

From: Amy Pattillo [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2024 9:58 AM
To: Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Subject: CRCRC - Agenda Item 3 comments

Hi Desiree

Could you please forward these comments to the members of the CRCRC?

Thank you,
Amy

CRCRC members:

Thank you for your continued service on the CRCRC. I'm glad to see a group of neighbors taking a next look at the City's Tree Canopy Ordinance and recommending amendments for our community to consider. When I helped draft the original ordinance, there was a frequently stated intention that this ordinance would be reviewed annually, and I'm glad to see another round of updates being considered.

I've reviewed the amendments to the Tree Canopy Ordinance you all are proposing for community review and have a few comments and questions. I'm not able to attend your meeting today, so I hope that these comments can be considered during the meeting as if presented in person.

(1) Paragraph 7 of the attachment to agenda item 3 states: "Remove Sections (d) and (e) of Section 107-373 as we believe all protected trees and heritage trees removed from a lot should be replaced on that lot unless a variance is obtained to replant elsewhere."

Please clarify the language proposed for removal in sections (d) and (e) of section 107-373. In the code of ordinances available online, I only see (a)-(c) under section 107-373.

(2) Paragraph 14 of the attachment to agenda item 3 states: "Change the requirement for replacement of protected trees removed from the setback areas to 2 replacement trees for each removed. (Currently it is 3:1.)"

What is the goal in reducing the ratio of replacement trees required for protected trees removed in setback areas? The ethos behind the initial ratio of 3:1 was to incentivize maintaining the canopy provided by protected trees within some setback areas - and in the event that trees are removed in these setback areas, to increase the number of new trees planted to support the canopy and with regrowth, also enhance the privacy between yards. It is unclear to me how the community feedback in the survey supports a reduction in the tree replanting ratio to 2:1 for protected trees in setback areas, which would result in a reduction of the replaced tree canopy. While very few residential lots in the city have more than 7 protected trees, many more residential yards have protected trees in setbacks. The proposed change appears to weaken the ordinance, not maintain or strengthen it.

Best regards,
Amy

AMY J. PATTILLO
[REDACTED]