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abstract

If the Montrose district’s most salient character is cultural diversity, then the restrictions set forth by the City of Houston Planning Department’s ‘Chapter 42’ have proven insufficient, in fact counterproductive to achieving the first publicly stated goal of those amendments: maintainence of neighborhood character. Ironically, what allowed the recent climax in diversity to accidentally emerge was the deterioration and subsequent inconsistent levels of maintainence/restoration of what began in the 1920’s as a pristine monoculture of middle class bungalows. But as the low-density, single family home has become an inadequate response to Montrose’s recent increase in market desirability, Chapter 42 and its resultant “townhouse” model threaten the district with yet a new promise of economic/cultural singularity. However, while embracing Houston’s strategy of dwelling-type-as-market-product, it appears possible to write in to the code the previously-accidental ingredient for neighborhoods like Montrose: community emergence through propagation of difference. Thus, Houston’s near-town neighborhoods could incrementally densify through means sensitive to local conditions, and simultaneously subvert the ever-present gentrification-oriented threat of monotony.

1 Marlene Gaffrick of City of Houston Planning Dept. Goals of Chapter 42 as stated in telephone interview.
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"...The only organization capable of unprejudiced growth, or unguided learning, is a network."

-Kevin Kelly
chapter one
Real Property and the Misrecognition of Ownership
The right to vote

Property and one’s ownership thereof, as a reified concept, is a most basic building block of modern western culture. In the United States’ Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal," it is well-known that the 'men' here did not, at the time it was written, refer to every man, but distinctly property-owning men.

Indeed the right to vote-to be one of the "people" entitled to use his voice to mold the laws of the state was granted only to this upper white male echelon. It was not until 1856, 75 years after the foundation of the U.S. Government that this clause was fully abolished by each state legislature. Of course now, the right to vote is granted to any person of any color, sex, religion, or class. But the broad acceptance of that original limitation set forth by a country which so recently declared and won independence from a force it deemed threatening to its god-given freedoms should be indicative of the extent to which owning property was not only understood as natural, but absolutely necessary in order to claim validity as a citizen representative of the country. The laws have since changed, but perhaps the ideology did not.

Territorial claims

At first glance, the idea of owning property may appear to be nothing but a modern manifestation of a very natural instinct of pre-historic man, or other high order species to territorialize a bit of the environment and protect it from intruders-as if they owned it. But, in fact stepping away from western capitalist society, we can find many other complex ways of conceiving relationships between beings and the land on which they dwell.

A nomadic society, like any ‘civilized’ sedentary society, operates under some sort of social contract-It is a nation-yet defines its nation in a much different way. The Plains Indians in America did not exist in a savage state of nature as many
white settlers believed. They had a strong identification as a society, but their way of life demanded that their geographical boundary be in constant flux, reacting to the erratic nature of a herd of buffalo or seasonal rains such that nourishing resources were always surmountable.

This is not to say they did not territorialize, but it was not through the seizing of land so much as it was the claiming of a mobile resource such as a herd. The idea that one might stake claim to a static area of soil under these terms did not exist—there was no pressure to conceive of land in this way, in fact it would have been a liability as that land was productive only intermittently. It came to follow that the quickest, most effective means the white men used to dominate the Plains Indians then was not to attack their villages, but to destroy their buffalo herds.

The nomadic being has a real relationship with its territorialized surroundings. The size of a clan’s territory and the manner in which this environment is modulated for the short time they occupy it is defined by an immediate set of physical parameters: an individual or a group is capable, as a function of the available methods of defense, of defending a limited area of turf. It is of the inhabitants’ best interest to maintain just enough of the environment to provide habitat and not more than this, as excess becomes a burden.

So why not secure a large enough swath of land to encompass a full year’s range of supplies? The simplest explanation might be that to have a piece of turf which one can vacate for a period of time, then return and expect it still to be their territory requires an understandable means of signifying ownership—a sort of white picket fence, as well as a means of ensuring that others will honor the defined boundary. It is at this point that one’s relationship to land is abstracted, where language stands in for physical presence.

In a modern capitalist economy, the method of ensuring one’s sole access to his or her piece of property is the contract, which always implies a third party with the power to enforce its terms. If you want my piece of land and declare your occupation

---

3 It should be noted that these processes are not restricted to humans, as it is well-known that to a wolf (a), the scent of an unfamiliar wolf (b)’s urine on a patch of ground signifies a possible future attack by wolf (b) when he returns should wolf (a) remain in wolf (b)’s claimed territory. But that is not to say that wolf (a) will not choose to remain and risk attack, with the possibility of victory in a potential scuffle, thereby territorializing the area for himself. Unless another higher code or governance over land acquisition is mutually understood by the interlocutors, this kind of violent turnover might always be a possibility.
of it against my will, it is not my task to force you off, as a state police force is readily deployable to defend the social system in which my contract was born, and from which it claims validity.

But pre-capitalist society, without a concept of the contract or police force, perhaps operates under similar fundamental principles. That is to say, the creative processes of claiming a territory or exchange of material goods is not shaped solely by negotiations between a first and second person.

The Declaration of Independence

For Derrida, Mauss' study of the gift through societies such as the Trobrianders' circumscribed everything but the gift because there was always the return, even if not simultaneous. Bourdieu asserts that the misrecognition of the gift-made possible through a temporal delay-as operating independent of an economy is all that differentiates a gift society from an exchange economy. Could we not see a declaration of independence that involves the acquisition of a piece of land for the 'newly created' people as a sort of inversion of the gift-misrecognized as existing along a first and second party axis and mistakenly appearing to be non-economical?

The United States Declaration of Independence, followed by the defeat of England in the American Revolution at first might appear to have been an acquisition not unlike the above example where wolf (a) acquires wolf (b)'s territory through face to face interaction, independent of a third party. This is performative in that it creates what it refers to: wealth for wolf (a) that did not exist before the event—the truly was no exchange. As in any declaration of independence, the American one appears not to have been an exchange authorized by the existing power structure—as that is the structure it is opposing. In fact it may appear not to be an exchange at all, hence the tendency to mistake the declaration for a pure performative act.

Bonnie Honig asks in response to Hannah Arendt, "can we conceive of institutions possessed of authority without deriving that authority from some law of laws, from some extrapolitical

---

4 In the Trobriand Islands, when a native receives an armband from (a), he is compelled to eventually pass it on to (b) not because (b) will attack him if he does not, but because that is the way of the his people who believe that their actions are subject to a force more powerful than any individual. Literally, if you hold on to a gift too long, death, administered by witchcraft could be the consequence. Magic is the third party.


source?" According to the logic of Arendt, the United States Declaration of Independence cannot in fact be seen as purely performative in that it importantly involved a third party to justify its action. Declaring that the land the colonists now lived on no longer belonged to the king of England, that it was now their own was justified because it followed morally, under God's terms that the existing circumstances created by the king were denying them certain God-given rights.

In practical terms, God did not act as the police force to come and enforce the terms the colonists established-like any revolution, the means of achieving the colonist's end was war-appearing as a 2-party axis, or transgression into a state of nature, devoid of any "third person objectification".

But the fact of the colonists belief that in their action they were actually carrying out the will of a higher power, believing that the outcome must have been part of His plan, allows us to draw a line between this particular brand of property acquisition and for example, the contractual sale of a piece of real estate from one citizen to another, objectified by the third party legal system. In other words, the colonists were not taking, as a villain takes, something they did not recognize as rightfully theirs. The right to be a nation and have this land was understood to be owed them by the British under the particular social code by which they operated. In a very literal sense, the American Revolution was exactly that, a revolution or return. However, like the gift in Bourdieu's terms, it is misrecognized as such due to a temporal delay.

Misrecognition

Interestingly, we are perhaps able to understand misrecognition as an equally necessary element to modern economic exchange especially when dealing with real property-particularly urban residential real estate. In fact it might be said that it is what differentiates real property from personal property.

As stated previously, the idea of an individual or group

---


8 The fact that Jefferson included a list of all the offenses of the King toward the colonies as the justification behind their declaration, to some extent implies that from the colonists' viewpoint, it was an exchange-Parliament took our rights from us, so we have no other alternative but to rescind our loyalty to them, and in-so-doing, acquire this property.

owning land is pure ideology. When one purchases a plot of land, it is sold for a monetary value in the same manner as personal property. But when that plot of land is a part of a neighborhood—whether its boundaries be clearly defined or not, then there is a network of societal trust, contingency and implication into which the buyer is entering. As clearly as the boundaries of a piece of property are defined on the appraisal district map, the phenomenological experience of a living in a neighborhood of real properties is not so pixelated.

If I purchase house (h) in neighborhood (n), then it is a certainty that my ability for personal expression on that property is bracketed, often limited to unseen portions of the property—the backyard. Even in Houston, Texas where there are no zoning requirements per se, it would not be possible for example, for me to live on my property in a trailer, or clad my house with recycled beer cans—unless I lived in the Houston Heights, where the network has been conditioned to handle this permutation. And if my lawn has grown more than a certain height, crossing the threshold of what is deemed aesthetically acceptable by my neighbors, I am certain to be subject to the fines associated with the City of Houston’s having to come and tame the yard for me, should I fail to meet the standard.

What has happened when I purchased my piece of property is that I entered into a collectivity that has decided at some point in time to form for the sake of maintaining a character deemed desireable by the local inhabitants. In Houston, deed restrictions can be sought on a block by block basis should a majority of the landowners on a block agree to a particular set of restrictions they wish to legally enforce. These neighborhood organizations can be understood as miniature instances of Hobbes’ social contract\textsuperscript{10} where we all agree to give up a certain freedom, i.e. the ability to build within ten feet from my front property line, such that a greater freedom can be achieved through collective compliance—now that nobody has built within ten feet of their front property line, we can all enjoy a view down the street, dominated by uninterrupted green foliage (provided we all water our plants).

\textsuperscript{10} Thomas Hobbes, “De Cive,” in: \textit{De Homine and De Cive} (Man and Citizen), 1651, 1990, Hackett, pp.121-133
The result of this kind of collectivity in a residential neighborhood is a smoothness across a field. A conglomeration of residential properties might be modelled more productively with fluid dynamics or long bending wires than with solid wooden blocks. Such a model might exemplify the arbitrary nature of property lines in such an environment, and suggest a building development strategy which moves from the existing field of conditions to one which more precisely houses the relationships that truly make a region a neighborhood.

11 A neighborhood of dwellings is rich in invisible relationships of contingency which create a field independent of the property lines that define the neighborhood on a map. Embedded in a model of such contingencies, is a potential for new development that materializes this field as opposed to the common upward extrusion of rectangles respective to artificial property lines.
chapter two

Montrose
rogue district...

The main public thoroughfares of the Montrose district are lined with countless commercial homages to the decisively rogue character with which this neighborhood identifies itself. It appears to be a natural expression of a certain pride in the area's progressive and liberal ideals. In practice, the neighborhood indeed maintains large degrees of cultural diversity within its every block—an attribute few of Houston's neighborhood's can claim.

While this neighborhood had its beginning as a uniformly white middle-class Houston suburb in the 1920's, by the 1990's racial, cultural, and economic diversity became the norm here. By the '90's the chance of any random-selected Montrose resident having a neighbor of a different race increased to about 50% 1 While at the same time it became quite common to find incidents of neighboring property values differing by hundreds of thousands of dollars 2.

One theory posited by the author as to how a neighborhood like Montrose might evolve has (of course) much to do with accidental circumstance. It starts in the material—the common material from which to build America's suburbs in the 1920's was wood—for framing, siding, and finishing.

---

1 Based on study of 100 random properties and their neighbors. Information from the Harris County Appraisal District (HCAD)
2 HCAD
For Houston’s moist, floodprone, insect-rich environment, the rates at which a wood home will deteriorate can swing wildly depending on slight variations in maintenance habits among the inhabitants. Relatively quickly—a few decades time—some houses on the block are dilapidated while other well kept homes from the same period stand proud. In turn, the market values vary as widely as the visual condition of the homes.

Along with this variance in property values in Montrose came the varied economic status of the inhabitants. And for a city like Houston, where industry in the mid-20th century was owned by whites and powered by non-whites, it would naturally follow that the non-whites would be the market for the low-valued bungalows in less than ideal condition.
Indirectly and accidentally, a cultural mix took hold in this neighborhood that, by the 90's, would become its identity and which it would nurture and offer as a commodity. This recently became attractive enough to some middle-class families that it would be here that they decide to build their new homes—replete with nostalgia for the original “period” of this neighborhood.

But, along with the middle-class rediscovery of the Montrose comes the inevitable raise in property value and annual taxes. Predictably, many of the lower-income residents have greater financial incentive to sell the property to the highest bidder and move on.3

3 At this point (year 2002), it is quite common to be able to shoot a photograph of a residential street (above) in Montrose catching three or four “for sale” signs in the frame.

Two scales

The past decade has shown us that in the Montrose district, it is when a neighborhood reaches this state, that an almost cataclysmic reform begins. With increased market desirability for the neighborhood, comes the developers’ increased propensity to take risks to maximize profits. They pay the large asking prices for the small single-family homes on 50' X 100' parcels and destroy them in order to build for higher densities. As for what the new profit-maximizing density shall be, many factors figure in:
profit-maximizing density shall be, many factors figure in: market desire, building codes, material costs, etc.

To varying degrees of success along major thoroughfares, high-density residential towers have been attempted by developers intermittently throughout the last two decades. The cataclysmic shift in scale between the single-family home and the tower is an expression of the differing economic returns to scale of two entirely different construction systems when overlaid with building codes.

Along with a shift in scale, the tower model, with its requisite multi-story parking infrastructure, completely reterritorializes (or deterritorializes) the ground plane, rendering it a sort of no-man's land\(^4\).

\(^4\) It should be noted however that, good or bad, the residential tower is but an anomaly in the Montrose District, arising only when an uncommon mix of forces converge on a suitable site.
Typically though, the manner in which residential density increases in Montrose has not been so catastrophic and decidedly aligns itself with the same pine-stud system of construction and the same building codes applicable to the single-family bungalow. And it purports to offer luxury in the same heaping spoonfuls with its advertisements of spaciousness and "garden living." It is called the Houston townhouse and in the last decade, the developers' propensity to choose this model for their speculative home-building investments is nearly ubiquitous.

One, or a multiple of 50'X100' lots are purchased and the single-family unit/acre density is either doubled or tripled based on how much vehicle access is possible on the site.

Enter Chapter 42

Perhaps fitting, it is almost entirely on this point—vehicle access—that the language in the Houston Planning Commission's most recent land development ordnance amendments reside. As we shall see, even the parts about building setbacks, always have a direct contingency on garages, driveways, and parking spaces.
chapter 42

A Sampling
Chapter 42: restrictions/incentives

minimum subdivided property size: 1400 ft$^2$

HPC's rationale: Allows for greater density while maintaining "single-family" scale properties.

practical effects: Typical 5000 ft$^2$ lot can accommodate a maximum of three subdivided properties.

This reinstates vertically extruded property convention: no stacking, or overlapping.

minimum parking requirement: 2 on-site spaces

HPC's rationale: Frees up on-street parking for public access.

practical effects: Discourages creation of properties for single-car, or no-car families.

This results in disproportionate amount of paved surface on each property.
Chapter 42: restrictions/incentives (cont’d)

10’ building setback

HPC’s rationale: allows for more buildable square footage than previous 20’ setback, while maintaining potential for “garden” street character.

practical effects: Lesser distance between home and street not great enough for privacy necessary for living spaces, resulting in mostly

exception to 10’ building setback: 5’ setback when driveway is shared

HPC’s rationale: incentive for fewer curbcuts; frees up on-street public parking.

practical effects: Encourages developer to seek two adjacent lots to create “six pack” development.

the six-pack creates enclave, removing most units from street

20’ garage setback

HPC’s rationale: car can park on driveway w/out blocking sidewalk.

practical effects: more paved surface.

garage space can be freed up for alternative program.
**I.B.C/Fire Codes**

**escape stairs:** any dwelling space above (3) stories must have at least (2) distinct egress stairs.

- **rationale:** fire escape routes
- **practical effects:** developer limits townhouse height to 3 stories of dwelling space.

**elevators:** any dwelling space above (4) stories shall have access to an elevator

- **rationale:** ensures accessibility for elderly and/or handicapped residents.
- **practical effects:** a building taller than four stories is not profitable for developer unless one elevator is shared by many, as in a tower.

**firewalls:** adjacent dwellings must be separated by either (a) a 1hr. rated windowless firewall, (b) a gap of min. 6'-2" between dwellings of separate developments, or (c) a 3'-1" min. gap between dwellings within the same development.

- **rationale:** fire spread is minimized
- **practical effects:** natural light conditions are poor, privacy is challenged, residents tend toward greater use of artificial means of environment control.
Montrose with chapter 42
Inner Houston
with Montrose District

(Property value analysis of orange shaded region on following spread)
2002 property values for Montrose
(Harris County Appraisal District)
"HINTING AT THE FINANCIAL UNSUSTAINABILITY OF THE SINGLE-FAMILY BUNGALOW IN THIS AREA, THE DENSE CLUSTERS OF DOTS ON THIS MAP (REPRESENTING TOWN-HOUSES) TEND TO BE VALUED AT 4 TO 5 TIMES THE GENEROUSLY SPACED..."
Hyde Park
existing buildings 2002
Hyde Park
new buildings
constructed 1997-2002

- townhouses
- single-family homes
Hyde Park
projected near-future site
availability (as of 2002)
The crack...

The crack, or the near-comical manner in which the Houston townhouse (under chapter 42) deals with adjacency conditions is the expression of a much larger problem with the current planning code. The rules for building are based only on an edifice’s relation to the edge of its property, entirely disregarding the space or anti-space it might create when contextualized against other local buildings. This not only ensures sub-satisfactory interstices, but discourages change across a field as the models can be (and are) carbon copied over and over again from plot to plot.
It is this point concerning adjacency conditions and repeatability from which we shall depart, seeking a new set of planning rules, a "chapter 43", loaded with the potential to reach yet higher residential densities, thicker infrastructures, and more robust culture in Houston's neighborhoods.

Units larger than the individual property cell will be considered as while not forgetting age old architectural commodities such as light, garden space, and gradients of public/private space.
chapter 43

part I: the rules
Chapter 43-NSF: New Street Formation
With an interest in allowing for dwellings to directly access the social space of the street, along with considering the increased need for parking which accompanies densification, a new incentive model is proposed to gradually thicken street infrastructure over time. At the expense of a few existing residential driveways and (mostly dilapidated) sheds, property homeowners and landlords can opt to sell what might be a strategically located 11' wide swath of little used side yard to a developer interested in securing a contract to more land which flanks the street for future use. (see NSF1.1)
NSF1.1 - 33’ Provisional R.O.W.

The developer of a new street initially pays only for the 11’ wide vehicle path while securing for future ownership the flanking 11’ on each side of this path totalling a 33’ right of way. This shall occur immediately upon the sale of property on which this provisional R.O.W. lies.

NSF1.2 - Occupation of provisional R.O.W.

The buyer who develops on a property overlapping a provisional R.O.W. has the option to buy or rent this portion of property from the owner for use as parallel parking only.

NSF1.3 - Sidewalks flanking provisional R.O.W.

A buyer who develops on a property overlapping a provisional R.O.W. must maintain a 3’ sidewalk at outermost extent of R.O.W.
NSF1.4 - Trees within provisional R.O.W.

A tree deemed suitable by the City of Houston shall be planted within the provisional R.O.W. at a minimum of 45' O.C. along the side of the new street.
Chapter 43-P: Parking

P1.1 - Private parking spaces

Dwellings with fewer than three bedrooms shall have a minimum of one private parking space. Dwellings with three or more bedrooms shall have a minimum of two private parking spaces.

P1.2 - Street parking

A minimum of one street parking space shall be provided per every 50’ of street frontage.

P1.3 - Parking Exemption

A tax exemption shall be rewarded as an amount per each additional street parking space provided along a property’s street frontage.
Chapter 43-B: Building restriction

B1.1 - 16’ Setback:

New buildings shall respect an easement of 16’ offset from any transparent wall (containing windows) of neighboring buildings.
B1.2 - Shared property lines:

A minimum of 50% of a shared property line shall be either void (having wall set-back 16' min. from property line), or firewall. The required area of such a void or firewall shall fit inside a single rectangle.
Chapter 43-S: Sale of Property

S1.1 - 3-D Property description and sale

Property shall be sold as (1) the three-dimensional space from the ground to 35′ (or three stories) and (2) the developable space above this height as provided by ample structure and provision of adequate vertical circulation.
Chapter 43-G: Garden Provision

G1.1 - Private gardens

A minimum of 350 s.f. inhabitable exterior space shall be allotted to each dwelling as private garden.

G1.2 - Public/private exterior space

Total S.F. of inhabitable exterior space (public and private combined) shall exceed a minimum of 200 S.F. per dwelling.

G1.3 - Sunlight

Each private garden space shall receive direct sunlight to a point four feet above the center of its surface for a minimum duration of (4) hours/day between the dates of March 21 and Sept. 21. No adjacent development shall be built in such a way as to deprive any existing garden of this minimum amount of natural light.
While accepting a reduction in the overall amount of
garden space in contrast to the single-family home,
a few rules governing exterior space allow for that
which is provided to be heavily activated as an exten-
part II: more cars
Scenario 1: spring 2003
Scenario 1: spring/summer 2005
Scenario 1: winter 2005-06
Scenario 1: winter 2006-07
part III: occupancy
Existing block: winter 2006-07

- total dwellings: 11
- total occupancy: 27
- private parking spaces: 17
- public parking spaces: 34
- parking spaces/inhabitant: 1.89
- private garden s.f.: 17,774
- private garden s.f./dwelling: 1615

*occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**statistics for shaded region
Lot 59: maximum buildout

- total dwellings: 13
- total occupancy: 35
- private parking spaces: 21
- public parking spaces: 32
- parking spaces/inhabitant: 1.5
- private garden s.f.: 17,774
- private garden s.f./dwelling: 1315

*occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**statistics for shaded region
Lot 59 (alt. 1): spring 2003

- total dwellings: 13
- total occupancy: 35
- private parking spaces: 21
- public parking spaces: 33
- parking spaces/inhabitant: 1.54
- private garden s.f.: 18,095
- private garden s.f./dwelling: 1315

*occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**statistics for shaded region
Lot 59 (alt. 2 with new street): spring 2003

- total dwellings: 13
- total occupancy: 34
- private parking spaces: 20
- public parking spaces: 33
- parking spaces/inhabitant: 1.59
- private garden s.f.: 18,093
- private garden s.f./dwelling: 1315

*occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**statistics for shaded region
Lot 59 (alt. 2, phase 2): spring 2003

total dwellings: 14
total occupancy: 34
private parking spaces: 22
public parking spaces: 33
parking spaces/inhabitant: 1.62
private garden s.f.: 17,899
private garden s.f./dwelling: 1279

*occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**statistics for shaded region
Lots 12 + 13 (tower w/ new street): winter 2003-04

- total dwellings: 28
- total occupancy: 62
- private parking spaces: 53
- public parking spaces: 32
- parking spaces/inhabitant: 1.37
- private garden s.f.: 19,999
- private garden s.f./dwelling: 714

*occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**statistics for shaded region
Lots 12 + 13 (alt. 2): winter 2003-04

- total dwellings: 19
- total occupancy: 52
- private parking spaces: 33
- public parking spaces: 32
- parking spaces/inhabitant: 1.25
- private garden s.f.: 19,552
- private garden s.f./dwelling: 1029

*occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**statistics for shaded region
Lot 62: summer 2004

- Total dwellings: 22
- Total occupancy: 63
- Private parking spaces: 37
- Public parking spaces: 32
- Parking spaces/inhabitant: 1.10
- Private garden s.f.: 16,967
- Private garden s.f./dwelling: 771

*Occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**Statistics for shaded region
Lots 35 + 36: winter 2003

- total dwellings: 28
- total occupancy: 84
- private parking spaces: 52
- public parking spaces: 32
- parking spaces/inhabitant: 1.00
- private garden s.f.: 15,864
- private garden s.f./dwelling: 567

*occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**statistics for shaded region
Lots 37 + 61: winter 2003

total dwellings: 34
total occupancy: 108
private parking spaces: 60
public parking spaces: 32
parking spaces/inhabitant: 0.85
private garden s.f.: 14,813
private garden s.f./dwelling: 436

*occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**statistics for shaded region
Lots 12 + 13 (tower w/ new street): winter 2003

Total dwellings: 44
Total occupancy: 129
Private parking spaces: 60
Public parking spaces: 32
Parking spaces/inhabitant: 0.71
Private garden s.f.: 18,845
Private garden s.f./dwelling: 428

*Occupancy based on number of bedrooms
**Statistics for shaded region
Development projection under Chapter 42: 2002

total dwellings: 27
total occupancy: 98
private parking spaces: 42
public parking spaces: 27
parking spaces/inhabitant: 0.70
private garden s.f.: 9112
private garden s.f./dwelling: 337.5

*occupancy based on number of bedrooms
*statistics for shaded region
part IV: Scenario: Emergent Community
Ground Level Plan
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