

Home located near Riley Road & Rollingwood Drive



1. The high point of this home is located at the NE corner of the house, which is where the yellow star is located on the picture (*top left*)
 - The max roof height at this point is 40.46', but the height to the top of the home excluding the roof is 34' 11"
2. Graphic (*top right*) is from a CRCRC member email dated August 9, 2024 to Planning and Zoning:
 - a) The parallel plane “lops off the top of this home in the areas of light blue circles”. Lopping off the top does not solve the problem. I believe this example exposes blind spots in their proposal and brings into question how thoroughly they even understand their proposal and the unintended consequences. In fact, due to the parallel plane restrictions, I think two things would have likely occurred:
 - i. That the builder would build the same home, but use a flat roof or a different pitch roof in order to stay beneath the parallel plane, or
 - ii. The builder would have increased the footprint and pushed the home down the lot, which would have brought the home closer to the rear setback and closer to the downhill neighbor.
 - Footprint expansion requires additional impervious cover, could lead to more trees being cut down and further negatively impact the downhill neighbor as the 35' of height at the setback creates less privacy than 40.46' over twenty (20) linear feet from the setback
 - b) Question: Would either of the provided Alternative Proposals fix this problem?

Answer: No, both alternative proposals would yield a similar result to the parallel plane, but unlike the parallel plane, it would allow:

 - The homeowner to retain roof type flexibility vs. being incentivized into a certain roof (*e.g. – flat roof home*). This flexibility will maintain and encourage architectural diversity in our neighborhood
 - The homeowner could build up vs out, which could save trees from being cut down and reduce impervious cover
 - Most importantly, if the parallel plane cannot solve the problem at the subject property any better than the current code or alternative proposals, than we as a city should not introduce overly restrictive rules that adversely impair our friends and neighbors that own sloped lots. The alternative proposals, which are equally effective and both utilize a tenting concept, provide relief to all sloped lot homeowners in the neighborhood and materially improve privacy for adjacent neighbors.

“You can't go back and change the beginning but you can start where you are and change the ending.”