

To: Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA  
 Senior Planner, City of Dublin

From: Dan Phillabaum, AICP, RLA  
 Landplan Studios, LLC

Date: September 5, 2023

**Re: 23-066Z-PDP—Amlin Crossing Neighborhood Design Guidelines Analysis**

Sarah—

This memo provides a chapter-by-chapter analysis of the proposed Amlin Crossing Preliminary Development Plan against the objectives and recommendations of the Neighborhood Design Guidelines, as is applicable to all future residential PUD developments in the City.

The text of the Guidelines pertinent to this FDP application has been summarized into the following table, followed by my analysis and recommendations for the specific recommendations, provided in *italic bullet points*.

<b>I. Public Realm—Macro Level Design Guidelines</b>
<b>A. Open Space Framework</b>
<p><b>1. Step One—Site Inventory and Analysis</b>          Significant and pertinent existing features of the site are inventoried and analyzed. The quantitative or qualitative outcomes of each step of the inventory and analysis are overlaid to illustrate the interplay of these features and their impact on the site layout.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Each of the site inventory steps lacks a narrative analysis of that particular site feature to convey the significance, or potential influence, of each of the existing conditions in the site planning process.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>No summary overlay exhibit of the site inventories has been provided to depict the interplay of the existing features that leads to Step Two—Identification of Significant Features &amp; Development Areas.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The Existing Zoning and Land Use Inventory should also acknowledge the Future Land Uses and Special Area Plans for this site and the immediate context from the current Community Plan.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Although these areas are currently being studied as part of the Envision Dublin Community Plan Update, it is likely that some of the existing recommendations will remain, if slightly modified.</i></li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The Transportation &amp; Access Inventory should also include required future street stub locations as directed by City of Dublin staff.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The Historic and Cultural Assets Inventory provided is simply a repeat of other existing site conditions already identified. It should denote contextual elements such as the unincorporated community of Amlin, the post office, Amlin Crossing Park, the Amlin United Methodist Church, and the Washington Elementary School (Hilliard L.S.D.).</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Step Two—Identification of Significant Features &amp; Development Areas</b>  Identify proposed areas to be preserved, including significant natural features, historic or cultural resources and potential locations for new open spaces. Identify areas of the site conducive to residential development and provide the acreages of development and preservation areas.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The acreage of preservation areas and proposed open space areas has not been provided.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Based on the Topographic &amp; Hydrologic Inventory, the high and low points and existing swales locations would provide a preliminary indication of where stormwater management facilities may be needed, these should be conceptually depicted as open areas.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>South of the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension in Subareas D and E, there are large expanses of developable areas with no preserved features to provide open space for residents.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The conceptual locations and sizes of equitably distributed new open spaces that may be necessary should be indicated in this analysis.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>In Subarea A, the southern half of the existing tree row is not included in the areas to be preserved. Of the 21 trees proposed to be removed, only three are listed in poor condition.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Additionally in Subarea A, an undevelopable residual triangle of land on the southwest side of the gas easement has been included as a potential development area.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Step Three—Conceptual Street and Path Network</b>  Delineate the conceptual locations and hierarchy of streets through the neighborhood and path network linking open spaces. At a site context level, depict path connections to points of interest in the area.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The conceptual street and path network provided is not ‘conceptual’. It is a literal translation of the proposed street and path network from the preliminary development plan. At this step of the Open Space Framework, the intent is to show the site design process through a conceptual street and path network overlayed on the identified preservation/open areas and developable areas that meets the objectives of a providing a hierarchy of street types and paths that link open spaces and provide connectivity to points of interest in the context of the site.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The conceptual street network should include a hierarchy of street types to provide clear organization and wayfinding through the neighborhood and connections to the contextual street network. As proposed, the network includes a Minor Arterial, Local Streets, and Service Streets, with no Collector to provide a transition between the Minor Arterial and Local Streets as directed by City of Dublin staff.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>As directed by City of Dublin staff, a neighborhood collector should be established connecting the two sides of the neighborhood and extending to Hayden Farms to the south and Cosgray Road to the northwest. This roadway should incorporate a</i></li> </ul>

<p><i>sidewalk on one side and a shared-use path on the other, with a median similar to Eiterman Road through Ballantrae.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The conceptual street network does not include a second street connection along the northern property line to provide connectivity to future development north of the site as directed by City of Dublin staff.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The proposed path network does not provide adequate shared-use path connectivity between open spaces and through the wetland preservation areas. The path should extend to the north to meet the Street ‘C’ cul-de-sac bulb, and continue to the north to traverse the northeast wetlands and woodlots, providing a stub at the northern property line and connecting to Street ‘A’ in-between proposed residential lots via minimum 20-foot-wide cross access easement radial to the Landmark Tree in. The eight-foot width of the shared-use paths does not meet the ten-foot width directed by City of Dublin staff.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Step Four—Refine Development Areas with Lot Lines</b>          Within the areas proposed for development, incorporate lot lines and other regulatory boundaries necessary to convey the lot/dwelling types proposed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>At this step, an explanation of which lot types and sizes are proposed in various locations throughout the neighborhood, and why, should be provided.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>B. Design Objectives—Preservation of Significant Existing Features</b></p>
<p>The preservation of existing natural features should be given highest priority as dedicated open space in the layout of the neighborhood. These should be embraced as public focal points of the neighborhood and may serve as the basis for the neighborhood identity.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The predominant preservation area on the site is the group of wetlands in the northeast portion of the site, but this feature is not effectively embraced as the focal point of the neighborhood. Instead, the majority of this preservation area is isolated at the rear of lots.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The precise type or types of wetlands present should be identified—for example, vernal pools, shrub swamps, swamp forests, wet meadows, etc.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Except for the southern portion of the north/south hedgerow in Subarea A, the majority of the existing mature hedgerows have been preserved and incorporated into the design of new open spaces.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The wetland areas could have served as the source of a neighborhood identity, but the neighborhood generally turns it back on these features by siting homes backing up to the perimeter of the preservation area wherever it is feasible to do so.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The wetlands are poorly connected to other open spaces in the neighborhood, and minimal paths are incorporated within the wetland preservation areas.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>C. Design Objectives—Creation of New Public Open Spaces</b></p>
<p>New open spaces should be coordinated with preservation areas to provide a series of opens spaces strategically and equitably distributed through the neighborhood. Open spaces should have public street frontage and homes facing the open space. New open spaces may be formal or informal, have a variety of sizes, and programmed to respond to the recreational needs of the neighborhood.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Open spaces should have frontage along public streets and/or have homes fronting onto the open space. For most of the smaller pockets of open space, street frontage is provided along a portion of the space and homes are oriented to face the remainder of the open space perimeter. The larger, significant wetland preservation area and wet basin along the railroad tracks at the east side of the site are only provided street</i></li> </ul>

<p><i>frontage in areas where it was not possible to site homes backing up to the preservation area.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>No details have been provided for the design and programming of any of the individual spaces. According to the proposed Development Text, these details are to be coordinated with City of Dublin staff as part of the Final Development Plan.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>A variety of open space sizes are proposed. However, within the most densely planned area of the neighborhood—Subareas D and E—the least amount of open space that meet the objectives of the Neighborhood Design Guidelines is provided.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>D. Design Objectives—Stormwater Management Facilities</b></p>
<p>The Neighborhood Design Guidelines only consider dry stormwater detention facilities as contributing open space when these areas achieve a superior and interactive design as useable open space when they are not intermittently put into use for stormwater management.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>None of the dry basins proposed appear to be designed to be interactive or useable when not actively managing stormwater events.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Stone walls are proposed on the side of the dry basins adjacent to development areas for five out of six dry basins proposed.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>These walls generally run the entire length of one side of the dry basin and are designed as highly fabricated linear stone walls that appear engineered to artificially prop up the development above the adjacent dry basins.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>No stone specification has been provided.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Stormwater ponds should be sited with homes fronting onto the basins. For the eastern wet retention basin, proposed townhomes back up to the facility.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Sufficient access is available to permit the facilities to be maintained, and in the case of the wet basins, to be enjoyed as neighborhood amenities pending additional details on the inclusion of amenities and landscaping for the wet basins.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>E. Design Objectives—Perimeter Setbacks as Open Space</b></p>
<p>Only perimeter setbacks from external collectors or arterial roadways may be counted as open space under the following conditions. Homes shall either front roadway setbacks that are designed as linear, park-like environments with shared-use paths, or homes may back up to the roadway setback with views of the rear of homes screened with landscaped, earthen berms and meandering shared-use paths through the setback area.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Areas within the railroad setback cannot be included as open space except for wetland and tree preservation areas overlapping into the setback.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Homes facing Cosgray Road and homes on the south side of the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard extension have been sited to face the setback, however the design of the setback as narrow, linear dry basins does not result in a park-like environment.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>II. Public Realm—Micro Level Design Guidelines</b></p>
<p><b>A. Streetscape Elements</b></p>
<p><b>1. Design Objectives—Pedestrian Realm</b></p> <p>The Neighborhood Design Guidelines seek to establish a hierarchy within the street network using medians, variable tree lawn widths, and incorporation of a variety of landscape materials in the streetscape. Existing tree stands and tree rows can be captured within the right-of-way, and varying the planting scheme for street trees can create a unique character for different parts of the neighborhood and further assist in wayfinding. Monocultures of street trees are to be avoided.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>No street sections have been provided except for the proposed Service Streets.</i></li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Based on the other plans provided, all local streets are designed with the same tree lawn width and regularly spaced street trees.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>No street tree specifications have been provided.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Based on the plans provided, sidewalks are proposed on both sides of all local streets.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Typically, along a collector street in the neighborhood, a shared-use path runs along one side of the street with a sidewalk on the other.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>As noted previously, Street 'A'/Street 'D' is the most logical collector street in the neighborhood and should be designed to include appropriately sized sidewalks and shared-use paths to serve the neighborhood and regional community.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>B. Design Objectives—Semi-Private Realm</b></p>
<p>Front yards should function as both a transitional space between the sidewalk and the front façade of the home and as contributing to the larger linear open space network within the streetscape.</p>
<p><b>1. Front Yard Landscaping</b></p> <p>Front yard landscaping should create a high-quality arrival experience unique and complementary to the design of the home, with consistent thematic elements shared by lots on the same street for a unified streetscape character. Where short setbacks are proposed, hedges at the edge of the public sidewalk should be incorporated. Where larger lots are proposed, attention should be given to the arrival experience between the driveway and the front door created by the landscape design.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>All Subareas—Per the proposed Development Text, a minimum four-foot-wide sidewalk extending from the public sidewalk to the front door is required for every residence.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>No further front yard landscape requirements are proposed by the Development Text.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Transitional Arrival &amp; Entry Spaces</b></p> <p>Architectural extensions at the dwelling entrance should be included to provide a transitional space between the public realm and the front door. These spaces must also function as useable outdoor space for the residents. The design of these spaces should highlight the primary entrance to the dwelling unit and be located at a comfortable conversational distance from the public sidewalk.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>All dwelling units in Subareas A, B, and D are required to incorporate front porches with a minimum depth of six feet, and in Subarea E all dwelling units are required to incorporate front porches with a minimum depth of four-and one-half feet, and all front porches may be covered or uncovered per the proposed Development Text.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The Neighborhood Design Guidelines recommend that porches be covered, open on at least two sides, and possess a minimum clear depth of six feet, but also note that an ideal depth of eight feet should be provided for optimal comfort and circulation.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Per the proposed Development Text, Subareas A, D, and E require a minimum eight-foot building setback from public street rights-of-way, and Subarea B requires a minimum eight-foot and maximum 18-foot setback from public street rights-of-way.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>An eight-foot minimum setback leaves little space for front yard landscaping, which is of critical importance in physically separating the dwelling unit from the public realm and providing a sense of privacy where short setbacks are proposed.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>No proposed landscape plans or requirements for individual lots have been provided.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>To provide further separation and additional privacy between the front porch and the public sidewalk eight feet away, the first floor of the dwelling unit should be elevated a minimum of two and a half feet above the finished grade of the adjacent public sidewalk.</i></li> </ul>

- *Based on the exhibits provided, the proposed townhomes in Subarea A, the single-family detached homes in Subarea B, and the cottages in Subarea D all appear to provide this vertical separation from the public sidewalk. The proposed townhomes in Subarea E appear to be at-grade or possess a minimally elevated (4-6 inches) finished floor.*

**3. Architectural Composition, Diversity, and Materials**

The facades of dwelling units are the most character defining element of the streetscape. The dwellings should have a timeless, high-quality design, with massing and details at a pedestrian-scale which contribute to the overall character of the streetscape. Where a range of dwelling types are proposed, varying dwelling types along the same block face is encouraged as a means to provide variety and visual interest. The massing and articulation of dwellings, and a variety of exterior materials should provide architectural diversity to the streetscape. Exterior cladding materials should be long-lasting, low-maintenance and repairable over time.

GENERAL COMMENT

- *A range of dwelling types are proposed, but they are organized into four distinct subareas, each comprised completely of a single dwelling type. No attempt has been made to provide architectural variety by combining different dwelling unit types on adjacent lots or within a block.*

SUBAREA A

- *Subarea A is proposed as attached, rear-loaded townhomes on individual lots and clustered into three areas. Buildings are typically comprised of either three or four dwelling units, with one building having five units.*
- *37 of the 90 dwelling units proposed either front directly onto a public street and/or have a side elevation facing the street. The majority of the units are oriented to front onto open spaces.*
- *The massing of the townhomes is unique in that the main roof ridge of each unit runs perpendicular to the front facade, with a short flat roof segment on one side of the and masonry clad parapet wall between units. This significantly reduces the mass of the roof and helps to bring the buildings down to a pedestrian scale. The building mass of each unit under the flat roof is recessed from the front and rear façade, and the end units of buildings incorporate front porches that wrap the corner and bump outs at the rear garages facing a public street.*
- *Based on the renderings and material palette provided, fiber cement board and batten siding in eight color options is the primary cladding and trim material, with stone accents in two colors at the foundations and porch column piers, and brick firewalls in two color options. Dimensional asphalt shingles in a range of four colors which vary within a single building.*

SUBAREA B

- *Subarea B is proposed as detached, front-loaded single-family homes on individual lots that back up to the wetland preservation areas and to the shared property lines with the parcels interior to the site, but not part of this application.*
- *A total of 58 dwelling units are proposed.*
- *The proposed single-family homes feature a consistent gable and ell massing scheme for all units, with a front facing two-story gable and an intersecting ell of either one or two stories. The front porch is integrated into the front facing gable mass of the home, and a front-loaded garage typically within the ell.*

- *The clean, simple massing and proportions of the homes have a timeless quality overall. However, the repetition of this same basic design throughout the Subarea lacks variety. The consistent garage handing and three over three window and door openings on the two-story gabled mass of the home becomes monotonous, particularly when the lots are arranged with long, uninterrupted runs with no apparent deviation in building setbacks as on Street 'C'.*
- *The design and massing of the ells provides the area of greatest architectural variety, but there is insufficient separation between the façade of the ell and the front façade of the home to meet the minimum 20-foot recommendation of the Neighborhood Design Guidelines to adequately reduce the prominence of front-loaded garages.*
  - *The material palette proposed with Subarea A is also applicable to these units, with the exception of brick as a proposed material. Based on the renderings, fiber cement board and batten siding is the primary cladding and trim material, with stone accents at the foundations and porch column piers. Dimensional asphalt shingles are also proposed.*

SUBAREA D

- *Subarea D is proposed as rear-loaded, single-family detached cottages on individual lots arranged around a loop service street with a central wet basin.*
- *A total of 43 front-loaded cottages are proposed.*
- *The proposed single-family cottage homes are one to one and one-half stories in height and feature a consistent massing scheme with a primary building mass connected to the rear accessed garage through a secondary, one-story hyphen mass for all units.*
- *A variety of roof forms are proposed, with dormers and secondary cross gables. The roof typically extends over the front porch is integrated into the front façade of the home.*
- *The massing and proportions of the homes are pedestrian-scaled.*
- *19 of the cottage units are oriented to face the central wet basin, and 15 units face the proposed dry basin along Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and Cosgray Road, nine units face a frontage street.*
- *The material palette proposed with Subareas A and B is also applicable to these units, with the exception of brick as a proposed material. Based on the renderings, fiber cement board and batten siding is the primary cladding and trim material, with stone accents at the foundations and porch column piers. Dimensional asphalt shingles are also proposed.*

SUBAREA E

- *Subarea E is proposed as a combination of attached, rear-loaded and front-loaded townhomes on individual lots.*
- *A total of 48 front-loaded townhomes are proposed, generally located along the shared property line with Hayden Farms south of the site. Each building contains three units.*
- *A total of 132 rear-loaded townhomes are located north of the front-loaded townhomes and within four blocks—two small blocks at the east side of the Subarea containing 19 units and 26 units, a large central block containing 62 units and three open spaces, and 25 units at the west side of the Subarea. Each building contains between three to six dwelling units, and there are seven (7) three-unit buildings, eight (8) four-unit buildings, five (5) five-unit buildings, and nine (9) six-unit buildings.*

- *147 of the 180 dwelling units proposed front directly onto a public street and/or have a side elevation facing the street. 33 of the units are oriented to front onto open spaces. Nine units at the eastern end of the Subarea back up to the proposed wet basin.*
- *For the proposed front-loaded townhomes, a variety of conceptual architectural elevations and perspective renderings have been provided. These exhibits depict a range of massing schemes, but it is not clear how each of these will translate to the three-unit buildings proposed.*
- *Exhibit 7 depicts a front-loaded three-unit building with the primary entrances within a secondary mass from the main building, recessed from the garage façade and with a slightly lower roof height. This secondary mass is located at the outside of each of the end units, creating a stepped down condition to the overall building, and a hyphen condition at the interior unit. The interior hyphen helps to break down the mass of the three-unit building, but also hides the entry in the narrow recess between units.*
- *The design of the front façades above the garages provides variety between the units with secondary massing projections, alternate window fenestration, dormers and other details, but is dominated by the garage door at the ground level.*
- *Contrary to the proposed Development Text, sidewalks are provided between the front door and the driveway, but not to the public sidewalk.*
- *The rear-loaded townhomes in Subarea E feature two different massing schemes for the front facades of the individual units—the primary mass of each unit is side gabled with a secondary, front-facing gable mass of different sizes which project four-and one-half feet beyond the front façade to create an inset front porch.*
- *When the units are grouped together, the adjoining side gable roofs create a significant, uninterrupted roof mass that becomes more problematic to the pedestrian scale of the Subarea as the building unit count increases.*
- *Within each building, variety is proposed through different cladding materials and alternating the handing/mirroring the two elevation options. Based on the limited massing schemes proposed, the potential for long uninterrupted roof masses, and the relative lack of open space the Subarea may be lacking in architectural diversity.*
- *Insufficient information has been provided for both the front and rear-loaded townhomes to conduct more detailed analysis of the proposed architectural character or exterior cladding materials.*

### **C. Design Objectives—Garages**

The presence of front-loaded garages should be minimized to the maximum extent possible to maintain high-quality pedestrian-oriented streetscapes.

#### **1. Garage Location & Orientation**

Attached, front-loaded garages should be located a minimum of 20 feet behind the primary façade of the dwelling. Where side-loaded garages are proposed on lots narrower than 85 feet, garage doors are recommended to be located at least 10 feet back from the front façade of the dwelling to allow for landscape screening. Rear-loaded garages should appropriately accommodate vehicle parking adjacent to the garage and should not encroach the public right-of-way or vehicular and pedestrian circulation in the service street.

- *Attached front-loaded garages are proposed within Subarea B and E.*



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Within Subarea B, the garages are proposed to be 20 feet from the right-of-way or sidewalk, whichever is closer per the Development Text. This translates to a minimum setback of 2' and a maximum setback of 6' from the front façade to the garage door.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Within Subarea E, the garages of the front-loaded townhomes are located forward of the primary building façade.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Side-loaded garages are depicted on corner lots of Subarea B, screened behind an extension of the dwelling that places the garage doors more than ten-feet behind the primary façade.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Rear-loaded garages with parking adjacent to the garage are proposed within Subareas A, D and E. In Subarea E, the parking is proposed directly behind the garage. In Subareas A and D, parking is proposed both behind the garage and next to the garage. In all locations, parking encroaches the service street right-of-way.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Garage Doors &amp; Facades</b></p> <p>The design of garage doors and the façade of the garage surrounding the door can reduce the negative visual impact of front-loaded garages by reducing the size of doors, the number of doors that may be on the same plane. The detailing of the garage doors and elements surrounding the door can further diminish the visual impact of garages to the streetscape.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>No more than one garage door is proposed with any of the dwelling units in the neighborhood.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>All garage doors for all dwelling unit types in the neighborhood are a two-car width, or approximately 16 feet.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Garage doors in Subareas A, B, and D are carriage house style with upper transom windows.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Subarea A garage doors also feature a short canopy above the door.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Subarea E garage doors incorporate decorative bracing.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Garages with Integrated Accessory Dwelling Units</b></p> <p>Rear-loaded garages present an opportunity for integration of accessory dwelling units into the design of the garage.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>No accessory dwelling units are proposed in conjunction with any of the dwelling unit types.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Design Objectives—Rear Service Streets</b></p>
<p>Service streets can provide vehicular access to lots with narrow widths to improve the quality of the streetscape at the frontage street by enabling garages to be located and accessed from the rear of the lot and improving the architectural and pedestrian-oriented character of the front façade of the dwelling unit. Service streets must meet the specifications set forth by the City Engineer. Where these streets intersect the frontage street, rear setbacks of corner lots should be reduced to narrow the view into the service street space, and lots adjacent to service streets should incorporate hedges and trees to enhance the quality of the space.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Service streets are proposed in Subareas A, D, and E.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Two design sections for service streets are included in the submittal with right-of-way widths of 24 feet and 44 feet, with a concrete valley gutter on one side of the street, although only the 44-foot width right-of-way option appears to be used throughout the neighborhood.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>This design section does not match the details as directed by City of Dublin staff for the design of these streets.</i></li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>The conceptual landscape plans do not propose any landscaping in the service streets.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>There is no proposed reduction in the setbacks of corner lots at the intersection of service streets and frontage streets. All rear setbacks are defined as eight feet minimum, with a minimum setback to garage doors of 18 feet.</i></li> </ul>
<b>III. Private Realm</b>
<b>A. Design Objectives for Lot Elements</b>
<p><b>1. Front Building Setback</b></p> <p>On narrow lots less than 45 feet in width, dwelling units tend to be narrow and deep. Reduced front yard setbacks may be considered where these lots include rear accessed garages. For all lot types, the front setbacks should be staggered along the block face to create variety along the streetscape.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>See Summary Table of Proposed Lot Element Dimensions</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Only the townhome lots proposed in Subareas A and E are less than 45' in width, and these lots feature a combination of rear-loaded and front-loaded garages.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>There is no provision for staggered setbacks in the proposed Development Text.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Side Yards</b></p> <p>The appropriate side yard widths will vary based several factors--the overall lot width, the width of the front facade of the dwelling relative to the lot width, and the prominence of the garage in the design of the front façade. Side yards should be wide enough to allow for positive drainage between adjacent dwelling units, and in no case should the minimum side yard be less than six feet wide on one side and a total side yard width of 14 feet on both side for detached dwelling units. Where six-foot side yards are used, AC units should be located in the rear yard.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>See Summary Table of Proposed Lot Element Dimensions</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Side yards are applicable to detached dwelling units in Subareas B and D, however for the townhomes proposed in Subareas A and E, a minimum building to building separation distance must be specified.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The proposed Development Text only specifies a minimum 6-foot side yard. The Neighborhood Design Guidelines recommend that in no case shall the side yards be less than 6 feet on one side and 14 feet total.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Maximum Buildable Depth/Buildable Area</b></p> <p>The maximum buildable depth on each lot from the front building setback should be provided to ensure that adequate space remains at the rear of the lot for private outdoor space. The maximum buildable depth will vary based on the dwelling type proposed and should be provided with each building type proposed as part of the Preliminary Development Plan application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>See Summary Table of Proposed Lot Element Dimensions</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The proposed Development Text does not include the maximum buildable depth for any of the primary building footprints in any of the Subareas.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Rear Yard</b></p> <p>Minimum rear yards ensure that adequate space is reserved for private open space. Private open space should be provided with each dwelling unit and is defined as the space between the maximum buildable depth and the minimum rear yard.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>See Summary Table of Proposed Lot Element Dimensions</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Private Open Space Area</b></p> <p>The private open space area defines the physical envelope of the lot where decks, patios, hardscape, seat walls, pools, play equipment, and other outdoor improvements may be</p>

constructed. To ensure that a minimum amount of private open space is provided with each unit type proposed, the maximum buildable depth of the primary structure on the lot must be indicated on the Lot Type Examples submittal. The typical minimum amount of private open space on any lot should not be less than 150-square feet, with a minimum dimension of 10 feet. The actual amount required will vary based on the dwelling type and be determined by City of Dublin staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission.

- *See Summary Table of Proposed Lot Element Dimensions*
- *The plans and exhibits provided do not indicate any private outdoor space in association with the rear-loaded townhomes proposed in Subarea E.*

#### **6. Lot Coverage**

Lot coverage for narrow lots, attached single-family dwellings may require lot coverage greater than 45%. Higher lot coverage should be reserved for dwelling types not presently available and which meet or exceed the high architectural quality of existing housing stock in the city. Where increases in lot coverage limit the amount of private outdoor space typical to that dwelling type elsewhere in the city, public open spaces must be provided in accordance with the Design Objectives for New Public Open Spaces.

- *See Summary Table of Proposed Lot Element Dimensions*
- *No maximum lot coverage amount is provided for the attached dwelling unit types proposed within the Development Text. A lot coverage amount must be specified. 100% lot coverage will not be permitted for these unit types.*

#### **B. Lot Type Examples**

Diagrammatic examples of all of the proposed lot/dwelling types proposed should be provided. Lot Type Diagrams should not be depicted in isolation, but as a cluster of the dwelling type to convey the larger development pattern that the dwelling type will create.

- *Lot Type Examples have been provided only for the dwelling units proposed in Subareas B and D.*
- *The Lot Type Examples provided do not specify the maximum buildable depth of the primary building.*

#### **C. Alternate Block Arrangements**

A variety of dwelling types on the same block is encouraged to provide variety and architectural diversity throughout the neighborhood. Where blocks of dwelling units are arranged to front onto a public open space, the distance from the public street to the front door should maintain a sense of connectedness to the public realm. Lot or block arrangements that result in the primary entrance to the dwelling for residents, visitors and deliveries being located at the rear of the lot from the service street should be avoided as detrimental to the creation of an active public realm.

- *None of the proposed dwelling unit types are proposed to be combined on the same block to provide architectural diversity.*
- *Subarea D has minimal direct frontage onto a public street—9 units total out of 43 in this Subarea are oriented to a public frontage street. The remaining units rely on the rear service street to provide access for residents, guests and deliveries. The disconnection of the front door of the unit from access to the public realm suggests that the front entrances will rarely be used, resulting in diminished activity in the public realm.*

**SUMMARY TABLE OF PROPOSED LOT ELEMENT DIMENSIONS**

	<b>Lot Depth</b>	<b>Lot Width</b>	<b>Front Yard Setback<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Side Yard Setbacks</b>	<b>Max. Buildable Depth</b>	<b>Rear Yard Setback</b>	<b>Private Outdoor Space</b>	<b>Lot Coverage</b>
<b>Subarea A</b> Townhome	70 feet min.	22 feet min.	8 feet min.	0 feet between units <sup>3</sup>	<b>NOT DEFINED<sup>1</sup></b>	8 feet min. from service street ROW/18 feet min. from ROW to garage door	<b>NOT DEFINED<sup>1</sup></b>	No maximum <sup>5</sup>
<b>Subarea B</b> SF Detached	110 feet min.	50 feet min.	8 feet min./18 feet max/20 feet min. setback from ROW to garage door	6 feet each side <sup>4</sup>	69 feet min. <sup>2</sup> 77 feet max.	15 feet.	12' Depth, 480 SF <sup>2</sup>	65% max.
<b>Subarea D</b> SF Detached Cottage	105 feet min.	50 feet min.	8 feet min.	6 feet for main structures <sup>4</sup>	<b>NOT DEFINED<sup>1</sup></b>	8 feet min. from service street ROW/18 feet min. from ROW to garage door	<b>NOT DEFINED<sup>1</sup></b>	65% max.
<b>Subarea E</b> Townhome	70 feet min.	22 feet min.	8 feet min. /20 feet min. setback from ROW or sidewalk to garage door, whichever is closer	0 feet between units <sup>3</sup>	<b>NOT DEFINED<sup>1</sup></b>	8 feet min. from service street ROW/18 feet min. from ROW to garage door	<b>NOT DEFINED<sup>1</sup></b>	No maximum <sup>5</sup>

**COMMENTS**

1	<i>Without a maximum buildable depth specification for the primary structure, the area available for private outdoor space cannot be determined. No Lot Diagram Exhibit has been provided for this dwelling unit type.</i>
2	<i>Based on the Lot Diagram Exhibit provided for this dwelling type.</i>
3	<i>A minimum separation between townhome buildings must be provided.</i>
4	<i>The Neighborhood Design Guidelines recommend that side yards be provided not less than 6 feet on one side and 14 feet total.</i>
5	<i>A maximum lot coverage must be specified.</i>
6	<i>The proposed Development Text should specify that the front building setback is measured to the closest portion of the structure to the right-of-way.</i>

In reviewing the submitted application materials, it is my opinion that the proposed Development Text requires significant revisions and cannot be approved as submitted, or by Conditions of Approval, as several of the proposed standards are inconsistent with the recommendations of the Neighborhood Design Guidelines or are otherwise unacceptable as proposed. Additional detail is necessary in this document to ensure that a high-quality, unique neighborhood consistent with the purpose of Planned Unit Developments is achieved. I would be pleased to discuss any of these items with you in greater detail at your convenience. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Daniel Phillabaum, AICP, RLA  
Owner | Landplan Studios, LLC

Office: 614.567.2000

Mobile: 614.327.5524

E-Mail: [dan@landplanstudios.com](mailto:dan@landplanstudios.com)