

Memorandum

TO: Planning and Zoning Commission
FROM: Bradley Dushkin, AICP – Senior Planner
RE: Round Rock Development Code update
DATE: December 7, 2016

This is the final informational presentation to the Commission regarding the Round Rock Zoning and Development Code, which is an update and consolidation of all regulations pertaining to land development. The first presentation, on October 5, provided background on the project, discussed new opt-in zoning districts, and reviewed changes to downtown zoning standards. The second presentation, on November 1, covered amendments to building design standards in the non-residential zoning districts, changes to subdivision platting procedures and requirements, and changes to certain use regulations. The third presentation, on November 16, addressed several site-related aspects of development such as landscaping, detention ponds, and compatibility fencing, in addition to sign regulations and historic preservation.

This presentation will provide a brief overview of the entire project and will address comments received at the November 16 public hearing and the discussion that followed.

Attached to this memorandum is a document detailing those comments, including descriptions on how the Development Code addresses them as well as how staff has edited the draft in response to the subsequent discussion.

Also attached is a list of commonly-used exterior building materials and their average cost. Please note that the cost reflects the estimated purchase price of the raw material from the manufacturer and is subject to change based on a number of factors. Additionally, the cost of installation varies widely, making an accurate comparison of one material to another, from start to finish, very difficult.

Staff comments regarding the discussion and public comments from the November 16, 2016, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

In light of the Commission's discussion regarding the proposed masonry requirement, staff has made the following edits to the draft Development Code:

- Increased the masonry requirement from 66% to 75% for the C-1, C-1a, and PF-3 zoning districts.
- Provided greater flexibility in materials that may comprise the remaining 25% of the total exterior wall finish in the above districts, including the provision that "new or emerging products" not explicitly listed may be approved by the zoning administrator.

Ms. Carter's comments:

- A recommendation that any bar in the MU-1 zoning district with two or more doors or more than 75 feet of frontage shall count as two bars for the purpose of enforcing the proposed limit of 15 bars total and 4 in any single block in the district.
 - Staff has incorporated a modified version of this recommendation into the draft Development Code as follows: bars whose primary façade exceeds 100 feet shall count as two bars (calculation includes building and patio areas).
 - Justification: building code may require two doors for safety even for smaller establishments; 75 feet would create non-conformities, which staff seeks to avoid.

Mr. Moman's comments:

- Recommendation to remove the Downtown Master Plan from Sec. 1-7
 - The Downtown Master Plan encompasses areas outside the downtown mixed-use zoning districts and will be consulted for guidance regarding future land use decisions and zoning recommendations in these areas.
- Request for clarification in Sec. 1-9 "Conflicting Provisions"
 - Staff has added clarification to subsection (a) stating that compliance with local regulations shall not preclude compliance with adopted international, federal, or state codes.
- Request to add "rain screen" to Sec. 1-50 "Definitions"
 - Staff has not included a definition for rain screen, but will consider it a "new or emerging product" which may be used on up to 25% of the total exterior wall finish in the C-1, C-1a, and PF-3 zoning districts.
- Request to treat smooth-face, scored, fluted, and burnished concrete masonry unit (CMU) as "architectural CMU" similar to split-face and stone-face CMU
 - Staff has edited the draft to increase the amount of CMU with finishes other than split-face or stone-face that may be used, up to 25% of the total exterior wall finish in the C-1, C-1a, and PF-3 zoning districts
- Request to lower the required warranty on architectural steel or metal products from 30 years to 20 years
 - Staff has incorporated this request into the draft
- Request to permit thin brick veneer

Item No. F1

- Staff has chosen not to incorporate this request due to concerns regarding the product's durability and water resistance, noting that similarly thin masonry products applied with an adhesive have shown defects in numerous projects across the city.
- Request to edit the definition of "fire wall" to clarify that there are different types of fire walls
 - Staff has edited the definition as requested
- Request to edit the definition of "public view" to add sidewalks and right-of-way
 - Staff has edited the definition as requested
- Request to edit the definition of "simulated stone" to permit thin stone veneer products
 - Similar to thin brick veneer, staff has chosen not to incorporate this request due to concerns regarding the product's durability and water resistance, noting that similarly thin masonry products applied with an adhesive have shown defects in numerous projects across the city.
- Request to consider adding a new single-family zoning district featuring smaller lots and one-car garages
 - Staff has chosen not to incorporate this request, noting that such projects can be created using Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning, similar to detached townhomes on a common lot.
- Request for the Commission and staff to consider more contemporary styles of homes for the city
 - The SF-2 zoning district, which covers much of the single-family housing stock in the city, does not include design standards, thus allowing any style of home to be built on a lot with SF-2 zoning. Many newer SF-2 subdivisions have Home Owners' Associations which include design standards that may prevent non-traditional styles, but the city's lack of design standards does not pre-empt those HOA regulations.
- Clarification regarding a regulation permitting wood shiplap siding but not cottage lap siding or shingle siding.
 - This applies only to the SF-D zoning district, which covers 27 lots in eastern downtown. The intent of this zoning district is to maintain the character of a historically sensitive area of the city. Cottage lap and shingle siding are prohibited because they are not characteristic of homes built at the time, while wood shiplap and traditional lapped siding are.
 - The other single-family and two-family zoning districts are already permitted to use any form of siding excluding horizontal pre-finished aluminum. This includes cottage lap and shingle siding (either Hardie board or wood).
- Request to consider lower roof slopes than 4:12
 - The requirement for a roof slope measuring a minimum of 4:12 only applies to the SF-D zoning district in order to maintain the historic character of the area it covers. Other residential zoning districts do not have a roof pitch requirement, permitting any slope of roof or even a flat roof.
- Clarification on parking lot lighting standards
 - Staff is confident that the proposed requirement to limit the cone of light to 0.5 foot candles at any residential property line meets the building code and can be

Item No. F1

achieved by the appropriate shielding and orientation of the light source. No changes are proposed to this requirement.

- Request to allow greater lighting along the street-side property line
 - Staff has incorporated this request into the draft Development Code, permitting the cone of light to reach up to 2 foot candles along the street-side property line.

Estimated cost of commonly-used exterior building materials

<i>Material</i>	<i>Estimated cost per square foot</i>
<i>Fiber Cement Siding</i>	\$ 1 - 6
<i>3-coat stucco</i>	\$ 1.75 - 3
<i>Nichiha Siding (Fiber Cement Siding from Japan)</i>	\$ 3 - 7
<i>Decorative CMU</i>	\$ 4 - 13
<i>Synthetic Stucco (EIFS)</i>	\$ 3 - 7
<i>Brick (solid wall)</i>	\$ 2 - 7
<i>Single-sided structural tile</i>	\$ 5.50 - 15
<i>Limestone veneer</i>	\$ 3.75 - 15
<i>Thin brick veneer</i>	\$ 8 - 20
<i>Marble face panel</i>	\$ 42 - 64
<i>Granite panel veneer</i>	\$ 45 - 55

Note: Estimated cost is for materials only. Many factors may affect the cost of any given product, including geographic location (shipping costs), economic conditions, product availability, installer availability, size of order, and time of year. For example, given normal market conditions, a solid brick wall and thin brick veneer typically cost the same per square foot installed.

Source: Boral Brick (8-29-2016)