

**From:** [irma alesna](#)  
**To:** [Callaway, Irma A](#)  
**Cc:** [Rory Escalante](#); [Melissa Strawn](#); [Matt Yarborough](#); [Carey Lankford](#); [Mike Johnson](#); [Eric Foerster](#); [Steve Boykin](#); [Kirsten Garcia](#)  
**Subject:** Oakwood shores zoning meeting Oct 18 2022  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 11, 2022 2:14:48 PM

---

To City of Richwood and City Council:

I am unable to attend the meeting about the discussion and possible change to our current building line setbacks Oakwood Shores Subdivision. I would like to document my stance on this important matter for the public record for this meeting. **I do not support that this change of setback from 25ft for accessory buildings for our community of oakwood shores.**

Most of us have chosen this community due to the size of property and to have the feel of country living and not be subjected to properties being too close to one another like most residential areas would. The best of both of both worlds includes being in a country feel and with city ordinances that protect our properties and their value. Our community has a big tax presence for this city of Richwood and there are a few residents in the minority that seek this change of zoning to better serve their specific situation.

Lots vary in size in the subdivision and with proper planning and following of regulations most families can find lots to suit their needs and build with more than enough space as the ordinances stand.

The current setbacks for accessory buildings in our the "R-4" zone state 25 ft from property line.

**This subdivision is the only "R-4" zone in the city of Richwood**, so this ordinance change only affects this subdivision and **not necessarily for the betterment of the city itself**. Before these changes are to be considered for further discussion: the council members should seriously consider the **validity** of making these changes along the big picture of the entire subdivision affected and potential for the devaluing of our resident's property values along with other potential hazards while keeping in mind that city ordinances should protect us from health, safety, and fire issues.

A government body should also consider liability the city could incur in making these changes without the due diligence of the proper third-party professionals for the planning and development to a fast-growing established community.

The proposed ordinance change would allow accessory buildings closer to our existing homes and pose real hazards if these accessory buildings are any closer to our homes by being allowed at less than the currently required 25ft setback. In this subdivision **most requested accessory structures are metal pole barns**. These pole barns being built *mostly* in rear of properties and not next door to an already built home in most cases. In my case the metal pole barn is next door to my property and right beside my main home that I built within the required setbacks in 2017. This issue is another way to resurface an issue with an existing violation already in place and will allow this violation to remain after the variance (that was asked for after violation) was denied. I have enclosed pictures of how I have been affected from my situation and to give all of you better picture of why the

25<sup>th</sup> minimum should stay in place. This building is at 17 ft and TOO CLOSE to my home. This building this close has affected my resale value, will cause flooding into my property and pool if we have heavy rains (as I have been through twice here). It also will store combustible equipment (fire hazard) and loud equipment that should be kept further from my property. If someone chooses a barn/ accessory building on their property it should not be a liability to me. That is the issues I am facing at 17ft. setback next door to me. Allowing less than 25ft will cause this for others going forward.

**The changing of setbacks for an accessory building in one single zone of the city is not for the betterment of the city** and oakwood shores residents that have followed guidelines to live within the rural like area and has the potential to devalue one of our biggest investments if changed. **\*LASTLY A primary home and a metal pole barn structure are not at all in the to be in the same classification of building. The argument being made that if a primary structure could be there then a metal barn should be allowed is not valid to consider make these changes.**

**Allowing metal pole barn structures (accessory buildings) closer to property line and homes has potential hazards to include:**

**Fire hazards** – these barns store combustible materials and gas-powered equipment (including welding machines in some cases)

**Flooding and runoff issues-** Especially due recent elevation changes to flood maps are requiring higher build up in our community and the neighboring properties are built up to previous specs will be more prone flooding and runoff. \* We have many new homes being constructed at this time and these hazards will be more and more of an issue going forward as we grow and the now empty lots start filling up.

**Windstorm hazard-** The metal buildings being that close to homes in the event of the metal flying off in high winds even after being windstorm inspected or being windstorm engineered (Example: at McCoy's this year on 288-B)

If setbacks are allowed to less than 25 ft. minimum there will be many adjoining properties being reduced of space and all the potential hazards and devaluing of properties will be inevitable. This is not just as simple a "aesthetic matter" to consider scratching out a current setback and replacing it with another. This change of setbacks will impose real hazards and devaluing of property values for our Oakwood Shores community in the future. The city should consider how it has invested our taxpayers' money in our roads and other utilities. The city could greatly benefit to focus on enforcing the current codes, bettering our community, and protecting our property values. It is my understanding Oakwood Shores roughly represents 40% or better (with ongoing growth) of the city tax revenue and that should be worth protecting.

If this email is not sufficient for my not being able to attend this meeting, please reply to how to get on record on this matter timely to be considered on the meeting date of Oct 18, 2022. I know other residents want to voice their opinions regardless of attendance due to conflicts .

Irma Callaway  
31603 Bayou Bend Drive



Get [Outlook for iOS](#)