

**Q9: Should we consider any limitations on what can be built along a setback? This was a question asked in response to residents that have written emails with concerns about the impacts of buildings and landscape along, and within the setbacks, including:**

- **Building to the allowable maximum height of 35 feet, and up to 45 feet on sloped lot**
- **Building along the entire length of setbacks, including to the maximum height**
- **Minimal side articulation by building flat walls and roofs with minimal variation or changes in building form or material**
- **Foundation height - allowable to any height within overall max. building height**
- **Land removal**
- **Tree removal**

**CRCRC Conclusions:** This was one of the more meaningful questions that led to thoughtful insights and observations. The crux of the question centers around privacy and quality of life between neighbors. It's clear that residents don't want rules that determine or limit designs, so creating a set of rules that serve only to restrict the most significant impacts that can occur between homes is critical, without limiting personal aesthetic choices. Many large homes that have been built in the last 10-20 years obey a set of traditional rules about design that favor a tiered approach to not only the landscape, but to making smaller or single-story areas of the home that are closer to neighbors, while consolidating the larger/taller portions of the home to the middle of the lot. That trend appears to be changing with a number of homes building-out along the setbacks in ways the neighborhood has not experienced previously. An effort should be made to restore the expected privacy traditionally afforded to RW residents by controlling the overall building and foundation height along the setback lines, as well as promoting side articulation to create variation, shadow lines, and reduced glare from continuous flat, white surfaces.

All summaries provided by ChatGPT:

**Yes (56%):**

Residents express a range of concerns and suggestions regarding Rollingwood's setback development. Many emphasize the need to avoid building along the entire length of setbacks, suggesting limitations on building height, foundation height, and tree removal within setbacks. There's a strong call to consider the impact on neighboring properties, ensuring shade, privacy, and visual appeal. Some advocate for a tiered setback system, incorporating both at-grade and above-first-floor setbacks. The preservation of heritage trees is a recurring theme, with residents calling for strict limitations on tree removal and potential penalties for violations. There's also a desire for more stringent rules and enforcement to prevent excessive construction and tree

removal. Overall, residents are looking to maintain the natural and open character of Rollingwood, advocating for thoughtful construction practices and limitations on the size and impact of structures within setbacks.

- Limitations on building along the entire length of setbacks, considering impacts on neighboring properties.
- Restrictions on maximum building and foundation height, with consideration for the natural topography.
- Preservation of heritage trees and limitations on tree removal within setbacks.
- Tiered setback system, including both at-grade and above-first-floor setbacks.
- Stricter rules and enforcement to prevent excessive construction and tree removal.
- Consideration of the impact on shade, privacy, and visual aesthetics for neighboring properties.
- Prohibition of exposed concrete foundations and encouragement of tasteful landscaping in setbacks.
- Preservation of a natural hill country feel, with a focus on maintaining trees and green space.
- Concerns about the potential negative impact of high foundations and structures on neighboring views.
- Suggestions for exemptions in cases where neighbors' existing structures do not meet new setback rules.

#### No (37%):

Residents express a desire for flexibility and individual choice within setbacks, emphasizing the importance of avoiding overly restrictive regulations. They argue against micromanaging the aesthetic aspects of construction, stating that allowing variety prevents the neighborhood from becoming a uniform collection of similar structures. The sentiment is that as long as setbacks and building heights are appropriately defined and enforced, property owners should have the freedom to make decisions within those limits. Some residents propose limiting foundation heights, while others advocate against further restrictions if existing setback and height regulations are sufficient. Concerns are raised about the potential negative impacts of constant changes to building codes and the need to avoid unnecessary regulations that could lead to increased architectural and engineering expenses.

- Residents advocate for individual choices within setbacks, emphasizing flexibility in landscaping and construction.
- Opposition to micromanaging aesthetic aspects to prevent the neighborhood from becoming uniform.
- Support for clearly defined and enforced setback and building height regulations.
- Some suggest limiting foundation heights to a maximum of three feet above ground level.

- Concerns about unnecessary regulations leading to increased architectural and engineering expenses.

Blank (5.8%)

- Mixed opinions exist among residents regarding building codes and construction practices.
- Visual concerns focus on large foundations, suggesting solutions like "tenting" or landscaping to mitigate their impact.