The screening will be removed and the concrete floor will be replaced with wood decking. No other changes will be made to the original house. The addition will extend 17 '-6" south of the main body of the house and feature one window and one overhead garage door under a partial shed roof. The second floor will feature five windows.

Side Elevation: The existing structure features three windows to be retained. An attached enclosed rear porch
(North) under a shed roof features one window and will be removed. The addition will begin at the rear wall and extend 36 ' back and feature three windows and a screened rear porch on the first floor and four windows on the second floor.
Side Elevation: The existing structure features three windows to be retained. An attached enclosed rear porch (South) under a shed roof features one window and will be removed. The addition will begin at the rear wall, separated by a piece of vertical wood trim, and extend 36 ' back and feature five windows on the second floor and one door on the first floor. The central portion of the second floor will be inset $14^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ from the east and $7^{\prime}-6$ " from the west. A shed roof will extend over the first floor toward the street.
Rear Elevation: Elevation not visible from right of way. See elevation drawings for details.
(West)

Transcription of Item B. 21 - 409 Harvard Street - HAHC September 25, 2014
(Unofficial transcript, prepared by Planning staff from audio of meeting for informational purposes)

Staff - The applicant requests approval to construct a two story addition and attached garage at the rear wall of a one story contributing house. The house will also be raised from 2' 1" to 2' 9" with 3 to 5 inches of fill to address drainage concerns. The existing non original concrete porch will be replaced with wood decking. The addition will be inset 1' 8 " on the north side and extend in line on the south side 7' 11" and expand out. The addition features a $22^{\prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$ eave height and a $30^{\prime} 11^{\prime \prime}$ ridge height. Staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay. We don't have any speakers signed up for this item. Do we have any questions for staff? It looks like we're back to some drainage issues now that our drought is over. Could staff restate their recommendation?

Staff - Staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness.
Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay do I hear a motion to approve per staff recommendation?
Commissioner Anna Mod - l'll comment: My concern with this one is, again, the scale. It seems oversized for this little house.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Do I hear any motions?
Commissioner Rob Hellyer - l'll move that we accept staff's recommendation to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay, Commissioner Hellyer has motioned to approve. Do I have a second? Okay, Commissioner Archer seconds. All of those in favor please raise your hands. Three in favor. Any opposed? Four. So that motion fails. So do we need an associate motion to deny the Certificate of appropriateness? Commissioner Blacklock-Sloan moves that we deny a Certificate of Appropriateness. Per which criterion? Because they may appeal this item, and they have received a staff recommendation of approval.

Commissioner Blacklock-Sloan - I think it's two. Whatever criteria it is. It's too large.
Chairman Maverick Welsh - For scale?
Commissioner Blacklock-Sloan - Scale.
Commissioner Anna Mod - So that's [criterion] four.
Chairman Maverick Welsh - Four, I believe. We have a motion on the table to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness. Commissioner Stava seconds. All of those in favor: four. Any opposed? Three opposed. Okay that item has been denied a Certificate of Appropriateness per criterion four. (90:20)

| From: | Tina Han [tinahan97@yahoo.com](mailto:tinahan97@yahoo.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, October 05, 2014 9:29 PM |
| To: | PD - Historic Preservation; Harris-Finch, Delaney - PD |
| Cc: | Mark Kuehler |
| Subject: | Appeal to Planning Commission for HAHC ruling on COA for 409 Harvard |

My name is Tina Han and my husband and I are the owners of 409 Harvard located in the Houston Heights Historic District. Our project for a renovation and addition to 409 Harvard was denied certificate of appropriateness by a $4-3$ vote from the HAHC at the September 25, 2014 meeting (Item B.21). I am submitting my written notice of appeal to this decision by the HAHC per 33-253 of the Code of Ordinances on the grounds of inadequate reasoning by the HAHC for violation of criteria \#4 in the face of a recommendation for approval for this application by the city staff of the Planning and Development Department.

Criterion \#4 states: The proposed activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities or character of the building, structure, object or site and its environment.
The following additional information in regards to Criterion \#4 is from the Historic Preservation Manual, City of Houston Planning and Development Department:
"Often, one distinguishing element can define the historic character of a building. A turret on a Victorian, the four-over-one windows on an American Foursquare, the bay window on a Queen Anne, or the porch on a Bungalow are all distinguishing characteristics that may leave the structure historically unrecognizable if removed. Every effort should be made to retain and preserve character-defining elements. For example, new windows, whether replacements or additions, should maintain the width and height proportion of the originals. Original porch structures should be maintained. The original roof pitch and shape should remain intact. In order to authorize a Certificate of Appropriateness the HAHC must find that the alteration, rehabilitation, restoration or addition preserves the distinguishing qualities that inform the character of the building, structure, object or site."

Distinguishing qualities of the contributing structure at 409 Harvard include many of the typical details and elements of a one story Queen Anne style house. The spindlework porch columns on the wrap around front porch, the low pitched roof of the porch contrasting with the steeper pitch of the main house, the front facing gable with the small gable vent all place this structure in its time and are all being preserved in the proposed renovation and addition project as stated by criteria \#4. A concrete floor for the front porch was built at some time in the past but is not original to the house and the look and feel of this material is not a distinguishing quality of a Queen Anne style house. This project will include restoring it to a more original look with painted wood porch decking. A low painted spindle porch rail will be added to the front porch in keeping with the character of a Queen Anne house. Original porch columns were removed during the construction of the concrete porch and were re-attached using visible steel angles. The proposed project will include reinstalling the columns properly, as they would have been when the house was new. The original wood teardrop siding is in place and will be maintained as part of the project. The current windows, although not original, are proportionally appropriate to the Queen Anne style, and are to be retained. The current front door is not original, but was designed by the previous owner to be in the appropriate Queen Anne style, and is to be retained in this project.

The current distinguishing environment of the lot at 409 Harvard will also be preserved as stated in Criteria \#4. A large and old pecan tree resides in the backyard. This tree will not be destroyed and the addition is intentionally designed to ensure the tree in its environment would not be impacted. Thus, the distance that the proposed addition of the house extends towards the back of the lot goes only as far as the drip line of the tree
allows.
The view from the street will show the original house virtually untouched other than an appropriately sized twostory addition at the very back of the house and the restoration aspects to the front porch to restore the distinguishing wrap-around porch of the house to its original look and feel. The front facade of the original house thus will actually be improved to better reflect the original distinguishing characters and qualities of the house. The two-story addition at the rear of the house maintains the pitch of the original house so as to remain consistent with the character of a Queen Anne. The view from the street will also show the original pecan tree continuing to offer shade and overlooking the original house and its addition.

I would like to reiterate that the city staff was involved at the very inception of design of this project. Each recommendation by the staff was met by the applicant throughout the design stage. Over 63 hours of our architect's time and $\$ 7700$ of our money was spent in additional architectural fees for all the time spent on just redesign recommendations that the staff provided. The staff recommended approval and 3 of the HAHC members voted for approval for COA. However, 4 HAHC members voted for denial of COA, thus this application was denied, citing violation of criteria \#4. I am asking that you consider our appeal for COA, consider the staff's recommendation, and consider the reasoning given above as to how we do in fact satisfy criteria \#4 with this proposed project.

Thank you for your time, Tina Han

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## ALTERATIONS, REHABILITATIONS, RESTORATIONS AND ADDITIONS

Sec. 33-241 (a): HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for the alteration, rehabilitation, restoration or addition of an exterior feature of (i) any landmark or protected landmark, (ii) any building, structure or object that is contributing to an historic district, or (iii) any building, structure or object that is part of an archaeological site, upon finding that the application satisfies the following eriteria as applicable:


> S-satisfies D-does not satisfy NA - not applicable
(1) The proposed activity must retain and preserve the historical character of the property;
(2) The proposed activity must contribute to the continued availability of the property for a contemporary use;
(3) The proposed activity must recognize the building, structure, object or site as a product of its own time and avoid alterations that seek to create an earlier or later appearance;
(4) The proposed activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities or character of the building, structure, object or site and its environment;
(5) The proposed activity must maintain or replicate distinctive stylistic exterior features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize the building, structure, object or site;
(6) New materials to be used for any exterior feature excluding what is visible from public alleys must be visually compatible with, but not necessarily the same as, the materials being replaced in form, design, texture, dimension and scale;
(7) The proposed replacement of missing exterior features, if any, should be based on an accurate duplication of features, substantiated by available historical, physical or pictorial evidence, where that evidence is available, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures;
(8) Proposed additions or alterations must be done in a manner that, if removed in the future, would leave unimpaired the essential form and integrity of the building, structure, object or site;
(9) The proposed design for any exterior alterations or addition must not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material and must be compatible with the size, scale, material and character of the property and the area in which it is located;
(10) The setback of any proposed construction or alteration must be compatible with existing setbacks along the blockface and facing blockface(s);
(11) The proposed activity will comply with any applicable deed restrictions.

## ALL II CRITERIA MARKED SATISFIES

 BY STAFF
## Ways the proposed addition to 409 Harvard satisfies criteria \#4

Criterion \#4: The proposed activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities or character of the building, structure, object or site and its environment.

1. Spindlework porch columns will be preserved, just attached properly.
2. Wrap-around front concrete porch will be restored to wood decking and the addition of wooden rails.
3. Low pitched roof of porch contrasts with steep pitch of main house will be preserved.
4. Front facing gable with the small gable vent will be preserved.
5. Original wood teardrop siding remains preserved.
6. Current windows, although not original, maintain the appropriate proportions and will be preserved.
7. Current front door, although not original, is in the Queen Anne style and will be preserved.
8. Old pecan tree in the backyard will be preserved.
9. The addition starts at the rear of the house, leaving the original house virtually untouched other than where the addition attaches and the improvements to the front porch.

# Architectural Time and Monies Spent on COA for 409 Harvard <br> Morningside Architects LLP 

## Standard fee for Schematic Design: \$3000 (29.35 hours)

# Additional time spent on COA changes: \$7660 (63.8 hours) 

Grand total: \$10,660 (93.15 hours)
All to try and obtain a COA.
We haven't even started construction
drawings yet!

## Morningside Architects

Invoice 9/2/2014

Tina Han and Mark Kuehler
121 East 4th Street
Houston, TX 77007


Terms: Net 30 Days
Morningside Architects LLP 4229A Bellaire Blvd.
Houston TX 77025
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Morningside Architects

Invoice 10/1/2014

Tina Han and Mark Kuehler
121 East 4th Street
Houston, TX 77007


[^8]October 1, 2014
Architectural Services Detail / Morningside Architects Period September 1-30, 2014
Han Kuehler Residence 409 Harvard
Houston, TX 77007

| September | Task | Gail Schorre AIA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SD | COA |  |
| 1 | COA application |  | 1.00 |  |
| 2 | emails, finalize dwgs for COA |  | 2.00 |  |
| 3 | get COA application in |  | 1.75 |  |
| 4 | send pdf prints to lucas, emails from city, response, sketches, phone calls |  | 2.50 |  |
| 5 | COA, work to comply, email, phone calls \& model |  | 3.00 |  |
| 6 | send dwg, call, model |  | 1.00 |  |
| 8 | email door \& revs to COA dwgs, email \& coa pdf sent |  | 3.00 |  |
| 9 | emails, s.f. revision |  | 2.00 |  |
| 10 | email, email to city, plus 2 more city emails |  | 1.00 |  |
| 11 | emails |  | 1.50 |  |
| 12 | revisions, email and further dims, email, draw |  | 1.00 |  |
| 12 | revise garage |  | 0.00 |  |
| 13 | fix garage, send out pdfs |  | 0.00 |  |
| 15 | email, update model \& plan, email |  | 1.50 |  |
| 16 | update drawings for coa, lower clg |  | 0.75 |  |
| 25 | call from Tina after the HAHC meeting |  | 0.75 |  |
| 26 | talk to John Gardosik, email response, email re phone call |  | 2.50 |  |
| 30 | talk to tina by phone, research code's appeal wording |  | 2.00 |  |
|  | Total | 0.00 | 27.25 |  |

Conversation by HAHC after Staff presents 409 Harvard's COA

After over 63 hours and $\$ 7660$ spent on redesigning our project per staff's recommendation, this was the extent of discussion and feedback for why our COA was denied.

Staff: "Staff recommends approval for Certificate of Appropriateness."
Chair: "Do I hear a motion to approve per staff's recommendation?"
Commissioner A: "My concern with this one, again, is scale. It seems oversized for this little house." (shrugs shoulders and raises eyebrows)
[NO COMMENT BY STAFF IN RESPONSE]
Chair: "Do I hear a motion?"
Commissioner B: "I move to accept staff's recommendation for approval."
Chair: "Do I hear a second from anyone? Anyone?
Everybody tired? We're moving through the agenda though.
C'mon. Motion? Second?"
Commissioner C: "Second."
[VOTE OCCURS. 3 FOR, 4 AGAINST. CHAIR PROMPTS FOR MOTION TO DENY.]
Chair: "Commissioner D moves to deny COA. Per which criterion because they may appeal since its got staff recommendation for approval."
Commissioner D: "Whatever criteria is for it's too large." Chair: "So for scale."
Commissioner A: "So it's 4."
[CHAIR ASKS AROUND, CONFIRMS IT'S 4. VOTING OCCURS, DENIED 4-3.]
Chair: "Denied COA per Criterion 4."

Scale of additions/remodels done within a 1 block radius of 409 Harvard (ALL IN HISTORIC DISTRICT)

| Address | Original <br> house (sq ft) | Total livable <br> space (sq ft) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 302 E. 5th <br> construction) | 1394 | 2753 |
| 409 Harvard | 1149 | 2859 |
| 446 Arlington (under <br> construction) | 1530 | 3233 |
| 525 Cortlandt (under <br> construction) | 1370 | 3500 |
| 523 Harvard (finished <br> construction 1 month <br> ago) | 1196 | 3722 |

Staff note: 446 Arlington and 523 Harvard were not approved by HAHC.

## Sizes of 2-story houses within a 1 block radius of 409 Harvard

| Address | Total livable <br> space (sq ft) | Address | Total livable <br> space (sq ft) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 420 Harvard | 3538 | 515 Cortlandt | 3220 |
| 440 Harvard | 3420 | 511 Cortlandt | 3312 |
| 444 Harvard | 3576 | 525 Cortlandt | 3500 |
| 448 Harvard | 2871 | 509 Cortlandt | 2293 |
| 515 Harvard | 4528 | 433 Cortlandt | 3775 |
| 541 Harvard | 4470 | 436 Cortlandt | 2125 |
| 505 Harvard | 3344 | 409 Cortlandt | 3016 |
| 536 Harvard | 2808 | 401 Cortlandt | 6106 |
| 528 Harvard | 2660 | 402 Heights | 2895 |
| 512 Harvard | 2541 | 404 Heights | 2971 |
| 532 Harvard | 2456 | 420 Heights | 4335 |
| 530 Harvard | 2336 | 424 Heights | 2146 |
| 523 Harvard | 3722 | 430 Heights | 3950 |
| 531 Harvard | 1872 | 438 Heights | 4958 |
| 547 Cortlandt | 3159 | 440 Heights | 2581 |
| 537 Cortlandt | 4181 | 442 Heights | 4046 |
| 532 Cortlandt | 4260 | 506 Heights | 2594 |
| 533 Cortlandt | 2994 | 516 Heights | 3945 |
| 530 Cortlandt | 3425 | 520 Heights | 2841 |
| 529 Cortlandt | 3490 |  |  |

## AVERAGE SQ FT OF 2-STORY HOME: 3340 sq ft. PROPOSED SQ FT OF 409 HARVARD: 2859 sq ft.

Per the Historic Preservation Manual put out by the Planning and Development Department $\rightarrow$ Houston Heights West, East, and South $\rightarrow$ Architectural Styles:
"Houses on Heights Boulevard and the parallel streets on either side, Yale and Harvard, tended to be larger than houses on the other residential streets in Houston Heights."

Staff Note: This addition was not approved by HAHC.
523 Harvard




525 Cortlandt



## 446 ARLINGTON STREET HOUSTON, TX 77007

THIS IS A CLASSIC BUNGALOW RENOVATION AND ADDITION BRINGS YESTERYEAR'S (1920) CHARM TO MEET TODAY'S NEEDS. FEATURING A FLOWING FLOORPLAN DESIGNED FOR CLASSIC ENTERTAINING,AND A MASTER SUITE THAT PROVIDES THE LUXURY YOU EXPECT, THIS HOME WILL EXCEED YOUR EXPECTATIONS. ENJOY A RARE OPPORTUNITY TO LIVE ON A BEAUTIFUL CORNER LOT IN THE HISTORIC HEIGHTS. WITH UPDATED
PLUMBING, ELECTRICAL AND HVAC SYSTEMS, THIS REN OVATION IS EXPECTED TO BE COMPLETED IN SEPTEMBER 2014.



Mr. Real Estate

## ERWIN NICHOLAS

DIRECT: 832.875.4309
INFO@MRREALESTATEHOUSTON.COM WWW.MRREALESTATEHOUSTON.COM

houston Planning Commission
Planning \& Development Department

Applicant: William C Riley, Bicycle Bungalows, for RR Development Holdings, owner Property Address: 544 Harvard Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District South

## Project Summary:

The project at 544 Harvard Street is a proposal to construct a two-story rear addition and attached garage to a contributing one-story house in the Houston Heights Historic District South. At their September 2014 meeting, the Houston Archaeological and Historical Commission (HAHC) reviewed the applicant's request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and found that the addition was too large for the historic house, and therefore did not meet Criterion 4 for approval found in Chapter 33 Section 33-241(a). The HAHC voted $4-3$ to deny the COA.

In accordance with Chapter 33 Section 33-253, the applicant is appealing this decision to Planning Commission.

## Charge to the Planning Commission:

To be approved, an addition must meet 11 criteria for approval found in Chapter 33 Section 33-241(a). The HAHC denied the request because it found the project did not meet Criterion 4.

The applicant has the burden of proof to demonstrate that the project meets the applicable criteria for approval. Unless the Planning Commission finds that the project meets the criteria, it must uphold the decision of the HAHC.

If the Planning Commission upholds the HAHC decision, the applicant may return to HAHC with a new or revised application.

## Project Description:

The applicant submitted an application on September 3, 2014, for approval to construct a 2,144 square foot twostory rear addition and attached garage to a contributing one-story 1,700 square foot house constructed circa 1930. The addition will have a ridge height of $28^{\prime}-8$ " and an eave height of $22^{\prime}-88^{\prime \prime}$. Original wood siding will be restored and exposed and new windows will be installed in original window openings. No original windows remain. The original brick chimney and porch columns will be retained.

See Attachment A, the September 2014 HAHC Action Report, for complete project details.

## Basis for the Houston Archaeological and Historic Commission's decision:

- Within city historic districts, exterior changes visible from the right-of-way must be approved by HAHC.
- Alterations and additions to Contributing Structures are reviewed according to 11 criteria found in Chapter 33-241(a) of the Code of Ordinances. The criteria are included on pages 3-4 of this staff report. In order to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, the HAHC must find that all eleven criteria are met.
- In following the criteria, the HAHC is required by ordinance to use only the 11 criteria in evaluating proposed additions to contributing structures. In applying these criteria, the HAHC is to look at existing contributing buildings within the same historic district for compatibility, as the historic structures define the neighborhood character that is to be preserved. The HAHC is not to consider new construction as evidence of what is appropriate for additions to historic structures.
- Additions should be compatible with the size, scale, material and character of the historic house and neighborhood. The impact of the addition on the original structure should be minimized both physically and

[^9]Houston Planning Commission
Planning \& Development Department

Applicant: William C Riley, Bicycle Bungalows, for RR Development Holdings, owner Property Address: 544 Harvard Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District South
visually as much as possible. Where visible from the right-of-way, the addition should be designed to be visually subordinate to the original structure. To achieve this, additions should be designed with simple massing, simple roof shapes, and a clean and minimal connection to the existing structure. A clear delineation should be made between new and old so that the form the original structure is still obvious. The original exterior shape, materials and original physical presence from the public right-of-way should be retained as much as possible.

- A two-story addition to a one-story house may be appropriate but should be hidden from view as much as possible. Second story additions should be set back as far as possible from the front facade of the house and should not be taller than the typical height of structures within the historic district.
- The HAHC determined that the scale of the addition was too large for the historic house and that the twostory portion should be pushed back further from the front. They voted $4-3$ to deny the COA based on failure to satisfy Criterion 4.

[^10]Houston Planning Commission
Planning \＆Development Department

Applicant：William C Riley，Bicycle Bungalows，for RR Development Holdings，owner Property Address： 544 Harvard Street
Historic District：Houston Heights Historic District South

## Approval Criteria：Exterior Alteration，Rehabilitation，Restoration and Additions

Sec．33－241（a）：HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for the alteration，rehabilitation，restoration or addition of an exterior feature of（i）any landmark or protected landmark，（ii）any building，structure or object that is contributing to an historic district，or（iii）any building，structure or object that is part of an archaeological site，upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria，as applicable：
（1）The proposed activity must retain and preserve the historical character of the property；（2）The proposed activity must contribute to the continued availability of the property for a contemporary use；3）The proposed activity must recognize the building，structure，object or site as a product of its own time and avoid alterations that seek to create an earlier or later appearance；
（4）The proposed activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities or character of the building，structure，object or site and its environment；

HAHC determined that the addition was too large and out of scale with the historic house．

（5）The proposed activity must maintain or replicate distinctive stylistic exterior features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize the building，structure，object or site；
（6）New materials to be used for any exterior feature excluding what is visible from public alleys must be visually compatible with，but not necessarily the same as，the materials being replaced in form， design，texture，dimension and scale；
（7）The proposed replacement of missing exterior features，if any，should be based on an accurate duplication of features，substantiated by available historical，physical or pictorial evidence，where that evidence is available，rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures；
（8）Proposed additions or alterations must be done in a manner that，if removed in the future，would leave unimpaired the essential form and integrity of the building，structure，object or site；

（9）The proposed design for any exterior alterations or addition must not destroy significant historical， architectural or cultural material and must be compatible with the size，scale，material and character of the property and the area in which it is located；

（10）The setback of any proposed construction or alteration must be compatible with existing setbacks along the blockface and facing blockface（s）；
（11）The proposed activity will comply with any applicable deed restrictions．

[^11]Applicant: William C Riley, Bicycle Bungalows, for RR Development Holdings, owner Property Address: 544 Harvard Street
Historic District: Houston Heights Historic District South

## Applicant's Grounds for Appeal:

See Attachment C for the applicant's grounds for appeal and supplemental appeal documents.

## Basis for Applicant's Appeal:

## Sec. 33-253. Appeal.

a) An applicant aggrieved by a decision of the HAHC with respect to any certificate of appropriateness may appeal to the planning commission by filing a written notice of appeal, stating the grounds for the appeal, with the director within ten days following the date the HAHC renders its decision.
b) The planning commission shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which required notice can be given. The commission shall consider the application, the findings of the HAHC and any evidence presented at the meeting at which the appeal is considered. The planning commission shall reverse or affirm the decision of the HAHC based upon the criteria applicable to the certificate of appropriateness. The decision of the commission shall be final. If the commission does not make a decision on the appeal within 30 days following the commission's hearing on the appeal, the decision of the HAHC with respect to the application for the certificate of appropriateness shall be deemed affirmed.
c) An applicant aggrieved by the decision of the planning commission on an appeal from a decision of the HAHC may appeal to the city council. The city council shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which the required notice can be given. The city council shall consider the appeal under the provisions of Rule 12 of Section 2-2 of this code. At the conclusion of the city council's review of the matter, the city council shall reverse or affirm the decision of the planning commission. The decision of the city council shall be final and exhaust the applicant's administrative remedies.
d) The director shall provide the applicant with notice of the time and place of the meeting at which the appeal will be considered by mail no less than ten days before the date of the meeting.

[^12]
## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Application Date: September 3, 2014
Applicant: William C. Riley, Bicycle Bungalows for RR Development Holdings, owner
Property: 544 Harvard Street, lot 23, block 289, Houston Heights Subdivision. The property includes a historic 1,707 square foot, one-story wood frame single-family residence situated on a 6,600 square foot (50' x 132') interior lot.

Significance: Contributing bungalow residence, constructed circa 1930, located in the Houston Heights Historic District South. The residence has been converted into office space which involved removing original windows, enclosing the porch and covering original siding.

Proposal: Alteration - Construct a 2,144 square foot two-story rear addition clad in cementitious siding to a contributing 1,700 square foot one-story contributing residence. The addition will have a ridge height of $28^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ and an eave height of $22^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$. Original wood siding will be restored and exposed and new windows will be installed in original window openings. No original windows remain. The original brick chimney and porch columns will be retained.
See enclosed application materials and detailed project description on p. 6-17 for further details.
Public Comment: No public comment received.
Civic Association: No comment received.
Recommendation: Approval
HAHC Action: Denied - does not satisfy criteria 1, 4 and 9

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## ALTERATIONS, REHABILITATIONS, RESTORATIONS AND ADDITIONS

Sec. 33-241(a): HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for the alteration, rehabilitation, restoration or addition of an exterior feature of (i) any landmark or protected landmark, (ii) any building, structure or object that is contributing to an historic district, or (iii) any building, structure or object that is part of an archaeological site, upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria, as applicable:

| NA |  | S - satisfies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (1) | Th |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (2) | The proposed activity must contribute to the continued availability of the property for a contemporary use; |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (3) | The proposed activity must recognize the building, structure, object or site as a product of its own time and avoid alterations that seek to create an earlier or later appearance; |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (4) | The proposed activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities or character of the building, structure, object or site and its environment; |
| ® $\square \square$ | (5) | The proposed activity must maintain or replicate distinctive stylistic exterior features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize the building, structure, object or site; |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (6) | New materials to be used for any exterior feature excluding what is visible from public alleys must be visually compatible with, but not necessarily the same as, the materials being replaced in form, design, texture, dimension and scale; |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (7) | The proposed replacement of missing exterior features, if any, should be based on an accurate duplication of features, substantiated by available historical, physical or pictorial evidence, where that evidence is available, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures; |
| ヌ | (8) | Proposed additions or alterations must be done in a manner that, if removed in the future, would leave unimpaired the essential form and integrity of the building, structure, object or site; |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (9) | The proposed design for any exterior alterations or addition must not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material and must be compatible with the size, scale, material and character of the property and the area in which it is located; |
| $\boxtimes \square \square$ | (10) | The setback of any proposed construction or alteration must be compatible with existing setbacks along the blockface and facing blockface(s); |
| 区 |  |  |
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## NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES



546 Harvard Street - Vacant - N/A (neighbor)


3601 White Oak - Contributing - 1920 (across street)


539 Harvard Street - Contributing - 1920 (across street)


540 Harvard Street - Contributing - 1915 (neighbor)


547 Harvard Street - Demolished 2014 - 1920 (across street)


537 Harvard Street - Contributing - 1920 (across street)
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WEST ELEVATION - FRONT FACING HARVARD STREET
EXISTING
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## NORTH SIDE ELEVATION

## EXISTING
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## SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION

EXISTING
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## EAST (REAR) ELEVATION

## EXISTING



Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM B. 22
September 25, 2014
HPO File No. 140922


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM B. 22
September 25, 2014
HPO File No. 140922


Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM B. 22
September 25, 2014
HPO File No. 140922


PROPOSED
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EXISTING CONDITION PHOTOS
PORCH COLUMNS


CHIMNEY AND WINDOW OPENINGS
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EXISTING CONDITION PHOTOS
NORTH WALL


Non-Original Window
Original Siding
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## SOUTH WALL WINDOW OPENINGS



## PROJECT DETAILS

Shape/Mass: The existing residence measures $32^{\prime}$ in width by $48^{\prime}$ in depth with a with a non-original rear addition measuring $12^{\prime}-4$ " wide by $5^{\prime}-8$ " deep to be removed. It features a ridge height of $19^{\prime}-8$ " and an eave height of $12^{\prime}$. The addition will measure $40^{\prime}$ wide by $58^{\prime}-4$ " deep with an eave height of $22^{\prime}-8$ " and a ridge height of $28^{\prime}-88^{\prime \prime}$. The addition will be inset $2^{\prime}$ on the south side and $1^{\prime}$ on the north side, with the second story measuring $24^{\prime}$ in width. A one story portion will begin $11^{\prime}$ ' 6 " back from the rear wall and extend 16 ' south of the two story portion and feature front and rear porches.
Setbacks: The existing structure features a west setback from Harvard Street of 14'-8", a north side setback of $13^{\prime}-10^{\prime \prime}$ and a south side setback of $1^{\prime}-7{ }^{\prime \prime}$. The addition will feature a north setback of $5^{\prime}$, a south setback of 5 ' and a rear (east) setback of $10^{\prime}$.

Foundation: The existing structure features a pier and beam foundation with a 2'-8" finished floor. The addition will feature a pier and beam foundation and the attached garage will feature a slab on grade.
Windows/Doors: The existing house features fixed wood windows. No original windows or doors remain. The original window opening will be exposed and new wood double hung $1 / 1$ windows will be installed. The addition will feature wood double hung $1 / 1$ windows and fixed wood windows.
Exterior Materials: The existing residence features wood siding with a modified 105 profile covered with plywood. The plywood will be removed and the wood siding will be retained. Two original front porch tapered columns on brick piers are currently covered in plywood. They will be exposed and retained. The addition will feature horizontal lap cementitious siding with a 5 " reveal.
Roof: The existing structure features a front gable roof with a $5 / 12$ pitch clad in composition shingles. A secondary gable projects slightly over the inset front porch. The addition will feature a hipped roof over the two story portion and a hip over a one story side addition, both with a $5 / 12$ pitch and clad in composition shingles.
Front Elevation: The existing elevation features a gable with a half size gable over an enclosed inset porch on the
(West) north side. The elevation is clad in non-original diagonal wood siding and plywood and features one non-original fixed window. All diagonal siding will be removed and the original porch and siding will be re-exposed. Two tapered porch columns on brick piers will be exposed and retained. Two new wood windows and two gable attic vents will be installed in original openings. The second floor of the addition will feature a pair of windows. A one story portion of the addition will extend 10 ' to the north and feature a porch with a square wood column, wood railings and a pair of windows.

Side Elevation: The existing elevation features non-original diagonal siding and an attached rear addition with a
(North) shed roof, both of which will be removed. Original window openings and siding will be re-exposed and six windows will be installed. The addition will begin at the rear wall extend 58 '-4" back and feature three windows on the first floor and two paired sets of two windows on the second floor.

Side Elevation: The existing elevation features an enclosed front porch, an original brick chimney, one non-
(South) original window, one non-original door with steps and an attached rear addition with a shed roof. The porch will be reopened with an entry door installed in the far wall and the original brick piers and tapered columns re-exposed. The diagonal siding will be removed to re-expose the original siding and the chimney will be retained. The non-original window, door, steps and rear addition will be removed. Original window openings will be re-exposed and six windows will be installed. The addition will begin at the rear wall extend $58^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ back and feature four windows on the first floor and five on the second floor. A one story portion of the addition will start 11'-6" back from the original rear wall and feature a front and rear porch.
Rear Elevation: Elevation not visible from right of way. See elevation drawings for details.
(East)

## Transcription of Item B. 22 - 544 Harvard Street - HAHC September 25, 2014 <br> (Unofficial transcript, prepared by Planning staff from audio of meeting for informational purposes)

Staff - The applicant requests approval to construct a two story addition and attached garage at the rear wall of a contributing one story house. Existing non-original siding will be removed to reveal the original wood siding, porch columns, and window openings. No original windows remain. The addition will feature a $28^{\prime} 8^{\prime \prime}$ ridge height and a $22^{\prime} 8^{\prime \prime}$ eave height. Staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness. And I believe the applicant is present if the Commission has any questions.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay Bill Riley. We have Mr. Bill Riley. Thank you.
Bill Riley: I'm just here in case there are any questions.
Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay. Do we have any discussion?
Commissioner Anna Mod - Again, I have concern about the scale of the addition. If the two story portion could be pushed back farther, l'd be happier to approve it. Also, my guess is that this was classified as Potentially Contributing?

```
Staff - Yes.
```

Commissioner Anna Mod - And then it rolled over to Contributing? I have a very hard time calling this a contributing building. I am really thrilled that the owner is restoring this house. It think it's really fantastic.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Looking at the inventory photo, I don't know why anybody would do that to a house.

Commissioner Anna Mod - I think with some reduction in scale of the addition, I've said this already many times in this meeting, I would be happier to approve it.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay do we have any more discussion or questions for staff?
Commissioner Rob Hellyer - Just a comment. We're already completely off the existing house, the addition, our sense of scale continually shrinks. We've regularly approve much larger additions than this. I think we are sending the wrong message, without something... and maybe that's what the committee is going to have to do, put something in the ordinance that specifically says and defines what that is. Not be subject to the Commission just shrinking the size of additions, we'll be down to closets and bathrooms and that will be it.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - Okay, any other discussion? Commissioner Archer?
Commissioner Edie Archer - I was just going to move to go along with staff's recommendation and approve the Certificate.

Chairman Maverick Welsh - So Commissioner Archer has motioned that we approve the Certificate of Appropriateness per staff recommendation. Do I have a second? Commissioner Hellyer seconds. All of those in favor please raise your hands. That's three. Any opposed? Four opposed. So that motion has failed. Do we have a secondary motion to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for this item?

Commissioner Debora Blacklock-Sloan - So moved.
Chairman Maverick Welsh - Commissioner Blacklock-Sloan moves that we deny the Certificate of Appropriateness. I assume it is the same criteria, criterion 4, in the case of an appeal. Commissioner Mod seconds that. All of those in favor of a denial please raise your hands. Four. So that item has been denied a Certificate of Appropriateness.

DuCroz, Diana - PD

| From: | Gardosik, John - PD |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, September 26, 2014 8:42 AM |
| To: | DuCroz, Diana - PD; Harris-Finch, Delaney - PD |
| Subject: | FW: 544 Harvard appeal |
| Follow Up Flag: | Follow up |
| Flag Status: | Completed |
|  |  |
| Categories: | PC APPEAL |

John Gardosik, City of Houston Planning \& Development Department
(713) 837-7944

From: Bicycle Bungalows [mailto: bill@bicyclebungalows.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2014 7:54 PM
To: Gardosik, J ohn - PD
Subject: 544 Harvard appeal

John,
I'd like to appeal the commission's decision to deny a COA for my project at 544 Harvard. As a backup plan, l'd also like to put the revisions for the project on the October meeting agenda. I'd be grateful for some guidance on how I'm supposed to reduce the scale of the addition. I understand that now the second floor addition needs to start further back than the back of the original house. Any ideas on how far back? Just a few years ago we were allowed to start the second floor and side additions at $50 \%$ back from the front of the existing house.

Thanks, Bill
REAR PROPERTY LINE
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Applicants: Michael and Laura Czapski, owners
Property Address: 528 Highland Street
Historic District: Woodland Heights Historic District

## Project Summary:

In February 2014, the applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness for a two-story rear addition to a one-story contributing house in Woodland Heights Historic District. The COA was granted after two previous HAHC denials, once the applicant made modifications to the design to gain approval.

After beginning construction, the applicant proceeded to deviate from the approved scope of work in multiple ways, including building elements of the project that had been removed from the scope of work in order to gain approval. In March, he was required to get a revised COA after removing historic materials from the house without approval. In late June, staff discovered additional deviations from the approved scope of work. The applicant requested HAHC to grant approval of his deviations from the approved COA in both August and September 2014, and was denied by HAHC both times, for not meeting Criteria 1, 4, 8, and 9 for approval. Staff has advised the applicant to remove the unapproved alterations and build according to his approved COA granted in February 2014, which is still valid.

In accordance with Chapter 33 Section 33-253, the applicant is appealing the decision of the HAHC to deny his request for a revised Certificate of Appropriateness.

## Charge to the Planning Commission:

To be approved, an addition must meet 11 criteria for approval found in Chapter 33 Section 33-241(a). The HAHC denied the request because it found the changes the applicant made during construction did not meet Criteria 1, 4, 8 or 9 .

The applicant has the burden of proof to demonstrate that the project meets the applicable criteria for approval. Unless the Planning Commission finds that the project meets the criteria, it must uphold the decision of the HAHC.

If the Planning Commission upholds the HAHC decision, the applicant may return to HAHC with a new or revised application. He also has the option to build according to his approved COA from February 2014, which is still active.

## Project Description:

The applicant applied in November 2013 and January 2014 for approval of a two-story addition to a one-story historic house. Both applications were denied after both HAHC and staff found the addition to be out of scale and too intrusive to the original structure, violating Criteria 1, 4, 8, and 9 of the approval criteria. In February 2014, the applicant modified the project in several ways, and was subsequently approved by HAHC. These changes included hipping the proposed front gable, dropping the overall ridge and eave heights, reducing the width of the addition, moving the addition further to the back, and eliminating an 11' long bump-out on the east elevation of the original house.

In March 2014, the applicant was red-tagged for removing historic material from the original house without approval. He was granted a COA in April 2014 for this unapproved work.

In July, staff discovered the following additional deviations from the approved scope of work:

- Roof pitch of the addition was increased from 6:12 to 8:12.
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Applicants: Michael and Laura Czapski, owners
Property Address: 528 Highland Street
Historic District: Woodland Heights Historic District

- Ridge height as constructed is $2^{\prime}$ taller than approved ( $32^{\prime}-6$ " rather than $30^{\prime}-5$ ").
- Second story addition encroaches an additional 18 " into the original structure.
- Construction of a bump-out approximately 3 ' wide by $11^{\prime}$ long on east elevation of original structure that resulted in the removal of an additional 11' of the original exterior wall and required a change to the approved roof shape.
- Removal of all original wood siding behind the bay window on the west elevation and replacement with cementitious siding.
- Removal of the front porch decking, railing, and ceiling beadboard.
- Installation of a window on the rear portion of the east elevation of the addition.

The applicant was red-tagged again on July 2. Staff met with the applicant to discuss the discrepancies between the approved COA and the work on site. Staff informed owner that only permitted work could continue -- all unpermitted activities were to stop unless and until a revised COA was approved. The applicant nonetheless continued to finish the unapproved alterations to the house to the point that virtually all work had been completed by August. He informed staff that he continued with the unapproved work, despite staff's earlier instructions to stop unpermitted activities, in order to weatherproof the house from the elements (the addition was sided, the roof was shingled, etc.)

In August 2014, the applicant requested that HAHC approve these alterations that exceeded the approved scope of work. The HAHC voted 4-3 to deny the request.

In September, the applicant reapplied for the same scope of work, except for the replacement of the west elevation siding and front porch elements, which he agreed to reconstruct appropriately with in-kind materials. The applicant also proposed a second option for the roof: to remove the top three feet of the current 8:12 roof and rebuild that portion at a 2:12 pitch in order to reduce the overall height by two feet. The HAHC voted $6-1$ to deny the revisions to the February 2014 approved scope of work.

See Attachment A, the September 2014 HAHC Action Report, for complete project details, including a detailed project timeline on p. 4.

## Basis for the Houston Archaeological and Historic Commission's decision:

- Within city historic districts, exterior changes visible from the right-of-way must be approved by HAHC.
- Alterations and additions to Contributing Structures are reviewed according to 11 criteria found in Chapter 33-241(a) of the Code of Ordinances. The criteria are included on pages 3-4 of this staff report. In order to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, the HAHC must find that all eleven criteria are met.
- In following the criteria, the HAHC is required by ordinance to use only the 11 criteria in evaluating proposed additions to contributing structures. In applying these criteria, the HAHC is to look at existing contributing buildings within the same historic district for compatibility, as the historic structures define the neighborhood character that is to be preserved. The HAHC is not to consider new construction as evidence of what is appropriate for additions to historic structures.
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- Additions should be compatible with the size, scale, material and character of the historic house and neighborhood. The impact of the addition on the original structure should be minimized both physically and visually as much as possible. Where visible from the right-of-way, the addition should be designed to be visually subordinate to the original structure. To achieve this, additions should be designed with simple massing, simple roof shapes, and a clean and minimal connection to the existing structure. A clear delineation should be made between new and old so that the form the original structure is still obvious. The original exterior shape, materials and original physical presence from the public right-of-way should be retained as much as possible.
- A two-story addition to a one-story house may be appropriate but should be hidden from view as much as possible. Second story additions should be set back as far as possible from the front facade of the house and should not be taller than the typical height of structures within the historic district.
- The HAHC determined that the scale of the addition was too large for the historic house and that the twostory portion should be pushed back further from the front. They voted $4-3$ to deny the COA based on failure to satisfy Criterion 4.


## Approval Criteria: Exterior Alteration, Rehabilitation, Restoration and Additions

Sec. 33-241(a): HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for the alteration, rehabilitation, restoration or addition of an exterior feature of (i) any landmark or protected landmark, (ii) any building, structure or object that is contributing to an historic district, or (iii) any building, structure or object that is part of an archaeological site, upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria, as applicable:

## $\square \square$ <br> (1) The proposed activity must retain and preserve the historical character of the property;

The 2'-1" increase in height, 18" extension onto the original structure, and the added bump-out on the east elevation negatively impact the historical character of the property. Initial denied proposals included a ridge height of 31'-8" and a bump-out on the east elevation. Working with the owner, staff was able to have the ridge height reduced to 30 '-5" in order to be more in scale with the district. However, the owner now requests approval for a ridge height of 32'-6", taller than previously denied versions. The owner also requests approval for the constructed east elevation bump-out even though this element was discouraged by Staff and denied multiple times by HAHC.
(2) The proposed activity must contribute to the continued availability of the property for a contemporary use;

(3) The proposed activity must recognize the building, structure, object or site as a product of its own time and avoid alterations that seek to create an earlier or later appearance;
(4) The proposed activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities or character of the building, structure, object or site and its environment;

Encroaching an additional 18" onto the existing structure and bumping-out a portion of the original wall do not preserve the distinguishing character of the structure. Previous denied version of this proposal had the addition encroaching $38 \%$ onto the rear of the structure and included an east
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side bump-out which would destroy original material. These proposals were denied for not preserving the distinguishing character of the building. The owner now requests approval for the east elevation bump-out as well as further encroachment onto the original structure, both of which were, in some capacity, previously denied by the HAHC.
(5) The proposed activity must maintain or replicate distinctive stylistic exterior features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize the building, structure, object or site;
(6) New materials to be used for any exterior feature excluding what is visible from public alleys must be visually compatible with, but not necessarily the same as, the materials being replaced in form, design, texture, dimension and scale;
(7) The proposed replacement of missing exterior features, if any, should be based on an accurate duplication of features, substantiated by available historical, physical or pictorial evidence, where that evidence is available, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures;
(8) Proposed additions or alterations must be done in a manner that, if removed in the future, would leave unimpaired the essential form and integrity of the building, structure, object or site;

The numerous unapproved incursions into the original structure, including the additional 18" on the second-story and the 3' x 11' bump-out on the first-story, negatively impacts the historic integrity of the house. These alterations further impair the essential form of the structure.
(9) The proposed design for any exterior alterations or addition must not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material and must be compatible with the size, scale, material and character of the property and the area in which it is located;
Further encroachment of the addition and the construction of the bump-out destroy a significant amount of historic material. The increased height and depth of the addition is not compatible or in scale with the property or the area in which it is located. The proposed secondary roof option (hipped gambrel), devised to reduce the overall height, is not a typical condition found within the Woodland Heights Historic District and is not compatible with the existing historic structure or district.

(10) The setback of any proposed construction or alteration must be compatible with existing setbacks along the blockface and facing blockface(s);
(11) The proposed activity will comply with any applicable deed restrictions.

## Applicant's Grounds for Appeal:

See Attachment C for the applicant's grounds for appeal.
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## Basis for Applicant's Appeal:

## Sec. 33-253. Appeal.

a) An applicant aggrieved by a decision of the HAHC with respect to any certificate of appropriateness may appeal to the planning commission by filing a written notice of appeal, stating the grounds for the appeal, with the director within ten days following the date the HAHC renders its decision.
b) The planning commission shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which required notice can be given. The commission shall consider the application, the findings of the HAHC and any evidence presented at the meeting at which the appeal is considered. The planning commission shall reverse or affirm the decision of the HAHC based upon the criteria applicable to the certificate of appropriateness. The decision of the commission shall be final. If the commission does not make a decision on the appeal within 30 days following the commission's hearing on the appeal, the decision of the HAHC with respect to the application for the certificate of appropriateness shall be deemed affirmed.
c) An applicant aggrieved by the decision of the planning commission on an appeal from a decision of the HAHC may appeal to the city council. The city council shall consider the appeal at its first regularly scheduled meeting for which the required notice can be given. The city council shall consider the appeal under the provisions of Rule 12 of Section 2-2 of this code. At the conclusion of the city council's review of the matter, the city council shall reverse or affirm the decision of the planning commission. The decision of the city council shall be final and exhaust the applicant's administrative remedies.
d) The director shall provide the applicant with notice of the time and place of the meeting at which the appeal will be considered by mail no less than ten days before the date of the meeting.
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## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Application Date: August 3, 2014

Applicant: Michael \& Laura Czapski, owners
Property: 528 Highland Street, Lot 8 \& Tract 7, Block 20, Woodland Heights Subdivision. The property includes a historic one-story residence situated on a 7,500 square foot ( $75^{\prime} \times 100^{\prime}$ ) corner lot.

Significance: Contributing Queen Anne residence with Colonial influence, constructed circa 1915, located in the Woodland Heights Historic District.

Proposal: Alteration - Request for HAHC approval of completed and partially completed alterations that have exceeded the scope of work approved in two previous COAs.
The applicant received a COA in February 2014 for a two-story rear addition to a one-story contributing house. In March, the applicant was red-tagged for removing all of the shiplap from the original house without approval. He was granted a COA in April 2014 for this unapproved work.
In July, staff discovered the following additional deviations from the approved scope of work:

- Roof pitch of the addition was increased from 6:12 to 8:12.
- Ridge height as constructed is $2^{\prime}$ taller than approved ( $32^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ rather than $30^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime}$ ).
- Second story addition encroaches an additional 18 " into the original structure.
- Construction of a bump-out approximately 3 ' wide by $11^{\prime}$ long on east elevation of original structure that resulted in the removal of an additional 11' of the original exterior wall and required a change to the approved roof shape.
- Removal of all original wood siding behind the bay window on the west elevation and replacement with cementitious siding.
- Removal of the front porch decking, railing, and ceiling beadboard.
- Installation of a window on the rear portion of the east elevation of the addition.

The applicant requested HAHC retroactive approval for the changes he made in the field. These revisions were denied by HAHC at their August 2014 meeting.
The applicant is again applying for approval for the same scope of work denied in August, except for the replacement of the west elevation siding and front porch elements, which he has agreed to reconstruct appropriately with in-kind materials.
In addition, he proposes a second option for the roof: to remove the top three feet of the current 8:12 roof and rebuild that portion at a 2:12 pitch in order to reduce the overall height by two feet.
See enclosed application materials and detailed project description on p. 4-29 for further details.
Public Comment: No public comment received.
Civic Association: No comment received.
Recommendation: Denial - does not satisfy criteria
HAHC Action: Denied - does not satisfy criteria 1, 4, 8, 9

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## ALTERATIONS, REHABILITATIONS, RESTORATIONS AND ADDITIONS

Sec. 33-241(a): HAHC shall issue a certificate of appropriateness for the alteration, rehabilitation, restoration or addition of an exterior feature of (i) any landmark or protected landmark, (ii) any building, structure or object that is contributing to an historic district, or (iii) any building, structure or object that is part of an archaeological site, upon finding that the application satisfies the following criteria, as applicable:

## S D NA <br> S-satisfies D-does not satisfy NA - not applicable


(1) The proposed activity must retain and preserve the historical character of the property;

The 2'-1" increase in height, 18" extension onto the original structure, and the added bumpout on the east elevation negatively impact the historical character of the property. Initial denied proposals included a ridge height of $31^{\prime}-8$ " and a bump-out on the east elevation. Working with the owner, staff was able to have the ridge height reduced to $30^{\prime}-5$ " in order to be more in scale with the district. However, the owner now requests approval for a ridge height of $32^{\prime}-6$ ", taller than previously denied versions. The owner also requests approval for the constructed east elevation bump-out even though this element was discouraged by Staff and denied multiple times by HAHC.
(2) The proposed activity must contribute to the continued availability of the property for a contemporary use;
(3) The proposed activity must recognize the building, structure, object or site as a product of its own time and avoid alterations that seek to create an earlier or later appearance;
(4) The proposed activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities or character of the building, structure, object or site and its environment;

Encroaching an additional 18" onto the existing structure and bumping-out a portion of the original wall do not preserve the distinguishing character of the structure. Previous denied version of this proposal had the addition encroaching $38 \%$ onto the rear of the structure and included an east side bump-out which would destroy original material. These proposals were denied for not preserving the distinguishing character of the building. The owner now requests approval for the east elevation bump-out as well as further encroachment onto the original structure, both of which were, in some capacity, previously denied by the HAHC.

(5) The proposed activity must maintain or replicate distinctive stylistic exterior features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize the building, structure, object or site;
(6) New materials to be used for any exterior feature excluding what is visible from public alleys must be visually compatible with, but not necessarily the same as, the materials being replaced in form, design, texture, dimension and scale;
(7) The proposed replacement of missing exterior features, if any, should be based on an accurate duplication of features, substantiated by available historical, physical or pictorial evidence, where that evidence is available, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures;

The original front porch was removed without approval. The owner has agreed to appropriately reconstruct front porch elements to match original with in-kind materials. During construction, the original siding on the west elevation was removed and replaced with cementitious siding. The owner has also agreed to replace the cementitious siding with wood siding to match original up to the original rear wall of the house. Trim board will delineate the rear wall from the addition, which will feature cementitious siding with a 4 " reveal.

(8) Proposed additions or alterations must be done in a manner that, if removed in the future, would leave unimpaired the essential form and integrity of the building, structure, object or site;

The numerous unapproved incursions into the original structure, including the additional 18" on the second-story and the 3' x 11' bump-out on the first-story, negatively impacts the historic integrity of the house. These alterations further impair the essential form of the structure.
(9) The proposed design for any exterior alterations or addition must not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material and must be compatible with the size, scale, material and character of the property and the area in which it is located;

Further encroachment of the addition and the construction of the bump-out destroy a significant amount of historic material. The increased height and depth of the addition is not compatible or in scale with the property or the area in which it is located. The proposed secondary roof option (hipped gambrel), devised to reduce the overall height, is not a typical condition found within the Woodland Heights Historic District and is not compatible with the existing historic structure or district.

(10) The setback of any proposed construction or alteration must be compatible with existing setbacks along the blockface and facing blockface(s);
(11) The proposed activity will comply with any applicable deed restrictions.
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## TIMELINE

11-17-2013: Two-story addition to a contributing one-story historic residence for 528 Highland Street denied at HAHC for being out of scale, encroaching too far forward onto the existing structure, and the excessive removal of original historic material.

01-16-2014: Revised two-story addition to a contributing one-story historic residence for 528 Highland Street denied at HAHC for being out of scale, not subordinate to the existing structure, and not retaining the historic character of the property.

02-13-2014: Revised two-story addition to a contributing one-story historic residence for 528 Highland Street approved at HAHC. The approved design included changes reducing the scale of the addition and the amount of the original house to be removed.

03-04-2014: $\quad$ Building permit issued (\#14019826).
04-01-2014: Stop Work order posted by Public Works for unpermitted work that involved the foundation, shiplap, and ceiling joists.

04-24-2014: New COA approved by HAHC to: replace removed interior shiplap with 7/16" OSB (Oriented Strand Board) or 1/2" CDX (Plywood); rebuild the damaged piers and level the house; repair the sagging ceiling joists and add additional joists as structurally required; remove, remediate, and replace termite damaged and rotted subfloor.

05-20-2014: Revision to building permit issued for change to guest bath (\#14053452). The revision was issued without Historic approval because permit application identified no changes to square footage and included only a floor plan of the guest bath changes. The project showed a bump-out on a portion of the historic wall and two historic windows that were identified on the COA to be retained.

06-27-2014: While surveying historic structures, staff noticed work that exceeded approved and permitted scope. Photos taken by staff showed inconsistencies with the approved plans - including a gable on the 2nd story roof instead of a hip, a bump-out on the east elevation, and discrepancies in the total height. Staff was not able to conduct a full evaluation or gain access to the property due to a construction fence.

07-02-2014: Public Works posted notice (Red Tag) on site for violation of COA, specifically "addition not to plan." Staff and owner met to discuss the discrepancies between the approved COA and the work on site. Owner agreed to submit as-built drawings and dimensions to compare with COA. Staff informed owner that only permitted work could continue -- all unpermitted activities were to stop unless and until a revised COA was approved. Staff asked for access to property but was denied.

07-09-2014: Owner submitted certified height certificate showing the actual height of the addition. Owner stated that the contractors had removed the gable and started to frame the hip. Staff again told owner to stop unpermitted work.

07-15-2014: Public Works inspector met with owner to discuss scope of work and building code issues.
07-23-2014: Owner met with staff and inspector to discuss the current construction vs. the approved scope of work. Owner informed staff that he continued with the unapproved work, despite staff's earlier suggestions to stop unpermitted activities, in order to weatherproof the house from the elements (the addition was sided, the roof was shingled, etc.)

08-04-2014: Revised COA application submitted to Planning for as-built project. All of the unpermitted work has been completed except for the work on the front porch.

08-28-2014: Revised COA for as-built project denied at HAHC.
09-08-2014: Revised COA application submitted to Planning for portions of the as-built project. All of the unpermitted work has been completed except for the work on the front porch.
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## CURRENT PHOTOS



## NORTH ELEVATION - FRONT FACING HIGHLAND STREET

## EXISTING



APPROVED FEBRUARY 2014


PROPOSED AUG.-SEPT. 2014 (AS BUILT)
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## WEST SIDE ELEVATION (FACING NORTHWOOD STREET)

## EXISTING



Removed

## EAST SIDE ELEVATION

EXISTING
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## SOUTH (REAR) ELEVATION

## EXISTING



PROPOSED AUG.-SEPT. 2014 (AS BUILT)


Area of Revision

## FIRST FLOOR PLAN

## APPROVED FEBRUARY 2014



PROPOSED AUG.-SEPT. 2014 (AS BUILT) Original Siding


Area of Revision
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## SECOND FLOOR PLAN

APPROVED FEBRUARY 2014


Area of Revision
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PROPOSED AUG.-SEPT. 2014 (AS BUILT)


# COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTATION <br> PERMITTING INFO 

| Project \#14019826 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Recorded | Permit | Insp | Comment Text |
| $07 / 24 / 2014$ | 13 | 139 | NEED NEW C OF A |
| $07 / 24 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | New COA required, scope exceeded. Owner met with PDD HPO 7.23.14. |
| $07 / 24 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | *** CALL HPO 713-837-7963 FOR TEMP OVERRIDE FOR WORK NOT ASSOCIATED |
| $07 / 24 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | WITH COA *** |
| $07 / 02 / 2014$ | 13 | 139 | NOT TO PLAN. SEE HISTORICAL, REVISE. |
| $06 / 11 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 W$ | Frnt porch at addition ok. |
| $06 / 09 / 2014$ | ES |  | SAWPOLE CUT IN \#919826 9 AM |
| $06 / 06 / 2014$ | ES | ESF | esf -3-\#4. ems-210032. |
| $06 / 04 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 W$ | Clips/straps. |
| $06 / 02 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 W$ | Prev corrctions incomplete .See tags on site. |
| $05 / 30 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 X$ | NO PLANS OR PERMITS ON SITE. |
| $05 / 30 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 X$ | plan and permit onsite corrections not made |
| $05 / 28 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 W$ | Anchor bolts nuts washers not installed. Coln at gar not |
| $05 / 28 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 W$ |  |
| $05 / 28 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 W$ | strapped per plan. |
| $04 / 18 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 X$ | addition piece less porch. less insul. |
| $04 / 18 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 X$ | missing hanger at triple mop |
| $04 / 17 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 X$ | CANCELLED BY MICHEAL |
| $04 / 04 / 2014$ | 13 | $13 S$ | rcvd pier letter, Debra A Banas Czapski 54232. |
| $04 / 03 / 2014$ | 13 | 138 | APPROVED PER MARGARET WALLACE BROWN |
| $04 / 01 / 2014$ | 13 | 133 | PENDIN OIER LETTER, ENGINEER ON SITE |
| $04 / 01 / 2014$ | 13 | 138 | Posted stop work order. Foundation worker asked to leave. |
| $03 / 04 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | ******** HISTORICAL ******** |
| $03 / 04 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | Issuance of this permit does not waive compliance with the Historic |
| $03 / 04 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | Preservation Ordinance per City of Houston Municipal Code of |
| $03 / 04 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | Ordinances Chapter 33 Article VII. For more information, contact 713 |
| $03 / 04 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | -837-7963. |
| $03 / 04 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | Project must conform to the Certificate of Appropriateness. Revisions |
| $03 / 04 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | to a project require Planning/Historical review and/or a new |
| $03 / 04 / 2014$ | GE | PRN | Certificate of Appropriateness. |
| $02 / 26 / 2014$ | 13 | PRN | NEW RESIDENTIAL ADDITION /REMODEL |
| $02 / 26 / 2014$ | 13 | PRN | ADDITIONAL PERMITS ARE REQUIRED ELEC./PLUMB./HVAC. |
| $02 / 26 / 2014$ | 13 | PRN | JAMES E. DEAVER JR. P.E.\# 96663 FOR FOUNDATION FRAME ROOF WINDLOAD. |
| $02 / 26 / 2014$ | 13 | PRN | TRUSS PLAN REVIEW AND PERMIT REQUIRED PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. |
| $02 / 26 / 2014$ | 13 | PRN | N.I.F. |
|  |  |  |  |

## Project \# 14053452

(Project submitted with different floor plan showing bump-out on east elevation; not routed through Historical)

| Recorded | Permit | Insp | Comment Text |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $05 / 20 / 2014$ | RV | PRN | Scope of revision; Changing first floor guest |
| $05 / 20 / 2014$ | RV | PRN | bathroom lay-out in guest bedroom. |

## HEIGHT CERTIFICATION

## CIIY OF WEST UNIVESTIY PLACE

HEIGHT CERTIFICATION Principal \& Rear Yard Structures


CITY OF WEST UNIVERSITY PLACE
BASE ELEVATION CERTIFICATE


## PROPOSED ROOF ALTERATION

## TO LOWER ROOF HEIGHT BY TWO FEET
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Applicant Photo; Gable removed (hipped)


Applicant Photo
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Applicant Photo


Applicant Photo; removed porch decking
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## PHOTOS



Staff Photo: 06/27/2014


Applicant Photo; showing re-sided west wall
Applicant continued to work after notified to stop all unpermitted work

Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM B. 13
September 25, 2014 528 Highland Street
HPO File No. 140913

## PHOTOS



Staff Photo: 06/27/2014


Staff Photo: 06/27/2014

Houston Archaeological \& Historical Commission
ITEM B. 13
September 25, 2014
528 Highland Street
HPO File No. 140913
Woodland Heights

## PHOTOS



Staff Photo: 06/272014; Showing gable


Applicant Photo
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Applicant Photo; Removed beadboard porch ceiling


Applicant Photo; Altered porch column
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Applicant Photo; Removed original porch railings


Applicant Photo; Unapproved bump-out on east elevation
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Applicant Photo; replaced boards with cementitious siding


Applicant Photo; Second-story addition encroaches an additional 18" onto original house
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Applicant Photo; Unapproved bathroom window


Applicant Photo; Missing/Broken trim


Applicant Photo; Replacement porch decking and beadboard on site
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Applicant Photo; Missing/Broken window sill


Applicant Photo; Damaged siding
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## PROJECT DETAILS

Shape/Mass: The following list details how the shape and mass of the proposed addition and existing structure has been altered and now exceeds the scope of work as outlined in the approved Certificate of Appropriateness:

- The second story addition extends $18^{\prime \prime}$ farther onto the original house than approved. This encroachment runs for 28 ' along the front elevation. No explanation of why this happened has been provided.
- Bump-out on east elevation. A 2'-10 wide by 10'-9" deep bump-out on the first-story of the original structure was constructed. In order to bump out the existing wall, historic material was destroyed. The original windows from the demolished wall have been installed in the bump-out.
- According to the applicant, the foundation company installed the piers based on the "bid set" of plans which included this portion of the addition. The final COA approved plans did not include this portion. The framer continued on with the error and it was not realized until the framing was complete.
- In previous denied versions of the project, the owner was repeatedly told to remove the east elevation bump-out because it destroyed too much historic material. When the project was finally approved in February 2014, the existing original east elevation was retained as requested by staff.
- Structure taller than approved. Due to the increase in roof pitch, the actual ridge of the addition is $2^{\prime}-1$ " taller than approved. The approved ridge height was $30^{\prime}-5$ " while the structure currently has a height of $32^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime \prime}$.
- See drawings and photos for more detail.

The applicant is seeking approval for the above work that expands the approved plans and that has already been completed.

Exterior Materials: The construction of the east elevation bump-out destroyed original wood siding. The constructed bump-out is clad in cementitious lap siding with a 4 " reveal.
See drawings and photos for more detail.
Roof: The following list details instances where work on the roof exceeds the scope of work as outlined in the approved Certificate of Appropriateness:

- Constructed a front gable roof as opposed to a hipped roof. Inconsistencies were discovered with the approved stamped set of plans. Plans showed a hipped roof on all elevations and a gable roof on the roof plan.
- When roof shape discrepancy was discovered, and after a meeting in which staff advised the applicant to stop all wok until a list of all unapproved work can be compiled, the applicant notified staff that his construction crew tore off the gable and constructed a hip.
- Incorrect roof pitches. Plans note that existing roof pitch is 6:12 and that the proposed addition roof was to match existing at 6:12. However, the applicant's designer incorrectly "eyeballed" the existing roof pitch at 6:12. The existing roof pitch is actually $8: 12$ and therefore, the roof of the addition was built at 8:12 (to match existing) and not at 6:12 as proposed. If staff was aware of the existing 8:12 roof pitch, staff would have advised that applicant to reduce the roof pitch to $6: 12$, or lower, in order to reduce the height of the structure.
- The applicant has proposed an option to remove the top three feet of the current 8:12 roof and rebuild that portion at a $2: 12$ pitch to reduce the overall height by two feet. This proposed option would create a hipped gambrel roof. This plan, however, does not address the issues of the bump-outs and loss of material.
- See drawings and photos for more detail.

The applicant is seeking approval for the above roof work that has already been completed.

Transcription of Item B. 13 - 528 Highland Street - HAHC September 25, 2014
(Unofficial transcript, prepared by Planning staff from audio of meeting for informational purposes)

Staff - The owner of 528 Highland has an active COA for a two story addition to a one story historic house. During construction of this addition, the owner has exceeded the approved scope of work in multiple ways.

The owner first applied for his COA in November 2013 and was twice denied by the HAHC because the addition was too large and removed too much of the original house. In February of 2014, the owner submitted a modified proposal that reduced the scale of the addition and the amount of material that would be removed from the historic house. The HAHC granted approval based on these modifications.

In March, the applicant was red-tagged for removing all of the shiplap from the original house without approval. He was granted a COA in April 2014 for this unapproved work and continued with construction.

In July 2014, staff became aware of the following work that once again exceeded the scope of the COA and building permit approvals. And that work included the roof pitch of the addition was increased from 6:12 to 8:12, ridge heights as constructed were two feet taller than approved: 32 ' 6 rather than 30' 5 . The addition encroached an additional 18" onto the original structure. A bump out was added on the east elevation of the original house. That bump out was 3 ' wide by 11' long. The applicant removed original wood siding behind the bay window on the west side and replaced with cementitious siding. And the front porch decking, railings, and ceiling bead board were removed.

After discovering these changes, the owner was again red tag and staff had several meetings with the owner in order to discuss how to proceed. Staff told him numerous times that he should stop all unpermitted activity and could only continue with permitted work. Despite this, the owner continued with unapproved work to the point where the exterior of the house is mostly complete.

The applicant then requested the HAHC retroactively approve the above changes made in the field: These changes were denied by HAHC last month. The applicant is again seeking approval for the same scope of work denied in August, except for the replacement of the west elevation siding and front porch elements, which he has agreed to reconstruct appropriately with in kind materials. In addition to that, the owner proposes a second option for the roof that is to remove the current 3 ' of the $8: 12$ roof and rebuild that portion with a pitch if $2: 12$ in order to reduce the overall height by 2 '. However, staff finds that the increased height, prominence, and complexity of the roof structure of the addition; the increased encroachment onto the existing structure by bringing the addition and additional 1.5 ' forward further than approved and by adding the unpermitted 11' long bump out on the east side of the original house, and the removal of substantial amounts of historic material, that was removed when that bump out was installed, that the project does not meet criteria 1, 4, 8, and 9 for approval, and therefore, staff
recommends denial for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the owner's changes to the approved scope of work.

Chairman Welsh - Okay thank you. We have a speaker signed up for this: Mr. Michael Czapski. (56:59)

Michael Czapski - Hello. My name is Michael Czapski and I am the owner of 528 Highland. To clarify, all of the items discussed at last month's meeting have been corrected, or are in the process of being corrected, with the exception of three structural changes that I am seeking approval for today. There's a lot of stuff in staff's report that doesn't apply to my current application. I'm also seeking approval of these three structural changes because the cost would be quite great. I would like to go on record stating that I don't agree with the description of events that transpired in the timeline on page 4 of staff's report. The wording doesn't accurately describe the events that took place and brought me here today.

Moving on to the items at hand, the three structural changes as well as the reasoning as to how the errors happened are in the report in front of you and are similar to the report I provided last month. Staff recommends denial based on criteria 1, 4, 8, and 9. Item 1: The activity must retain and preserve the historical character of the property, The three changes comply with this item. They match the existing structure's wall height, design, overhangs, shape, siding size, trim size, and finally the roof pitch.

Item 4: The activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities and character of the building. I feel these changes also comply for the same reasons. They match the existing structure's wall height, design overhangs, shape, siding, trim size, and roof pitch.

Item 8: The addition must be done in a manner that if removed would leave unimpaired the essential form and integrity of the building. I find this one difficult to understand the item says I cannot make the house the way it was but the recommended repair is to remove the addition to make the house as previously, or as per the original COA. The changes can be corrected but at a great cost. I don't believe this item is applicable.

Item 9: The proposed design of any exterior addition must not destroy significant historical material, and must comply with the size scale, material, and character of the property. In regards to significant historical material, the two story addition does not affect any historical material. Therefore, it is not applicable to this item. The first floor addition does remove 13 linear wall feet of wood siding. The remainder of the house is 112 linear wall feet of wood siding. That equates to $10 \%$ of wood siding being removed. I don't feel that meets the definition of significant. In regards to size, scale, and material, the addition is at the back of the property, the height meets the line of sight requirements and deed restrictions.

Staff is saying the height is not approved because in previously denied designs a lower height was also denied. However, the height of the structure was never brought into question during the review process. It was the size of gables and encroachment that staff was concerned with and were changed in order to get approval.

In closing, I recognize mistakes were made. Even though some of them were not my fault, I should have done a better job supervising construction. I've done our best to correct everything, I'm just looking for your help on these three costly items. Thank you.

Chairman Welsh - Thank you. Alright, I don't believe we have any other speakers. Do we have any questions for staff? Okay could staff please re-state their recommendation?

Staff- Staff recommends denial. (60:43)
Chairman Welsh - Okay staff recommends denial. Do I hear a motion to deny?
Commissioner Blacklock-Sloan - Motion Blacklock-Sloan
Chairman Welsh - Oaky so we have a motion to deny. Do I have a second to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness per staff's recommendation? Okay Commissioner Mod seconds. All of those in favor please raise your hands. Six. Any opposed? Okay one opposed. So that item has been denied a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Hellyer?

Commissioner Hellyer - I would like the Commission and staff to tell this homeowner what he can do that will get passed, and I don't know if we tell you that you have to tear the whole second floor off and build it back the way it was. This is just going to keep going on month after month after month. The only reason I voted against the denial is because we're not giving this man any direction on what to do, I don't feel like.

## Chairman Welsh - Director Walsh?

Director Walsh - l'll say that I agree with the Commissioner's underlying perspective, which is that we need to provide to the applicant specific direction about what it is that we can support. So that he understands what he needs to come back to the Commission with, so that we can recommend approval, and we'll do so.

## DuCroz, Diana - PD

| From: | Michael Czapski [mczapski@nationsconstruction.com](mailto:mczapski@nationsconstruction.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, October 01, 2014 1:41 PM |
| To: | Kriegl, Matthew - PD; PD - Historic Preservation |
| Cc: | Kim@hillpclaw.com |
| Subject: | RE: 528 Highland |

Ok. In the event we are able to come to an agreement but it will need to go in front of the commission, attached is the application for the month of October. Just in case...

In the event we cannot come to an agreement, then please let this email server as my notice to appeal the HAHC Commission decision of Denial from the September meeting to the Planning Commission. Please let me know the date of the planning meeting.

Staff recommends denial based on items $1,4,8 \& 9$. I disagree and feel the 3 structural changes comply with those items based on the following reasons:

Item 1, the activity must retain and preserve the historical character of the property. The three changes comply with this item. They match the existing structure's wall height, design, overhangs, shape, siding size, trim size and finally the roof pitch.

Item 4, the activity must preserve the distinguishing qualities or characters of the building. The three changes comply with this item. They match the existing structure's wall height, design, overhangs, shape, siding size, trim size and finally the roof pitch.

Item 8, the addition must be done in a manner, that if removed would leave unimpaired integrity of the building. The changes can be corrected and that is the recommendation of staff. This item is not applicable.

Item 9, the proposed design of any exterior addition, must not destroy significant historical material and must be compatible with size, scale, material and character of the property and area which it is in
In regards to significant historical material, the two second story changes do not affect any historical material. Therefore this part is not applicable to them. The first story addition does remove 13 Linear wall feet of wood siding. The remainder of the house has 112 linear wall feet of wood siding. That equates to an additional $10.4 \%$ of wood siding being removed. That does not meet the definition of a significant.
In regards to size, scale and material: the additions are at the back of the property, the height meets the line of sight requirements and deed restrictions. The changes match the existing structure's wall height, design, overhangs, shape, siding size, trim size and finally the roof pitch.

## Michael

From: Kriegl, Matthew - PD [mailto:Matthew.Kriegl@houstontx.gov]
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2014 9:07 AM
To: Michael Czapski; PD - Historic Preservation
Subject: RE: 528 Highland
Good morning Michael,
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[^18]:    In previous denied versions of the project, the owner was repeatedly told to remove the east elevation bump-out because it destroyed too much historic material. Initial versions of the proposed addition also included gable roofs, were taller, wider, and out of scale with the existing historic structure.

    The project was finally approved in February 2014, after being denied twice. In the approved version, the owner agreed to make several compromises which included hipping the proposed front gable and dropping the overall ridge and eave heights by a foot (from $31^{\prime}-8$ " to $30^{\prime}-51^{\prime \prime} 4^{\prime \prime}$. The addition was also reduced in width (from $65^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ to $59^{\prime}-3^{1} / 2^{\prime \prime}$ ) and started closer to the rear wall ( $32^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ ( $62 \%$ ) back from the front wall to $44^{\prime}(86 \%)$ back from the front wall).

    The completed field changes, that the owner now requests approval for, increases the height of the addition by 1 foot taller than previously denied versions (two feet taller than approved). Additionally, the nonapproved constructed encroachments and bump-outs destroy original historic material that the owner had previously agreed to retain.

