



CITY OF ROLLINGWOOD COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA

Tuesday, February 27, 2024

Notice is hereby given that the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee (CRCRC) of the City of Rollingwood, Texas will hold a meeting, open to the public, in the Municipal Building at 403 Nixon Drive in Rollingwood, Texas on Tuesday, February 27, 2024 at 5:00 PM. Members of the public and the CRCRC may participate in the meeting virtually, as long as a quorum of the CRCRC and the presiding officer are physically present at the Municipal Building, in accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act. The public may watch this meeting live and have the opportunity to comment via audio devices at the link below. The public may also participate in this meeting by dialing one of the toll-free numbers below and entering the meeting ID and Passcode.

Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5307372193?pwd=QmNUbmZBQ1lwUINjNmK5RnJreIRFUT09>

Toll-Free Numbers: (833) 548-0276 or (833) 548-0282

Meeting ID: 530 737 2193

Password: 9fryms

The public will be permitted to offer public comments via their audio devices when logged in to the meeting or telephonically by calling in as provided by the agenda and as permitted by the presiding officer during the meeting. If a member of the public is having difficulties accessing the public meeting, they can contact the city at dadair@rollingwoodtx.gov. Written questions or comments may be submitted up to two hours before the meeting. A video recording of the meeting will be made and will be posted to the City’s website and available to the public in accordance with the Texas Public Information Act upon written request.

CALL COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING AND PUBLIC WORKSHOP TO ORDER

1. Roll Call

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Citizens wishing to address the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee for items not on the agenda will be received at this time. Please limit comments to 3 minutes. In accordance with the Open Meetings Act, the Committee is restricted from discussing or taking action on items not listed on the agenda.

Citizens who wish to address the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee with regard to matters on the agenda will be received at the time the item is considered.

CONSENT AGENDA

All Consent Agenda items listed are considered to be routine by the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee and may be enacted by one (1) motion. There will be no separate discussion of Consent Agenda items unless a Board Member has requested that the item be discussed, in which case the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered in its normal sequence on the Regular Agenda.

- 2. Discussion and possible action on the minutes from the February 13, 2024 CRCRC meeting

REGULAR AGENDA

- 3. Discussion and possible action on the Tree Subcommittee Progress Report
- 4. Discussion and possible action on the Building Height/Envelope Subcommittee Progress
- 5. Discussion and possible action on the Lighting Subcommittee Progress
- 6. Discussion and possible action on recommendation regarding driveway ordinance
- 7. Discussion and possible action on future meeting dates and agenda topics for discussion

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING AND PUBLIC WORKSHOP

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING

I hereby certify that the above Notice of Meeting was posted on the bulletin board at the Rollingwood Municipal Building, in Rollingwood, Texas and to the City website at www.rollingwoodtx.gov at **5:00 PM** on **February 23, 2024**.

Desiree Adair
Desiree Adair, City Secretary

NOTICE -

The City of Rollingwood is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable modifications and equal access to communications will be provided upon request. Please contact the City Secretary, at (512) 327-1838 for information. Hearing-impaired or speech-disabled persons equipped with telecommunication devices for the deaf may call (512) 272-9116 or may utilize the stateside Relay Texas Program at 1-800-735-2988.

The City Council will announce that it will go into executive session, if necessary, to deliberate any matter listed on this agenda for which an exception to open meetings requirements permits such closed deliberation, including but not limited to consultation with the city's attorney(s) pursuant to Texas Government Code section 551.071, as announced at the time of the closed session.

Consultation with legal counsel pursuant to section 551.071 of the Texas Government Code;
discussion of personnel matters pursuant to section 551.074 of the Texas Government Code;
real estate acquisition pursuant to section 551.072 of the Texas Government Code;
prospective gifts pursuant to section 551.073 of the Texas Government Code;
security personnel and device pursuant to section 551.076 of the Texas Government Code;
and/or economic development pursuant to section 551.087 of the Texas Government Code.
Action, if any, will be taken in open session.



**CITY OF ROLLINGWOOD
 COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE
 MINUTES**

Tuesday, February 13, 2024

The Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee of the City of Rollingwood, Texas held a meeting, open to the public, in the Municipal Building at 403 Nixon Drive in Rollingwood, Texas on February 13, 2024. Members of the public and the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee were able to participate in the meeting virtually, as long as a quorum of the Comprehensive Residential Code Review Committee and the presiding officer were physically present at the Municipal Building, in accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act. A video recording of the meeting was made and will be posted to the City’s website and available to the public in accordance with the Texas Public Information Act upon written request.

CALL COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL CODE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING AND PUBLIC WORKSHOP TO ORDER

- 1. Roll Call

Chair Dave Bench called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Present Members: Chair Dave Bench, Alex Robinette, Duke Garwood, Thom Farrell, Jay van Bavel, and Brian Rider

Also Present: Assistant to the City Administrator Makayla Rodriguez and Development Services Manager Nikki Stautzenberger

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

CONSENT AGENDA

- 2. Discussion and possible action on the minutes from the January 22, 2024 CRCRC meeting

Thom Farrell moved to approve the minutes. Jay van Bavel seconded the motion. The motion passed with 6 in favor and 0 against.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 3. Report, discussion and possible action regarding Planning and Zoning Commission response to January 17, 2024 CRCRC recommendation preview

Chair Dave Bench discussed feedback he received from the recent City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. He would like to review the recommendations and make edits if needed to move forward with the process.

The CRCRC discussed the survey response recommendations. They went into detail on setbacks and floor to area ratio. Chair Dave Bench stated that City Council would like to receive updates at meetings.

The CRCRC discussed floor to area ratio of homes in Rollingwood.

The CRCRC moved to item 7 at this time.

4. Discussion and possible action concerning Survey Statistics Reporting

Chair Dave Bench stated that Buie made the survey report and he would like to produce a document that would show data differently based on resident responses.

Thom Farrell left the meeting at 5:57 p.m.

The CRCRC agreed with Chair Dave Bench on his decision and discussed survey results.

5. Discussion and possible action on the Tree Subcommittee Progress Report

Jay van Bavel discussed that himself, Alex Robinette, and Duke Garwood reviewed the ordinance and have 19 recommendations. He stated that maintaining a tree canopy was of high value to residents.

Jay van Bavel went over the recommended changes. He discussed residential landscaping, defining heritage trees, alternative protective tree criteria, and defining critical root zone.

The CRCRC discussed City Arborist involvement in the tree removal process. Development Services Manager Nikki Stautzenberger stated that she is in the process of becoming a certified arborist.

The CRCRC and Development Services Manager Nikki Stautzenberger discussed arborist enforcement, trees, and changing the process for good neighbor replanting.

Jay van Bavel continued to discuss the recommendations including a process for a heritage tree removal permit and replacement plans for trees. Development Services Manager Nikki Stautzenberger and the CRCRC discussed the current replacement plan.

The CRCRC discussed a recommendation regarding removing trees from the buildable area. The CRCRC asked questions of Ms. Stautzenberger in regards to trees and tree clusters.

Jay van Bavel continued to review recommendations and discuss with Development Services Manager Nikki Stautzenberger trees in the setback area, changes to the tree removal permit process and site plan project design.

The CRCRC discussed a recommendation in regards to removing tree replacement limitations.

The CRCRC will continue reviewing recommendations in the next meeting.

- 6. Discussion and possible action on the Building Height/Envelope Subcommittee Progress

This item was not discussed.

- 7. Discussion and possible action on incorporation of draft Commercial corridor lighting for residential

Thom Farrell discussed light pollution in the residential area coming from the commercial corridor and how it is a quality of life issue for residents. He mentioned that he would like to formulate recommendations for proper shielding, eliminate light pollution going across a property boundary, and foot candle regulations.

The CRCRC discussed residential and commercial lighting as well as recommendations.

Chair Dave Bench and the CRCRC discussed the process document received from Council Member Brook Brown.

Jay van Bavel moved for the CRCRC to form a subcommittee to investigate the lighting code for the residential neighborhood and to include input from the commercial corridor draft lighting plan. The motion was seconded by Brian Rider. The motion passed with 6 in favor and 0 against.

Thom Farrell, Duke Garwood, and Dave Bench volunteered to be on the subcommittee.

The CRCRC discussed resident feedback with lighting and will bring this item back at the next meeting.

Brian Rider discussed commercial light reflection. Thom Farrell referenced code for Mr. Rider. The CRCRC continued to discuss light reflection.

The CRCRC returned to item 4 at this time.

- 8. Discussion and possible action on driveway ordinance recommendation

This item was not discussed.

- 9. Discussion and possible action on future meeting dates and agenda topics for discussion

This item was not discussed.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING AND PUBLIC WORKSHOP

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Minutes adopted on the _____ day of _____, 2024.

Dave Bench, Chair

ATTEST:

Desiree Adair, City Secretary

Recommended Changes to Rollingwood Tree Maintenance Ordinance from the Tree Ordinance Subcommittee of the CRCRC.

1. Change the name of section to “Residential Landscape and Tree Canopy Management.”
Approved.
2. Introduce the concept of xeriscape landscape into the ordinance with some suggestions to consider regarding using native and adapted low water use plants, and drought tolerant turf grasses for lawns. (no regulations, only suggestions) “ Landscape: Because the city experiences frequent drought conditions, low water demanding landscapes (Xeriscapes) are encouraged by using native and adapted low water use plants from the Grow Green Guide https://services.austintexas.gov/watershed_protection/publications/document.cfm?id=198301. Consideration should also be given to planting turfgrass on less than 50% of the landscaped areas, with turf grass preferably having summer dormancy capabilities such as Buffalo grass, Zoysia grass, or non-seeding varieties of Bermuda grass.” Approved.
3. Insert definition for a “heritage tree” category into ordinance with trees 24 inches in diameter measured 4 ½ feet above natural grade. A heritage tree means a tree that has a diameter of 24 inches or more, measured four and one-half feet above natural grade, and is one of the protected species. Approved.
4. Change the criteria for planting alternatives to protected species (utility setback trees) to limit it to only areas 20 feet from a utility line. In other words, a protected species removed from setbacks, right of way and buildable area must be replaced with a protected species if not removed from the 20 ft utility setback area. For protected trees planted removed from within 20 feet of an above-ground power, cable, or telephone line the following species can be used for replacement: These species CANNOT be used to replace a protected tree removed from areas that are not 20 feet from an above ground power cable, or telephone line. Approved
5. Adding a definition for Critical Root Zone (CRZ) that is area around tree trunk with a radius of one foot for every inch of diameter. Critical Root Zone (CRZ) means an area around the trunk with a radius of one foot for every inch of trunk diameter. No construction or disturbance shall occur within an area that constitutes more than (50%) of the total critical root zone, and one half the radial distance of the CRZ for each tree being preserved as a protected tree or heritage tree. Approved.
6. Emphasize the role of a city arborist in the review, approval, and implementation of all tree removal permits. The definition of “City Arborist” used throughout has been amended to include a city development official. City Arborist means an ISA certified arborist, or a development services officer of the city appointed by the city council to perform the duties of a city arborist. Needs Review again.
7. Remove Sections (d) and (e) of Section 107-373 as we believe all protected trees and heritage trees removed from a lot should be replaced on that lot, if possible, and unless a variance is obtained to replant elsewhere. Approved.
8. Removal of Heritage trees requires a separate “Heritage Tree Removal Permit” that can only be approved by a majority vote of the city council. Approved

9. (A proposal that the permit for removal of Protected trees and Heritage trees together with the replacement plan must be reviewed by the city arborist and approved before any demolition can occur on the lot). ~~Removed from Recommendations as redundant.~~ **Approved**
10. Protected trees removed from the buildable area must be replaced by one protected species tree. ~~Replacement of a Heritage tree removed from the buildable area with City Council approval must be replaced with one tree 6 inches in diameter, or more, for every 12 inches in diameter of the removed tree. For example: 24 inches = 2 trees, 36 inches = 3 trees, etc. to be replaced We will also come up with a definition of how to measure multi-trunk trees and branched trees , which occur below the 4 ½ foot measuring height.~~ **Needs to be reviewed again by CRCRC**
11. If a protected or heritage tree straddles the boundary between setback line and buildable area line, it shall be considered removed from the setback area if 25% or more of the trunk diameter is in the setback area. **Approved.**
12. An application for a tree removal permit must include a tree survey that shows all trees that are at least 12 inches in diameter 4 ½ feet above natural grade and indicate the Critical Root Zone of these trees as well. **Approved.**
13. Inserted statement that “the site plan and project design will preserve the existing natural character of the landscape and the retention of protective trees as much as possible. **Approved and moved to “Purpose Section.”**

Review at CRCRC meeting 2/3/24 ended here due to lack of time.

14. Either increase the maximum number of trees that need to be replaced to 10 or 12 or remove this limitation altogether. Currently it is 7 no matter what the size of the lot. See section 107-375 (h).
15. Change the requirement for replacement of protected trees removed from the setback areas to 2 replacement trees for each removed. Currently it is 3:1.
16. Development application requirements must include a tree survey indicating the location of all protected and heritage trees together with their CRZ. A protection plan must be submitted for these trees to include evidence that sufficient care must be demonstrated to ensure survival of these protected trees including adequate watering during construction.
17. All replacement trees must survive for at least three years, and the city arborist or other suitable city employee shall keep tract of these replacements, so that at 3 years post planting their survival and health can be assessed.
18. Include a section on intent to implement a program for the city, at its expense, to plant trees in the right of way of residences (with owner approval), and/or a program to plant “commemorative trees” on city property where the cost would come through citizen donations.
19. Section 107-380 requiring all vendors doing tree trimming, removal, or demolition, have a annual permit to do so from the city secretary should be enforced or removed from ordinance.

SURVEY RESULTS:**Q2/Consider Code Changes****175 (64%) Yes**

80 (29%) No - 15 ambiguous, more like "sorta yes"

Answered "No" to Code Changes, but 33% still want some form of change:

5 - said Max. Ht. was too high

24 (30%) - Want a diff. Ref. Datum Measurement

12 - Want to consider FAR

6 - Setbacks are too small

21 - (26%) Want limits along the setback

15 - (19%) want some form of tenting

Answered "Yes" to Code Changes:

135 (77%) - change Ref. Datum

Most felt Setback distance was ok

122 - Want building limits along setback

117Y/43N - Want Tenting

Q3/MAX HT. - No change, leave at 35ft.**175 (63%) - About Right**

70 - Too High

21 - Too Low

Q4/Reference Datum Options**172 (62%) Yes**

89 (32%) No - with 11 ambiguous

22 - Option. 1

26 - Option. 2

75 - Option 3**Q7/Change Setback Dimensions****Side - No change****Front/Corner - TBD****Q9/Setback Bldg. Limitations (Articulation/Eave Ht. Max/Tenting)****154 (56%) - Yes**

103 (37%) - No

Q10/Tenting**142 Yes****112 No - 23 still want Setback Bldg. Limitations**

HEIGHT

Recommend:

Maximum permitted building height shall be 35ft.

The maximum allowable height shall be measured as the vertical distance from the existing grade of the site to an imaginary plane located at the allowed height above and parallel to the grade. Height measurements shall be based on existing topography of the site, before grading for proposed on-site improvements, or finished grade, whichever is lower.

Include graphic

Maximum permitted building height shall be measured based on the criteria:

- There shall be no point of any building or structure that exceeds the prescribed height above the existing or finished grade, whichever is lower,
- All measurements shall be made vertically; i.e., each point of a roof shall be measured to the point of grade that is directly below it--vertical and plumb.
- Roof points that are not at the exterior of the building will be measured against nearest and adjacent existing grade.
- Antennae, chimneys, flues, vents, and similar structures shall not exceed the prescribed height limit by more than ten (10) feet. Water towers, mechanical equipment, solar equipment, and similar equipment shall not exceed the prescribed height limit by more than three (3) feet. (or match current RW code language)

(NEED) Definition of how existing and finished grade are measured or documented.

SETBACK (Bulk) PLANES, i.e. “tenting”

Recommend:

Some cities try to minimize the impact of new residential construction on surrounding properties by defining an acceptable building area for each lot within which new development may occur. Prescribing side and rear setback planes helps to minimize the impact of new development and rear development on adjacent properties, but still allows a home to reach its maximum height further from adjacent properties.

The bulk plane begins at a point 12 feet above the side property line of a lot, and then rises at a 45 degree angle until it reaches the maximum permitted height.

The bulk plane can be measured one of two ways:

1. For generally flat sites, the grade level point method allows the bulk plane to be measured at one time, at the midpoint of the side property line.

OR

2. For generally sloping sites, the parallel point method allows the bulk plane to be measured from a series of points taken at 10 foot intervals along the side property line.

Maximum eave height along any setback shall be 25ft.
There shall be no eave-point that exceeds the prescribed height above existing or finished grade, whichever is lower.

Include graphic

SIDE WALL ARTICULATION

If a side wall of a building is more than 15 feet high and is an average distance of ten feet from an interior lot line, the sidewall may not extend in an unbroken plane for more than 36 feet along a side lot line without a sidewall articulation that meets the requirements of this section.

A. To break the plane, a sidewall articulation must:

- be perpendicular to the side property line, at least three feet deep, and extend along the side property line for at least 10 feet *Include graphic*
- extend the entire height of the first floor of an addition to, or remodel of, an existing one-story building;
- extend the entire height of the second story of an addition to, or remodel of, a two or more story building;

B. Sidewall articulation required under this section may be satisfied by horizontal articulation, such that each story above the first story is setback further from the property line by at least nine feet and extends along the side property line for at least 10 feet.

The requirements of this section do not apply to:

- Any side of a structure that is adjacent to a commercial use, unless the commercial use is occupying a residential structure.
- An addition to or remodel of an existing principal structure, or the construction of a new principal structure, provided that the resulting structure is less than 2,000 square feet in net building coverage and less than or equal to 32 feet in height.

FOUNDATIONS/STREET-SCAPE R.O.W.

This standard seeks to establish a relationship between buildings and streets to create an engaging streetscape and discourage the isolation of homes from the surrounding neighborhood. The placement of buildings should seek to frame street edges physically or visually. Buildings should be oriented in a manner such that they are a component of the streetscape, which consists of the street itself and the buildings that surround it. Building orientation should provide a sense of interest and promote interaction between buildings and passersby.

Foundations should be measured from the estimated finished floor level to grade, regardless of finished exterior material.

Foundations shall not exceed 6ft...