



CITY OF ROLLINGWOOD COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

Monday, March 18, 2024

The Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee 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 March 18, 2024. Members of the public and the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee were able to participate in the meeting virtually, as long as a quorum of the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee 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 5:04 p.m.

Present Members: Chair Dave Bench, Alex Robinette, Duke Garwood, Brian Rider, and Thom Farrell (virtually)

Jeff Marx joined the meeting during item 3.

Also Present: City Administrator Ashley Wayman and Assistant City Administrator Desiree Adair

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Discussion and possible action on the minutes from the February 27, 2024 CRCRC Meeting

Brian Rider moved to adopt the minutes. Duke Garwood seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 in favor and 0 against.

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Discussion and possible action on residential building height, size and setback recommendations

Chair Dave Bench discussed the recommendations brought to the last Planning and Zoning meeting and the process going forward.

Alex Robinette led a detailed discussion of building height, parallel plane, building height measurement, side setback vertical articulation, side setback “bulk/tenting” planes, and foundation heights.

The CRCRC discussed how Chat GPT was used to provide a summary and analysis of the survey comments.

Brian Rider moved that we approve 35 feet as the height maximum for the initial purposes contingent on future agreement and action with respect to tenting setbacks, articulations on the sides, and other aspects that go into how to implement a ceiling of 35 feet.

Duke Garwood requested a friendly amendment of “35 feet measured by way of a parallel plane method”. Brian Rider accepted the amendment.

Duke Garwood seconded the motion. The motion carried with 4 in favor and 0 against with 1 abstention (Farrell).

The CRCRC discussed terrain, measurement of building height, parallel plane, garages, natural grade, finish grade, basement space, and building envelope.

Jeff Marx joined the meeting at 5:22 p.m.

Brian Rider moved to make a supplemental motion that, in considering the building height, that areas of rugged terrain or minor topographic variations with a width of less than 25 feet, including pools and ponds, shall not be included when establishing the imaginary plane for building height maximum purposes.

Duke Garwood suggested changing the word “minor” to “unique”. Brian Rider suggested “which are unusual aspects of a particular property including pools, ponds, existing basements, or garages”. Duke Garwood recommended including “Rock outcroppings and natural drainage ways.”

Brian Rider restated his motion that, in considering building height, that areas of rugged terrain or unusual topographic variations with a width of less than 25 feet, including pools, ponds, existing basements, rock outcroppings, and natural drainage ways, shall not be included when establishing imaginary planes. Duke Garwood seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor and 0 against.

The CRCRC discussed “tenting” rules regarding height in conjunction with setbacks.

Brian Rider moved to make a supplemental motion to the 35 foot parallel plane concept that with respect to side walls of buildings, we have a program that requires a limitation of side building height that starts at 25 feet at 10 feet from the property line, and then incrementally goes up such that at 15 feet we would have 30 foot wall height maximum and at 20 feet, we would have reached the 35 foot maximum horizontal plane.

The CRCRC discussed incentivization to build particular roofs and use of the words “yard” and “setback”.

Jeff Marx recommended using a table to explain the information.

The Committee continued to discuss side setback planes including bulk, dormer and shed roofs, cumulative horizontal feet, height max of dormers, and side yards with associated height.

The CRCRC discussed front and side yard definitions and how those are defined with corner lots.

City Administrator Ashley Wayman explained that typically plats define the setbacks and determine the front of the house instead of addresses. She suggested that staff and the committee obtain more information regarding the front of the lot and how it is interpreted from the Code, plats, and addressing.

Alex Robinette moved to recommend 25 feet maximum height on a 10 foot setback, add one foot of wall height for every additional horizontal foot from the property line provided that the maximum height does not exceed 35 feet. Brian Rider seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor and 0 against.

Chair Dave Bench moved that with regard to dormers, 3 feet back from the wall line minimum and they do not exceed maximum heights and are no more than 15 feet cumulative along any axis measured from outside wall to outside wall. Alex Robinette seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor and 0 against.

Brian Rider moved to amend the prior motion regarding maximum building height related to the size of the side yard, we intended that height measurement to be measured to the upper most edge of roofing material or parapet. Duke Garwood seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor and 0 against.

Alex Robinette led a discussion on side wall articulation.

The CRCRC discussed sidewall articulation and alternate means of articulation in detail including the following recommendations:

If a side-wall of a building is more than 15 ft. high, the sidewall may not extend in an unbroken plane for more than 40 ft. in length along a side lot line without a sidewall articulation that meets the requirements of this section. (Or, every 50 ft. of a first floor wall that is 18 ft. tall or greater.)

A. To break the plane, a sidewall articulation must:

- be perpendicular to the side property line, at least 3 ft. deep, and extend along the side property line for at least 10 ft.;
- extend the entire height of the first floor of an addition to, or remodel of, an existing one-story building; flat decks and patios are not permissible;
- extend the entire height of the second story of an addition to, or remodel of, a two or more story building.

B. Alternate means of articulation within the same 15 ft. x 40 ft. plane, may include, but are not limited to:

- clear change in building materials for a minimum of 10ft., horizontal and vertical;
- windows that are recessed at least 6 in. as measured from face of veneer to face of glass, and that are a minimum of 30 sq. ft. in area.

The CRCRC discussed the latitude given by section B above. Chair Dave Bench would like to bring this back to the next meeting.

4. Discussion and possible action on residential trees ordinance recommendation

The CRCRC did not discuss this item.

5. Discussion and possible action on future meeting dates and agenda topics for discussion

The CRCRC did not discuss this item.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING AND PUBLIC WORKSHOP

The meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

Minutes adopted on the _____ day of _____, 2024.

Dave Bench, Chair

ATTEST:

Desiree Adair, City Secretary