

Q7 - Please indicate your feelings on Rollingwood's current setback dimensions, and clarify in the comments if you have thoughts or concerns specific to front, side, or rear.

CRCRC Conclusions: After examining the potential benefits between neighbors in simplifying RW side setbacks to both be 15ft., including slightly reduced fire risk, we concluded that making this change might be too disruptive to current precedent and infrastructure, and based on resident feedback, that addressing specific vertical impacts along the building setbacks would be more beneficial.

There is still on-going discussion regarding front and rear setbacks, and corner lot setback dimensions. Additionally, we are examining pool setback requirements.

Following summaries provided by ChatGPT:

[About Right \(64%\):](#)

The majority of respondents (177) feel that Rollingwood's current setback dimensions are "about right." Some specific feedback includes suggestions for adjustments in certain situations, such as corner lots where the owner might choose which side is considered "side" or "rear." Others recommend reducing front setbacks for privacy, allowing some auxiliary building within setbacks, and ensuring setbacks are consistently enforced. Concerns about tree removal within setbacks and the need for better enforcement are also mentioned. Overall, while many find the setbacks appropriate, some suggest considering adjustments in specific circumstances.

This consolidated list captures the key themes from resident "About Right" responses regarding Rollingwood's current setback dimensions:

Mixed Opinions on Setback Adjustments:

Varied opinions on setbacks, ranging from suggestions to reduce setbacks for urban living to concerns about preserving space and tree appeal.

Specific Recommendations for Change:

Specific recommendations include allowing owners to choose sides for corner lots, combining setbacks with new restrictions, and adjusting setbacks based on lot characteristics.

Concerns About Developer Exploitation:

Residents express concerns about developers exploiting setbacks and propose solutions such as grandfathering existing buildings to maintain boundaries.

Enforcement and Consistency:

Strong emphasis on consistent enforcement of setback rules, addressing issues like encroachments and acknowledging the importance of understanding and following the rules.

Consideration for Corner Lots:

Proposals for corner lots include adjustments to setback sizes, ROW inclusion, and a case-by-case approach to accommodate unique configurations.

Preserving Aesthetics and Greenery:

Residents highlight the importance of setbacks in preserving the neighborhood's aesthetics, greenery, and overall appeal, emphasizing the need for tree preservation.

Flexibility for Specific Structures:

Calls for flexibility within setbacks for specific structures, like pools, decks, and auxiliary buildings, with conditions to maintain harmony with neighboring properties.

Balancing Privacy and Design Flexibility:

Suggestions to balance privacy concerns with design flexibility, including considerations for setback adjustments, especially in the context of larger, custom-designed homes.

Zoning Disparities and Jurisdictional Impact:

Concerns about zoning disparities, with proposals to align setbacks with neighboring jurisdictions, especially where Austin properties are involved.

Impact on Neighborhood Character:

Reflections on setbacks influencing the overall character of the neighborhood, with some advocating for larger setbacks to maintain spacious lots and others suggesting adjustments for more usable space.

Too Small (22%):

The residents who feel that Rollingwood's current setback dimensions are "too small" (61 respondents) express concerns primarily about side and rear setbacks. Common themes include the impact on privacy, the encroachment of larger homes on neighboring properties, and the need for more space between houses. Suggestions for improvement include increasing side setbacks to 15-20 feet, adjusting cumulative setback calculations, and considering setbacks relative to lot size. Some residents emphasize the importance of maintaining the appeal of Rollingwood with larger setbacks to accommodate the size of new constructions. Overall, the feedback suggests a desire for adjustments, especially in side and rear setback dimensions.

This consolidated list captures the key themes from resident “Too Small” responses regarding Rollingwood's current setback dimensions.

General Concerns about Setback Size:

Many residents express concerns that setbacks, especially for the sides and rear, are currently too small, leading to issues with privacy, sunlight, and overall neighborhood character.

Proposals for Larger Setbacks:

Several suggestions advocate for larger setbacks, ranging from specific measurements like 15 feet to more flexible approaches relative to lot size and increased dimensions for specific sides.

Specific Issues with Side Setbacks:

Residents highlight specific problems with side setbacks, including the 10-foot minimum with a cumulative 25 feet, which some find inelegant and difficult to resolve in case of disputes between neighbors.

Impact of New Construction:

Concerns are raised about the impact of new construction, with mentions of houses becoming too close, reduced open spaces between homes, and a shift away from the natural feel that attracted residents to Rollingwood.

Flexibility Based on Lot Characteristics:

Calls for setbacks to be more flexible, considering lot characteristics such as trees and terrain, with a focus on preserving greenery and privacy.

Need for Increased Rear Setbacks:

Specific emphasis on increasing rear setbacks for more yard space, with suggestions ranging from 15 to 30 feet to address concerns about the scale of new constructions.

Concerns about Sunlight Blockage:

Specific instances are cited where a 10-foot side setback is deemed insufficient, especially with taller homes, resulting in sunlight blockage to neighboring properties.

Desire for Consistent Enforcement:

Residents express the need for consistent enforcement of setback rules, suggesting that the effectiveness of setbacks lies not in the rules themselves but in their enforcement.

Proposals for Setback Adjustments:

Proposals include adjusting setbacks based on lot size, ensuring setbacks are relative to Rollingwood's lot dimensions, and making allowances for specific structures like pools within setbacks.

Balancing Privacy and Design Flexibility:

Suggestions for setbacks that balance privacy concerns with design flexibility, acknowledging the importance of tree preservation and the overall aesthetic appeal of the neighborhood.

Too Large (11%)

Residents who feel that Rollingwood's current setback dimensions are "too large" (31 respondents) express concerns, especially regarding the front setback. The common themes include the perceived wastage of land, water usage issues, and outdated regulations that were established during the septic system era. Some residents suggest decreasing setbacks, particularly for corner lots, to allow for more usable land and to align with neighboring cities' regulations. Concerns are raised about the impact of setbacks on the buildable area, limitations on pool construction, and restrictions on land use. Overall, these residents advocate for a more flexible approach, considering the unique characteristics of Rollingwood's lots and the desire for increased choice in land utilization.

This consolidated list captures the key themes from resident "Too Large" responses regarding Rollingwood's current setback dimensions.

Concerns about Setback Size:

Residents express that setbacks, especially for corner lots, are perceived as too large, limiting buildable space and restricting land use, particularly with regard to swimming pools.

Front Setback Criticisms:

Specific criticisms focus on the front setback, describing it as outdated, excessively large, and environmentally unfriendly due to the encouragement of large grass front yards, leading to water wastage.

Inconsistencies and Rigidity in Setback Rules:

Concerns are raised regarding inconsistencies and rigidity in setback rules, with residents suggesting that rules should be more consistent, especially for corner lots, and that the setbacks are often too rigid, especially for irregularly shaped lots.

Impact on New Constructions and Building Rights:

Residents express dissatisfaction with recent constructions, describing them as too cramped and emphasizing the need for more significant borders. There's a

call to allow residential owners more flexibility in using their land without excessive limitations on building rights.

Desire for Choice and Flexibility:

A desire for more choice and flexibility in land use, suggesting that residents should be able to use their land more freely. The argument includes opposition to setbacks that limit usable space, particularly in front yards, and a preference for larger back setbacks and smaller front setbacks.

(1) Comment from “Blank”(3%) responses:

The resident disagrees with the 20-foot setback requirement along the back fence for pools, emphasizing the relatively small yards in Rollingwood. They express frustration with the building code restrictions that prevent the construction of a deck for an outdoor table or a retaining wall within 10 feet of a fence, as required by the city.