

Building Height Recommendation Update – City Council

6-12-24

April 24 City Council meeting – citizen awakening

- Seek additional public input
- Look for opportunities to compromise
- Consider using “special exceptions” as a tool for reaching consensus

May 14 CRCRC Meeting – 5 citizen speakers

- Concerns with survey interpretation; lack of confidence in process; winners and losers
- Concerns that lots with drainage issues are not being given special consideration
- Concern that recommendations are confusing; seeking an understanding of how they would affect her lot if she had to rebuild
- Concern that proposed recommendation would be especially hard on properties with highly sloped lots and would force families to build split levels
- Support for more limitations on building and support for CRCRC efforts
- A lot of discussion about highly sloped lots

May 28 CRCRC Meeting – 4 Citizen speakers

- CRCRC presented an addendum to its previous recommendation that provides relief for lots that are sloped 18% or greater (we think about 10% of Rollingwood) – not well received
 - Creates “winners and losers” –Those lots that are at 18% or greater: winners; Those at 17% or below: losers
 - Forces split levels – too many stairs; not good for young families or older citizens
- Tabled vote to approve newly amended recommendation until next CRCRC meeting or later

June 10 CRCRC Meeting – 3 Citizens attending; 2 by Zoom

- Only 4 CRCRC members present. Both architects on vacation
- Focus on Trees Ordinance changes. Occupied most of the meeting. Coming your way soon!
- New draft recommendations document introduced in the end
 - Ties recommendation to 2023 survey
 - Includes guiding principles and rationale behind recommendations
 - Includes discussion on opposing views

Where we are today

- Responding to a small but vocal group proposing new variations on previous alternatives
 - Average grade; Average elevation
 - Both result in greater than 35 foot maximum for lots that have any slope (almost all)
- CRCRC is fairly certain that its proposed changes would have had very little impact on almost all new-builds from the past 10 years – excluding well-known outliers.
 - Internally tested
 - Challenged to share testing with public due to “Intellectual Property” concerns
- Propose a workshop where City Engineer calls up plans and tests them against CRCRC proposals in real time.