



Meeting Notes

February 9, 2021

Call to Order

Recording started by Truscenia Garrett.

Lisa Clark, Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. There were 81 participants.

Welcome by Co-Chairs

Ms. Clark took the roll, presented the speaker rules and welcomed Council Member Sallie Alcorn.

Dustin O'Neal was represented by Shawn Massock. John Blount was represented by Lloyd Smith

Director's report

Margaret Wallace Brown, Director, Planning & Development Department, welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the Co-Chairs for their continued work with the Committee.

Garage Screening Standards

- Current garage screening standards were presented followed by potential options for strengthening them.
 - Require 42" tall opaque exterior cover for every floor of garage structures regardless of the height & adjacent development; and
 - Require full screening for the first three above grade levels of ALL garage structures
- What we learned from advisory group:
 - Increase the 42" height requirement
 - The opaque screening does not have to be masonry wall
 - Internal garage lights must be full cutoff or shielded properly
 - All garage structures must be screened from spilling light
 - Openness requirement must be met for ventilation
 - Build in some flexibility instead of every face of the garage to be screened
 - comply with the requirements of construction code
- Proposed amendment after Technical Advisory Group meeting
 - To address lighting from car headlights
 - Provide 50" opaque (light blocking) exterior cover required for all garage faces on all tiers adjacent to residential developments or streets
 - To address lighting spillover from garage ceiling lights, select one of the following:
 - Full screening for entire height of the garage structure to block light or
 - All internal garage lights must be full cutoff fixtures and shielded properly from adjacent developments as needed or
 - Provide a photometric plan to demonstrate no light trespass beyond property line that exceeds 0.2 fc

Committee Discussion

Ron Lindsey: With full screening, the amount of light going through office windows would exceed the amount coming from a garage, so it is not about making that wall black, where you can't see through it at all and no lights comes through it, it's about screening the appearance of a garage, the best you can. But the idea that you need a totally light blocking cover is neither feasible nor do I find it to be particularly desirable. Why are we treating the light coming through a garage any differently than a light coming through in office? It's the same light. The amount of light that comes out of a garage ought to be whatever an office building window would show otherwise, because that's your condition without a garage. So, the garage shouldn't be held to a higher standard than the office.

Margaret Wallace Brown: I think one of the concerns that we have and what we have heard from the public is that garage fixtures are on 24 hours a-day and office fixtures are typically not. They may be on later into the night, but they are typically not on 24 hours a-day and there is some flexibility about when they come on and off, but garage fixtures are ubiquitous and that was the concern.

Muxian Fang: To address Mr. Lindsay's point, we are talking about the open garage, which means that most of the garages have lots of openness, not like an office. An office building, even though they have lots of windows, sometimes they also have blinds that will help to reduce the spill over of the light. That's why we propose screening for this open garage structure but at the same time, whatever screening they are proposing, they are required to comply with the building code regulation requirement.

Ron Lindsey: 0.2-foot candle is very low, and that is much less than the light that comes out of an office. So, whatever normally comes out of an office building window, that ought to be the standard.

Lisa Clark: We can certainly take those comments in, we appreciate that Mr. Lindsey.

Mike Dishberger: First point is 50" is probably good for exterior cover but most of the big pickup trucks are 40 to 42" above the ground, the top of the headlamps. So, I might suggest maybe the 50 becomes 52 or something, just a couple more inches just to give a covering. The second point is the height of parking structure. If you are a single family residential, you can't be higher than 4 stories, or you are not single family anymore. It just seems a little unfair to screen something where the lights will never ever go into somebody's windows, because the windows are a lot lower than the 50'.

Suvidha Bandi: The proposed amendment will require screening along all faces that front abutting streets and abutting single family and residential. Any kind of residential, so condominiums and apartments are also a part of the discussion.

Sandy Stevens: I just wanted to thank you for having this image on the screen as I speak because I've heard the word onerous used about the requirements. We are asking the developers screen the light from residential neighborhoods. The developers must design buildings in residential areas that are respectful of those who already live there. Absolutely there are likely costs involved, but it is to protect the urban neighborhoods that we have and value.

Scott Cubbler: Couple of things have already been raised is that light going from window to window is not the issue, it's the enjoyment of your entire property, not just the window, and its already been brought out that garage lighting and office lighting are not the same thing. And then as we look at standards, there are multiple standards out there. The American Institute of Architects has a set a standards for movement and usability. There are also security standards from the American Society of Industrial Security. I was a certified protection professional when I worked for the Department of Homeland Security. We did lighting audits to determine what foot candle impacts were for security purposes that we needed to have at certain levels. And we were conscious of the fact that they would have some impact on the surrounding areas.

Sonny Garza: We use the terminology, full screening, and my only question was, is that 50" opaque considered full screening or are we talking about the screening above the 50 inches to the ceiling of the garage?

Suvidha Bandi: Full screening means, above the 50" that is required. There are different purposes for the screening. The lower 50", the purpose is to block the light from the car headlights, which is required for all garages tiers that are abutting streets and residential developments. Then above the 50", the purpose of the screening in that area is to stop the light from spilling from the garage ceiling lights. So, for that we provided three options.

Suvidha Bandi: That's a good point and definitely we don't want completely black screens. What we are talking about is a type of screening that still provide perforation while minimizing glare onto adjacent properties. We are not talking about completely black or opaque surfaces.

Lisa Clark: We also must be very careful because, these garages need to be ventilated so we can't cut off ventilation. So, you can't really, fully block, everything.

Peter Freedman: Who is responsible financially for the screening if the building is there first. What I mean is if a residential home is built after the fact.

Suvidha Bandi: Yes, we considered this. We think that, when the garage is being built, it must be screened when there is residential adjacent to it or along the street. In the case where there is no

development and the property is not platted as single family, then there is no requirement to screen on that side.

Peter Freedman: Part of the suggestions is that we do screening up to the height of building. if you don't know what the future height of residential buildings is going to be, what screening will be required.

Suvidha Bandi: The screening is for the height of the proposed development. So, let's say, if I am proposing a garage structure, then I would screen the face that is along the residential development for the full height of the garage structure.

Director Wallace Brown: I think the question is if residential comes in after the garage, what is the garages responsibility. And in that instance, there would be no retrofit required. The screening is for existing residential, but if residential comes in after the garage is built, there would be no requirement for the garage to retrofit their circumstances.

Peter Freedman: Talking about adjacent residential, is that the lot that is directly next to the building? Or, say you have several adjacent lots and one is not developed but you have another residential right next to it? How far over are we talking when we are discussing adjacency to the building.

Suvidha Bandi: That's a good question. Immediately abutting properties, the development has to screen from and also along the street.

Lisa Clark: Let's say there's a hundred feet along the property line and you have two or three houses then you have an opening or two then you have another house or two. That's the way I understand the question. So, the screening would be required just like if it was fully developed as residential in that case.

Ron Lindsey: So, what you just said is actually not what I understood. I think the word adjacency, adjacent is not what we should use. Abutting, that make sense. Adjacent could mean a lot of things and I think the ordinance currently says or uses the word abutting. Let's stick with that word. Secondly, we are talking about screening, abutting existing residential, and if there is nothing on that lot, it is not residential. There's no residential structure so I don't think that it's meant that just because you have a reserve next to you that you have to know that that's going to be residential when you have to screen because someday it may be residential.

Lisa Clark: The clarification I was making Mr. Lindsay was if you have six single family lots and 4 or 5 of them are built. Just because there's a vacant lot in the middle doesn't mean that you screen two parts of the building and leave the middle unscreened. That was my point.

Ron Lindsey: Whenever we are ready or allowed to give comments on these amendments before they go forward, I would like to reserve the opportunity to do that

Director Wallace Brown: I have a question based on that statement. What if it is a vacant residential lot? How would we treat that?

Suvidha Bandi: If the property is already platted as single family residential and there is a recorded plat, then that face of the garage must be screened. but if the property immediately abutting is platted as a reserve, it could be another garage, it could be a midrise development. We don't know. So, in that case when there are multiple possibilities then we don't need to screen on that side.

Ron Lindsey: With that very defined set of circumstances, I would say that sounds fine to me.

Hector Rodriguez: Going back to the lots, there are many lots that are not restricted to residential and it could be developed as nonresidential. Just something to look at.

Suvidha Bandi: Screening is required if the structure faces lots are restricted to single family. On any sides of the structure facing property platted as a reserve and no development has occurred, then no need to screen from that side.

Lisa Clark: Now committee, we are looking for consensus. Let's go back to work and clarify some of the language that we've discussed here.

Ron Lindsey: So, the way that is addressed, there are two issues. One, I think the point 0.2-foot candle is way too low. It's far less than the pedestrian light would be on a sidewalk and number two it's a full screen that blocked light I see a black wall. So, I disagree with that wording.

Lisa Clark: Well we can work on that language. because it's not intended to make the whole wall black.

Sandy Stevens: I would suggest increasing the 50" on the light blocking exterior cover to 52", because of the concern about the big trucks and their headlights.

Mike Dishberger: Have a list of written down examples, so when this does go to permitting, they can go, here's 15 examples or 20 possible ways that this thing can be interpreted. I think this is an adjacent lot, I think this is an abutting lot, there's one house here, there's three houses here. I can think of an example where there is 25-foot lots next door. That have been platted years ago, and there is nothing on those two lots, and just on one of the lots, it is 25 feet away from the other house but not that lot. There are all sorts of things here but I would like to see them in writing. A lot of the things, what

we are doing, have them in writing so the implementation goes through smoothly and you are not inundated with all these different calls. I'm asking you about all the different situations, so we will get the same answer, throughout this process. Define what's adjacent, what's abutting, what's platting residential, what's platted commercial. People like to know the answers when the ordinance goes out. So, that's my suggestion.

Lisa Clark: We will work on the language and come back in front of you before it goes anywhere as we have consensus on the concept.

Sandy Stevens: I just want to express an opposite opinion regarding the 0.2-foot candles of beyond the property line. As I said I live in a neighborhood that is being impacted by high density high rise development and often times we are assailed with the light that spills from these buildings and so I do think the 0.2' candle measurement is important for maintaining a quality of life in these mixed neighborhoods.

Shawn Massock: Yes, I wanted to compliment you all on giving options here, and I also want to echo that I don't feel the 0.2' candles is too low. If it were to raise, I wouldn't want to see go past half a foot candle. Again, in somebody's backyard, they are not living on a sidewalk either so, they should be able to have that amount of light they want by lighting their own backyard. I think providing a definition of what full screening is, would help identify number one for folks, and two, you guys have definitions of full cut off, and I know what that is already, at least we will be looking at that in the next few sections so, In general I would say that I am in agreement with three as they are written moving forward. thank you.

Suvidha Bandi: We will look at the foot candles one more time to see that it is the lowest that's possible., This was a recommendation made by one of the lighting designers, But we will compare it with how much office light spills out of buildings. I understand that .5 is lighting that you can function in without hurting your eyes. So, we were trying to cut that .5 in half, but I will look into that in a little more detail.

Lisa Clark: OK Suvidha I think you have consensus and ready to move forward to work on the language.

Lighting fixture standards

- Current lighting fixture standards were presented followed by potential option for strengthening them.
 - All wall mounted outdoor fixtures installed on any development to be full cut off.
 - Require all pole mounted outdoor fixtures to be full cut off with house side shields.
- Outcome of Technical Advisory Group meeting:
 - Horizontal spread

-
- Provide shielding
 - Keep the light on the property
 - Specify lightning analysis requirement
 - Better to have adaptive light controls
 - LED light is too bright (warm light should be recommended)
 - Exception for accent lights and banding lights
 - Proposed amendments on lightning fixtures standards
 - Full cutoff lights not to create glare
 - House side shields or other shields when necessary
 - Exception for lights signifying a brand, architectural façade illumination, task lights and display or ornamental lights

Ron Lindsey: Just to clarify, the discussion we had last time was about parking lots and we say that the cut off fixture requirements only apply to the perimeter. Are we now saying that it now applies to all the lights in the parking lot?

Suvidha Bandi: yes sir, that is the recommendation right now, to have all the lights be full cut off.

Ron Lindsay: The image where you show what a cutoff fixture was made sense. It's just where it doesn't let the light go vertically go above the fixture. Is that correct?

Ron Lindsey: Okay. Then we did talk about protection for the property owners that were on the perimeter of the parking lot. How is that addressed in your proposal. We would have essentially a shield preventing the light from crossing the property line, but only for those that are along the perimeter of the parking lot.

Suvidha Bandi: yes sir, so all the lights would be full cutoff. But the lights on the periphery would have to provide, when they are abutting another development, they must include the shields to make sure that the light is not going in the opposite direction. Where it's not supposed to go.

Lisa Clark: We would like to get consensus to move forward to finalize the language and we will run this back by the committee.

Noise Control

- Residential buffering ordinance doesn't regulate noises.
 - Noises due to mechanic equipment are mostly made by air conditioners.
 - Dumpster noises are occasionally.

Mechanical equipment - Enclosures help to minimize noises

- Current requirements were presented followed by potential options for strengthening them.
 - Require screening for mechanical equipment adjacent to residential uses and public streets.

-
- Outcome of TAG meeting
 - Screening does not block noise
 - Mechanical equipment needs lot of ventilation
 - Improper screening may lead to unintended consequences
 - Can continue to be enforced on complaint basis
 - Park this item for future consideration and not be addressed at this time

Suvidha Bandi: Do we have consensus to park this issue for later?

Lisa Clark: Ms. Bandi I believe you have a consensus on that.

Dumpster Screening

Different regulations overview followed by potential option:

- Require screening for dumpsters when located adjacent to residential uses and public streets

Outcome of TAG meeting

- Main issue with dumpsters is not noises but unpleasant views
- Enclosed screening must be considered

Proposed amendment

- Enclosed screening when located adjacent to residential development
- Exception for dumpsters during construction or renovation

Requested committee guidance on this item

Committee Discussion

Ron Lindsey: If you try to put the dumpster in the building, how does the dumpster truck access it? Because when they pick that dumpster up, it goes over the cab and into the back. So, your vertical clearance required to achieve that, I'm going to guess that it is probably close to 16 to 18' if not more. You can't put that thing in the building. And then the idea is, even if you could, when you bring the truck in, in order for it to turn and be perpendicular in the building, where you could actually pull that canister out, you would need a separation between the building and the property line, probably approaching 80', if not more, because the dumpster trucks are quite large. So I understand the concern about looking into the dumpster and I understand that as much as the property owner tries to tell its tenants, you have to close the duster when you use it, a lot of time the staff is not. But I think you've created something that I don't know how it could even be done. Now if you have smaller dumpsters, and they could be rolled out by hand, and the truck comes by and picks them up, that's different, but a lot of larger tenants, in a retail situation don't have that. They have a very large dumpster that requires it to be picked up and dumped into the truck. You can't roll them out, they are too heavy.

Suvidha Bandi: May I ask a question for clarification for my knowledge please? So, I am trying to imagine how this works out. What I have learned, if you look at the images, what we did see is some of the dumpsters, they were within the garage or they were kept in a separate enclosure, the roll out type. But I think you're referencing to the kind that cannot be rolled out, so I want to learn from you. Do they get lifted all the way up by the truck? Because I know services to these types of buildings are handled by private pickups, and it's not City pick up. Help me understand does the whole dumpster, the huge ones that cannot be rolled up, do they get picked up and then tilted into the pickup vehicle?

Ron Lindsey: it depends, a lot of them are roll offs. So, you have like a tow truck. The truck comes it pulls the dumpster out, it rolls out a fresh dumpster. Then it takes that dumpster away and empties it, because it is too large to be picked up. But for the ones that are shown in the enclosure, I don't know how they get that out of that enclosure, because, to have a person push it out, when it is full. That's a relatively small dumpster, but still, I don't know how they get it rolled out there. That's not something that I've ever seen before. Is this photo in Houston?

Suvidha Bandi: This is in Houston. What I can see is that it contains wheels and I was informed that, these get rolled out by the staff of the development itself and they get rolled back in, after the pickup service has been completed.

Ron Lindsey: If that dumpster is full, it's going to weigh much more than a person can push. No degree of metal wheels on a relatively rough surface, it's going to be very hard to push them out. I understand it may be a way to do it. Maybe the dumpster service has a way to attach them to a pulley and pull out, but I just can't imagine that's a feasible approach for most people to use.

Lisa Clark: So Ms. Bandi, when you have an instance where you are going to use a larger dumpster or there's concerns that you can't move the dumpster because of its location and its heaviness, they also have the option to screen it, correct? It's an either or, is that right?

Suvidha Bandi: It is an either or. They can locate it on other than residential side of the property and still function like the examples that you have seen. Put it on the street side where there is no enclosure needed, it's only screening. Solid Waste department has reached out to me, with similar questions that have been brought up, so I think we will need more time to discuss on how to address the huge containers. What I understand is, no matter what they have to get emptied. Some get rolled and taken with the truck, so a new container is put in the place. So, it's like a rotation system. The other ones, it gets rolled out, emptied, and put back in. And the development employees handle that. So those are two different kinds that are available. We may have to think about both the situations differently. We may need more time on this one. If there are other comments, I would appreciate that.

Lisa Clark: So because we have comments from solid waste and Ron Lindsey, he brings up good comments, we'll take this back, work on it a little more with the technical advisory group and then bring some different language and options back to the committee.

Suvidha Bandi: In the interest of time I would like to table the additional items on the Agenda and proceed to the homework. Do I have your permission to do that? We will come back and present the physical separation items next time.

Lisa Clark: That's fine

Homework Activity Read the various articles on the Let's Talk Houston website

Next Meeting: March 9, 2021 – 3:00pm through 5:00pm

During the next meeting, we will present the options related to physical separation distance.

Public Comments

Cindy Woods: My name is Cindy Woods, and I would first just like to applaud you for attacking some of these issues that do affect all the residents in the City of Houston. I still have a question about how, which residents are protected. When you say abutting, does that include me, that's across the street from a development. I disagree with the 30', because I am more than 90 feet right now, I think, across from a huge development and which affects me. So, I would like to make sure that, all sides of a development are being protected. I think parking the noise is a mistake and is a big issue. With all the things going on in residential neighborhoods now. I understand that it's not really part of the buffering ordinance, but I think it would mean a lot, if suggestions came from this committee, that whoever is responsible for revising the noise ordinance, do that now, not later. Especially with construction noise. The days and times. Most cities don't allow it on Sundays, Houston does. That needs to be revised. The weekend hours of noise should be less than the weekdays. I don't think that HPD being the only enforcement for noise, is a good use of our city's resources. I think someone from the city needs to be able to do that. I think that I sent a many of my points in writing. I hope that you got them today

Barbara McGuffey: I just would like to speak too about the dumpsters and the noise on the dumpsters and that that may be under chapter 30 I don't know where that needs to be but what we need is strengthening on the hours that they can pick those up, They are very noisy when they get picked up and fortunately so far I have been able to track down vendors and basically beg them to please, not pick up before 7:00 a.m. and we would have them picking up near us at 4:00 a.m. in the morning and everybody in our area was awakened when they would come in and dump those, so I don't know if it is specifically in there but, I think we need to make sure that we've got some wording. And again, I agree with Cindy woods that HPD does not need to be our enforcer, we got enough problems getting HPD, having HPD enough resources to deal with real crime, and we need civil enforcement of this. There no reason we can't have that and have a better enforcement, because right now it's not working

and you know, if it's a design issue, then we need the fines increased. If they have poor designs, that's not our problem. The fines need to increase considerably and the whole structure needs to be reworked on how they get a citation, how they get a conviction and a fine on that. So, I applaud everything you are doing. Thanks. I'm looking forward to the physical separation distance. I think what I hear is good, that it's going to be, a lot of this is just facing a public street, which is wonderful news for those of us who live across the street. So, I hope that, that turns out to be the way that works. So, thank you all again for addressing all of this, and I am all for full screening on garages. And quite frankly think that, you know, other businesses and other entities would probably welcome having a nice garage near them, if it was designed well and not just residential. So, I hope you all would consider requiring all garages to be screened in and they can always request a variance if it's not needed.

Suvidha Bandi: It was brought up that the private companies pick up at odd hours. Unfortunately, we have no jurisdiction over the provider companies, and it has to be handled through maybe noise ordinance provisions of what time there is violations. They may have to be handled that way, through the enforcement process.

Lindsey Lindsey: So, I just want to say, based on the committee's conversation, I just wanted to reiterate that, you'll be discussing commercial development next to or abutting residential homes on residential streets. I think that's a big component here. And one of your goals is to preserve great neighborhoods. I live in one those neighborhoods in the heights, and I just feel like a lot of the comments I heard today were developer focused, which I understand that's where the technical expertise is and I truly appreciate the committee members who spoke up on behalf of the residents point of view and I just encourage you to continue to do so because you are all we got on this committee and so I appreciate that. A general question that I wanted to ask is, what's the harm in setting the bar high for these standards. People want to live in the city. We know that developments are going to happen, and I guess I just don't understand why, a bar set high, why that's a problem. You know the standards are going to be followed and the best developments are going to be built that align with the neighborhood, so, I'm not quite sure why we are going against some of what the planning department was saying in the recommendations, because it seemed like they were doing that and it just seemed like, a lot of the conversations were based on this exact photo or that exact photo being showed and you have to remember that, there's a sliding scale of these examples across the city. There's going to be worst offenders and there's going to be developments that the neighborhood loves and so, I think that this ordinance needs to be addressed to protect the residents from the worst offenders. That's your responsibility on this committee. Finally, again, set the bar high and the variance process, it's going to be used, and then let that process actually work to benefit the development, maybe they can lessen it, but if the bar isn't being set high then you know, you are just lessening an already low bar.

Dale Furrow: I'm rising to support the changes that were submitted by Sandy Stephens on behalf of museum park and in general her work on this committee, as other people have noticed. There's a lot of developer focus here, not as much on residents. Sandy is carrying that work, and there's large group of people in the neighborhood supporting her. I want to respond to a point that Suvidha just made, where she says basically look, we don't have jurisdiction on a noise. We certainly, there is nothing to keep this group from proposing appropriate penalties associated with encroaching developments and the noise they create. And putting penalties on it, related to what's going on in chapter 30. Nothing that I can see keeps you from doing that, and it's in keeping with the mission of encouraging responsible density in development, while preserving great neighborhoods. That's in your mission statement. So, you need to widen the applicability of this current buffering ordinance, and you need to broaden the protections. I heard good things today, about broadening the protections, not a lot about widening the applicability. I live across the street from a 13 Story apartment building. The lights from the parking garage regularly shine into my building. But I am not protected because it's across the street. So, we need to talk about that. Also the previous comment about the noise being very occasional doesn't account for the fact that the huge intensity of it and the fact that it is occurring at 4:00 a.m. There needs to be sufficient penalty for noise associated with encroaching development to encourage good design. So, I applaud you for the work that you are doing thus far. I'm going to reiterate on widening the applicability of this idea of abutting developments being a limiting factor.

Jack Miller: I'd like to comment about the high standards for garage shielding. There was excellent work done in passing the transit-oriented development ordinance and emphasizing a more pedestrian friendly Houston. Having strict garage shielding standards furthers that goal as far as encouraging pedestrian use in the city. I have a concern right now about that word abutting. As an attorney, we use that word when it means a property that it immediately touches on the line. But it could be used to abut a street, upon which homes that face a garage are on and I hope that it will incorporate those. We must consider broadening the scope for not just single-family development but for residential development in general. I know there's been a lot of attention paid to the so-called missing middle, which is partially what the transit-oriented development ordinance was designed to encourage.

Barb Brooks: I live in the Museum Park District and Sandy Stevens is representing all of the homeowners from that group, and I know she's done an excellent job in getting feedback from all of us to the Committee. One of the things that's important to us is that the garage screening and the lighting cover homes that are across the street because it shines into our homes. And the only other comment is, noise is a big concern and I understand tabling it for now, but I think you ought to bring up, all the different noise issues soon.

Jane Kramers: I'm a resident of the Heights, just like Lindsey, I would like to lend support and encouragement to everybody to set the bar high in these circumstances. We need to find a good balance between, you know, commercial, industrial, residential development, in our neighborhoods

because we don't want to see a diminishing aspect to the character of neighborhoods. The point I want to make is that when we say we can't do that, to a particular element of what we are discussing here, for example to dumpster discussion, then we are stopping all of our minds from putting together innovative solutions to these sorts of problems.

Mark Williamson: I want to thank somebody for pointing out that lights from office's can be just as disruptive as lights from garages and we ought to think about regulating how much light pollution can be caused by office buildings also by façade illustration and branding illustration. I don't want to live next door to the supernova Company that decides that it wants to put a huge light on the front. And finally, that, all of these things, rather than being adjacent or abutting, ought to be within eye shot. if it's going to fall in my house, I don't know why it matters that there is a low-rise parking garage or something else between me and the high-rise piece. I still want to be protected from it.

Council Member Sally Alcorn: There's been quite a few comments about noise. I am working on that through the Regulatory and neighborhood affairs committee. I'm specifically dealing with noise coming from these big night clubs and things, but we are, I am working with the administration regulatory affairs committee, legal, HPD on the noise ordinance. And I am happy to bring up some of the issues that arisen here. Please direct any comments, related to the noise with specifics that I can deal with to atlarge5@houston.tx.gov. Would be happy to try to address some of those concerns in my work there.

Melanie Harris: Houston is home, to me. And with a mission of preserving great neighborhoods, I live in the heights and I bought here for my neighborhood and for my neighbors and for that feel of home and so I just want to reiterate the need to find that balance, to ensure that we are challenging ourselves to be creative, and challenging ourselves to be able to grow, while maintaining the neighborhoods that people come and people stay for.

Kathleen Gunter: I just wanted to see, have you guys considered, removing the 75' requirement from this ordinance in order to include other areas of Houston, specifically some of the northeast area where we have a time and issues as it relates to buffering

Suvidha Bandi: A couple of committee members said in chat that we are trying to discourage LED lights with our proposals on lighting. I just want to clarify that led lights can also be warm lights and we are not banning LED lights. We just recommend using the one warm lights.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:01pm