

Ms Amy Pattillo,

Thank you for your recent email to the CRCRC committee with comments on our proposed changes to the Tree Canopy Ordinance. I am answering at the request of Dave Bench (committee chairman) in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Tree Canopy Ordinance Revisions.

First let me thank you for your work on the current ordinance years ago. It has served the community well. There is strong interest in the community preserving this feature of Rollingwood and the CRCRC is suggesting an update to strengthen the current ordinance.

Specific responses to your 2 points:

1. You are correct that the statement should read "Remove Sections (d) and (e) of section 107-372, not section 107-373. Thank you for picking up on this typo.
2. The goal of the CRCRC is to strengthen the ordinance to preserve the current tree canopy, not necessarily to increase the number of protected trees. In order to do this, we propose:

- Instituting a Heritage Tree definition and protection clauses that will do more to protect these trees. Currently an Oak tree with a diameter of 24 inches can be removed without special permit and replaced with small diameter trees.
- We removed the loophole in the current ordinance that allows one to remove a protected tree from a setback area and replace it with "shrub like" trees in the utility line setback area. (e.g. removing a 12-inch oak from the front yard setback can be remediated by planting 3 Mountain Laurels in the 20 ft utility setback area, if there is one.)
- Changed the criteria for a tree that straddles the buildable area and a setback area to be, if 25% of the tree diameter is in the setback area, it will be classified as a setback tree and will need to be replaced with multiple trees. Currently it is 50%. This will increase the number of setback trees that would require replacement.
- The current ordinance states that one only needs to replace a total of 7 replacement trees. (not 7 protected trees) If one replaced 4 protected trees removed from a setback, which currently requires 12 replacement trees, only 7 would need to be replaced. (see section 107-375 (h).) We are removing this limitation as there are many lots that have 3 or more protected trees in setback areas.
- Because these proposed changes will result likely in more protected trees to be replaced, we felt it was necessary to give some and reduce the replacement ratio to 2:1 from 3:1.

I hope this clarifies our reasoning behind these suggested changes.

Thank you again for your interest in working with us to help preserve the "wood" in Rollingwood.

Regards,

Jay van Bavel

From: Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 9:37 AM
To: Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Cc: Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Subject: FW: Rollingwood Comprehensive Residential Code Review Comments

**** Please do NOT reply all to this email because more than one of the boards/commissions are copied on this email. ****

Good morning Planning and Zoning Commission and CRCRC members,
Please see email discussion below requested to be sent to you by Dave Bench.

Best,

Desiree

Desiree Adair

Assistant City Administrator

City of Rollingwood

512.327.1838

www.rollingwoodtx.gov



From: Dave [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 8:03 AM
To: Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Cc: Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Rollingwood Comprehensive Residential Code Review Comments

Good Morning, Desiree

Please forward the attached discussion to members of P&Z and CRCRC

Thanks very much,

Dave

From: "Brook Brown" <bbrown@rollingwoodtx.gov>
To: "Ricky Joshi" [REDACTED]
Cc: "dcbench" [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 2:04:16 AM
Subject: Re: Fw: Rollingwood Comprehensive Residential Code Review Comments

Ricky,

Sorry for the delay in responding - I am on vacation at present. There is a P&Z meeting on Apr. 3 at 6pm. I would recommend you contact Dave Bench, who chairs that committee and the CRCRC and let him know of your concerns. I have copied him on this reply, so that you will have a direct email.

I will be in touch when I get back in town.

Thanks,

Brook

From: Ricky Joshi [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, March 30, 2024 4:36 PM
To: Brook Brown <bbrown@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Subject: Re: Fw: Rollingwood Comprehensive Residential Code Review Comments

Hi Brook,

Thank you again for all the work you do. As a reminder I'm the resident who bought a home to renovate at 303 Pleasant Drive. I'm not sure the best way to re-enter the conversation on the Residential Code? The house next to me (301 pleasant) becomes further dominating as it gets built, to the point where we've considered selling our home (unfortunately currently under construction) to not live next to it towering over us. My realtor has stated that there is no question this has negatively impacted the quality and value of my lot.

I believe the neighboring home took advantage of every loophole, especially with a very high foundation that essentially makes the home 12+ feet higher than its natural (already high) design). It really has taken away the residential feeling on our side of the street, with my home being the most impacted. Rollingwood's rolling hills are such an asset, except when homes are allowed to tower over their neighbors due to rules that are not restricting this development. I cannot imagine what would happen if the same developer were to build on other lots on the street.

I don't believe CRCRC meetings are public. Is the best way to make my voice heard to go to the next City Council meeting?

Thanks,

Ricky

On Fri, Jun 16, 2023 at 1:54 PM Ricky Joshi [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Brook,

Thank you for responding! I'm sorry you are most likely correct, it's likely 10 feet. One other thing i didn't mention is that there was absolutely no need for a non livable first level in this home. Also a permanent structure including permanent stairs are being built within the front setback.

I have been disheartened to see this home going up. I cannot imagine what could possibly happen with future homes on my street. An unscrupulous builder could easily build 45 feet upwards across from me for example, having a home almost 65 feet above street level.

I personally feel that, within reason, anyone should be able to build a dream house. However when it impinges on quality of life for those surrounding these homes it becomes an issue.

I appreciate all of your hard work on this!

Ricky

On Fri, Jun 16, 2023 at 11:03 AM Brook Brown <bbrown@rollingwoodtx.gov> wrote:

Dear Ricky,

Thank you for your letter addressing concerns with our current residential building code. I am hopeful that with comments like yours, we can make progress on these issues.

One question - your letter says there is a 7.5ft. setback between the property at 301 Pleasant and your property line. I have not looked at the building permit for the 301 Pleasant property as yet, but my understanding was that the minimum side setback under the code is 10 feet. Do you know how this setback came to be less than the 10 feet?

Thanks,

Brook Brown

From: Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Sent: Friday, June 16, 2023 9:06 AM
To: Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Subject: FW: Rollingwood Comprehensive Residential Code Review Comments

Good Morning CRCRC Members,

Please see the email below from Ricky Joshi. There was an error in our domain names when he shared this email with you, so I am forwarding this on.

Mayor and Council are blind copied since they were also intended recipients of this email.

Thanks,

Ashley

Ashley Wayman

City Administrator

City of Rollingwood

(512) 327-1838

www.rollingwoodtx.gov



From: Ricky Joshi [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 15, 2023 1:16 PM
To: Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; dadair@rollingwoodatx.gov;
arobinson@rollingwoodatx.gov; kglasheen@rollingwoodatx.com; bbrown@rollingwoodatx.com;
pmcduffee@rollingwoodatx.gov; shutson@rollingwoodatx.gov; gmassingill@rollingwoodatx.gov;
crcrc@rollingwoodatx.gov
Subject: Rollingwood Comprehensive Residential Code Review Comments

Hi All,

I'm a new resident moving into 303 Pleasant Drive.

It's my strong feeling that the integrity of Rollingwood's residential nature is critical to keeping the beauty and cohesiveness of our wonderful community. I feel that without restrictions, opportunistic builders will continue to overbuild on lots. This significantly diminishes the quality of life for surrounding neighbors, and I feel is also deleterious to neighboring property values.

I personally am faced with a straight wall building edge on a new home going up next to mine that is 3 high stories tall (right at the 7.5ft setback). While nothing can be done about this building, I'm very worried about new homes that are 3 and 4 stories tall significantly impacting the sanctity of the community. It feels like this will be a race to the bottom (or "top") as more developers realize they can maximize square footage and height at the expense of their neighbors' sunlight and views.

Here are a few points:

- 1) The 45 ft height allowance for sloped lots allows for "high rise" type buildings that significantly overshadow neighboring homes - Neighboring flat lots below them are significantly now disadvantaged. Even the 35 foot allowance, right at the setback, seems overbearing to neighboring homes.
- 2) The 45ft height allowance can currently be taken advantage of to make super tall front facing highrise type homes which do not sit the spirit of a residential community.
- 2) The lack of fair FAR restrictions allows for overbuilding that will impact drainage and negatively impact neighborhood feel.

Here are a few proposed ideas:

- 1) Eliminating the 45ft slope allowance (with exceptions for houses whose front yards on a downward slope or back-facing).
- 2) **McMansion Ordinance** (tent rule) to allow neighbors to keep their signlines and sense of space. Walls going up to the edge of lots are problematic in my opinion.
- 3) FAR restrictions of 45-50% that fairly allow for large homes but with reasonable lot presence.
- 4) Impervious cover rules to allow for reasonable drainage

Thanks!

Ricky