

Note: I was asked to add these first 2 emails to the cache of emails by Dave Bench on June 14, 2024.- City Secretary Desiree Adair

From: "Brian Rider" [REDACTED]
To: "Dave" [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 5, 2024 11:58:13 AM
Subject: Fwd: City of Rollingwood Commercial Ord changes question

Forwarded Conversation
Subject: City of Rollingwood Commercial Ord changes question

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, May 5, 2024 at 11:25 AM
To: Brian Rider [REDACTED]

Brian,

Are you in town? I recall now you have a trip planned. No need to reply to below if you are.

As a member of Rollingwood Community Development Corporation Commercial Exchange (RCDCE), are you aware of any objections to, criticism of or complaints about the proposed changes to CoR's commercial zones or nonresidential zones ordinances from members of Rollingwood Community Development Corporation Commercial Exchange ?

This Wednesday a vote by Planning and Zoning Board is planned on the proposed changes with some revisions.

As a new member of P & Z, I would like to be as fully informed as possible on all points of view.

I only heard one comment from a commercial building owner during the joint public hearing. It was "Does any proposed change effect existing properties?" Brook Brown replied "no, except replacing existing light fixtures shall be in compliance with new ordinance." Or words to that effect. Owner did not voice a complaint about that or anything else.

Your input will be most welcomed.

Thanks.

Jerry Fleming

BTW: Next week construction may be starting on the Nixon/Pleasant Dr drainage project which should begin from bridge over dry creek and proceed up stream. They probably will be chainsaw cutting trees.

From: Brian Rider [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, May 5, 2024 at 11:55 AM
To: [REDACTED]

I am in The Netherlands (Den Haag or The Hague to be precise) visiting grandkids for a few days, then to Ireland for a group trip, returning late night the 16th, if the airlines cooperate, which did not happen on the way here. So I will miss the meeting.

I have not been involved at all on the proposals with respect to the commercial areas. My involvement with CRCRC has been entirely focused on residential matters. I think that there has been some overlap between those working on the exterior lighting parts of the commercial and residential, but I have just been put on a subcommittee to deal with the residential exterior lighting and have been told that some concepts from the commercial should come over to the residential such as how lighting is aimed so as not to encroach onto a neighbor's property, use of "cut off" fixtures to focus the light down and not horizontally, etc., but I really have not dug into that, other than a conversation with you, for which I thank you for furthering my education about lighting matters.

I attended the same meeting you did about the commercial zoning changes, and heard the same questions. I also heard Alec say that his email had blown up with people sending in messages, but he did not really reflect on the content. In the similar meeting about the interim status of the building height matters on the residential side, similar comments were made about there being lots of comments -- but I took the podium to say that while I have been on the CRCRC we have had no one show up at our public and announced meetings to talk to us about what we are doing.

I'm afraid that in the case of the residential matters, what I can tell you is that the usual course of these committee workings has been that we gathered and studied a lot on the responses to a whole community questionnaire which got 2200 responses, some with clear statements of opinion, some with ambiguous responses, and then used our experience and judgment about what we were proposing. But while we had no public participation during our work sessions, we got, I think (I got none directly), lots of questions and comments sent to the council members at the last minute.

So I suggest that you try to get the people who are sending in last minute thoughts (good or bad or whatever) out of the woods and see what they have to say, then use your judgment about how to respond. You will likely have to make that kind of call on the fly, so to speak, but given our neighbors' behaviors, I don't see an alternative.

I hope that helps.

Brian Rider

Dave: If this needs to be put in the public record, send it along to our committee site.

B. Rider

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 8:00 PM
To: CRCRC <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Cc: Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Subject: Role of the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee

Dear Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee Members,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to address a couple of concerns regarding comments made by the Chair of the committee in tonight's discussions on building height, and the direction of our committee's efforts. I had my hand raised to comment on the last agenda item but was not called on before the meeting was adjourned.

Firstly, I would like to clarify that when Chair Bench stated that the "only" reason the CRCRC is in existence is to address building height, I believe this does not fully encompass the broader scope of your responsibilities. This is not the residential building height review committee. Our City has Comprehensive Plan, and it is essential that the CRCRC reviews the residential code comprehensively.

Additionally, I have concerns regarding the characterization of the summary provided in the packet by Chair Bench. I believe that such summaries are better left to the minutes of the meeting for accuracy and context. For instance, my attendance at the last few meetings was not to see if the proposed height restrictions would work for my house specifically. Instead, I used my house as an example to try and understand how the proposal would function, because I found the language unclear and confusing.

Furthermore, I don't think that the CRCRC needs to "stand by the principles" that were voted on months ago that do not include recent public participation and feedback. I find the idea that the committee is "losing momentum and is out of control" for considering public comments and concerns offensive. Public input is crucial for ensuring that our codes serve the community effectively and fairly.

I appreciate the committee's hard work and dedication. I very much appreciate the committee members who have listened and incorporated public feedback, have advocated for consideration of broader perspectives, and have advocated for public workshops. Thank you for your work to align our committee's efforts with the comprehensive needs of our city's residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Wendi Hundley

From: Dave [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 12:12 PM
To: Wendi Hundley [REDACTED]
Cc: CRCRC <CRCRC@rollingwoodtx.gov>; Ashley Wayman <awayman@rollingwoodtx.gov>;
Desiree Adair <dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov>
Subject: Re: Role of the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee

Dear Wendi

Thanks for reaching out. It is regrettable that we missed your raised hand at the end of last evening's meeting. I assure you that it was unintentional.

Regarding my "only reason" comment: it needed broader context to be clear. While it is true that the CRCRC is charged to be comprehensive, it was public concern over residential building heights that started the conversation that ultimately led to the committee. If there were no perceived public concern over the height of recent builds, I doubt that the CRCRC would have been commissioned.

Regarding principles: I think that principles are important as they are what got us to the place we are today. If we abandon them, then we abandon much of the good CRCRC work that has happened to date. And while there was no audience in the room when we established those principles, they were built on and have the strong support of our 2023 survey responses. To me, that's "public participation".

Finally: we are a volunteer group of citizens asked to review Rollingwood's residential ordinances. We are not a governing body but we are expected to make recommendations that will be considered by such. One of the pleasures of this committee has been our comfort with speaking freely in public. I believe that that freedom and candor has resulted in a more thoroughly vetted and higher quality set of recommendations. If you find my comments about momentum or control offensive, sorry about that. They were not directed at any person or group. They were directed at process. And yes, our process has slowed.

Thanks again,

Dave