

DESIGN REGULATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The following design regulations are recommended for implementation consistent with survey feedback from The Hill Community. The survey was administered starting October 30th through December 10th, 2020. The detailed results can be found at www.SugarLandTX.gov/TheHill.

Text marked in italics under the column “Committee Recommendation” indicates a modified design regulation than what was originally presented in the survey.

Committee Recommendation	Survey Question and Results	Additional Explanation
BUILDING WIDTH		
<p>1. Implement a Building to Lot Width Ratio of 0.46</p> <p>2. <i>Lots under the existing minimum lot width of 60 feet would be exempt from the BTLW ratio of 0.46 and allowed to have a maximum building width of 30 feet within the BTLW Measurement Zone.</i></p>	<p><u>Question 4</u> “I am willing to limit the width of new construction and additions to existing houses using the proposed BTLW of 0.46.” Community Feedback: 63% agreed</p>	<p>Staff further examined the impact of the BTLW on small lots and determined that lots under the 60-foot minimum width requirement will instead be allowed a maximum building width of 30 feet. (see also suggested opportunity for increasing BTLW under Mature Trees).</p>
<p>3. Measure building width at the widest point in the BTLW Measurement Zone (between front property line and 25 feet behind front façade)</p>	<p><u>Question 5</u> “Measuring the building width at the widest point in the BTLW Measurement Zone, as described above, is appropriate.” Community Feedback: 71% agreed</p>	<p>Please note that when an attached garage is built 25 feet behind the front façade to comply with recommended standard #5, then the attached garage would not count towards the building width.</p>
BUILDING HEIGHT		
<p>4. Limit existing houses plus additions or new construction to a Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) of no more than 0.45</p>	<p><u>Question 9</u> “I am willing to limit existing houses plus additions or new construction to a Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) of no more than 0.45 for a two-story house.” Community Feedback: 54% agreed</p> <p><u>Question 10</u> Most preferred option overall (other options included limiting height to 1-story, 1.5-stories, and 2-stories with a 3,000 square footage cap)</p>	<p>Majority of respondents agreed with this option and was the most preferred option over limiting homes to 1-story or 1.5 stories.</p>

Committee Recommendation	Survey Question and Results	Additional Explanation
ADDITIONS & GARAGES		
<p>5. Increase the existing garage front façade setback to 25 feet.</p>	<p><u>Question 12</u> “I am willing to increase the mandatory 15-foot setback for garages to 25 feet (from the front façade of the house).” Community Feedback: 59% agreed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
ROOF PITCH		
<p>6. Require minimum roof pitch of 4/12 7. Redefine existing maximum height measurement to be from finished grade to top of ridge rather than to mid-gable 8. 27 feet maximum height will remain, but will follow modified height measurement definition</p>	<p><u>Question 15</u> “I am willing to require a minimum and maximum roof pitch for new construction.” Community Feedback: 75% agreed</p>	<p>Although there was community support as indicated by results of Question 15, staff recommended the Committee modify the design standard to only implement minimum roof pitch.</p> <p>Community input indicated support to continue allowing 2-stories. Depending on the design of the home, a steeper roof pitch is appropriate to design 2-story homes at a smaller scale.</p> <p>In addition, survey comments suggested to address maximum height rather than maximum roof pitch.</p>
<p>No implementation</p>	<p><u>Question 16</u> “I am willing to require garages to have a roof pitch equal to or less than the roof pitch of the house, as long as it meets other design standards for roof pitch.” Community Feedback: 70% agreed</p>	<p>After further examining the existing regulations, staff recommended the Committee not implement this regulation.</p> <p>Maximum heights are already established for 1-story and 2-story garages which in turn establishes the maximum roof pitch of the garage.</p>

Committee Recommendation	Survey Question and Results	Additional Explanation
<p>MATURE TREES</p>		
<p>No implementation</p>	<p><u>Question 17</u> “I am willing to require property owners to obtain a permit, which may require a report from a certified Master Arborist, before they remove a tree of a certain size.” Community Feedback: 49% agreed</p>	<p>This standard will not be implemented, which means property owners can continue to tear down trees at any time, as long as the removal of the tree is not tied to a demolition or addition of an existing home.</p> <p>With the following recommended tree regulations (#9-12), a property owner will only be triggered for city review when applying for a residential building permit (new construction or addition) or demolition permit.</p>
<p>9. Preserve at least 1 mature tree <i>in front half of lot</i> during construction of new houses or additions</p>	<p><u>Question 18</u> “I am willing to require that at least one mature tree be preserved during the construction of new houses or additions.” Community Feedback: 66% agreed</p>	<p>This would not apply to property owners wanting to remove a tree when it is not associated with building or adding onto a structure. The review process is only triggered when the property owner applies for a building permit (new construction or addition) or a demolition permit. At least 1 mature tree must be preserved in the front half of the lot in order to grant the building permit (new construction or addition) or demolition permit.</p> <p>Further clarified the focus for the tree preservation to be the front half of the lot in order to focus preservation on the street canopy.</p>
<p>10. Incentivize the preservation of more than 1 mature tree in front half of lot by allowing an increase in BTLW to 0.50</p>	<p><u>Question 19</u> “I am willing to require more than one mature tree be preserved during the construction of new houses or additions.” Community Feedback: 55% agreed</p>	<p>Based on results of Question 19, this standard was modified as an incentive that grants additional building width (BTLW increase to 0.50) in exchange for preservation of additional mature trees.</p>
<p>11. Require tree survey & tree relocation/ replacement plan with demolition permit <i>and additions</i></p>	<p><u>Question 20</u> “I am willing to require that property owners submit a tree survey and tree relocation or replacement plan as part of the demolition permit.” Community Feedback: 54% agreed</p>	<p>Committee recommends implementing this standard to serve as tool in enforcing the preservation of trees (Survey Question 18) and expanding requirement to additions.</p>

Committee Recommendation	Survey Question and Results	Additional Explanation
MATURE TREES		
<p>12. <i>New trees replacing mature trees must be at least 4-inch caliper in size</i></p>	<p><u>Question 21</u> “I am willing to require property owners to replace mature trees if removed (measuring at least 8-inch caliper) on a 1-to-1 basis, based on caliper inches, with replacement trees measuring at least 4-inch caliper.”</p> <p>Community Feedback: 47% disagreed, 42% agreed</p>	<p>After further examining the survey comments, there was disagreement with replacing trees on a 1-to-1 caliper basis. There was no indication with disagreement on the size of replacement trees.</p> <p>Instead, Committee recommends implementing the second portion of the standard presented in the survey, which increases the size requirements of replacing removed mature trees from 2.5-inch caliper to 4-inch caliper.</p>
ENTRY FEATURES		
<p>13. Require all new houses to have a covered front porch <i>or stoop</i></p>	<p><u>Question 23</u> “I am willing to require all new houses to have a covered front porch.”</p> <p>Community Feedback: 61% agreed</p>	<p>Revised to include stoop as an entry feature as suggested in the survey comments.</p>
<p>14. Require new front porches to be a minimum of 6 feet deep</p> <p>15. <i>New proposed regulation to allow existing homes which do not meet porch depth or other standards such as building width to replace porch.</i></p>	<p><u>Question 24</u> “I am willing to require new front porches to be a minimum of 6 feet deep.”</p> <p>Community Feedback: 61% agreed</p>	<p>Modified to allow existing homes which don’t meet porch depth requirement or other standards to do in-kind replacement. Staff will define in-kind replacement during the code writing process.</p>
<p>16. Require new houses in The Hill to have walkways between front porch/door and the street</p>	<p><u>Question 25</u> “I am willing to require new houses in The Hill to have walkways between the front porch or front door and the street.”</p> <p>Community Feedback: 66% agreed</p>	<p>New houses should have paved walkways extending from the porch or front door to the street or sidewalk. The minimum width of the walkway should be 4 feet. A second walkway from the door to the driveway can be optional.</p>

Committee Recommendation	Survey Question and Results	Additional Explanation
BUILDING MATERIALS		
<p>17. Primary finishes must be a minimum 85% for each façade <i>a. Primary Finish – Brick and/or Horizontal Siding (fiber cement or wood)</i></p> <p>18. Secondary finishes can be a maximum of 15% for each façade <i>a. Secondary Finish – Vertical board & batten siding (fiber cement or wood), stone, stucco, shingle siding</i></p>	<p><u>Question 26</u> “I am willing to limit exterior materials on new houses, additions, and garages in The Hill to horizontal siding and/or brick.”</p> <p>Community Feedback: 55% agreed; 17% did not respond to this question</p>	<p>The majority of respondents supported this recommendation. However, after further examining the comments, there was a desire to allow other exterior finish materials on houses such as vertical board and batten siding.</p> <p>Staff recommended the Committee modify the regulation from what was presented in the survey to allow additional finishes in a limited quantity (15% per façade). A similar regulation is currently applied in the Mixed Use Conservation district assigned to the company town buildings on the east side of Brooks Street.</p>
<p>19. Limit exterior finishes to no more than 2 different finishes (wall cladding materials)</p>	<p><u>Question 27</u> “I am willing to limit exterior wall cladding materials to no more than two different materials on a single house.”</p> <p>Community Feedback: 70% agreed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>20. Limit horizontal siding to either wood or fiber-cement (e.g., Hardieplank)</p>	<p><u>Question 28</u> “I am willing to limit horizontal siding to either wood or fiber-cement (e.g., Hardieplank).”</p> <p>Community Feedback: 68% agreed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
FENCES		
<p>21. Prohibit fences in front of houses in The Hill</p>	<p><u>Question 30</u> “I am willing to prohibit fences in front of houses in The Hill.”</p> <p>Community Feedback: 63% agreed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

ADDITIONAL STANDARDS NOT PRESENTED IN SURVEY		
<p>22. Require carports to follow the same standards as garages, including following building finish requirements</p>	<p><u>N/A not presented in survey</u></p>	<p>The existing regulations do not address carports for height and setbacks. Staff recommended to the Committee to have carports follow garage requirements to ensure carports are built in character with the neighborhood.</p>

The following design standard options in the survey **will not be implemented** as they did not gather enough community support or conflicted with feedback from previous questions or surveys.

- Limit height to 1-story (Question 6)
- Limit height to 1.5 stories (Question 7)
- Limit total square footage for additions & new 2-stories to 3,000 sq. ft. (Question 8)
- Limit additions & garages to same stories as house (Question 11)
- Establish a 25-foot front façade setback for 1-story additions (Question 13)
- Establish a 25-foot front façade setback for 2-story additions (Question 14)
- Require garages to have a roof pitch equal to or less than the roof pitch of the house (Question 16)
- Require property owners to obtain a permit, which may require a report from a certified Master Arborist, before removing a tree of certain size (Question 17)
- Require property owners to replace mature trees if removed (measuring at least 8-inch caliper) on a 1-to-1 basis, based on caliper inches (Question 21)