

On Apr 29, 2023, at 12:38 PM, Save Rollingwood [REDACTED] wrote:

Hello friends and neighbors,

The City of Rollingwood has begun the process of putting together a vision for the future of the residential areas of Rollingwood (much like the previous commercial area plan). This process, led by a council-appointed committee of Rollingwood residents called the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee ("CRCRC"), very much needs your input to begin the process. Your input can be as brief or detailed as you want and on whatever issues you want to weigh in on. To provide your initial input, please email the committee at [CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov).

What do you dislike about the residential areas of Rollingwood? What do you love? What do you want to protect? What do you want to change? What drives you crazy? What are you worried about? What do you want to see more (or less) of? More topics your input might cover:

- Size and scale of homes in Rollingwood
- Maximum building heights or square footage
- Setbacks on front, sides, and backyard of homes
- Impervious cover
- Drainage / water runoff
- Trees
- Privacy
- Anything else you think is important

If you could please provide some initial input to the committee by Wednesday, May 3rd, it would be greatly appreciated (but you can send it in after that too). Again, the email address for citizen input is [CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov).

Thanks very much,  
Sarah & Ryan Clinton  
4714 Timberline Dr.

**From:** robert turner [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 29, 2023 1:12 PM  
**To:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Your Initial Input Needed for Rollingwood Residential Planning

Hi Desiree —

for the committee, please

Committee -

This effort could have far reaching ramifications to both our quality of life and our property values, so I believe it's very important that whatever changes are being considered, that they are well thought through, provide a net positive impact to the community, and are not simply punitive or anti-growth in nature. And, while I'm at it, thank you for your service!

All the best..... Bob

=====

Robert Turner

[REDACTED]  
(c) 512.517.7923

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** robert turner [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Your Initial Input Needed for Rollingwood Residential Planning  
**Date:** April 29, 2023 at 12:55:37 PM CDT  
**To:** [CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov)  
**Cc:** Save Rollingwood [REDACTED]

Thanks Ryan -  
I'm so pleased that Save Rollingwood has gotten involved.

Committee -

This effort could have far reaching ramifications to both our quality of life and our property values, so I believe it's very important that whatever changes are being considered, that they are well thought through, provide a net positive impact to the community, and are not simply punitive or anti-growth in nature. And, while I'm at it, thank you for your service!

All the best..... Bob

=====

Robert Turner

[REDACTED]  
(c) 512.517.7923

**From:** Terri McCabe [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 30, 2023 1:43 PM  
**To:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Cc:** Save Rollingwood [REDACTED]; ARCHIVE Carrie Caylor <ccaylor@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Nikki Stautzenberger <nstautz@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Phil McDuffee <pmcduffee@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Kevin Glasheen <kglasheen@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Makayla Rodriguez <mrodriguez@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Rollingwood building restrictions enforced

Rollingwood council-

Please enforce:

- Scale of home to lot size in Rollingwood. There should be a reasonable upper bound to the percent of a lot that can be the house. Otherwise it looks unwelcoming!
- Maximum building heights should be less than 35' at any angle or point; make no exceptions and don't allow loose interpretation.
- Setback rules on front, sides, and backyard of homes should be enforced,
- Impervious cover rules should be enforced, both for the reduction of flooding / excess runoff and to stop houses dominating their lots and their neighbors.
- Protection of Trees: any trees damaged or removed by building/construction should be replaced by ones of equal size.
- Privacy: some houses go to silly extremes to obtain views of downtown. This should be stopped. 3rd floor roof terraces, observation platforms and over-height houses are all invasions of neighbors' privacy and unsightly.
- Some fences are obnoxiously high. 6 or 7 foot should be plenty. Higher fences are an eyesore and should be cut down.
- Have a complete sidewalk on Rollingwood Dr from Bee Cave to MoPac
- Water pressure increased and calcium removed (monster homes are taking our water pressure and cutting down our oxygen by removing trees).
- Light pollution by paranoid or inconsiderate neighbors looking like Ft Knox including mailboxes, trees, porch, house and security lights. This affects sleep for humans and all wildlife including birds and butterflies. Oh, and thanks to all the nuisance, we can't even sit and see the stars at night! This is a waste of energy and super annoying!

Best,

Terri McCabe  
512-300-6575  
4704 Timberline Dr

**From:** Terri McCabe [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 30, 2023 1:57 PM  
**To:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Cc:** Save Rollingwood <saverollingwood@gmail.com>; ARCHIVE Carrie Caylor <ccaylor@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Nikki Stautzenberger <nstautz@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Phil McDuffee <pmcduffee@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Kevin Glasheen <kglasheen@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Makayla Rodriguez <mrodriguez@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Rollingwood building restrictions enforced

Rollingwood

I'd like to add to my list.

- foliage removed or set back from all curbs to improve on visibility and safety. Some houses have overgrown trees, shrubs, bushes and weeds. Pruning should be enforced at every house and is particularly important around stop signs and crossings.
- ask the city of Austin for permission to cut back the dead overgrown tree at MoPac entrance off Rollingwood. It hangs into car lane before / at stop sign. This is a major nuisance!!! Add that to the tree cutters list.
- ask the city of Austin to repair street properly from Vale to Mopac entrance off Rollingwood
- ensure there aren't campers (overnight or permanent) off or near the creek beds including Delilah toward Bee Cave and ensure no vans, campers, etc at the park / gravel at the end of Rollingwood Dr. Have you ever seen people living off our land for free? We pay crazy high land prices and taxes. It's not ok for our homes to be threatened by squatters and encroaching our homes.

Best,

Terri McCabe  
512-300-6575

**From:** Terri McCabe [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 30, 2023 2:01 PM  
**To:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Cc:** Save Rollingwood <saverollingwood@gmail.com>; ARCHIVE Carrie Caylor <ccaylor@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Nikki Stautzenberger <nstautz@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Phil McDuffee <pmcduffee@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Kevin Glasheen <kglasheen@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Makayla Rodriguez <mrodriguez@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Rollingwood building restrictions enforced

"Dellana Ln" not Delilah

Best,

Terri McCabe  
512-300-6575

**From:** Taylor Jobe [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 30, 2023 1:54 PM  
**To:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Rollingwood input

Hello Desiree. Here is my input on some housing issues for Rollingwood:

- Size and scale of homes in Rollingwood

No need to restrict size.

- Maximum building heights or square footage

No houses over 5 stories.

- Setbacks on front, sides, and backyard of homes

Same as now

- Impervious cover

Same as now

- Drainage / water runoff

Look out for the downhill neighbors

- Trees

Keep current code

- Privacy

Let people build fences and grow landscape that blocks neighbors back yard views. It doesn't block scenic views. Not big fences everywhere, but be reasonable.

Thanks!

Taylor Jobe  
4828 Timberline Dr. Austin, TX 78746

- Anything else you think is important

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Philip Ellis [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 30, 2023 2:13 PM

**To:** [REDACTED] ARCHIVE Carrie Caylor <[ccaylor@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:ccaylor@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Nikki Stautzenberger <[nstautz@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:nstautz@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Phil McDuffee <[pmcduffee@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:pmcduffee@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Kevin Glasheen <[kglasheen@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:kglasheen@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Ashley Wayman <[awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Makayla Rodriguez <[mrodriguez@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:mrodriguez@rollingwoodtx.gov)>

**Subject:**

Hi there,

I used to like Rollingwood's live and let live approach. It worked when people wanted ordinary-sized houses, and some flexibility to do their own thing. But many recent houses, and particularly some of the more speculative builder-financed constructions, have been too big, ugly and inconsiderate. I think we need to look at all of the following.

- Making the house fit the lot . a) There should be a reasonable upper bound to the percent of a lot that can be the house. We are getting like Dallas: huge houses crammed onto less than a quarter of an acre.
- Making the house fit the lot: b) Setback rules on front, sides, and backyard of homes should be enforced,
- Making the house fit the lot c) Impervious cover rules should be enforced, both for the reduction of flooding / excess runoff and to stop houses dominating their lots and their neighbors.
- Making the house fit the lot d) Maximum building heights should be less than 35'. Measure from the lowest point on the house to the highest point on the roof. There are several new houses that have been wildly abusive of this rule. Closely related to this, some houses go to silly extremes to obtain views of downtown. This should be stopped. 3rd floor roof terraces, observation platforms and over-height houses are all ugly invasions of neighbors' privacy, unfriendly and unsightly.
- Protection of Trees: any trees damaged or removed by building/construction should be replaced by ones of equal size.
- Some fences are obnoxiously high. 6 or 7 foot should be plenty. Higher fences are an eyesore and should be cut down.
- Have a complete sidewalk on Rollingwood Dr from Bee Cave to MoPac
- The water pressure or flow rate should be increased. Monster homes are taking our water, in addition to cutting down our oxygen by removing trees.
- Some houses are needlessly bright at night. Rollingwood is a safe area. It is a paranoid waste of electricity to have lights on the houses, back yards, front yards and mailboxes. It affects sleep for humans, birds and butterflies. And we can no longer see the stars at night.
- What is the deal with the huge new Rollingwood Office Park? I thought that was supposed to reduce our taxes. Instead our taxes have gone up and we have concreted over another few acres of greenery. Well done to whoever approved that!

Best,

--

Kind regards

Phil Ellis  
+1 512 665 3968 (cell)

**From:** Eva Ruth [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 1, 2023 9:41 AM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** residential code review input

Good morning,

I live at 4 Inwood Circle and have the following input regarding the City of Rollingwood's residential code:

I believe it is important for the city to have control over the movement of water via drainage, particularly as storms intensify as scientists have predicted. Please consider that all residents should feel safe from flooding and adopt stricter limitations on impervious cover.

Rollingwood is a lovely place to live, in part because of its residential character. Please keep that in mind while amending the code and safeguard our city's unique character from commercial infringement.

Thank you for your service to the city, and for your time.

Eva Ruth Glasheen

--

(210) 422-9737 cell

[Twitter](#)

[Portfolio](#)

[Texas Justice Initiative](#)



**From:** George Rian Grisemer [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 1, 2023 3:25 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Rollingwood Issues

The following is our response for input requested by your April 29, 2023 email:

- 1) We're against any apartment or condominium development along Bee Cave Road. We're also against any development along Bee Cave road that would exceed current height restrictions.
- 2) Current Rollingwood speed limits should be reduced and enforced for residents' safety.
- 3) Cross walks (painted with signage) are needed at busy intersections for residential foot traffic safety (including safety for children).
- 4) Hatley park/baseball fields - Should remain open for dogs to use as a dog park AND all baseball activity and usage should be required to remove trash and food from the park.

Thank you

Lea & Rian Grisemer  
826 Timberline Dr

**From:** John Hinton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 1, 2023 4:53 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Input for CRCRC

May 1, 2023

Members of the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee,

As you know, the installation of the Rollingwood wastewater system in 2002 has allowed our city to redevelop to become the extraordinary community in which we live. However, today we face the challenge of the significant and increasing problem of stormwater drainage.

Prior to 2002, the only constraint to the development of a residential lot was the setback requirements within the City Development Code, which were sufficient during that time because large house development was also constrained by the individual septic systems that we needed to dispose of the wastewater of each home. Since each lot had sufficient pervious area to absorb the rainwater falling on the lot, drainage onto neighborhood lots was generally not an issue. And we were proud of the fact that we had much easier constraints on residential development as compared to Austin, Westlake Hills and Lakeway, including the lack of an impervious cover code requirement.

However, over the last twenty years significant encroachment has occurred on the original setback requirements, with Code changes that allowed redevelopment to occur that reduced the amount of pervious area on each lot. And drainage problems have multiplied along with the concomitant, adverse impacts on downstream residences. During that same period, our weather has changed, with intermittent storms now dropping very large amounts of rain on our community in a short amount of time. And because we live in a rolling wood without a stormwater drainage system, that water rapidly flows to lower elevations where many of our neighbors live, overwhelming our topographical drainage system. The City has borrowed \$2 million to address the two most severe residential drainage problems. And our City Engineers estimate that \$17 million more will be needed to address the currently-identified drainage problems in Rollingwood. In my opinion, the status quo is untenable, not only because the property values and lifestyle of our downstream neighbors are adversely impacted, but also because ultimate resolution of this problem will require the borrowing of tens of millions of dollars (doubling our existing debt) to address the drainage problems that are **currently** identified, not considering additional drainage problems that may be created by future residential development under the current development code.

I believe that it is time that we as a community address our development code to allow reasonable but responsible residential development to occur in the future. Although improving and enforcing our setback requirements is an important first step, it is insufficient in my opinion. Both Westlake Hills and Lakeway have impervious cover residential development code requirements, and Rollingwood could add a reasonable impervious cover requirement to our

Code that is more lenient than those cities, address our present and future drainage situation and still maintain our competitive development position.

In the past, defenders of our existing development code have promulgated a fear-based argument that if we tighten up and vigorously enforce the Rollingwood Residential Development Code that our home values would be adversely impacted. Our small community culture, our trees, our park, our superb location (near downtown, Zilker Park and Lady Bird Lake) and our nationally-ranked public school system will continue to draw high-income buyers to our little one square mile city, even though a reasonable and responsible impervious cover requirement is added to our Code.

In my opinion, it is time for our community to address our current development code, which is the source of our drainage problems.

Respectfully,

John Hinton  
2 Jeffery Cove  
512-327-5155

**From:** Diane Butler [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 2, 2023 11:42 AM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Input for CRCRC Committee

## Memorandum

**To:** Members of the CRCRC  
[CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov)  
**From:** Diane and Jess Butler  
4822 Rollingwood Drive  
**Re:** Input for Committee  
**Date:** May 2, 2023

We would like to respond to the following questions that we received from Ryan Clinton, member of the CRCRC.

Questions:

1. What do you dislike about the residential areas of Rollingwood?

Some homes are built too close to the street  
Drainage concerns ---

2. What do you love?

Friendly and safe neighborhood  
Many beautiful trees throughout the neighborhood  
A beautiful community park that is casual and comfortable

We like City Council and city committee meetings available for viewing

3. What do you want to protect?

Safety of children,  
Lovely trees  
Open spaces  
All of the park grounds---prevent commercialization and signage in park.  
Birds, bees and butterflies  
Protect parking spaces in park-- Maintain number of parking spaces on North Side

4. What do you want to change?

Change speed limit in Rollingwood to 25 mph and enforce it.

Enforce speed limit

Develop a code to address impervious cover to resolve drainage concerns

Develop Delana tract without disruption of homes on Timberline

5. What drives you crazy?

Young children riding electric bikes speeding and some riding without helmets

Cars speeding, Dump trucks speeding, school buses speeding by the park

Homes crowded too close to the street

Emptying trash dumpster in park before 7:00 a.m.

After every rain, needing to shovel debris created by new home construction---- sand, dirt and mud that runs into our streets.

6. What are you worried about?

Safety of children on bikes.

7. What do you want to see more of (less) of?

Enforcing current speeding limits

8. More topics?

Drainage concerns in some areas

The privacy of neighbors should be respected in a new building code

The space allowed between homes and set back from the street should be determined and then followed. We are glad to know the current building code is being revised.

Encourage citizens to plant more trees.

We believe that Rollingwood is a wonderful place to live. We appreciate the current City Council members working together to keep our city safe and beautiful.

Sincere best wishes to all members of the CRCRC as you work together to give well thought out recommendations to our City Council.

-----Original Message-----

From: Carla Moore [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 2, 2023 9:10 PM  
To: Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
Subject: Input for the CRCRC

We are very appreciative of the opportunity to have input to the committee. We have been concerned, and are not happy, with what appears to be a "trend" in new construction. The setbacks and heights of homes seem to be "out of control" with no restrictions any more? I feel for the neighbors who have these large new homes built right next to them. Rollingwood, in my opinion, should maintain enough pervious cover, not only for run off and drainage, but to maintain the over all appeal of yards and trees in our community.

Just a side note: When we moved to Rollingwood in 1991, we heard comments on how there had been a recent building trend for 4,000 square foot homes. I remember someone saying how this was excessive and homes were becoming more reasonable again.

Fast forward to current trends where homes average 6,000 square feet, or more?

Thank you!  
Paul and Carla Moore  
204 Ashworth

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Maria Abernathy [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 3, 2023 9:14 AM  
**To:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Cc:** Sarah and Ryan Clinton [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Citizen input re building code ordinances

For the CRCRC:

Thank you for volunteering to tackle this very contentious issue. I sent a letter to Council and to P&Z in February 2023 regarding building code ordinances and will try to summarize points here in response to your recent request for input:

I have been very fortunate to live in Rollingwood (3216 Park Hills Dr) since March 1979 - 44 years.

What I like about Rollingwood:

1. Small community with wonderful, friendly neighbors
2. Single-family homes with lots large enough to allow for privacy, but front yards deep enough and streets wide enough to encourage socialization
3. Trees - The tree canopy was the first attraction for me and continues to absorb me.
4. Accessibility - walking distance to 2 grocery stores, post office, small shops and restaurants, some medical offices; easy access to Austin
5. Self-governing community
6. Some truly beautiful new construction (See cautions below.)

What I dislike:

1. Tree destruction in favor of concrete
2. Sprawling new construction which tests (and often seems to exceed) the setback limits, violating privacy of neighbors and destroying natural beauty
3. Hulking size of new construction, with radical heights sometimes achieved by drilling out the limestone base for months in order to measure building height from an advantageous point on the lot
4. Overwhelming congestion of streets (e.g., Park Hills Dr) by work trucks and subcontractors who endanger resident drivers and walkers, for up to 3.5 years per new home
5. Danger of flooding from great increase in impervious cover

I strongly support careful review of Rollingwood's residential building codes, with residents' input. When revised codes are adopted, I believe they should be clearly explained to existing and prospective residents and builders - and enforced. Plans for new buildings and major remodels should be carefully reviewed by credentialed city staff or by contracted engineers, with costs paid by the applicants.

I also strongly support limits on impervious cover. This issue will be especially contentious but must be addressed: Impervious cover impacts our drainage problems and threatens our tree canopy and privacy.

Thank you, again, for your service. I hope that this task can be completed fairly soon (vs. the "Go slow" approach) so that new projects which are testing the limits will not be grandfathered.

Maria Abernathy

**From:** Mary Elizabeth Cofer [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 3, 2023 9:20 AM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Residential development

Having lived in Rollingwood for almost 40 years, one of the most striking changes that is difficult to live with for my husband, George Cofer and myself is the outdoor lighting that is being placed in the landscaping of ALL the new homes.

This lighting shines up into the trees and the sky as well as into the street and neighbors yards. This adversely affects both birds and insects as well as any possibility of seeing the stars in the sky. We have just gone through an annual migration period for many birds but all the lights negatively impact these birds and can harm them as they travel.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak up.

--

Mary Elizabeth Cofer



**From:** Tony Stein [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 3, 2023 8:08 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** CRCRC Feedback

Hi CRCRC – thank you so much for volunteering your time on such an important (and challenging) initiative. I'd like to share a few thoughts re: the residential review. It's a delicate balance you'll need to weigh regarding many issues impacting the residential areas of Rollingwood. I certainly would like to preserve the overall feel of Rollingwood but also recognize that market forces have dramatically increased the value of the lots in Rollingwood, which has had a hand in dictating the direction of the city in terms of overall size of homes. In general, I err more toward property rights but also favor strict enforcement of the rules. I'd encourage step 1 for the committee to be assessing whether we have a "problem" and what the nature of such a "problem" really is. As I've heard many views on the overall issue in serving on P&Z, it's been very clear that there are some specific recently constructed homes in the city (mostly spec homes) that have raised the most objections from concerned citizens. I'd encourage you guys to assign one of those homes to each member of the committee and have each member really dig into one home each to study what specific factors are contributing to the perception of some concerned citizens that those houses feel out of scale, with a specific focus on whether all of the existing rules were followed appropriately. There have been some people who have alleged that there has been some "gaming" of the system, possibly some rules broken outright, and some possible mistakes made by past city staff. I think step 1 is to understand what has happened to this point and, most importantly, whether there have been any issues with enforcement of the code.

To the extent the group decides there are "problems" that need solving, I'm in the camp that changes should be more subtle vs. sweeping and layered change. It can be very difficult to foresee the collective impact of many layered changes and I'm glad you have some architects on the committee to help the rest of the "laypeople" understand the practical implications of a set of layered changes. I'd also encourage some active outreach to other experts – builders, engineers and other architects, as needed. As you well know, any changes recommended by this committee has the potential to impact every single homeowner in the city and the value of their home or lot. Below are some specific thoughts re: the bullet points that were sent out via email.

- Size and scale of homes in Rollingwood – while there are some homes that I agree feel out of scale for various reasons, many of which are specific to the lot or average age of other homes on the street, I do not consider the issue to be widespread but more situational. I certainly wish there were a way to reign in the spec homes specifically since they are generally the most offensive in scale, but obviously we can have a different set of rules for them. I do want to make sure that thoughtful homeowners and architects have design flexibility to work around trees, etc. while understanding that larger homes are the only way that one can make economic sense of the lot values in our city.

- Maximum building heights – I would favor some modest adjustments to the rules around building height, which I also think would help mitigate the feeling of homes that are out of scale without necessarily having to make meaningful changes to other areas. I think it's imperative that we continue to have an adjustment for sloped lots. That 10' slope adjustment has been in city code since at least 2013 and was an intentional change made by the city council at the time. It was thoughtfully considered and specifically implemented in an effort to give greater flexibility and fairness to sloped lots. I'd recommend keeping the 10' adjustment and an incorporation of the removal of the 5' adjustment vs. the building footprint that was recently considered by P&Z (and not approved) and council (not sure if they overruled P&Z and approved that change in language. I support that change but felt strongly that it should be considered by the committee along with any other possible changes before P&Z and council actually implemented it. There are some homes on flat lots that I feel like are taller than they need to be. As you talk about all issues, I'd strongly consider lowering the current 35' max to 30' (which would lower max height vs. original natural grade to 40' on sloped lots). I'd also consider a limitation of no more than 3 stories. I actually have a design and building permit on a sloped lot at 4902 Timberline and was able to thoughtfully design a 6,000+ SF home with 2 stories in the front and 3 (or sort of 2.5) in the back. I re-reviewed my plans and I could have likely maxed out the height to achieve a 3 story elevation in the front and 4 stories in the back. I don't think there is a good case for allowing more than 3 stories – one can build a very large house without having 4 stories on one side and there are several houses that have done that. I also don't think 30' vs. 35' would prevent someone with a large family from building a large home. I personally believe that homes that max out current height limits contribute the most to homes that feel out of scale.
- Square footage – I do not favor specific limitations on square footage or FAR. Too complicated, paints with too broad a brush given the variability of topography and lot size in the neighborhood.
- Setbacks on front, sides, and backyard of homes – I don't have any issue with current setbacks, which are generally more significant than most other cities with similar sized lots. I do not favor limiting where A/C units, pool equipment, etc. can be placed within the setbacks. If something is lower than a normal 6' fence height then I do not believe it imposes on the neighbor, nor do I think noise with that type of equipment is a practical concern. In fact, that equipment is best placed in the side setback – one of my neighbors has pool equipment in the backyard and that's the only unnatural noise I ever hear. If the committee ultimately decides the community wants a greater buffer, let's not "backdoor" larger setbacks by dictating where items can be placed; just change the setback. As mentioned, we've had the current setbacks in place for a very long time and if we start changing them, then significant study of lots needs to be undertaken. My house is very narrow front to back and very wide, many others are deeper and narrower. An argument could be made that we should have had a complicated formula years ago that would somehow account for depth and width differences in lots but we didn't. If we change setbacks now it's going to have different impacts to different residents based on the shape and size of their lot. Let sleeping dogs lie.

- Impervious cover – do not favor impervious cover. We already have some natural limitations imposed by the drainage requirements and TCEQ. Our drainage requirements are very intense and every new house being built captures more rainwater than the prior improvements, even when the new improvements are significantly larger. That's a base requirement, at least to my understanding. The drainage manual was implemented relatively recently.
- Drainage / water runoff – I think there are some specific situations that are caused more by specific conditions in those areas than they are caused by a larger home (with superior drainage) being built. Find the specific problem areas and figure out how to solve those with city initiatives or if an engineer determines it's caused by a newer larger house then figure out why the drainage manual didn't work for that house.
- Trees – I wouldn't mind a stricter policy as it relates to trees in the setbacks that are removed. We should also explore incentivizing new tree planting in the setbacks somehow. I do not favor an onerous policy like Westlake Hills or Austin.

- Privacy –

most of the privacy concerns that I've heard raised relate to heavily sloped lots. Some of those situations are inevitable and will exist no matter what changes you may recommend. A good example that is raised often is the new spec home at the corner of Riley and Rollingwood. If anything other than a 1 story ranch style home were built there, then it was going to loom at some level over the rear neighbor. My proposed house at 4902 Timberline was going to loom large over the rear neighbor whether it is 40' or 25', it's just a function of the slope. Even from the patio of the existing 1 story ranch you can look right into all of the neighbors' yards. Houses are going to be larger than the prior home no matter what and there are going to be natural sloping conditions that are going to create some privacy issues. In most cases I don't believe a 10' taller house materially increases the privacy issue that's going to naturally occur no matter what. At some point I am going to have taller houses surrounding me and I knew that when I bought my house. Anyone who has bought in Rollingwood post septic should have known that the smaller ranch houses were going to be replaced some day; it may be happening sooner than we all thought or hoped, but it was always going to happen. I feel for some residents who have been here a very long time and long for the days of a neighborhood of one story ranch homes but change, unfortunately, is inevitable. Some of the homes that appear the tallest to me were actually built in the 80's and 90's (see Wallis and Hatley). I just don't think there is a solution that solves most of the privacy concerns outside of a 1 story requirement and even that wouldn't solve many, like 4902 Timberline.

Thank you again for your service! I hope to make some of your meetings in the future and look forward to meeting those of you I don't know.

Best,

Tony Stein

5012 Rollingwood

Tony Stein 512-786-2936 Sent from iCloud

**From:** Ryan Clinton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 4, 2023 2:18 PM  
**To:** Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: 4902 Timberline Plans

Hi Ashley and Desiree,

Would one of you mind please forwarding Tony's email below to the CRCRC email address? (I received permission to share it with the committee.)

Thank you,  
Ryan

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Tony Stein [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Thu, May 4, 2023 at 1:48 PM  
**Subject:** 4902 Timberline Plans  
**To:** <[REDACTED]>

not sure if these were final submitted to the city but if not they are very close. This version appears to show some elevations too. looks like my lot slopes close to 20' front corner to back corner. Looks like about 11' from high point to low point of building footprint, if i'm reading the plans correctly. i think i could have maxed out the 10' "bonus" to 45 feet and it appears i could have feasibly done 3 stories in front and 4 in back. like i said we wound up at about 6500 sf which was way more than we initially wanted (and imo about as much as one could argue needing but that's obviously subjective) but part of it was the extra basement type space due to the slope. i bet we could have gone to 8500 sf or more in looking at this. that's part of my position on height. I think we should be max 3 story. so on this house i could have had 3 story in front and 3 story in back but not 3 story in front and 4 story in back. need to think that through more. In general i dont love 3 story houses outside of a partial like i had on mine that's purely driven by slope. Looks like we also set the house back from that corner rather than running a wall straight up 3 stories. Actually i guess mine is almost like a split level house that's 2 stories on 2 different sections. Maybe this is a good lot/example to discuss. Feel free to share with the group.

Tony Stein 512-786-2936 Sent from iCloud

**From:** Jeff Marx [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 4, 2023 3:36 PM  
**To:** Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Rollingwood building restrictions enforced

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Terri McCabe [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Thu, May 4, 2023 at 1:52 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Rollingwood building restrictions enforced  
**To:** Jeff Marx [REDACTED]

Jeff

City Ordinance Sec 107-32 discusses vision clearance. Also, Arborists know that the street tree overhang/canopy should be raised above 12' - recommended 15' to prevent tree damage from delivery trucks and prevent vehicles from driving down the center of the road (not staying to one side). Please see tree canopies too low doc.

Please see photos in separate doc to support list of items.

I put this together quickly. If you have questions, please let me know.

Thanks

Terri K McCabe  
m) 512-300-6575

On Tuesday, May 2, 2023, 08:41:26 PM CDT, Terri McCabe <[terrikmccabe@yahoo.com](mailto:terrikmccabe@yahoo.com)> wrote:

Hey there.

I'll drive and take photos if that's what you need. I see this stuff every day on walks and drives.

Here's one example that I don't have to move for:



Best,

Terri McCabe  
512-300-6575



**From:** Tony Stein [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 5, 2023 11:40 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Alex Robinette [REDACTED]; Barry Delcambre [REDACTED]; Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: FAR Research

Tcad also has a number for garage and patio I believe but they are separate from conditioned and I don't know how accurate they are. Prob more accurate on newer homes bc they started tracking building permit data.

Tony Stein  
512-786-2936

On May 5, 2023, at 11:33 AM, Jeff Marx <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I believe it is conditioned space. At least that's what it is for my home.

TCAD data is hopefully standardized and useful to get us in the right ballpark.

We can and should adjust the code to reflect the desire of the community. Nuance around those items can be incorporated into the FAR formula in our code, based on survey input.

On Fri, May 5, 2023 at 11:25 AM Alexandra Robinette <[REDACTED]> wrote:  
Thanks Jeff, super helpful to have all in one spot!

Can you clarify what the TCAD square footages include- is it just conditioned space, or also including covered porches, decks, garages and/or detached accessory structures?

Thanks,  
Alex

Sent from my iPhone

On May 5, 2023, at 10:29 AM, Jeff Marx <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Tony / Barry -

Attaching relevant files to this point.

On Fri, May 5, 2023 at 10:23 AM Jeff Marx <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Adding Barry & Tony.

Will forward along info in a separate email.

On Fri, May 5, 2023 at 10:11 AM Alexandra Robinette [REDACTED] wrote:  
Adding Barry is fine with me.

I also like the idea of allowing us to all email as a group, this is kind of ridiculous!! If we can't share all the info, we can't be effective.

On May 5, 2023, at 10:05 AM, Jeff Marx [REDACTED] wrote:

Alex -

Request to also add Barry Delcambre.

On Fri, May 5, 2023 at 9:56 AM Jeff Marx [REDACTED] wrote:

On Fri, May 5, 2023 at 8:11 AM Alexandra Robinette [REDACTED] wrote:  
Hi Jeff,

I'm attaching the file, it's Numbers for Mac but should work in Excel if you are on a PC.

[I'm on a Mac, can learn to use Numbers.](#)

Just let me know if you have any issues opening. I think that's a great idea on adding new color for new homes.

[I'll create a request to Ashley for data on new homes.](#)

What are your thoughts on also finding away to represent lot size by color as well, like the chart I sent earlier?

Maybe we make separate graphs for each and not all on the blue one we are using?

[I'm not following 100%... I suggest a trial & error approach if it doesn't take too much time to build. If you can focus on charts, I can focus on modeling \(will explain later\). Does that work? I can circle back to charts if I find time.](#)

I agree with your thinking on trying to nuance the FAR to work with excessive height. I'd still like to cap the height by enforcing a rule that requires a 35' measurement from any point, but the FAR needs to be used to prevent the building of a volumetric 35' cubic volume that runs the length of the buildable area.

Height would be capped. I was thinking of a sliding scale to solve for the same ratio of volume to total lot size. I haven't done the math yet and these #s are completely made up. Something along the lines of

<image.png>

I can build an Excel tool that calculates the volume ratio to land sq footage ratio. From there, we can measure the volume ratio for the top 20 homes and calibrate the tool based on community input. Other inputs can be where to calculate top height, how much bonus sq footage to allow for slopes. Let me know any other inputs to add. I can't think of a way to incorporate setbacks into the tool. We can still address setbacks if needed.

I spoke to Tony Stein and Kevin Glasheen.

I envision this email thread can grow to include others (not on CRCRC, no quorum of governing bodies). Are you okay if I start adding folks to this thread? Tony would like to be included.

Kevin is going to raise an agenda item to the next Council meeting to change our charter to allow us to email openly across CRCRC.

On May 4, 2023, at 9:53 PM, Jeff Marx <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Impressive work! I don't totally follow the Santa Barbara FAR application, but I like how they apply if / then logic on top of it to achieve a desired outcome. We can apply different FAR / height combinations, for example. The most offensive homes max out FAR and height at the same time. Would a mix & match give you the architectural flexibility that you're looking for? If FAR is over X then height is capped at Y, but if FAR is below X then height can be Z. I think that would really help mitigate our data collection efforts, as it'd be very challenging to calculate the cubic volume of homes. I'd also prefer not to introduce a new metric if we can avoid it.

Seeing the FAR chart speaks volumes. What program are you using?

I'm interested in overlaying the homes in the current pipeline in a different color.

We can also overlay the historical FAR chart. I don't want to kill the city / TCAD in pulling data. How far apart should the increments be? Every 3 years, or every 5 years?

On Thu, May 4, 2023 at 1:39 PM Alexandra Robinette <[REDACTED]> wrote:  
Thanks Jeff!

I would be very interested in joining this group, I think it's an important piece of the entire discussion and I'd love to be brought up to speed on the progress you all have made so far on this topic. My cell: 512-656-8272.

Here's the graph as promised:

Interesting historic precedence discussed in this article, indicating FAR goes back to 1913 in New York, as would be expected.

[Floor Area Ratio](#)  
[planning.org](http://planning.org)

I'm still looking into other smaller cities with FAR requirements. St. Paul, MN has 35%; Telluride, CO uses max. sq. footage - perhaps another consideration; Boulder, CO tied to lot size.

[Zoning Basics](#)  
[PDF Document · 233 KB](#)

[3-204 Residential Zone District | Telluride Land Use Code](#)  
[telluride.municipal.codes](http://telluride.municipal.codes)

[download](#)  
[PDF Document · 149 KB](#)

On May 4, 2023, at 10:30 AM, Jeff Marx  wrote:

Hi Alex -

Nice data analytics skills!

The build date is one of the items that I'm also interested in. That will require a visit to city hall and digging into the plans. We have the plans for the top 20 FARs on the city computer. Based on my initial review, I'm guessing only about 40% are newer homes. My initial thought was a FAR above 35%, but also combining other measures like a height adjustment.

If we can assemble the right data for a sample of homes, we can play with the levers to get to a few different proposed outcomes, and then present those options to the community. I think we're actually pretty far along. The biggest need right now is data collection.

I'm currently recruiting a community-driven working group to collaborate on this. Would you be interested in joining? I'm aware we cannot exceed 3 CRCRC members in the working group. Please share your phone # if interested. I'm at 908-377-0655.

Dave Bench assembled the attached data during his visit.

Thanks,  
Jeff

On Thu, May 4, 2023 at 9:17 AM Alexandra Robinette [REDACTED] > wrote:

Hi Jeff,

Thank you for taking the time to create the FAR document. I took your data and deleted duplicates, although I'm not sure what I was deleting, but the percentages stayed the same and I only wanted one line for averages. I also edited out the park, and other properties that were not homes, along with a few homes on Tremont that I think fall just outside of RW boundaries.

The average is 19.9%, but I think a bell curve is more interesting to show trends and outliers - I'm working on generating that graph. Like you said, I'm not sure what we can do with this, there are homes with high percentages, but I'm not sure they are also over-whelming to their neighbors. It may be that we use a maximum % just to catch anyone that successfully finds a way to run the gauntlet of other restrictions. 35% is looking like a good number if I had to pick, which puts the top 5% of your list over the maximum. To say that 95% of homes fall within an acceptable margin seems reasonable.

Austin has a FAR of 40%, but they are much higher-density lots. RW is unique, and if we want to honor the request that we preserve the quality and character of the neighborhood, then 35% is a good start.

Other cities have complicated formulas, but it might make sense to offer something similar in RW. I'll keep researching.

Also, it would be interesting to note the completion dates for homes at the far ends of the bell curve. I think we might find the newest homes fall within the highest percentages. Do you know how to get that data?

Alex

Floor Area Ratio  
PDF Document · 217 KB

3 @ 5%  
4 @ 6%  
8 @ 7%  
7 @ 8%  
10 @ 9%  
19 @ 10%  
19 @ 11%  
25 @ 12%  
21 @ 13%

22 @ 14%  
30 @ 15%  
33 @ 16%  
30 @ 17%  
30 @ 18%  
19 @ 19%  
18 @ 20%  
20 @ 21%  
23 @ 22%  
16 @ 23%  
15 @ 24%  
9 @ 25%  
13 @ 26%  
10 @ 27%  
9 @ 28%  
12 @ 29%  
9 @ 30%  
7 @ 31%  
8 @ 32%  
9 @ 33%  
4 @ 34%  
6 @ 35%  
3 @ 37%  
4 @ 38%  
2 @ 39%  
4 @ 41%  
2 @ 42%  
1 @ 43%  
1 @ 44%  
2 @ 45%  
1 @ 46%  
2 @ 50%  
1 @ 53%  
1 @ 59%

<Floor area ratio.numbers>  
<Floor Area Ratio WS (2).xlsx>  
<IMG\_0103.jpeg>  
<preview (3).png>  
<Santa Barbarara Floor Area Ratio.pdf>  
<preview (4).png>  
<2021 Residential Survey Insights.docx>  
<RW TCAD Summary 5.3.23.xlsx>

**From:** jack holland [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 13, 2023 2:18 PM  
**Cc:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Save Rollingwood [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Input Needed for Rollingwood Residential Planning

Hi All,

Had some trouble with the [CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov) email address being rejected so have copied y'all in on our feedback. Please make sure it gets to the members of the CRCRC. Thank you.

Firstly, thank you all for agreeing to serve on the CRCRC. It is much appreciated.

My wife and I bought our house on Park Hills Drive back in 2009 and we intend to stay here for many more years.

Here is our input on the residential areas of RW.

- 1) Keep ALL residences as Single Family Residences. Do not allow Duplexes, triplexes or any other form of multi family. In the Austin area RW is unique in this way. We should keep it that way.
- 2) RW should allow guest houses/garage apartments but on the strict caveat that they can ONLY be used for family/friends and are NOT to be used as short term or long term rentals. People are living longer and some RW residents might want the option of creating separate living quarters for their elderly parents to come live with them.
- 3) Do NOT allow smaller lot sizes to be formed from subdividing existing lots if the new lots are smaller than currently allowed. RW has larger lots than most subdivisions in Austin and it creates a spacious, natural, classy vibe which should maintain. We don't mind an existing larger lot, say 0.72 acres, being divided into two 0.36 acre lots but we are firmly against a single existing lot of 0.36 acres, being divided to create two 0.18 acre lots. Hope that makes sense!
- 4) RW should enforce the NO short term airbnb rentals rule. It is unfair to the immediate neighbors if some homeowners allow their homes to be rented out for weekends and other short term periods. No one wants to live next to a "Party House".
- 5) There should NEVER be commercial/non residential enterprises allowed to open in the existing residential areas. Keep commercial etc in the commercially zoned areas only.
- 6) Impervious cover levels to remain the same as they are. However.....
- 7) Drainage measures to be incorporated in all new construction to ensure neighbors are not affected by excess water flow from new construction. These drainage measures are to be paid for by the

constructors and must be part of the planning permission process.

8) Maximum building heights of 35 ft to remain in place. However where there is a gradient on the lot the building height must adjust down accordingly. We cannot have a new build that is 35 ft tall at the high end and, because of a gradient, 45 ft in height at the lower end of the slope. It is unsightly for a neighbor to have to look across at a 45 ft high wall of brick/stucco.

9) Current setback levels to remain in place. However, we think NO part of the house structure should be allowed to enter into the setback airspace by means of cantilevers etc - that defeats the purpose of keeping a healthy distance between residential space and is the reason for having setbacks in the first place. The only exception to anything being in the setback area would be an HVAC condenser or pool pump and they should be placed as close to the house exterior/ setback lines as possible.

10) If new construction housing complies with all of the building and code regulations there should be NO maximum building square footage rules. For example, if the lot is big enough for an 9500 sq ft house then it should be allowed. But if the lot is only big enough for a 5000 sq ft house then it has to comply to that.

Thanks for listening.

Jack and Torye Holland

3307 Park Hills Drive



**From:** Jeff Marx [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 13, 2023 3:56 PM  
**To:** Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Cc:** Alex Robinette [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: Input Needed for Rollingwood Residential Planning

Please forward to CRCRC

----- Forwarded message -----  
**From:** jack holland [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Sat, May 13, 2023 at 3:52 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Input Needed for Rollingwood Residential Planning  
**To:** Jeff Marx [REDACTED]

Hi Jeff,

We would consider for a FAR to be introduced. We would want it set somewhere between 40% and 45%.

We think our society is trending towards more multi generational families living under one roof. We could foresee one day having an elderly parent(s) come live with us and if that were to be a reality we would consider either adding a huge extension or even tearing down our current home of 3600 sq ft in order to build a new, bigger house on our Park Hills lot that could accommodate both generations comfortably. With land prices having risen tremendously in Austin over the last five years I know there are a growing number of RW residents who think the same on this issue. We were just discussing this possible option with six of our neighbors at the RW dog park last week.

Thanks,

Jack

On May 13, 2023, at 3:10 PM, Jeff Marx [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Jack -

Thanks for sharing! There's no Floor to Area Ratio cap in our code. I'm proposing we consider including one. I think bullet #10 indirectly addresses that.

Would you consider an FAR to be introduced? If yes, where would you set it? Your home is at 21% FAR. 3225 Park Hills is 53%. Only 5% of the homes exceeded 35% on 1/1/2023.

<IMG\_0103.jpeg>

On Sat, May 13, 2023 at 2:18 PM jack holland [REDACTED] wrote:  
Hi All,

Had some trouble with the [CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov) email address being rejected so have copied y'all in on our feedback. Please make sure it gets to the members of the CRCRC. Thank you.

Firstly, thank you all for agreeing to serve on the CRCRC. It is much appreciated.

My wife and I bought our house on Park Hills Drive back in 2009 and we intend to stay here for many more years.

Here is our input on the residential areas of RW.

- 1) Keep ALL residences as Single Family Residences. Do not allow Duplexes, triplexes or any other form of multi family. In the Austin area RW is unique in this way. We should keep it that way.
- 2) RW should allow guest houses/garage apartments but on the strict caveat that they can ONLY be used for family/friends and are NOT to be used as short term or long term rentals. People are living longer and some RW residents might want the option of creating separate living quarters for their elderly parents to come live with them.
- 3) Do NOT allow smaller lot sizes to be formed from subdividing existing lots if the new lots are smaller than currently allowed. RW has larger lots than most subdivisions in Austin and it creates a spacious, natural, classy vibe which should maintain. We don't mind an existing larger lot, say 0.72 acres, being divided into two 0.36 acre lots but we are firmly against a single existing lot of 0.36 acres, being divided to create two 0.18 acre lots. Hope that makes sense!
- 4) RW should enforce the NO short term airbnb rentals rule. It is unfair to the immediate neighbors if some homeowners allow their homes to be rented out for weekends and other short term periods. No one wants to live next to a "Party House".
- 5) There should NEVER be commercial/non residential enterprises allowed to open in the existing residential areas. Keep commercial etc in the commercially zoned areas only.
- 6) Impervious cover levels to remain the same as they are. However.....
- 7) Drainage measures to be incorporated in all new construction to ensure neighbors are not affected by excess water flow from new construction. These drainage measures are to be paid for by the constructors and must be part of the planning permission process.
- 8) Maximum building heights of 35 ft to remain in place. However where there is a gradient on the lot the building height must adjust down accordingly. We cannot have a new build that is 35 ft tall at the high end and, because of a gradient, 45 ft in height at the lower end of the slope. It is unsightly for a neighbor to have to look across at a 45 ft high wall of brick/stucco.

9) Current setback levels to remain in place. However, we think NO part of the house structure should be allowed to enter into the setback airspace by means of cantilevers etc - that defeats the purpose of keeping a healthy distance between residential space and is the reason for having setbacks in the first place. The only exception to anything being in the setback area would be an HVAC condenser or pool pump and they should be placed as close to the house exterior/ setback lines as possible.

10) If new construction housing complies with all of the building and code regulations there should be NO maximum building square footage rules. For example, if the lot is big enough for an 9500 sq ft house then it should be allowed. But if the lot is only big enough for a 5000 sq ft house then it has to comply to that.

Thanks for listening.

Jack and Torye Holland

3307 Park Hills Drive

<RW TCAD Summary 1.1.23.xlsx>

**From:** Brook Brown <[bbrown@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:bbrown@rollingwoodtx.gov)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 14, 2023 12:42 PM  
**To:** Ashley Wayman <[awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Desiree Adair <[dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: email to CRCRC

Please see revised email below - please send this one to the CRCRC, if permitted, rather than the first.

Sorry for any inconvenience.

---

**From:** Brook Brown <[bbrown@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:bbrown@rollingwoodtx.gov)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 14, 2023 9:37 AM  
**To:** Ashley Wayman <[awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Desiree Adair <[dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fw: email to CRCRC

Dear Ashley and Desiree,

I am sending the email below and ask that you forward it to the members of the CRCRC.

It addresses items 7 and 8 on the Council agenda, dealing with "building height, residential", that the CRCRC is also working on, and may help answer any questions regarding the overlap of these two agenda items and the work of the CRCRC.

Thank you for all you do!

Brook

---

Dear CRCRC,

I send this email in explanation of two items that appear on the City Council agenda for this Wednesday related to the definition of "building height, residential". The definition "building height, residential" appears in two places in our ordinances: first, in Section 101(c)1, amending the definition of "building height, residential" as used in the 2015 International Building Code (IBC) that governs building standards such as wiring, construction materials, etc., and second, in the Zoning Code in Section 107-3 – Definitions, which governs height of buildings in the residential zone of the city.

Item 7 on the Council agenda is a proposed change to amend the definition of "building height, residential" in the residential code. This is an agenda item I initially proposed in April to address the building height issue. I have since requested it be postponed pending the formation of the CRCRC. At Wednesday's meeting, I intend to discuss with the Council whether to withdraw this item, so that this issue will remain with the CRCRC for a recommendation, or proceed with the recommendation.

Item 8 on the council agenda for this Wed. that is intended to correct an issue with our current definition of "building height, residential" as it appears in our Building Code. The defined term "building height, residential" does not appear in the IBC. Instead, the IBC uses the terms

"height, building" and "grade plane" to address building height. The proposed amendment in item 8 is intended to correct this issue.

I am happy to address any questions you may have regarding these matters.

Thanks for your service on the CRCRC.

Brook Brown

**From:** Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 15, 2023 8:43 AM  
**To:** Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Cc:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: CRCRC next steps

Good Morning, Mayor and Council,

Please see below from Jeff Marx.

Thanks,  
Ashley

**Ashley Wayman**  
City Administrator  
City of Rollingwood  
(512) 327-1838  
[www.rollingwoodtx.gov](http://www.rollingwoodtx.gov)



**From:** Jeff Marx [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 13, 2023 3:46 PM  
**To:** Ashley Wayman <[awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Desiree Adair <[dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov)>  
**Cc:** Alex Robinette [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: CRCRC next steps

Hi Ashley / Desiree -

Please pass this along to Council.

City Councilmembers -

Alex Robinette and I shared the following summary of ideas with Thom (see email below). I saw overlapping items on the Council's agenda and thought it was appropriate to pass this along to Council.

Updates:

- 1) On Friday, we agreed on a plan with city staff for CRCRC to receive the square footage of the homes that are currently being built. Once I receive that info, I can calculate the FAR for those homes and share the updated graph.
- 2) I reviewed the [proposed code amendment](#) and agree with the recommendations.

3) Currently, CRCRC members are not allowed to email the CRCRC distribution list. I'm hopeful that the Council can agree to allow us to do so. I agree with the spirit of the Open Meetings Act and can make all my CRCRC-related electronic communications public information. My hope is that CRCRC members can make progress between meetings via email, so that the public meetings can be used to focus on community engagement.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jeff Marx [REDACTED]  
Date: Wed, May 10, 2023 at 1:04 PM  
Subject: CRCRC next steps  
To: Thomas Farrell [REDACTED]  
Cc: alexrobinette [REDACTED]

Hi Thom -

Alex and I have been active on CRCRC since our last meeting. Lots of progress. We're hoping to present you with our thoughts for where to go from here. We can discuss further on Friday.

### **Workshop**

We've been performing outreach and speaking with neighbors to learn about the issues. We think it's a priority to book a Community Workshop ASAP.

The Workshop would include presentations from CRCRC on the topics we think are relevant (Height, FAR, setbacks), plus presentations from Council, P&Z & city staff on the topics we have already heard concerns about (non-confirming, enforcement, etc). We should give ample time to those from both sides of issues to respond / debate, and include an open-ended discussion from residents at the beginning and end. The Workshop should be recorded so we can share with those who aren't around.

### **Community engagement**

We believe it's very important to consider the resident's input throughout this process. We suggest that the future CRCRC meetings be used as an opportunity for residents to share their thoughts. We propose the city heavily promote our efforts so everyone knows they have the chance to be heard during our meetings. Emails should also be encouraged.

### **Survey**

We'd like to administer two surveys.

The first survey would be open-ended, and can be low-tech (if needed). This survey would give residents flexibility to share any concerns they have that they'd like for the CRCRC to address. The responses should not directly impact the proposed rewrite of the code.

The second survey would happen later in the process, be high-tech to limit ballot-stuffing, and be multiple choice. The responses should clearly define how residents propose we re-write the code.

### **Timeline**

Alex is traveling for for the summer starting June 17th. I'm traveling May 27 through June 4th.

We're proposing the open-ended survey be sent out by May 27th, and the Workshop happen at the June 13th CRCRC meeting.

The multiple choice survey can be sent out during early August.

Survey analysis / code revision proposals to occur in September.

### **Sensitive topics**

While we perform the analysis, it'd be helpful to compile a list of homes where we have heard the most complaints about. This is a sensitive conversation and we'd like guidance on how to proceed.

### **Issues**

We suggest a prioritization of the issues. If it's concluded that there is broad consensus across the community, we suggest swift action for those issues. Based on review of the resident emails, along with the data, we anticipate the following issues to be the highest priorities. We're open-minded and are eager to get more input through the Workshop and Surveys to test our hypothesis.

### *Height*

The following homes are examples where the 10ft. rule is not used on sloping lots and the overall home size is not impacted.

For reference - and it's a little hard to see - but this home at 2401 Hatley has two separate two-story volumes, where the ground floor of one becomes the second floor of the other (no 3rd story). It's a big home and nothing was sacrificed by having to terrace, in fact, it's very pretty how it steps the massing down the slope.

Similarly 2403 Hatley does the same thing, and you can see how much the lot slopes. They could have used the 10ft. bonus, but opted to follow the slope.

5 Inwood Cr. is another beautiful example of following the grading on a steeply sloping lot.




2808 Pickwick, another steeply sloping lot found a way to elevate their property without creating an excessive volume - i.e. no giant foundation wall. I don't think it exceeds 35ft., and the way it steps back away from the street is lovely.

209 Ashworth is another good example of terracing on steep slopes and/or significant grade changes.

### FAR

The attached FAR image is based on 1/1/23 TCAD data. 5% of the homes exceed 35% FAR. Of those, we suspect the majority have been built recently. We're speaking with the city on Friday to determine whether they will provide that data to us.

Based on a review of the emails, we suspect the neighbors concern is related to homes with FAR in excess of 35%. We would like to engage the community to determine whether it's appropriate to introduce an FAR limitation in the residential code.



Other issues we suggest prioritization are setbacks and trees.

We look forward to speaking more about these topics on Friday morning.

Thanks,  
Jeff

**From:** Jeff Marx <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 13, 2023 3:56 PM  
**To:** Ashley Wayman <[awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Desiree Adair <[dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov)>  
**Cc:** Alex Robinette <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Input Needed for Rollingwood Residential Planning

Please forward to CRCRC

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** jack holland <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** Sat, May 13, 2023 at 3:52 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Input Needed for Rollingwood Residential Planning  
**To:** Jeff Marx <[REDACTED]>

Hi Jeff,

We would consider for a FAR to be introduced. We would want it set somewhere between 40% and 45%.

We think our society is trending towards more multi generational families living under one roof. We could foresee one day having an elderly parent(s) come live with us and if that were to be a reality we would consider either adding a huge extension or even tearing down our current home of 3600 sq ft in order to build a new, bigger house on our Park Hills lot that could accommodate both generations comfortably. With land prices having risen tremendously in Austin over the last five years I know there are a growing number of RW residents who think the same on this issue. We were just discussing this possible option with six of our neighbors at the RW dog park last week.

Thanks,

Jack

On May 13, 2023, at 3:10 PM, Jeff Marx <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Jack -

Thanks for sharing! There's no Floor to Area Ratio cap in our code. I'm proposing we consider including one. I think bullet #10 indirectly addresses that.

Would you consider an FAR to be introduced? If yes, where would you set it? Your home is at 21% FAR. 3225 Park Hills is 53%. Only 5% of the homes exceeded 35% on 1/1/2023.

<IMG\_0103.jpeg>

On Sat, May 13, 2023 at 2:18 PM jack holland <[REDACTED]> wrote:  
Hi All,

Had some trouble with the [CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov) email address being rejected so have copied y'all in on our feedback. Please make sure it gets to the members of the CRCRC. Thank you.

Firstly, thank you all for agreeing to serve on the CRCRC. It is much appreciated.

My wife and I bought our house on Park Hills Drive back in 2009 and we intend to stay here for many more years.

Here is our input on the residential areas of RW.

- 1) Keep ALL residences as Single Family Residences. Do not allow Duplexes, triplexes or any other form of multi family. In the Austin area RW is unique in this way. We should keep it that way.
- 2) RW should allow guest houses/garage apartments but on the strict caveat that they can ONLY be used for family/friends and are NOT to be used as short term or long term rentals. People are living longer and some RW residents might want the option of creating separate living quarters for their elderly parents to come live with them.
- 3) Do NOT allow smaller lot sizes to be formed from subdividing existing lots if the new lots are smaller than currently allowed. RW has larger lots than most subdivisions in Austin and it creates a spacious, natural, classy vibe which should maintain. We don't mind an existing larger lot, say 0.72 acres, being divided into two 0.36 acre lots but we are firmly against a single existing lot of 0.36 acres, being divided to create two 0.18 acre lots. Hope that makes sense!
- 4) RW should enforce the NO short term airbnb rentals rule. It is unfair to the immediate neighbors if some homeowners allow their homes to be rented out for weekends and other short term periods. No one wants to live next to a "Party House".
- 5) There should NEVER be commercial/non residential enterprises allowed to open in the existing residential areas. Keep commercial etc in the commercially zoned areas only.
- 6) Impervious cover levels to remain the same as they are. However.....
- 7) Drainage measures to be incorporated in all new construction to ensure neighbors are not affected by excess water flow from new construction. These drainage measures are to be paid for by the constructors and must be part of the planning permission process.
- 8) Maximum building heights of 35 ft to remain in place. However where there is a gradient on the lot the building height must adjust down accordingly. We cannot have a new build that is 35 ft tall at the high end and, because of a gradient, 45 ft in height at the lower end of the slope. It is unsightly for a neighbor to have to look across at a 45 ft high wall of brick/stucco.

9) Current setback levels to remain in place. However, we think NO part of the house structure should be allowed to enter into the setback airspace by means of cantilevers etc - that defeats the purpose of keeping a healthy distance between residential space and is the reason for having setbacks in the first place. The only exception to anything being in the setback area would be an HVAC condenser or pool pump and they should be placed as close to the house exterior/ setback lines as possible.

10) If new construction housing complies with all of the building and code regulations there should be NO maximum building square footage rules. For example, if the lot is big enough for an 9500 sq ft house then it should be allowed. But if the lot is only big enough for a 5000 sq ft house then it has to comply to that.

Thanks for listening.

Jack and Torye Holland

3307 Park Hills Drive

<RW TCAD Summary 1.1.23.xlsx>


**From:** Jeff Marx [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 17, 2023 6:06 AM  
**To:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Cc:** Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** FAR analysis of residential construction projects

Hi Desiree -

Please forward along to the City Council.

Hi City Council -

As you're aware, I'm a member of CRCRC and have been performing analysis of FAR ratios based on TCAD data. We already know that according to the TCAD records as of 1.1.23, the FAR only exceeds 35% for 26 homes (5% of the population, image attached).



I'm not sure where the residents would prefer to draw the line with FAR. Based on a review of the resident's emails, I suspect the community would prefer to not leave FAR uncapped.

I was interested to see what the FAR looks like for the homes either approved for permitting, or pending permit approval.

There's 363 total active / pending permits (active / pending permits tab). Of those, I've flagged 61 as new residential homes (new resi flag). For 3 of them, the city doesn't have sq footage info, leaving 58 left to analyze. I suspect the city defines sq footage as total covered space, including garages & porches. I suspect TCAD defines sq footage as livable space, which is a smaller #. I believe this because for newer homes included in the 1.1.23 TCAD data, the TCAD "Main Area" is smaller than the square footage

reported by the city. Further investigation is needed and the FAR% based on city data may be inflated by 8 - 15% relative to the FAR based on TCAD data.

The city data doesn't report land sq footage, but the TCAD data does. If the addresses match, we can link the two tables. I had to do some manual adjustments to the addresses provided by the city. Despite my best efforts, there's still 21 addresses that don't match. I'll check with the city on those when there's more time.

For the matches, you can find the updated FAR data in column J of the Resi 1.1.23 tab. For the 7 pending projects, the average FAR is 14% according to 1.1.23 TCAD data. The proposed FAR based on the new construction averages 43% for the pending projects. If we apply a 15% haircut, the average FAR would be 36%. With a 15% haircut, 4 of the 7 would exceed 35%.

Thanks,  
Jeff

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 17, 2023 7:38 AM  
**To:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Cc:** Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: FAR analysis of residential construction projects

Please add -

I suggest we consider height and FAR as related topics. Some will argue that 35' is plenty of height to work with. Others will suggest that homes with sloped lots should get bonus height. I'm open to a 35' max height, but also think we should consider a sliding scale so that if you use the max height, you don't also use the max FAR. That would give flexibility to adapt to the lot slope, while also limiting the ability to overbuild on the lot. To simplify things, I suggest we add max height + FAR %. The concern is homes like 3225 Park Hills, which maxed out the height, built to setbacks, and wasn't constrained by FAR. That home has max height of 45' and TCAD FAR of 53%, which sums to 98. While I do hear some arguing for height over 35' for sloped lots, I don't hear much argument for homes with a FAR > 45%. Based on conversations, I don't hear many suggesting a height below 35' or FAR below 35%, which would sum to 70. I expect the consensus of the residents to prefer a sum # somewhere between 70 and 85.


On Wed, May 17, 2023 at 6:06 AM Jeff Marx [REDACTED] wrote:  
Hi Desiree -

Please forward along to the City Council.

Hi City Council -

As you're aware, I'm a member of CRCRC and have been performing analysis of FAR ratios based on TCAD data. We already know that according to the TCAD records as of 1.1.23, the FAR only exceeds 35%

for 26 homes (5% of the population, image attached).



I'm not sure where the residents would prefer to draw the line with FAR. Based on a review of the resident's emails, I suspect the community would prefer to not leave FAR uncapped.

I was interested to see what the FAR looks like for the homes either approved for permitting, or pending permit approval.

There's 363 total active / pending permits (active / pending permits tab). Of those, I've flagged 61 as new residential homes (new resi flag). For 3 of them, the city doesn't have sq footage info, leaving 58 left to analyze. I suspect the city defines sq footage as total covered space, including garages & porches. I suspect TCAD defines sq footage as livable space, which is a smaller #. I believe this because for newer homes included in the 1.1.23 TCAD data, the TCAD "Main Area" is smaller than the square footage reported by the city. Further investigation is needed and the FAR% based on city data may be inflated by 8 - 15% relative to the FAR based on TCAD data.

The city data doesn't report land sq footage, but the TCAD data does. If the addresses match, we can link the two tables. I had to do some manual adjustments to the addresses provided by the city. Despite my best efforts, there's still 21 addresses that don't match. I'll check with the city on those when there's more time.

For the matches, you can find the updated FAR data in column J of the Resi 1.1.23 tab. For the 7 pending projects, the average FAR is 14% according to 1.1.23 TCAD data. The proposed FAR based on the new construction averages 43% for the pending projects. If we apply a 15% haircut, the average FAR would be 36%. With a 15% haircut, 4 of the 7 would exceed 35%.



Thanks,

Jeff

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2023 2:21 PM


To: Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>

Cc: Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Nikki Stautzenberger <nstautz@rollingwoodtx.gov> [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: FAR analysis of residential construction projects

Hi Desiree -

Please include this image, courtesy of ChatGPT / Streamlit. Can be included in the CRCRC agenda and forwarded to Council / Mayor.



On Wed, May 17, 2023 at 10:44 AM Jeff Marx [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Desiree -

Yes, please include in the CRCRC meeting agenda item.

Nikki -

Any input that you have related to these data requests would be appreciated.

Thank you

**From:** Jeff Marx [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 17, 2023 3:39 PM  
**To:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Cc:** Alex Robinette [REDACTED]; Nikki Stautzenberger <nstautz@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** FAR potted on map


Hi Desiree -

Please pass along to whoever you think would find this useful (Council, etc).  
Please include in the packet the next CRCRC meeting.


Here's the FAR as a radius on a map, using the following color scheme:

- <10% FAR - Blue
- 10-20% FAR - Green
- 20-35% FAR - Yellow
- 35% FAR - Red


Here's 2002:



Here's 2014:



Here's 2023



**From:** Kevin Schell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 23, 2023 4:57 PM  
**To:** Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Feedback on drainage for CRCRC meeting 5/25

Ashley/Desiree please forward to the CRCRC members:

Unfortunately, I'm behind on watching the CRCRC meetings and cannot attend tonight. Apologies if this topic has already been discussed. I'm putting this together quickly, at the last second.

I was surprised with the agenda item tonight to not have a subcommittee to review how current code impacts drainage in the city. Here are a few topics worth exploring:

- Our lack of impervious cover restrictions are different than surrounding cities. We are trying to build regional drainage remediation features without knowing the limit of development. The cost of a drainage system with 50% impervious cover vs 90% impervious cover is significant on a tax base of our size.
- The drainage criteria manual seems to only deal with issues relative to TCEQ. It requires expensive measures that have limited impact on the types of storms that cause our local drainage issues. These measures, without maintenance, are pointless over time. I repeatedly have to push back on the belief that the DCM prevents flooding. It only does to a point.
- We allow(or do not enforce) improvements to dry creeks that change existing drainage patterns without an understanding of the downhill impact.
- We have a significant number of homes that were built/modified between the installation of the sewer lines and the implementation of the drainage criteria manual. Currently, that delta does not need to be brought into compliance when a property is improved. What is the scope of this problem?

This is a beefy topic that I argue impacts all of Rollingwood. Directly with issues to public safety and damages to property, or indirectly through increased taxes for increasingly expensive remediation features.

I do not believe there is a singular solution to this problem in our building code. But I hope this committee will explore what is possible and report back to the council what will need to be solved through other means.

Apologies again for this being last second. Feel free to reach out if you have any questions or want a first hand tour of the Nixon/Pleasant drainage problem that continues to worsen as we continue to ignore the problem

K-

Kevin Schell  
300 Pleasant Dr.

-----Original Message-----

From: Salen Churi [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2023 8:10 AM

To: Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>

Subject: Feedback on code change proposal

Hi there,

I live on park hills, and though these changes wouldn't directly affect me, I'm opposed to additional restriction. What makes rollingwood an appealing place to build (and in turn drives our property values vis a vis Tarrytown for example) is the relative ease of building and creative freedom. I don't support constraining that even if I don't always like the visual results.

I do think, if there's concern about spec builders thoughtlessly maxing out sqft, you could find a constitutional way to extend the period that you'd have to live in a home over a certain FAR or height before renting or selling. The likely answer is that the market will punish these builders, as I think most buyers don't want what they are building either. But making our code more restrictive like westlake or city of austin will destroy what makes RW uniquely appealing vs other nice areas and have a detrimental impact on everyone's property values, which in a crashing real estate market feels like an unforced error.

**From:** Tony Broglio [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 24, 2023 8:32 AM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Code changes

Hi All,

Thank you for taking the time to serve on this committee. I think the best course of action before considering any code changes is to take a comprehensive survey of the residents and work really hard to encourage broad participation. Most people won't take the time to understand the potential impact of broad based topics, so I believe the survey should be very simple & specific. For example, "the committee is proposing to recommend a change to the max building height from X to Y. Do you support this? Y or N". I also think the committee should work hard to avoid introducing bias with the phrasing of the questions. The recent text message sent out had bias in it. It talked about the city of Austin's FAR limit of 40% and said that was put in place to allow for more urban density. It also referenced the 19% average in the hood as an anchoring point to justify 35% as a proposed rule that would provide significant cushion to the average. That 19% is clearly weighted way down based on older home stock that is largely irrelevant to anyone considering the investment costs required to rebuild on an existing lot. Members of the committee may believe 35% is more appropriate for Rollingwood, but the survey should work hard to gather genuine feedback without biasing the respondent.

I believe any changes that are ultimately made should make it clear that existing properties won't become non-confirming regardless of the changes implemented. I also think there's a meaningful risk that the pendulum will swing too far in the wrong direction based on the proposed changes that I've seen discussed to date. There are a few "problem homes" being developed in Rollingwood but I think the city might over-react to those and implement stricter changes than would have been required to prevent those problem homes based on the feedback of the very vocal minority. I think any code changes made should focus on things that would have prevented the most problematic aspects of the homes causing concern and not reach beyond that.

Thank you again for taking the time to serve our city.

Best  
Tony  
773-865-7130

**From:** Amy Pattillo [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 17, 2023 4:11 PM  
**To:** Gavin Massingill <[gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Sara Hutson <[shutson@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:shutson@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Brook Brown <[bbrown@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:bbrown@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Phil McDuffee <[pmcduffee@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:pmcduffee@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Alec Robinson <[arobinson@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:arobinson@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; Kevin Glasheen <[kglasheen@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:kglasheen@rollingwoodtx.gov)>  
**Cc:** Ashley Wayman <[awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov)>; dukester [REDACTED]; rdclinton [REDACTED]; westbank [REDACTED]; Alex Robinette [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 5/17 Council meeting - comments to Item 7

Dear Mayor Massingill and Rollingwood Council Members:

With regard to item 7 on tonight's City Council agenda regarding building heights, I would respectfully request that the Council move forward with options #2 (Adopt amendments to give effect to only the "survey" requirements) and option #3 (moving the building height discussion to the CRCRC) as proposed on the one sheet, but not option #1.

Regarding building heights, I would respectfully request that the Council provide the opportunity for the CRCRC to consider code amendments to where and how building heights are measured as a part of a holistic review of the residential zoning code.

One of the issues that residents have said they would like addressed in the City is the drainage infrastructure in the residential corridor. I would respectfully ask the Council to request that the CRCRC consider setbacks, height measurements and other zoning issues with a lens of providing equitable credits or other adjustments for any modifications to these code areas on lots such as mine where the City and its residents receive the benefit of resident-installed drainage infrastructure on residential properties without having paid for this benefit.

My property is one of several along a main drainage area where over 1/3 of the water that leaves the City during a rain event converges before flowing into Lady Bird Lake. I purchased my home from Duke Garwood, who made significant investments in the landscaping of the property to effectively install drainage infrastructure elements that were not required at the time and which are similar to many drainage infrastructure elements the City is now paying to add to other residential areas upstream from our home. The drainage infrastructure on our lot shores up the areas where water reaches our lot during a rainfall, both through the dry-creek area on our lot and through other sections of the lot where water from neighboring homes and the street flows through



our yard to reach the dry-creek. The infrastructure on our lot also reduces erosion and the washing away of sediment from our yard into the waterway - though every rainfall we end up with a significant amount of sediment flow into and through our yard from upstream. To understand the scope of how much water and debris reaches our yard, we've had railroad ties wash down from Rollingwood Park into our yard during storms and get caught up at the bridge that our yard empties to.

Duke also positioned the house on the lot in such a way that the foundation of the house is built up on the slope of the lot and presses into the setbacks in the corner of the yard away from the rain areas. The house was built to the maximum height at the time of 35 feet, from a foundation that starts well above the grade level that exists at the street. The house was also built pre-sewer system has not been expanded since that time.

My request is that changes to the code that would impact the buildable footprint of a lot, both vertically and horizontally, would be sent to the CRCRC to consider holistically. I would posit that changes to the point on lots where the building height is measured from, by themselves or in tandem with changes to the maximum allowable building height, should be considered in tandem with providing a credit or adjustment of some type to reflect the portion of my lot that includes resident-installed drainage infrastructure at no cost to the City. To the extent that a portion of our lot is not considered buildable area because of the drainage infrastructure, the property value impact of building height adjustments and height caps that limit future development is not comparable to impacts to other lots that do not have these types of limitations, and I would request that it be considered with a separate lens. To the extent that a property includes flood plain, I also hope the CRCRC would consider credits or adjustments to allow properties to be built at a higher lift off the property to reduce changes of future flooding.

I would also note that we have not as of yet received a property tax benefit from Travis County for the portion of our yard that is dry-creek (though we have requested it in prior years) and includes resident-installed drainage infrastructure. The City Engineer stated, on the record during a Council meeting, that we may not modify this drainage area that the City receives the benefit of through our yard. Please consider allowing the CRCRC to evaluate adjustments to the residential zoning code in a manner that allows building height to be considered in conjunction with credits to lots that include drainage infrastructure that benefits the City, to allow for equitable development of the lots in the future with lots that do not include such infrastructure.

As always, I appreciate each of you volunteering your time to consider how to arrange the spaces we share in our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

**AMY J. PATTILLO**

*Direct: 512-633-9571*

-----Original Message-----

From: Andy Richardson [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2023 10:19 AM

To: Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>

Subject: Code changes

I would like to voice my strong opposition to any code changes the council and P&Z is considering.

Historically, the city of Rollingwood has had a leaner building code with less rules than surrounding cities. This has served the city well in that there has been a tremendous amount of development in the last decade. Changes such as lowering building heights, reducing impervious cover allowances and increasing restrictions on what trees can be cut down will only reduce development further. The lengthy drainage manual that was enacted in 2016 is already way too much regulation. Building permits take a year to get done if there is any drainage issue on the property. This is unacceptable to developers and homeowners.

Rollingwood is not a museum. Trees are not historical artifacts. The only tree ordinance I'm in favor of is if someone wants to cut down a protected tree, that tree should be offered to the community. It is now feasible to move almost any oak tree. If a community member that doesn't live on the property in question wants to keep a tree on someone else's lot. They can pay to have it moved themselves. Any other burdensome tree ordinance such as the ones in the city of Austin are not necessary. It reduces property values in practice since older lots are not able to be developed if they have old trees on them. As someone that has a nice new house in Rollingwood, I'm in favor of continued development.

There are countless cities across the country that enact increasingly more regulations on development. This is causing increasing unaffordability and keeps a community stuck in the past. Not everyone is in favor of living in a museum like Paris, France or countless other cities across the world that only add regulations every single year. They members of the community in favor of more regulation always state that they will only support sensible new regulation but it never goes in reverse. It's much much harder to reduce regulation once enacted.

Please keep the status quo. The slippery slope of more rules benefits nobody.

Thanks,

Andrew Richardson and Erika Whitehouse  
208 Ashworth Dr,  
Rollingwood, TX 78746

**From:** Derek Mellencamp [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 24, 2023 1:33 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Residential Zoning Changes Feedback

Hi Team;

My wife has been a RW resident at 4903 Timberline since 1999. We have seen quite a few changes to the neighborhood over that time.

We rebuilt our house in 2016, and are contemplating adding a pool, a partial second story to our single story home, and/or ADU in the near future.

First - thanks for tackling this effort. It is seemingly emotionally charged. Everyone has an opinion. Here is mine:

1) Its really hard to know how to engage in this process. I am a working parent with a young child and so can't engage in any way that consumes a lot of time. It seems like important decisions are being made that will impact the whole community. I read e-mails from our representatives as they come out, I see threads on conversations on the RW Gentlemens club WhatsApp. I even downloaded and read the final comprehensive plan to educate myself. Even with all of that it is hard to understand the details and the implications of the decisions being made.

2) Transparency is key - which I think this team does a good job of managing. I just read through the comprehensive plan and saw this:

<b>Residential Policies</b>	Commission a traffic study to address residents' concerns over the amount and speed of traffic within residential areas; look for ways to reduce cut-through traffic; consider installation of crosswalks and pedestrian islands to permit the safe crossing of Rollingwood Drive near the park.
	Prohibit short-term rentals.
	Connect residential and commercial areas with a dedicated, safe pathway for pedestrians and bicyclists alongside Edgegrove Drive between Rollingwood Drive and Bee Caves Rd.
	Evaluate and consider connecting residential and commercial areas with a dedicated pathway along old Dellana Lane.
	Maintain standard and uniform setback and building rules on residential lots throughout Rollingwood regardless of whether a residential lot borders a lot that is either non-residential or outside Rollingwood.
	Regulate "estate lots" as necessary to protect nearby and adjacent residential properties.

Nothing in there looks objectionable....but the devil is in the details. I hear chatter about height restrictions and changes to setbacks that will make many homes non-conforming. I am not sure what I am missing, or how to stay better informed?

3) For issues that may be controversial (that will create a large number of existing homes to be non-conforming) - or selfishly - will prevent me from executing my future plans, I think the team should frame them in a way that is fact and example based and let the community chime in on its collective opinion via a survey. A sample question could be, "We recommend to change the height restrictions of homes, here are three examples of homes that would be non-conforming under that change, here are three that are barely conforming. Just a thought.

In general I support the work you all do, and thank you for it. To make more meaningful collective decisions, it would be helpful if you all could distill the key changes into concrete examples of what would change and the homes it would impact. It could even be a poll on our community website where each address can only vote once. Maybe we are not there yet or I am missing information I need to understand the recommendations.

Thanks for reading.

Derek Mellencamp  
4903 Timberline

-----Original Message-----

From: Justin Davidson [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2023 11:57 AM

To: Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>

Cc: aeddavidson@gmail.com

Subject: feedback for Residential Code Review committee

Hello,

I live at 3207 Pickwick Lane.

Please do not change the current code or otherwise change the rules for home building height limits, impervious cover, setbacks, etc. I do not support making changes to the current codes or adjusting how they are enforced.

Please let me know if you have questions on my feedback.

Thanks,

Justin Davidson

-----Original Message-----

From: Sam Attal [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2023 8:47 PM

Cc: Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>

Subject: Residential Zoning Feedback

Dear CRCRC Members,

I am writing to provide my input and express my concerns regarding the ongoing discussions about residential zoning in our community. While I appreciate the committee's efforts to address the issue of building height, I urge you to take a comprehensive look at all aspects of our zoning regulations, rather than solely focusing on this particular aspect.

First and foremost, I believe it is crucial to emphasize that the actions of a few bad actors should not dictate the future of our community's zoning regulations. It is unfair to penalize the majority of law-abiding citizens who wish to exercise their rights to build new custom homes based on the misconduct of a small minority. Instead, I encourage the committee to focus on enforcing existing regulations more effectively and ensuring that any future zoning amendments target the root causes of the issue rather than limiting everyone's options.

By adopting a comprehensive approach to residential zoning, we can address multiple concerns that our community may be facing. While building height is an important consideration, it should not overshadow other items that contribute to the overall character and livability of our community and warrant equal attention.

Furthermore, I believe that community engagement and input are paramount during this process. I urge the committee to organize public forums, open houses, or surveys to gather feedback from residents, architects, builders, and other stakeholders. This inclusive approach will ensure that any proposed changes truly reflect the aspirations and desires of the community as a whole.

In conclusion, I kindly request that the committee takes a holistic view of our residential zoning regulations and considers the wider implications of any proposed changes. It is vital that we strike a balance between preserving the character of our community and allowing for growth and development. By focusing on addressing the underlying issues and engaging the community throughout this process, we can arrive at zoning regulations that are fair, sustainable, and representative of our shared values.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I trust that the committee will make the best decisions for our community's future.

Best Regards,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** robert turner [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2023 5:49 AM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>; [REDACTED] Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Gavin Massingill <gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Residential Zoning Feedback

Dear CRCRC Members,

I am writing to provide my input and express my concerns regarding the ongoing discussions about residential zoning in our community. While I appreciate the committee's efforts to address the issue of building height, I **urge you to take a comprehensive look at all aspects of our zoning regulations**, rather than solely focusing on this particular aspect.

First and foremost, I believe it is **crucial to emphasize that the actions of a few should not dictate the future of our community's zoning regulations**. It is unfair to penalize the majority of law-abiding citizens who wish to exercise their rights to build new custom homes based on the **whims of a small minority**. Instead, I encourage the committee to focus on **enforcing existing regulations more effectively and ensuring that any future zoning amendments target the root causes of the issue rather than limiting everyone's options**.

By adopting a **comprehensive approach to residential zoning**, we can address multiple concerns that our community may be facing. While building height is an important consideration, it should not overshadow other items that contribute to the overall character and livability of our community and warrant equal attention.

Furthermore, I believe that **community engagement and input are paramount during this process**. I urge the committee to organize public forums, open houses, or surveys to **gather feedback from residents, architects, builders, and other stakeholders**. This inclusive approach will ensure that any proposed changes truly reflect the aspirations and desires of the community as a whole.

In conclusion, I kindly **request that the committee takes a holistic view of our residential zoning regulations and considers the wider implications of any proposed changes**. It is vital that we **strike a balance between preserving the character of our community and allowing for growth and development**. By focusing on addressing the underlying issues and engaging the community throughout this process, we can arrive at zoning regulations that are fair, sustainable, and representative of our shared values.

**Thank you for your time and consideration. I trust that the committee will make the best decisions for our community's future.**

Best Regards,  
All the best..... Bob



=====

Robert Turner



(c) 512.517.7923

**From:** Sean Brown [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2023 6:02 AM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>;  
[REDACTED]; +awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov; +gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov  
**Subject:** Residential Zoning Feedback

Dear CRCRC Members,

I am writing to provide my input and express my concerns regarding the ongoing discussions about residential zoning in our community. While I appreciate the committee's efforts to address the issue of building height, I urge you to take a comprehensive look at all aspects of our zoning regulations, rather than solely focusing on this particular aspect.

First and foremost, I believe it is crucial to emphasize that the actions of a few bad actors should not dictate the future of our community's zoning regulations. It is unfair to penalize the majority of law-abiding citizens who wish to exercise their rights to build new custom homes based on the misconduct of a small minority. Instead, I encourage the committee to focus on enforcing existing regulations more effectively and ensuring that any future zoning amendments target the root causes of the issue rather than limiting everyone's options.

By adopting a comprehensive approach to residential zoning, we can address multiple concerns that our community may be facing. While building height is an important consideration, it should not overshadow other items that contribute to the overall character and livability of our community and warrant equal attention.

Furthermore, I believe that community engagement and input are paramount during this process. I urge the committee to organize public forums, open houses, or surveys to gather feedback from residents, architects, builders, and other stakeholders. This inclusive approach will ensure that any proposed changes truly reflect the aspirations and desires of the community as a whole.

In conclusion, I kindly request that the committee takes a holistic view of our residential zoning regulations and considers the wider implications of any proposed changes. It is vital that we strike a balance between preserving the character of our community and allowing for growth and development. By focusing on addressing the underlying issues and engaging the community throughout this process, we can arrive at zoning regulations that are fair, sustainable, and representative of our shared values.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I trust that the committee will make the best decisions for our community's future.

Best Regards,

Sean Brown

**From:** Alexandra Robinette [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2023 9:06 AM  
**To:** robert turner [REDACTED]; Sean Brown [REDACTED]; Sam Attal [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Wendi Hundley <rollingwoodnews@gmail.com>; Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Gavin Massingill <gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Residential Zoning Feedback

Dear Neighbors,

I want to thank you for sharing your thoughts and concerns. We would very much like to know what those multiple concerns are.

I'm responding in bulk to the letters which all same the same things as I want to address your comments specifically.

The formation of the CRCRC was notified in March, and our first meeting was April 5. It's an open meeting that anyone can attend, and no one showed up. We have been chewing on all sorts of topics without much direction in where to take them. We also had a batch of emails at that time asking us to look at some core building code issues as they had been discussed on council. A few of us began to focus on trying to understand those issues, what other cities near and far might be doing to resolve similar questions, and then gathering our own data on just what exactly we have in RW, rather than speculate. It was also an attempt to keep the conversation moving forward at our meetings.

I have reached out to architects that do a lot of work in our community, before it was suggested, but have not yet heard back. I have asked repeatedly that additional notification be sent out by the city soliciting input from citizens. I've posted on Whatsapp. I know that Wendi and Amy Patillo have also been sharing it in newsletters. So it's not a secret that we want input.

I know that maybe in your emails you don't know what input to give on zoning and have asked for a comprehensive approach. My attempt at being comprehensive was to gather data and solicit input via the notice the city posted on the website in March or April, the notice that went out last week, the workshop we had earlier this week, and the second one we are planning in June, noodling amongst 2-3 committee members at a time (since that is all we are allowed to do) over ideas of options and issues that we can then present in a clear way to the community to discuss. I would feel silly if I kept showing up at meetings having done nothing to prepare or present. I was asked to look at this, and so I'm doing the best job I know how to do with the skill set I have.

I've done a great deal of research in looking at building plans for homes that have been built in the last ten years, are currently being built, and are pending in permitting. The reason I did this was to amass data on what the building trend shows so that we are not making assumptions. One thing I've discovered is that a number of homes have bent the rules to build something they should not have been able to - for instance, taking their Reference Datum height measurements from the entire lot and not the new building footprint. So, if you are asking for better enforcement, it's likely that some people would not have exactly the home they want under the current rules. What is interesting though is that

in this process of analyzing many options, some of the ideas we have thought about would actually allow those houses to still be built as is, and maybe stop the very few that have elicited the most complaint.

I know research can be ugly before the dust settles. People tend to grasp one aspect and hold it up as the only thing being considered. I recall when council hired a consultant to look at Bee Caves Rd. redevelopment and asked them specifically to look at highest and best use for revenue generating, and then act shocked when the consultant did what they asked. The community only heard the worst case and yard signs started going up. I was disappointed because after having been interviewed personally by that consultant, I felt optimistic there was a really great option in there because I had been dreaming about redeveloping that area since I moved to Rollingwood in 2008. I said then that the creek was an asset that development had turned its back on and we should do the opposite and turn to engage the creek, create shops and restaurants, and increase walkability. My kids were still little at the time so it seemed especially appealing.

Other ideas have been presented in RW that have caused an uproar: paving the park parking lot; adding a speed table or road hump in front of the park; a police station at 503 Vale; Milk & Cookies: turf in the park... All of these issues had controversy and the people behind them defended themselves by saying they needed to examine all the issues that come before them because that is the reasonable thing to do. That is how some of us on the CRCRC view zoning - that there are in infinite number of solutions and suggestions, but likely only one or two that might work best as tailored to our community. But we might also conclude we should do nothing and just hope for the best.

The last meeting was incredibly helpful for myself because it's only when we present options that we get actual feedback. Just asking people to give feedback doesn't get much response, they sometimes need something to respond to. I immediately knew that finding a way to stop talking about height and instead talk about impacts along the setback when height is unchecked is maybe a better idea worth studying. I also thought the idea of zoning districts where people that face greenbelts, have actual really steep lots, or have excessive drainage runoff across their property, might be granted more leniency in the rules.

I'm going to step back now, I'm not going to spend any more time on research or ideas, and let the community tell us what they want, or don't want.

Alex Robinette  
2500 Hatley Dr.

**From:** Dana Hollingsworth [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2023 9:52 AM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>; [REDACTED] Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Gavin Massingill <gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Residential Zoning Feedback

Dear CRCRC Members,

First, please see the numerous emails my husband and I sent to to City Council and P&Z objecting to changing height restrictions on Rollingwood lots with slopes. We would be negatively impacted by reduced heights.

Also, I am against any further restrictions that will reduce lot values. Our lot in Rollingwood is our retirement and limiting development will reduce our retirement security.

I do not understand the rationale behind letting some build large tasteful homes and now restricting others from doing the same.

Second, I am writing to provide my input and express my concerns regarding the ongoing discussions about residential zoning in our community. While I appreciate the committee's efforts to address the issue of building height, I urge you to take a comprehensive look at all aspects of our zoning regulations, rather than solely focusing on this particular aspect.

First and foremost, I believe it is crucial to emphasize that the actions of a few bad actors should not dictate the future of our community's zoning regulations. It is unfair to penalize the majority of law-abiding citizens who wish to exercise their rights to build new custom homes based on the misconduct of a small minority. Instead, I encourage the committee to focus on enforcing existing regulations more effectively and ensuring that any future zoning amendments target the root causes of the issue rather than limiting everyone's options.

By adopting a comprehensive approach to residential zoning, we can address multiple concerns that our community may be facing. While building height is an important consideration, it should not overshadow other items that contribute to the overall character and livability of our community and warrant equal attention.

Furthermore, I believe that community engagement and input are paramount during this process. I urge the committee to organize public forums, open houses, or surveys to gather feedback from residents, architects, builders, and other stakeholders. This inclusive approach will ensure that any proposed changes truly reflect the aspirations and desires of the community as a whole.

In conclusion, I kindly request that the committee takes a holistic view of our residential zoning regulations and considers the wider implications of any proposed changes. It is vital that we strike a balance between preserving the character of our community and allowing for growth and development.

By focusing on addressing the underlying issues and engaging the community throughout this process, we can arrive at zoning regulations that are fair, sustainable, and representative of our shared values.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I trust that the committee will make the best decisions for our community's future.

Best Regards,

Dana Hollingsworth  
303 Almarion Dr  
Austin, TX 78746  
512.627.6660

Sent from my Galaxy

**From:** Wendi Hundley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2023 9:55 AM  
**To:** Alex Robinette [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** robert turner [REDACTED]; Sean Brown [REDACTED]; Sam Attal [REDACTED]; Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Gavin Massingill <gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Residential Zoning Feedback

This is a great email Alex! Also, thank you to those of you who took the time to send an email. Residential zoning will affect all of us— even more so than the commercial district.

Alex, thank you for your service and for the incredible amount of work you have already done.

We do need more input and participation and I'm worried about how much we'll get as people depart for their summer holidays. I guess it is never going to be a perfect time but the summer seems extra difficult to me.

We will get there and I'm really hopeful this will be an inclusive process that will look at all the issues that can improve our quality of life in RW!

Wendi

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Mary Elizabeth Cofer [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2023 2:09 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>;  
+awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov; +gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov  
**Subject:** Residential Zoning Feedback

Dear CRCRC Members,

I want to thank all of you for your diligent work and again add my voice to those that are concerned with the setbacks of homes being built in our community. I see no reason for us to change those or to impose on our neighbors. It is the open space between homes that allows us to enjoy a bit of privacy but even more so, appreciate a tiny bit of nature if we care to and even appreciate our neighbors more when we are not on each other's backs, so to speak. This space makes for better neighbors, I believe. I also hope that we will continue with the height restrictions that we have used in the past or even lower those if possible. If this keeps someone from building a home in our neighborhood, perhaps they need to move to a neighborhood with larger lots.

Again, I wish there was some way we could restrict or limit landscape lighting so that we could appreciate the night sky. This could be done by curfews on some of these lights or using shields on them so that the lights shine down on the yard and not in the street or any one else's yard. This is very important for not only human health but also many animal species, especially during migratory seasons. Thank you again for your time and attention to these matters.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I trust that the committee will make the best decisions for our community's future.

Best Regards,



From: Deets [REDACTED]  
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2023 3:51 PM  
To: Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
Subject: Comments Regarding Residential Task Force

I appreciate each of you making the time and effort to serve on this committee.

We have lived in Rollingwood for almost thirty years during which time I have observed most of the new builds and significant remodels that have taken place.

I am supportive of this re development and have no desire to recapture Rollingwood as it existed years ago.

Property owners have a vested interest in preserving and enhancing the value of their homes. We will all sell our homes at some point and I hope the City does not impose changes that would diminish the present or future value of our homes.

Yes, recently there seem to be a couple of houses that have pushed the envelope, but it is not a widespread occurrence and, when measured against the vast majority of new builds/remodels, is not a compelling justification for significant changes to our codes, particularly those based on individual aesthetic preference.

We all have different tastes, but I would place my faith in individual homeowners exercising control over their property under existing rules so long as health or safety issues are not raised. As such I do not support floor to area ratios or similar restrictions.

I support the 35 foot height limitation and do not wish to see it modified. That change was initiated years ago to encourage architectural interest and to provide greater living space under roof. Granted, we were thinking of gabled, not flat, roofs so perhaps a distinction can be made in those instances.

I understand sloped lots make measurements problematic, but I think we are best served with a single measurement point as the code currently provides. For those lots sloping dramatically towards the street, perhaps consider a height limitation on the front facing foundation (measured from grade to finished floor).

Finally, I am concerned about creating non conforming uses.

I very much appreciate your consideration of my comments.

Deets D. Justice  
310 Pleasant Drive

**From:** bobby.hempfling@gmail.com [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2023 5:24 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Feedback

Thanks so much for the effort you guys are putting into this. I love that you are taking the committees feedback as well as residents.

- The driving factor of this call for change seems to be the homes being built straight up and maximizing the building setbacks and heights. My opinion is that we should look at 4 or 5 methods that other neighborhoods have implemented, create a pros/cons evaluation of each method, and then have the neighborhood look at it and give their feedback at that time.
- Maybe we consider 2 methods to evaluate a home build so that different lots with different challenges could use the method that best suits the lot.
- Once building projects have had variances approved by the city those changes should be re-zoned with the new setback or other improvements appropriately noted on the deed/plat/title

Please take your time and don't rush this just to see us having to change it. I do see a rush for answers on a project that should be thoughtfully considered

**From:** Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2023 5:46 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Contractor/ Builders Input- Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee (CRCRC)

Good Afternoon CRCRC Members,

The email below was sent to all contractors who have active or pending residential projects.

Thanks,  
Ashley

**From:** Nikki Stautzenberger <[nstautz@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:nstautz@rollingwoodtx.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2023 1:57 PM  
**Subject:** Contractor/ Builders Input- Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee (CRCRC)

Good Afternoon,

The City Council of the City of Rollingwood has formed the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee (CRCRC) that is tasked with reviewing potential changes to the building and zoning codes for residential properties. The CRCRC would like your input regarding your experiences with our building and zoning codes as well as any recommended changes that you would like to see enacted.

You can share your opinion by emailing the CRCRC at [CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov). Your input is appreciated and will be taken into consideration.

Thank you,  
City of Rollingwood

## **Nikki Stautzenberger**

### **Development Services Manager**

Qualified Construction Stormwater Inspector #6628

City of Rollingwood

512.327.1838

[www.rollingwoodtx.gov](http://www.rollingwoodtx.gov)



**From:** prasidh [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2023 10:22 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Fw: 2004 Building Code Review Task Force

Hello All,

I am sorry for sending the email without attaching the Minutes as promised! I am re-sending and please use this **Yahoo email address** if you need to respond.

I am attaching the Minutes from August 18, 2004. Agenda Item 12 is the presentation to the council. I am hoping that the City has a copy of the Task Force report that includes recommendation for a FAR etc.

Hope this helps as a starting point while I search for the original document from the author. You might consider asking Ashley to check City Hall records.

Sincerely,  
-Shanthi.

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** V Jayakumar [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Fri, May 26, 2023 at 9:58 PM  
**Subject:** 2004 BuildingCode Review Task Force  
**To:** <[crcrc@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:crcrc@rollingwoodtx.gov)>

Hello all,

I just found the Minutes to the RW City Council meeting of August 2004.

These Minutes are a synopsis of the Task Force's presentation. I am working on finding a copy (or a link) to the full report for your committee.

Until then, I hope this will be informative to you.

Sent from my iPhone

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Duncan Ashworth [REDACTED]  
Date: Sat, May 27, 2023 at 9:54 AM  
Subject: Residential Zoning Feedback  
To: <[CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov)>, <[REDACTED]>, <[awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov)>, <[gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov](mailto:gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov)>

Dear CRCRC Members,

I am writing to provide my input and express my concerns regarding the ongoing discussions about residential zoning in our community. While I appreciate the committee's efforts to address the issue of building height, I urge you to take a comprehensive look at all aspects of our zoning regulations, rather than solely focusing on this particular aspect.

First and foremost, we need to act as a democracy and take into account the desires of the majority of those voting on the issues.

Building height is an important consideration but restrictions must be codified with consideration for the local terrain such as slope, adjacency to greenbelt, etc. As Alex Robinette elegantly summarized at the May 23 CRCRC meeting, other communities around the country have addressed these issues. We are not unique in our situation and can leverage off the experience of other communities and their quantified codes. This will help speed up our process. Additionally, it will help, as Alex also presented, to show examples of what the codes would mean to future construction in Rollingwood. For example, if a house is on a sloping lot (with the street being the highest elevation) but the back of the house faces a greenbelt, it is much more acceptable for the back of the house to be at the maximum height. In contrast, given the same slope, if the house backs up to a neighbor's house (downhill), the new house is now towering over the existing house and invades the privacy of the neighbor's backyard. I propose, as given in Alex's presentation, a set of graphic scenarios so as we discuss the new building restrictions, we can see how they would play out.

Furthermore, I believe that community engagement and input are paramount during this process. I urge the committee to organize public forums, open houses, or surveys to gather feedback from residents, architects, builders, and other stakeholders. This inclusive approach will ensure that any proposed changes truly reflect the aspirations and desires of the community as a whole.

I've also attached my inputs to the previous survey.

Best Regards,  
Duncan Ashworth

**From:** prasih [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 30, 2023 6:53 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** RW Building Code Review Task Force 12/2003 to 6/2004

Dear CRCRC member,

I was able to locate the attached documents from my history collection. I used to attend most of the meetings, and I felt these details might be of interest to you.

Hope it helps. Thom Farrell can provide more details since he was Mayor at the time this committee was formed. I have also tried reaching out to the author of the research project, but have yet to hear back.

Sincerely,

-Shanthi.

**From:** V Jayakumar [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 30, 2023 10:10 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** More data from Building Code review 2004

FYI.  
-Shanthi


Sent from my iPhone



YOUR STREET

15,000 SF Lot Area  
 6,650 SF Allowable Bldg. Area @ Gmd. Lvl.  
 8,350 SF Non-Bldg. Area

MINIMUM 15,000 SF LOT







Hypothetical Homes




## Pop Quiz

Match the qualities below with one of the homes:

- Largest Floor Area?
- Has hardwood floors?
- Least Floor Area?
- Is painted a color you don't like?
- Highest FAR?
- Has an SUV in the garage?
- Lowest FAR?
- Has a vegetable garden in backyard?
- Best illustrates desired setbacks?
- Has an avocado green refrigerator?
- Least desirable setbacks?
- Probably owned by someone you would like?
- Best shows positive impact of height restrictions?
- Best illustrates positive impact of municipal regulations?
- You would least enjoy being next door to?
- Is your dream house?



## The Details



**About FAR:**

One of the City of Austin's most restrictive development zones allows 25% impervious cover, which is a very restrictive number. If we applied that same percentage to a 15,000 SF lot (15,000 x .25 x 2) and assumed a two story home, you could build a home of approximately 7,500 SF, an FAR of .50. Our current code which allows a building footprint of up to 6,650 SF on a 15,000 SF lot is effectively a 44% impervious cover (before driveways, pool, patios, etc).

Hypothetically, current Code would allow a home up to 13,300 SF, though nothing presently even approaches that size. An FAR of .35 would reduce that allowable to 5,250 SF - a 61% reduction in the theoretical maximum building size.

Green space between homes could be saved by stipulating that driveways/pavement could not be located within 10 feet of the property line.

Many large homes built on smaller lots use a significant portion of the front yard for circular driveways, etc. Why not put a limit to the amount of any front yard that can be paved for any purpose?

Expand side yards to 15 feet on both side except where a building exists. Contemplate incentives for future homes to observe the 15 feet even though they may have a "grandfathered" 10 foot setback.

The City owns a significant portion of green space in the ROW of every street. The City should be actively engaged in upgrading their properties, especially in the case of vacant and/or unmaintained yard areas. The City should perform at the same standard it expects of its citizens.

**From:** Danny Waters [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 31, 2023 8:08 AM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** CRCRC

To the City of Rollingwood CRCRC:

My name is Danny Waters of Waters Custom Homes, LP. I have been building in the Rollingwood neighborhood for 4 years, and in the City of Austin for over 18 years. I wanted to send my thoughts on what the city is trying to accomplish in regards to residential building and construction.

1. Setbacks - Rollingwood has very aggressive side setbacks as is. 10' on one side and 15' on the other, and 30' on the front. I would think that restricting the rear setback to 25' instead of 20' would be better for privacy and provide more backyard space.
2. Impervious Cover - The current code for the impervious cover is not as restrictive as most cities, but due to the requirement of on site detention and rainwater collection I feel the impervious cover requirement is adequate. Most lots in Rollingwood average .4 Acres, and if fully developed to the setbacks would give 53% impervious cover, with a required detention system and rainwater collection.

However, we should not focus on reducing the impervious cover, and focus on requiring a detention system for new construction that would restrict runoff to the point where we have massive improvements to our storm water issues. We should be encouraging development and place the financial burden on the developers to detain runoff. By doing this, it could save the city literally millions. The average cost for a detention system for every new home constructed is around \$50K. Currently we have around 50 new homes either being built or under permitting. This totals \$2,500,000 in costs that is carried by the developer and not the city.

Why not reduce the impervious cover? It would do two things: 1. Reducing impervious reduces the main floor footprint, and would push the designer to build taller with more focus on maximizing the 2nd floor space (this happened in Austin). 2. It would make the land less valuable to the builder as it restricts the buildings footprint and reduces the air conditioned space to maximize profits.

There are those that like their property to have less value because it brings less taxes, but the amount of savings in taxes vs. the amount of loss in sale price would never compare. There are many who do not want to lose value in their land. The more restrictive the city gets, the more reduction in land valuations. I say this from an investor point of view, and it is a fact that if the numbers don't work, we have to find the savings in the land.

3. Building Height - We do need to revisit the building height for sloped lots. I am currently building the home at 3225 Park Hills, and on paper it did not give the massive look that it now gives on site. The way the code is written for sloped lots allowed for this and I believe we should change the code for sloped lots in regards to building heights

The current building height could come down to 32' which would match the City of Austin. For the sloped lots, The city of Austin uses the average slope of the buildable lot as the base line to determining building height, and this is simple and easy to configure.

We should also continue to allow for flat roofs to be the building height, but on pitched roofs, use the center height of the pitched roof as the top of building at 32'.

We should ALWAYS ALLOW FOR ROOF OVERHANGS WITHIN THE SETBACKS. If the city reduces the overhangs to the setbacks, you will have all modern boxes in the neighborhood. One of the city council staff suggested this and I would steer far away from this idea.

4. Architectural Design - This is where the city of Austin got it wrong. They developed the McMansion Ordinance which only pushed the builder to maximize buildable space and left the neighborhood with massive 2nd floors. We should have some type of 2nd floor setback in the front, rear, and sides to create more pleasing architectural features to the home.

5. Timeliness of permitting and overview - We should keep the code simple and NOT COMPLICATED. I won't build in the City of Austin anymore simply because it is a permitting nightmare, a code that completely confuses, and an inspection craziness that I don't wish upon anyone.

Rollingwood should be a development friendly neighborhood with mutual respect from the Owners and the Builders. I believe one of our biggest issues is the stormwater flooding, and I believe that with effective development and proper detentions in place provided by the developer can only help to solve those issues.

Thank you for your time, and I hope for all the best with revisiting the code for Rollingwood.

Sincerely,

Danny Waters

Danny Waters  
Waters Custom Homes, LP  
675 Bluff Woods Drive  
Driftwood, TX. 78619

512-589-4913

  
[www.waterscustomhomes.com](http://www.waterscustomhomes.com)



**From:** prasidh [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 31, 2023 8:45 AM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Letter from a resident to the Building Code Review Task Force.

FYI : More data from my collection.

Sent from my iPhone

**MEMORANDUM**

To: Members of the Building Code Task Force

From: Deets D. Justice *DDJ*

Date: April 26, 2004

I have addressed you on a couple of occasions and am thankful for your efforts in streamlining and modernizing our building codes as well as appreciative of the opportunity to speak to you. A portion of your discussion relative to residential Rollingwood has centered on "preservation of green space", "open space" or the "character of the community". Other discussion has focused on "proportionality". Those are interesting and thought provoking concepts worthy of inquiry. In connection with those ideas, it has been suggested that the City of Rollingwood (the "City" or "Rollingwood") limit home size through imposition of a floor to area ratio ("FAR"). This is a dramatic and far reaching suggestion, the consequences of which are unknown and is not contemplated by many of our neighbors. Implementation of a FAR would not prevent the construction of 400 Riley Road. Setting improved standards of quality and demanding enforcement will go much farther than a one size fits all approach. The fact that another municipality may have imposed a FAR is a response, but not an analysis. You have spent a lot of time talking about this issue. Expenditure of time itself can sometimes create the impression and sense that action is appropriate or desirable. On the contrary, sometimes the best decision is to do nothing at all and I urge you to take that course of action with regard to the idea that home size should be limited.

As you are drawing your discussions to a close, I would like to take the opportunity to summarize some of the points I have raised with you.

**The Major Assumptions Upon Which this Discussion is Premised**

1. Some fear that the City will turn into another "West U" (West University Place in Houston). I see no persuasive evidence to support the concern. Moreover, the differences between the two areas are more striking than any similarities. Most of the lots in West U are in the 6250sf (50 X 125) to 9,000 sf (60 X 150) range. Most lots in Rollingwood are nearly double that. In fact, I believe that there is only 1 lot equal to or less than 10,000 sf in Rollingwood (exclusive of Tremont) and subdivision of larger lots requires a minimum of 100 feet street frontage (fewer than than 5 could be so subdivided). With the limited exception of corner lots (which have larger setbacks than others), setback to setback build out has not occurred in a concentrated fashion anywhere else in Austin on lots our size and it is pure speculation to suggest such is inevitable here. This suggestion contemplates 100 homes costing millions each.

Also under girding the discussion is an assumption that we all moved here primarily for the open space, trees, etc. I don't know how any of us can presume to know what

motivated each resident to locate in Rollingwood, but I suspect that the reasons are almost as varied and numerous as the number of homes here. Some residents may have been highly motivated by such characteristic and to others it was virtually irrelevant. Some may have moved here because of proximity to downtown or a particular school, while others could have not cared about such matters.

#### The Benefits Have Been Discussed, but What About the Costs

Any analysis of the benefits of a contemplated action should also give serious consideration to its costs. A favorable recommendation ought to, at the very least, be substantiated by professional, uncontroverted evidence and analysis. In addition, I fear that an affirmative recommendation will result in a divisive, and perhaps bitter, community debate. While some may feel strongly about imposing size limitations, there is no persuasive evidence of a community outcry for such a dramatic act. For many Rollingwood residents, their homes are the most significant financial asset. To impose limitations as suggested may "lock in" the potential value of such asset. This hardly seems fair.

Some questions to consider:

1. What happens to our market values when we are tagged "as the place where City hall tells you the size of your house"?
2. Can anyone guarantee me that no one in this community will lose money as a result of this type of decision?
3. How would this affect each lot and home in our City? Can you quantify this for each homeowner?
4. Under existing setbacks, the average 15,000 sf lot (measuring 125 X 120) is required to have 56% of the surface area open. Why isn't this enough?
5. Have we considered the disparate economic position that owners of smaller lots will find themselves in vis a vis larger lot owners or newer homes? Would we, in effect, create different classes of homeowners?
6. Why must there be a uniform vision of what Rollingwood should be? Why shouldn't we have big homes next to small ones, new ones next to old ones? Shouldn't individual citizens make that determination on their own properties?
7. Will Rollingwood, as a low cost alternative in EISD, be an area where rent homes proliferate?
8. How heavy handed will we be in our design process? As you have seen, design can make small homes look larger than they are and large homes look smaller. One story

homes look like two story ones and vice versa. How far do we carry this concept of proportionality? What is next?

9. Do all residents want to maximize value? I can't speak for others on that issue, but I suspect the vast majority would demand that potential even if it were not at the forefront today. I don't know what the future holds for any of us, but one who does not care about maximization of value today may care very much a year or two from now. Life can be full of unpleasant surprises and none of us know when we may need to realize the greatest amount possible (through sale or equity) in order to meet a demand or personal or family emergency. I want that ability for my family. I want the ability to tap into the most equity possible. What if there is a debilitating family illness? What if I need to expand my home to care for an aging parent? What is the compelling governmental interest in depriving any homeowner of that right and ability?

#### Alternative and Less Intrusive Means to Achieve Aesthetic Improvement

We have also discussed the concept of "proportionality" which, boiled down to its essence, is aesthetics. Future and current homeowners have just as much, if not more, interest in ensuring that their new homes/remodels are appropriately sited and blended in the community. After all it is their rather significant amounts of money that will be invested in these homes and most will hire architects to design and properly site the home/remodel to ensure that all the pieces fit together properly. Why would we assume otherwise?

I am sure others can make some suggestions, but why don't we consider:

1. Requiring dimensioned, sealed plans (with elevations for each side) for all new homes and remodels of a specified nature.
2. Put sidewalks in certain high pedestrian or dangerous areas (the Park).
3. Install attractive entrance features to the City's residential areas.
4. Force the cleanup of neglected lots.
5. A uniform side setback seems reasonable, although we ought to determine how many homes would be classified as a non conforming use as a result of such a change and what would be the practical effect to each such homeowner.

#### Conclusion

I am not suggesting that we be allowed to do anything we want with our own property. Clearly, we all are subject to nuisance, health and safety concerns as we should be. If those issues are not properly addressed, they ought to be. Over time a city changes. It is a natural progression and in our case will probably result in some larger homes. Construction of a new or remodeled home accompanied by tasteful landscaping next to



my home will only enhance my property, both financially and aesthetically. I don't want to see that potential short-circuited. The proposal to limit home size is draconian, dramatic and far-reaching in its consequence. The law of unintended consequences can be frightful in its application and I am very concerned for myself and neighbors should this idea be implemented. Do we really need to open up this can of worms now? We are just now finishing the sewer project and will soon enter the final stages where all of our streets will be repaved. The sewer project is significantly over budget based on charges submitted to us by LCRA. City leadership is devoting its attention to these negotiations, but the project is complex as will be the discussions and negotiations. In addition there are ongoing discussions about City hall and its potential remodel or replacement to better accommodate resident requests and legal requirements. Our focus and energy ought to be directed at these issues.

**From:** Rishi Shah [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 31, 2023 11:31 AM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Input

Residential Code Review Committee,

First of all, thank you to all of you for doing this and spending your time.

My input:

I support no change to current building code or as little as possible. Unless there is a reason for change due to drainage problems.

If there are changes, I think current non-conforming structures have to be grandfathered in. Anything else would be a huge burden.

I can provide some reasoning to the above if anyone would like to hear it please let me know.

Regards,  
Rishi Shah

P.S. My family and I currently live at 2800 Rock Way and we are building at 301 Pleasant.

**From:** Melissa Morrow [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 31, 2023 4:51 PM  
**To:** Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>;  
[REDACTED]; +awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov; +gmassingill@rollingwoodtx.gov  
**Subject:** CRCRC

Dear CRCRC Members,

Thanks for your time and hard work on this process. I strongly support strict enforcement of our current code, including building height restrictions that are understandable and easy to enforce, limiting impervious cover, and possibly expanding setbacks where appropriate, not allowing the removal of heritage trees, and other things that help maintain the rolling green spaces of Rollingwood.  
Thanks, Melissa

**From:** Susan Fernandes [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 1, 2023 12:54 PM  
**To:** Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>  
**Subject:** Rollingwood CRCRC input

Sorry this is late. But here is our input:

—Need setbacks on front, sides, and backyards to protect privacy of neighboring homes. Balconies looming over the yards of adjacent houses are a problem! Setback limits should be enforced for full structure—not ok to only apply to foundation.

—Need to protect impervious cover. Structures should not be allowed to cover whole lot.

—Overall, size and scale of new homes are a concern. Can a ratio of structure size to lot size be established to fairly address this concern?

Susan Fernandes

Brian C. Rider  
2906 Hatley Dr.  
Rollingwood, Texas 78746

June 6, 2023

Mayor and City Council, and  
Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee Rollingwood City Hall

Re: Public Workshop June 13, 2023 Ladies and Gentlemen:

First, thank you for your time and service for our city. It is important for us - for the nature of our community, for the continuation of our community, for the values of our homes, and for the critical matter of the degree of neighborliness that we will have in Rollingwood, for you to get these issues considered and resolved.

I will be out of the country visiting grandkids in Netherlands at the time of your community workshop. This letter is my attempt to give you my thoughts and put on the record my recommendations.

The issues which you are trying to deal with are not new. When the prospect of a sewer system became a reality several years ago, we had a series of meetings to talk about and anticipate what that development would do to our community. I was an active participant in those meetings, and can report that we talked about the same things you will deal with now - building height limitations, setbacks, maintenance of the "woods" in Rollingwood, floor-to-area ratios and the like.

Frankly, the citizens of Rollingwood then were not willing to put in place the kinds of legal controls which were discussed. We as a community were not willing to give up some of what we felt were our "property rights". We also underestimated the wave of development which would occur when most of us no longer needed septic absorption fields and so the building of much larger homes on the existing lots became possible. We did this even though some of us could point out the experience of similar neighborhoods (West University in Houston and examples in the Dallas area) where the results of limited regulation and builder pressures to maximize house sizes (and prices and profits) had resulted in almost exactly what we are now experiencing in Rollingwood. Houses have been built and are being built which are just totally out of scale with the neighborhood that we have and the neighborhood that we want to continue to have in the future.

We can't put the genie back in the bottle. But we have to pull back some on the out of scale projects that will continue to be proposed. This will not be simple or easy. What it requires is to look at what we have now (as well as looking at what has happened in those neighborhoods which became full of "McMansions" in other places) to see what the future might hold for us. And then we have to express what we like and what we do not like about what we see. Finally, we have to listen this time to the experts who are all around us in Austin who can tell us how to articulate in regulations those things we like and those things we do not like. The regulations have to be straightforward enough to be understood and not fail to produce the desired results when subjected to the stresses which will be coming from both our own neighbors and from the builders who want to continue to use our city as their place to build for profit and leave us with the results, as we have seen in the recent past.

I am a property lawyer and a person of libertarian bent. I have seen many disputes about "property rights". I want to maintain and protect my property rights to my home in Rollingwood. But we have to understand that the property rights of neighbors living on residential lots near the center of a major city are not the same property rights as neighbors living on a 200-acre ranch surrounded by other 200-acre ranches. I have to give up some freedoms to do what I want in order to protect myself from the excesses of those around me who want unlimited rights to do what they want. Frankly, if we were all people of unlimited goodwill and without the human frailty of greed, no regulations or losses of property rights would be necessary, but that is not what we have to deal with.

So, I recommend that we look around us at what we see and determine what we want our community (and as a result our regulations) to look like. I think we need at least the following:

1. Setback lines which really restrict how close we can build next to our neighbors. I do not think that swimming pools and associated improvements should be allowed within the setback lines. I think we should very tightly control what projections and overhangs can encroach into the setbacks. Maybe allow enough of a roof to keep the rain off someone ringing the doorbell, but not bay window projections. And not more than one or two projections per home. Given the modern custom of daily package deliveries from internet merchants, we do need to allow delivery boxes of appropriate (which is not equal to a garage) and appropriate design (matching the facade design and color of the home I think). I think that the setback areas should be mostly grass, shrubbery, and tree areas, and not paved for driveways. These limitations (and maybe others which our neighbors can suggest) will serve not only to add some separation between homes but also limit the size of the homes when considered with other limitations so as to maintain what I think is a more livable neighborhood.

2. I think we need a floor-to-area ratio for homes. This is the primary tool used to see that the residence built on a large lot can be a larger residence but keep an out of scale big house from being built on a smaller lot. I don't suggest a number for that ratio - but I suggest that we look around at houses we like and do some calculation

about what ratio would allow those homes while prohibiting those homes which we collectively feel are out of scale.

3. We obviously need to reconsider the height limitation regulations we now have. I have trouble understanding them and I dislike the results of applying them to some of the houses which I see built in the neighborhood. I know that "city views" are desirable in marketing houses and in giving higher values to houses (but also higher tax bills) but the height of some of the houses built recently is just too much.

4. If we are to preserve the "woods" of Rollingwood, we do need impervious cover limits. But again, I do not believe that a swimming pool is qualified as pervious cover and so the pool and its hardscape adjacent to the pool should be counted just as a driveway or patio in the calculations. The requirement of planting of new trees as an offset for trees destroyed in the building process needs to be continued, and the maintenance of those trees for a number of years after planting needs to be required and replacement should be required if the initial planting is not successful in creating some shade and foliage cover. These ideas need to be added to our rules.

5. The skilled development professionals (meaning the landscape architects, the land planners and the like) may suggest other tools by way of regulations which can be considered to achieve the goal of having our neighborhood look like and feel like we want it to look and feel in 20 years. Listen to them.

Patsy and I have lived in Rollingwood since 1985. We are making some changes to our home so as to allow us to age in place and we want to remain in the neighborhood as long as we are able to do so. We also plan to continue to be contributing citizens to the community. Someday, our house and lot will be sold for redevelopment, but even then, we want the result to be something which will be a responsible redevelopment for new residents of Rollingwood who will be contributing members of the community and not just someone who is trying to maximize the profit on building as big as possible on what is now our home.

Thank you for your time to consider these thoughts.

Very truly yours,

Brian C. Rider