

Village of College Park
Residential Design Review Committee
Regular Meeting – 4:00 p.m. –June 07, 2012
The Woodlands Township Service Center
2801 Technology Forest Blvd.
The Woodlands, Texas 77381

Members Present: Roger McDonald, Barbara Jarvis, Brent Foster and Wayne Mulkey

Members Not Present: Gail Carney

Staff Present: Pam Forde and Janet Loll

Public Present: None

Minutes

A. Welcome/Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m. by Roger McDonald

B. Consideration and Action of Minutes of May 03, 2012

It was moved by Brent Foster and seconded by Barbara Jarvis to approve the minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Consideration and Action regarding the Joint Meeting with the Development Standards Committee.

Roger McDonald presented a report on the Joint Meeting held May 29, 2012. After distributing a written report, he recommended that further discussion of this item be tabled until the July 5, 2012 meeting so that all the members would have an opportunity to read the report. Roger recommended that all the members of the RDRC should attend Joint Meetings and DSC meetings if possible to have a better understanding of decisions made by the Committees. Wayne Mulkey made the motion to table this item until the next RDRC Meeting on July 05, 2012 and Barbara Jarvis seconded the motion.

D. Review and Disposition of the Applications on the Review List for "Exhibit A"

The members reviewed and acted upon the application review list. All agenda item votes were unanimous.

E. Staff Approval List for June 07 , 2012

The "Staff Approval" List was accepted by all members present.

F. Consideration and Action Concerning the Absence of any Committee Member

After discussion, Brent Foster moved to excuse the absences of Gail Carney and Wayne Mulkey at the May 03, 2012 meeting and to table the absence of Gail Carney until the July 05, 2012 meeting. Barbara Jarvis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

G. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

H. Committee Member Comments

There were no committee member comments.

I. Staff Comments

Janet Loll asked the Committee members for their availability for the July 5th, 2012 meeting. Barbara Jarvis informed the committee that she would not be able to attend, however, Roger McDonald, Brent Foster and Wayne Mulkey all commented that they should be able to attend this meeting.

K. Adjournment

There being no further business, Roger McDonald made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:58 p.m.

Report to RDRC on Joint Meeting (5/29/2012)

Synopsis:

First, I would like to make the suggestion that each member of the RDRC attend the joint meeting whenever possible. Originally the joint meetings were scheduled when there was a fifth Wednesday in a month. There are actually four, fifth Wednesday's, this year and in 2013. There has only been one joint meeting for each of the last two years (May, 2010 and June, 2011). It seemed to me that the attendance for this meeting was down from the last meeting in June of 2011.

Second, it might be very helpful if every RDRC member attends a DSC meeting to see how decisions are made and to understand all of the facts and information that is taken into consideration, in addition to the RDRC's recommendation, by the DSC to make a decision. The DSC meetings that cover matters from the former TWA, are held on the third Wednesday of each month, beginning at 5:30 pm.

I found the joint meeting very helpful to me in that it helped me get a little perspective on what happens when an application is rejected by the RDRC and then appealed to the DSC. I must admit that it seems to me that once a matter goes up to the DSC, it does not matter that the RDRC had recommended that the DSC reject an application, a variance would be granted by the DSC on the matter. Note: The recommendations of the RDRC are only one of the items that the DSC will look at when making their decision, such as, (a) additional input from the homeowner, (b) input from the affected neighbors, (c) sometimes the DSC may have had similar cases in the past that affect whether they approve/disapprove, or approve with modifications or subject to conditions. The DSC may allow an improvement with the requirement that the improvement must be removed when the home is sold or otherwise no longer the residence of the applicant. In my mind that situation seems to set up the scenario where a homeowner sees that another homeowner got something passed, and they assume that whatever the other homeowner did was OK, so they go and do the same thing.

The first major item of business was to go over a number of items that are being considered for the Residential Development Standards. I cannot even list all of the issues being considered, but home businesses, fence staining, driveway widening, outdoor kitchens, pergolas, sail shades, placement of natural gas fill-up stations for automobiles, and rock beds in front yards are just a few. The DSC is still in the process of making final decisions on some of these items, so no new standards have been issued.

One of the things that I was unaware of is that the DSC has apparently requested that all applications for a home business must be brought to them after first being reviewed by the RDRC for a recommendation. This apparently came about because the DSC believes that some of the RDRC's were not enforcing the standards consistently. There was a lot of discussion about this with several of the chairmen (including myself) voicing the opinion that the standard should be very clear and then it should be enforced according to the standard by the RDRC, who are closer to the situation in their particular villages. If there are particular circumstances that fall outside the written standard, the RDRC should reject the application and send a recommendation to the DSC stating why they rejected the application along with a recommendation to the DSC.

Recommendation:

- We need to remember that most items that the RDRC reviews MUST BE disapproved because they do not comply with Standards. The only other option that the RDRC has is to impose a condition that will bring the improvement into compliance with the Standards. When we

disapprove an application, we should be very specific in our wording of a recommendation to the DSC so that our thinking is very clear on the matter.

- The format of our minutes is standardized throughout the several RDRC's and is by necessity very general. It would be a good idea if each of us took our own notes and kept up with them so that we can individually keep track of items that go forward to the DSC, to see how the situation was finally resolved.
- In view of the fact that at least for the last two years the joint meeting has only been held once a year, I would recommend that dialogue be opened between the RDRC's and the DSC to increase the number of joint meetings held throughout a year to at least three, if not return to the every fifth Wednesday routine.

The following table is provided by our excellent staff and includes all items reviewed by College Park RDRC that went to the DSC since January 1, 2012.

Meeting Month	Address	Item	DSC Decision
January	78 Genesee Ridge	Corrugated roof	Disapproved, but allowed with execution of a Memorandum of Agreement that will be filed with the County to remove when they vacate. NOTE: DSC has discussed and will allow corrugated roofs that are trimmed on edges in the near future
March	95 Wood Manor	Summer Kitchen less than 10' from property line	Conditionally Approved (needs inspections) NOTE: DSC has discussed and will change Standard to allow within 10'.
	94 Wood Manor	Patio Cover encroaching easements	Disapproved
April	10 Prairie Dawn	Home Business; RDRC recommended approval	Conditionally Approved; permit must be renewed in 2 years. Comply with standards. Pet sitting to be performed off site.
	6 Florian Court	Detached Pergola that encroaches easement; RDRC recommended DSC require screening	Conditionally Approved, DSC required screening.
	66 N. Creekmist	Paving installed without approval to rear and side easements; RDRC had no recommendation other than DSC to review.	Conditionally Approved - Remove a 1' wide section of flagstone along the entire side fence line on both sides of the property.

Thank you Pam and Janet!

**Exhibit A - Village of College Park
Application Review List**

Item	Applications Reviewed	Owner Name	Property Address	Sec	Block	Lot	Committee Action
1	Trellis and related improvements	KIRIT V. PATEL	70 W. KNIGHTSBRIDGE DR.	0002	0001	0028	Approved with Conditions
2	Patio Cover and related improvements	TRISTA J. BLAIR	19 SHIMMER POND PLACE	0005	0001	0063	Resolved by Staff Action
3	Walkway and related improvements	DAVID OSIER	107 S. CREEKMIST PLACE	0004	0002	0017	Disapproved