



## **CITY OF ROLLINGWOOD COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**Tuesday, August 20, 2024**

The CRCRC of the City of Rollingwood, Texas held a meeting, open to the public, in the Municipal Building at 403 Nixon Drive in Rollingwood, Texas on August 20, 2024. Members of the public and the CRCRC were able to participate in the meeting virtually, as long as a quorum of the CRCRC and the presiding officer were physically present at the Municipal Building, in accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act. A video recording of the meeting was made and will be posted to the City's website and available to the public in accordance with the Texas Public Information Act upon written request.

### **CALL COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING AND PUBLIC WORKSHOP TO ORDER**

1. Roll Call

**Chair Dave Bench called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m.**

**Present Members:** Chair Dave Bench, Jay van Bavel, Brian Rider, Duke Garwood and Thom Farrell.

**Also Present:** City Administrator Ashley Wayman

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

2. Discussion and possible action on previously approved lighting recommendations
3. Discussion and possible action on previously approved recommendation regarding a driveway special exception

Dave Bench discussed that Jerry Fleming found a small typo in the recommendations.

**Thom Farrell moved to approve the consent agenda with the correction of the typo on the lighting recommendation proposal. Jay van Bavel seconded the motion. The motion carried with 5 in favor and 0 against.**

Chair Dave Bench clarified that these items would go to the Planning and Zoning Commission next.

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

4. Discussion and possible action of recommended building height text starting with “Suggested Rules” document, item 4

Chair Dave Bench introduced this item and discussed the parallel plane model.

The CRCRC discussed the proposed building height recommendations including the parallel plane model, the special exception process, allowances allowed through the Board of Adjustment when in the flood plain.

**Brian Rider moved with respect to CRCRC recommendations approved on 7-23, the language on the first line be changed to read, “should some portion of the buildable area reside on or be adjacent to a flood plain.” Thom Farrell seconded the motion. The motion carried with 5 in favor and 0 against.**

The CRCRC continued to discuss the parallel plane, the provided definition.

**Duke Garwood moved that the parallel plane is defined as described as approved by the CRCRC. Jay van Bavel seconded the motion.**

The CRCRC clarified that this was referring to the blue text under the word “proposed.”

**The motion carried with 5 in favor and 0 against.**

The CRCRC discussed the text regarding the excavation area.

**Brian Rider moved that the words “as to the portion of building above the excavated area,” be inserted before “40 ft.” and “50 ft.” at the beginning of A and B. Duke Garwood seconded the motion.**

The CRCRC clarified that the amendment is to be inserted before A and B, where they currently start with “40 ft.” and “45 ft.”

Jay van Bavel clarified that this motion does include the last sentence that reads “Any exposed foundation resulting from this increase may not exceed 18 inches.

**The motion carried with 5 in favor and 0 against.**

Chair Dave Bench and the CRCRC discussed the proposed amended language regarding adjustments to the existing grade for minor topographic variations.

**Jay van Bavel moved to substitute the proposed language in blue regarding adjusting existing grade for unusual or minor topographic grade changes. Thom Farrell seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried with 5 in favor and 0 against.**

Chair Dave Bench stated that they had now concluded building height.

The CRCRC discussed the “Side Setback Projections” section as shown in the packet, and whether air conditioning units are allowed in setbacks.

Council Member Brook Brown discussed possible language options, as well as that there are not setbacks in the residential zoning code, only required yards.

The CRCRC discussed the purpose of the “side setback projections,” language.

**Thom Farrell moved to accept Council Member Brook Brown’s language with the addition of a provision at the end that says, “in no event shall any construction be within the 10-foot side yard.” The motion failed for lack of a second.**

Chair Dave Bench clarified that the CRCRC is still preserving “overhangs.”

The CRCRC further discussed the proposed language.

**Brian Rider moved that with respect to the text in the packet called “Side Setback Projections” the CRCRC amend side yard rules section 107-76 as follows: “in a side yard of 12.5 feet or greater, other ordinary projections of building features typically used in residential building construction may project into any required yard a maximum of two feet.” \*The drafter of code language is requested to honor the intention of the committee that this means that no projection will be closer than 10 feet to the adjacent property line. Thom Farrell seconded the motion.**

**Chair Dave Bench amended the motion that all the language described does not include roof overhangs. Brian Rider accepted the amendment. The amended motion carried with 5 in favor and 0 against.**

5. Discussion and possible action on foundation height

Chair Dave Bench discussed previous discussions about foundation height.

Jerry Fleming, 305 Nixon Drive, discussed his suggested amendments to the foundation exposure language.

The CRCRC discussed possible amendments to the proposed language and the intent of this language.

**Brian Rider moved that with respect to foundations the recommendation is “Foundation exposure within public view from the right-of-way cannot exceed 6ft. Foundation exposure within public view from the right-of-way must be screened such that viewable portion does not exceed 2.5ft (30in). Dave Bench seconded the motion. The motion carried with 5 in favor and 0 against.**

6. Discussion and possible action on critical root zone protection

Jay van Bavel discussed a suggestion to spell out what must be done to protect the critical root zone.

Jerry Fleming stated that his suggestion is to use similar language as the City of Austin requirements.

The CRCRC discussed whether there needs to be additional language regarding protecting the critical root zone.

Jay van Bavel proposed to take the information and write up specific recommendations, present it to the tree subcommittee and bring it back at a future meeting.

Chair Dave Bench stated that item 6 would be tabled to the next CRCRC meeting

7. Discussion and possible action on fence height recommendation

The CRCRC discussed the current rules regarding fence height and whether fence height restrictions should be imposed.

Thom Farrell volunteered to gather local ordinances related to fence height.

8. Continued discussion and possible action on Enforcement recommendation

The CRCRC discussed possible enforcement recommendations, and conferred with staff regarding possible enforcement recommendations.

Chair Dave Bench stated that he would draft a paragraph regarding enforcement to be reviewed at the next CRCRC meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING AND PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:07 p.m.**

**Minutes adopted on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2024.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dave Bench, Chair**

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Ashley Wayman, City Administrator**