

1. GetGo Gas Station at 6725 Perimeter Loop Road, 23-017AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan

Exterior building modifications to replace roof material at an existing gas station/convenience store/car wash on a 45.56-acre site zoned Planned Commerce District, Perimeter Center. The site is located southeast of the intersection with Avery-Muirfield Drive and Perimeter Loop Road.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to approve the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions.

Vote: Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Way, yes.
[Motion approved 5-0.]

2. Open and Uncovered, 22-178ADMC, Administrative Request - Code Amendment

Review of proposed language to amend Zoning Code Sections 153.002, 153.071, and 153.074 to address the definitions of accessory structures in residential and non-residential districts.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell stated that this is an introduction for a future proposed Code Amendment. He provided history on the anticipated proposed amendment. In February 2022, the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) heard an Administrative Appeal case regarding a determination made by staff regarding the installation of a trellis/pergola over an existing patio that encroached 5 feet into the required rear yard setback. Staff determined the pergola was not permitted to encroach 5 feet within the rear yard setback, as the encroachment, regulated by Zoning Code Section 153.071(B)(1)(c), is only permissible for open and uncovered porches/patios and not for covered structures. The applicant requested an Administrative Appeal to the determination that a pergola is considered "open and uncovered." The BZA upheld the determination of staff, but directed staff to define the terms open, uncovered, pergola, patio, trellis, porch, and any other definition regarding these accessory structures that is currently not contemplated in the Zoning Code.

There are two sections of the Code that are in need of amendments. The first section is in Section 153.002, Definitions. Draft definitions have been provided for the following terms: awning, patio, pergola, porch, portico, and trellis. Any reference to open and uncovered structures has also been removed to avoid any subjectivity. The second section of the Code in need of change is Section 153.071(B) regarding Lot and Yard Requirements. Section 153.071(B)(1)(c) states that open and uncovered porches may project beyond the front building setback line or into a required rear yard a distance not to exceed 5 feet. Staff has interpreted this requirement to allow for at-grade patios to encroach, with the intent to provide additional usable amenity space for all residential lots in the City. The intent behind the rear yard setback requirements is to preserve the viewshed of adjacent properties and to preserve a green buffer between adjacent property owners and adjacent uses. At-grade patios do not hinder this intent, as there are no vertical elements to impact the view sheds.

Planning staff has provided draft language to clarify this requirement to maintain the intent of rear yard setback requirements, while allowing for at-grade patios to continue to encroach 5 feet into the rear yard setback. Structures that are not built at-grade, including porticos, pergolas, awnings, decks, and canopies, are not permitted to encroach into the rear yard setback requirement. Seating walls that are incorporated into the design of the patio and do not exceed an additional 24 inches in height would be permitted to encroach 5 feet, along with the patio. Mr. Hounshell stated that clarity of these sections has been requested by BZA, who has frequently reviewed cases where the homes have been built to the maximum size on small lots, thereby limiting the outdoor amenity space. This need addresses current residential lots only. Recently, Council adopted Neighborhood Design Standards, and one of the changes addressed was to accommodate additional amenity space outside of the buildable area in new PUD developments.

Planning staff is requesting informal discussion of these Code modifications. Based on tonight's feedback, modified Code language will be finalized for the Commission's review and recommendation to City Council. To guide the discussion, Staff requests feedback on the following topics:

- 1) Does the Commission generally support the direction of this Code modification?
- 2) Do the definitions proposed require any additional modifications to clarify their use?
- 3) Are there additional definitions that should be considered that are currently not provided?
- 4) Other considerations by the Commission.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Supelak inquired if cantilevered roofs without supports would continue to be in violation.

Mr. Hounshell responded affirmatively.

Ms. Harter inquired about temporary structures, such as sky shades.

Mr. Hounshell responded that any vertical element that requires a permit, which is encroaching into the rear setback, would not be permitted.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the 24-inch patio height.

Mr. Hounshell responded that it would be a straight line up from grade, all the way across the back of the structure.

Mr. Way noted that might need to be clarified in the Code. He inquired about the potential for a homeowner to add additional dirt to alter the grade.

Mr. Hounshell responded that is not an unfamiliar scenario. It is an issue, for example, that is addressed by the fence Code. He would look into that possibility further with this draft language.

There is the variance option available to the property owner.

Mr. Way stated that the concern is that if property owners alter the grade, it could affect the stormwater draining within the neighborhood.

Ms. Call stated that there are other areas of the Code specific to lot grading and the need not to impact adjacent properties. She requested that information be provided when this Code revision is brought back to the Commission for the next review.

Mr. Fishman inquired if swingsets/playsets would continue to be prohibited within the setbacks.

Mr. Hounshell responded that a few years ago, Council determined not to regulate those. They now can be anywhere in the yard, including the setback.

Mr. Fishman responded that is unfortunate. That has been a significant complaint of adjacent property owners. Placing a playset within a setback can be placing it near a neighbor's home.

Ms. Call requested that staff share the Commission’s concern about the placement of play structures within setbacks with City Council.

Mr. Supelak pointed out that if there is no regulation at all, they could be placed in front yards.

Mr. Fishman stated that today, play structures can be massive. He would prefer they be regulated in this current Code revision in some manner, if possible.

Ms. Call stated that in the definition of trellis, there is reference to latticework used as a screen or as a support for climbing plants. We also do not want trellises that are not used for screening. There are some lattice-like structures in the City that do not fit the definition of pergola because they do not have seating areas, but they are not used for trellising.

Mr. Hounshell stated that trellis is defined as a fence, so they are addressed in the fence Code. That Code section will be updated, as well.

PRESENTATION

3. Dublin Area Housing Study and Strategy

Presentation of the findings and recommendations of the Dublin Area Housing Study and Strategy, recently accepted by City Council.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Noble stated that the City’s consultants, Urban Partners, worked with staff to analyze the City’s housing inventory and to project future needs. The study area included the periphery areas around Dublin and analyzed Dublin’s role in the region. The housing study assessed the financial impacts of land use and housing; identified common housing themes from residents and stakeholders. Finally, it attempted to define how housing could support business growth and retention, consider the role of mobility and identify best practices and trends. The study occurred in two phases. The first phase was an existing conditions assessment, which includes demographics, economic trends, peer community benchmarks, a stakeholder meeting and housing inventory. This phase occurred January to April 2022. The second phase was a market outlook, including market demand and opportunities, example pro forma analysis, best practices and identification of potential housing strategies. This phase occurred May to December 2022.

Phase 1 of the study identified the following demographic trends:

- Dublin’s population increased by 18% from 2010-2020 (compared to 26% for the Study Area).
- The largest segment was school-aged children 5-17 (22% of population).
- The most significant growth was residents 65+ (7.5% in 2010 to 12.2% in 2019).

In regard to employment growth, of the 48,007 jobs within the City, 7.4% of the workers live in Dublin; 92.6% live outside of Dublin. The majority are coming from Columbus.

Phase 2 of the study examined detailed records of 7,901 home sales (Jan. 2017-Dec. 2021). For the 5-year study period, the median sale price was \$320,000; the median sale price/SF was \$154.02; the median living space was 2,021 SF. Home prices have increased by 22% since 2017 (\$286,000 to \$350,000). Since 2021, single-family homes in Dublin are selling for prices 52% higher than the Study Area. Of home rentals, 72 multi-family rental communities (17,544 units) were within the study area, while in Dublin proper, there are only 13 communities with 3,592 units. A total of 213 units were available, representing a vacancy rate of 1.2%. Dublin is forecasted to grow