

From: Jeff Marx [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 6:23 AM
To: Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Subject: 6-6-24 Residential Building Height Recommendation DRAFT Feedback

Hi Desiree -

Please pass along to CRCRC members.

Hi CRCRC members -

I'm on my family's annual vacation to Seaside, Florida this week and unable to attend this Tuesday's meeting. I think it's appropriate that I share my thoughts on the latest height proposal.

Overall, I think there's a lot to like about the height proposal. It addresses prior concerns about the reference datum. I agree with the intent of the 18% slope / 45' rule and agree with some flexibility for sloped lots.

I have concerns about the incentive structure that's created by such an extreme increase in height created by this step function. I'm referring to the 45' height calculations only being introduced on lots with 18% or greater slope. With 17% slope or less, there's no forgiveness. At the beginning of the presentation there's reference to possibly moving this to 15%. In my view, the step function puts unnecessary pressure on CRCRC to find the perfect number for when to introduce this step. In my view, there is no perfect number when using a step function. I don't think it's fair to anyone who's buildable area is just below the step function threshold. If we apply a new set of rules for slope beyond a certain threshold, we are incentivizing development to occur on the more highly sloped portions of lots if it means having the new rules applied. Have we contemplated edge cases where the developments are close to, but below the step-function threshold? Would the developer purposely seek out a more sloped portion of the lot just to get a new set of rules? None of us know the answer, and I don't want to find out.

I propose we consider a linear function instead. Please see the attached Excel file. In the file, adjusting the inputs for max slope % and max height (cells E4 & E5) will allow the user to customize how much height forgiveness is applied for sloped lots. I defer to others on CRCRC to determine the inputs for max slope % and max height.

I appreciate the hard work everyone has put into this and am not looking to derail or slow down those efforts. This is simply one person's view that I want the full group to be aware of.

Thanks,
Jeff

Alt proposal

Buildable feet
 Beginning max height
 Max slope % to provide
 forgiveness
 max height

100
35
30%
45

Lot slope	Slope %	Max height - current code	Max height - CRCRC Proposal (step function)	Max height - Alt Proposal (linear function)
0	0%	35	35	35.0
1	1%	36	35	35.3
2	2%	37	35	35.7
3	3%	38	35	36.0
4	4%	39	35	36.3
5	5%	40	35	36.7
6	6%	41	35	37.0
7	7%	42	35	37.3
8	8%	43	35	37.7
9	9%	44	35	38.0
10	10%	45	35	38.3
11	11%	45	35	38.7
12	12%	45	35	39.0
13	13%	45	35	39.3
14	14%	45	35	39.7
15	15%	45	35	40.0
16	16%	45	35	40.3
17	17%	45	35	40.7
18	18%	45	45	41.0
19	19%	45	45	41.3
20	20%	45	45	41.7
21	21%	45	45	42.0
22	22%	45	45	42.3
23	23%	45	45	42.7
24	24%	45	45	43.0
25	25%	45	45	43.3
26	26%	45	45	43.7
27	27%	45	45	44.0
28	28%	45	45	44.3
29	29%	45	45	44.7
30	30%	45	45	45.0
31	31%	45	45	45.0
32	32%	45	45	45.0
33	33%	45	45	45.0
34	34%	45	45	45.0

35	35%	45	45	45.0
36	36%	45	45	45.0
37	37%	45	45	45.0
38	38%	45	45	45.0
39	39%	45	45	45.0
40	40%	45	45	45.0
41	41%	45	45	45.0
42	42%	45	45	45.0

From: Jeff Marx [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 5:41 AM
To: Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Subject: RE: 6-6-24 Residential Building Height Recommendation DRAFT Feedback

Hi Desiree -

Please pass this response along to CRCRC.

Hi CRCRC members -

Alex sent me a separate email that clarified my understanding of the slope calculation. I thought it was being calculated on the buildable area under the house, not the buildable area of the lot. I take back my point regarding the construction potentially being gamed by seeking out the higher sloped portion of a lot. I still think a step function with a 10' increase would create inequities between lots on either side of any threshold we come up with.

Thanks,
Jeff