



April 9, 2025

Rollingwood City Council
Rollingwood, TX

Dear City Council Members:

We write to you regarding the project to upgrade the racquet facilities at the WHAC, the basis of which your body reviewed and approved in 2021. We have been working steadily on the project since we first came before you, and we now seek your final approval.

Since the process has been rather protracted, we thought it helpful to provide a chronology of the events in the permitting process, which according to our records is the following:

October 2020	TCEQ Review 1 (approved)
May 2021	City Council Review (approved)
June 2021	Board of Adjustment, Review 1 (three variances granted)
September 2021	Board of Adjustment, Review 2 (two of three variances granted)
January 2023	Board of Adjustment, Review 3 (special exception granted)
October 2024	Engineering Review (complete with formal approval in March 2025)
March 2025	TCEQ Review 2 (approved)

We note that the Board of Adjustments (BOA) review has been a rather lengthy but highly productive part of the process. By way of background, the BOA's *first* review granted the WHAC's request for three variances, but the case was ultimately re-heard due to concerns about the extent of the city's noticing process. In its *second* review, the BOA granted *two* of the three requested variances, a result that may or may not have provided grounds for permitting, depending upon one's interpretation.¹ For good measure, a *third* Board of Adjustments meeting was held to review our request for a "special exception" from two code restrictions due to the special nature of the project and its purported benefits for the community. That exception was granted, which removed any uncertainty regarding compliance with city code.

The BOA process was long but productive and cooperative. In preparation for the third review with the BOA, about whose concerns we were at that point well aware, we worked with our design team to minimize significantly the degree of non-compliance with city code. A revision of the site plan shifted the additional courts inward and sliced the courts' corners (AKA, "California corners"). These changes actually *decreased* the degree of the plan's non-compliance compared with not only the original plan but also the status quo.²

¹ The third variance would have allowed the WHAC to "extend any non-compliance." But since the first two variances rendered the current and future courts compliant, the extension of non-compliance was arguably irrelevant. This inference was not something that was understood at the time, apparently.

² The improvement over the status quo relates to current non-compliance. Part of the existing courts extends into the building setback because the setback lines were imposed *after* the courts were built in 1976. The revised plan's California corners and the removal of both a volleyball

Drainage has been another central part of our conversation with the BOA. In fact, a condition of the BOA's granting of the special exception was that the project improve drainage substantially compared to the status quo. Specifically, the BOA required that the new plan decrease the flow rate by 5% compared to the current courts. The existing courts do not have a mechanism for restricting outflows. Our engineering team has designed a drainage system that calculations suggest would decrease the flow rate by at least 10%. The flow rate varies with the amount of water, and the decrease is actually more substantial during heavy rains. For example, during a 10-year rainfall, which is 6.8" over 24 hours, the decrease in flow rate would be 13.8%. For an even heavier rainfall event such as a 100-year storm (more than 12" over a 24-hour period), the decrease in flow rate would be 16% as compared to existing conditions.

Finally, we should note that we have not altered materially the elements of the plan that the City Council originally approved in 2021: namely, the landscape and parking plans. Community members have since made very helpful suggestions for revisions to the landscape plan (more trees and plantings, mostly). Some of the suggestions have come up in the context of a partnership with members of the community and the City Council intended to improve public areas in the city, including the WHAC. These suggestions are welcome, non-controversial, and an inevitable part of a long public design process such as this one. We would appreciate the flexibility to make such changes, but we are hesitant to alter a plan that your body has already approved.

We would be happy to describe these plans in more detail and answer any questions during your meeting on April 16, and we appreciate your service to the city.

Sincerely,



Zach Elkins
President, WHAC Board of Directors

WHAC Board of Directors

Zach Elkins (President)
Scott Buchholtz
Allegra Feito
Dave French
Edward Henigin
Steve Marcie
Mark Monti
Brian Nash
Sarah Stotts

court (in the setback) and a 6x20 ft asphalt berm reduce the encroachment into the setback by 416 sq ft, compared to the existing layout.