



MEETING MINUTES

Board of Zoning Appeals

Thursday, January 29, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Murphy called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 5555 Perimeter Drive. He welcomed members of the public and stated that in addition to attending the meeting, the public can access the livestream on the City's website. The City welcomes public participation including public comments on cases. He reviewed the meeting procedure.

ROLL CALL

Board Members Present: Garrett Anderson, Brad Linville, Patrick Murphy, Bridget Tyznik
Board Members Absent: Abigail Dalesandro
Staff Members Present: Zachary Hounshell, Bassem Bitar, Tori Brubaker, Anthony Severyn

APPROVAL OF MINUTES/ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Anderson moved, Mr. Linville seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the December 18, 2025 regular BZA meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Murphy, yes; Ms. Tyznik, yes; Mr. Linville, yes; Mr. Anderson, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0]

Mr. Murphy shared the procedures for the meeting and swore in staff and members of the public who planned to address the Board during the meeting.

CASE REVIEWS

Case #25-116AA

Coffman Residence Fence - Administrative Appeal

An Administrative Appeal of a determination by the City of Dublin Community Planning and Development Division regarding whether a new fence is considered a replacement fence. The 0.26-acre site is zoned R-4, Suburban Residential District and is located approximately 40 feet northeast of the intersection of Scribner Way and Anselmo Court.

Mr. Murphy stated that the applicant for Case #25-116AA had requested to postpone their hearing due to illness.

Mr. Linville moved, Ms. Tyznik seconded to postpone Case #25-116AA to a future meeting date.

Vote: Mr. Linville, yes; Ms. Tyznik, yes; Mr. Anderson, yes; Mr. Murphy, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0]

Case #25-120V

Kaufmann Residence – Non-Use (Area) Variance

Request for review and approval of three Non-Use (Area) Variances to allow for a new single-family home to deviate from the Residential Appearance Standards and to allow for a detached garage to encroach into the front yard. The site is zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development, Deer Run and is located at 4700 Deer Run Drive.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Brubaker presented the staff report. She explained that the case involved four non-use area variances for the construction of a single-family home. The variances related to three criteria concerning residential appearance standards - specifically roof requirements, trim requirements, and garage opening width requirements - as well as development standards for detached structures. She noted that two of the requests were based on the architectural character proposed for the site.

Ms. Brubaker outlined the non-use area variance process as a singular step allowing the Board to determine unique circumstances associated with the property, natural characteristics, and potential impacts on adjacent properties. She explained that approval would allow the applicant to apply for a building permit with Board recommendations, while disapproval would require modification to meet zoning code requirements.

Ms. Brubaker described the site as approximately five acres, located east of Deer Run Road and Deer Run Court, adjoining the Scioto River. Access is provided via a cul-de-sac on Deer Run Road leading to the currently vacant parcel. The subdivision consists of three phases, with this property in Sub-area A containing larger estate lots. She highlighted significant site features including floodplains associated with the Scioto River and Deer Run tributary, as well as mature vegetation throughout. These conditions create a scenic character, help determine home location, and provide limited visibility.

Ms. Brubaker presented maps showing the floodplains surrounding the proposed home location, demonstrating limited buildable area. She also showed contour maps indicating the proposed home sites in the area with the least grade change, with the site sloping significantly downward to the Scioto River and Deer Run tributary. She displayed images from Dublin Road showing no visibility of the site from the right-of-way, noting this as one of the few subdivisions in Dublin where lots cannot be seen from the street.

Ms. Brubaker grouped the first three variance requests as they all relate to residential appearance standards, which were adopted by Council in March 2004 to create minimum design standards for residential development. She noted these standards are less applicable to most current residential developments due to increased standards from developers implementing many Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) since then.

Ms. Brubaker detailed each variance request. The first would allow roof pitches that do not meet the minimum requirement for secondary architectural features. The second would permit trim narrower than the required 3.5 inches around windows. The third would allow combined garage door openings of 38 feet when 36 feet is the maximum allowed. The fourth variance would permit

a detached garage to be forward of the principal structure, based on the determination of what constitutes the front yard on this unique property.

For variance Criteria A regarding the first two requests, Ms. Brubaker stated the site has special conditions with a more rural character than typical suburban lots, featuring large size and greater setbacks in a heavily wooded area. She believed these criteria were met, as the architectural style warrants the variance without indicating applicant action or inaction, and would not impair code intent since the style provides visual interest and high-quality design without adverse community impacts.

Regarding variance Criteria B, she noted no special privileges would be granted as similar cases have been approved for architectural character. The requests would not be recurrent in nature, would not impact governmental service delivery, and no other method would propose the same high-quality design.

For the third variance regarding garage door width, Ms. Brubaker acknowledged the special conditions but stated the applicant action/inaction criteria was not met since the variance results from the applicant pursuing wider doors than permitted. She believed this could be avoided by reducing door widths to meet code requirements. While not recurrent and not impacting services, she felt it would grant special privileges and that other methods were available by reducing the width by two feet.

For the fourth variance regarding the accessory structure location, Ms. Brubaker found special conditions existed without impairing code intent or applicant action/inaction. She stated no special privileges would be granted, it is not recurrent and would not impact services. While acknowledging the garage could be relocated or attached to the structure, she believed such changes would detrimentally affect the architectural character.

Planning staff recommends approval of variances one and two for roof pitch and window trim as they meet criteria and are consistent with previous Board recommendations. Disapproval of the garage door width variance was recommended as it does not meet code intent and would grant special privileges. They recommended approval for the detached garage location as it meets code intent and is consistent with previous recommendations.

Mr. Linville questioned why the garage doors were not considered part of the architectural style, when the roof and other elements were. Ms. Brubaker explained that staff viewed trim and roof pitch as related to architectural character commonly seen in modern homes being built in Dublin including in this PUD. However, they did not consider garage door width as architectural character, since it is also addressed under general development standards for front-loaded garages. Given the determination of this being a side-loaded garage based on the front access point, the distinction could go either way.

Mr. Linville asked for clarification about the side-loading designation. Ms. Brubaker explained that under general development standards, the 36-foot combined width requirement applies specifically to front-loaded garages. In this case, they did not need a variance for that specific code line but did not group it with other architectural standards. Mr. Hounshell added that traditionally the first two requests regarding roof pitch and trim are tied to architectural style, while garage door widths have not been traditionally seen this way. He deferred to the applicant to explain how they believe it fits the architectural character but noted that even shortened doors would still fit the character.

Mr. Murphy asked if the detached garage status affected the architectural structure consideration. Ms. Brubaker clarified that the detached garage variance relates to general development standards, not residential appearance standards. Mr. Hounshell explained that the garage door width variance

only applies to the attached garages shown in the elevation, as it looks at everything on a plane spanning 38 feet of garage door width on the home's front plane.

Mr. Murphy inquired about the distinction between front-loading and side-loading garages based on property orientation. Ms. Brubaker explained they determined it based on how garage doors are accessed - typically straight in for suburban subdivisions versus the side angle approach in this case due to lot circumstances.

Mr. Linville sought clarification on whether the 36-foot requirement would apply differently for front versus side-loading garages. Ms. Brubaker confirmed it would apply for front-loaded garages. Mr. Hounshell clarified that the standard applies in either case, with the residential appearance standards applying to all garage doors while general development standards specify front-load garages, creating some overlap. They applied the more universal standard.

Applicant Presentation

Jeff Memmer, Memmer Homes, 10473 Mackenzie Way, Dublin, thanked staff for their assistance throughout the process. He described the home as quite special and not of standard character. He explained that Mike and Linda Kaufman approached them a year ago with a vision to create a truly special home to attract their children and grandchildren on what he described as a second-to-none property - the most beautiful lot he had seen or built on.

Mr. Memmer detailed how they gathered world-renowned architects, land planners, and landscape architects to create a comprehensive site view, taking into account views and substantial topography. He described not only the fall toward the river but a literal cliff on the Deer Run side. Despite the five-acre site, the buildable window is tight given the land constraints. The team considered sight lines to neighboring properties in creating the floor plan and site design for this unique home.

Addressing the garage door size specifically, he explained this would present as a side-load garage despite technical discrepancies in orientation from overhead views. He described the freestanding garage on the right side of the rendering, with the cliff dropping into the ravine immediately to its right. He emphasized that it is a sheer cliff, not just a hill, which limits how far they could position structures.

Mr. Memmer explained their design approach as the lot continues falling left toward the river. They wanted to create a nice, approachable, usable driveway allowing vehicles to turn into garages while shielding garages from neighboring properties and avoiding a garage-door-dominated approach to the house. This required creating certain spacing between garages.

He explained the garage door sizing serves dual purposes. First, the doors are scaled visually to match the large home's size and scale, with three ten-foot doors and one eight-foot door totaling 38 feet. The ten-foot doors are on the larger massing with the eight-foot door on the smaller massing to maintain proportion. Second, they positioned the garages facing each other to create a garage courtyard, avoiding the need to move structures toward neighboring properties or remove additional trees. This design shields most of the garage doors internally, with none facing outward toward other properties.

Mr. Memmer emphasized the practical consideration of navigating between two structures when turning left into the garage doors. They wanted sufficient target area for comfortable turns with full-size SUVs without requiring careful maneuvering. He summarized that the sizing addresses both visual screening and practical daily use.

Board Questions

Mr. Anderson requested verification that the first garage door would be eight feet. Mr. Memmer explained that it would likely store lawn equipment, golf carts, and bikes while the closer garages would house cars.

Mr. Murphy inquired about the topography's steepness. Mr. Memmer described entering at the northwest corner at Deer Run's dead end, immediately going downhill, then veering right heading south. He pointed out the harsh topography lines indicating Deer Run Creek, emphasizing again the cliff nature, which requires safety fencing. He described working with the engineering department regarding the floodplain line, which runs northwest to south then wraps around toward the Scioto River. While the grade from house to river is more gradual than the opposite side, it still falls substantially. They are positioned on a ridge in a cone-wedge space with grades heading off in both directions.

Mr. Murphy confirmed the home's location is essentially set given its size and scale. When asked about aesthetic or utilitarian reasons for the two-foot garage width increase, Mr. Memmer reiterated it maintains scale with the overall home structure while providing practical space for maneuvering between garages, making entry and exit more generous without constantly risking hitting garage doors.

Mr. Murphy noted previous situations where extra space was required for vehicle mobility and asked if this was anticipated here. Mr. Memmer confirmed they pushed structures as far as possible, given the floodplain constraints on both sides, to accommodate reasonable-sized vehicles. He explained that larger doors ease entry, with importance varying by approach direction. They tried accounting for maximum space and turning radius given the straight approach requiring a left turn.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Board Discussion

Mr. Linville expressed continued struggle with the reason garage doors were not considered part of architectural design when the applicant discussed scalability with the house. He questioned why they were not treated similarly to rooflines and window treatments.

Mr. Murphy suggested they might require greater clarification on the reason garage doors would not fall under the same considerations as roof pitch or window trim. Mr. Hounshell responded that this represented staff's perspective, but the Board could view it differently. Staff believed it could be mitigated while maintaining the home's character.

Mr. Anderson referenced the Cotterman residence case, where staff recommended approval for 40 feet of garage doors, asking for perspective on why that was acceptable versus this case. Ms. Brubaker clarified they recommended approval for the detached garage in the front yard but disapproval for garage widths exceeding 36 feet. Mr. Anderson stated that Mr. Cotterman had received approval for four garage doors totaling 40 feet three years prior. Mr. Hounshell acknowledged this was true but could not provide an immediate answer. He indicated that if the Board decided it contributed to the home's character, that was valid.

Mr. Anderson stated he agreed it could be architectural while acknowledging Mr. Murphy's points about utility. He was inclined to find criteria 2A met for the garage door variance and would approve all four requests.

Ms. Tyznik commented that the larger size seemed to fit the home's scale and that the detached garage's positioning prevented viewing of garage doors, making it aesthetically pleasing despite being slightly larger than standard recommendations. She would be inclined to approve the garage door width.

Mr. Murphy noted the mature vegetation screening the property and asked about visibility from surrounding areas and the road. Ms. Brubaker stated the garage would be completely screened from the right-of-way and likely significantly screened from other properties due to vegetation, though she could not speak completely to all surrounding properties. Mr. Memmer added that the heavily wooded area and different orientations of northern properties mean they are positioned as far from others as possible. While perhaps visible from far distances in winter, summer foliage would provide complete screening.

Mr. Linville asked about Deer Run's architectural review requirements. Ms. Brubaker confirmed homes in this PUD have (a)n (homeowners' association) HOA-specific architectural review committee that reviewed and approved this home's layout and design. Mr. Hounshell clarified this is separate from City requirements and entirely within the HOA's purview.

In final discussion, Mr. Anderson reiterated agreement with staff's assessment on the roof pitch, trim, and detached garage variances and would vote to approve those. For the garage variance, he found criteria 2 under A met for both architecture and utility in providing maneuvering space; therefore, he would approve all four variances.

Mr. Linville thanked staff for their presentation on this unique, sprawling house, which required many judgment calls. He agreed 100% with most of staff's recommendations, noting the detached garage placement along the river made practical sense and had precedent. Given the house's architecture and the code's intent for modern, interesting architecture in the area, he considers the garages fit based on the applicant's explanation and would vote accordingly.

Ms. Tyznik stated that as she indicated in her earlier comments, she supports the garage door width based on scale and aesthetic considerations.

Mr. Murphy emphasized the unique location, shape, and topography of the property with considerations about its considerable size and limitations on where structures could be located. While uncertain how much is related to garage size specifically, given the home's scale and proposed garage scale, utilitarian considerations for vehicle movement and aesthetic considerations for scaling up two feet to match the overall structure would fall within their scope, especially given Code section 153.19B allowing latitude for variety in construction and aesthetic considerations. Mr. Murphy stated he was inclined to agree with staff recommendations on variances one, two, and four, and given the discussion regarding aesthetic choices and vehicle mobility considerations, he would lean toward granting the third variance as well.

Ms. Tyznik moved, Mr. Anderson seconded approval of the non-use (area) variance to permit multiple roof pitches that do not meet the minimum roof pitch for secondary architectural features of 4:12.

Vote: Mr. Murphy, yes; Mr. Linville, yes; Mr. Anderson, yes; Ms. Tyznik, yes.

[Motion carried 4-0.]

Mr. Anderson moved, Ms. Tyznik seconded approval of the non-use (area) variance to permit no shutters and trim of less than 3½" around the windows of the residential building.

Vote: Mr. Anderson, yes; Mr. Linville, yes; Mr. Murphy, yes; Ms. Tyznik, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0.]

Mr. Anderson moved, Mr. Linville seconded approval of the non-use (area) variance to permit the total of all combined garage door openings to be wider than 36 feet.

Vote: Mr. Murphy, yes; Ms. Tyznik, yes; Mr. Linville, yes; Mr. Anderson, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0.]

Ms. Tyznik moved, Mr. Linville seconded approval of the non-use (area) variance to permit a detached garage to be forward of the primary dwelling.

Vote: Mr. Linville, yes; Ms. Tyznik, yes; Mr. Anderson, yes; Mr. Murphy, yes.
[Motion carried 4-0.]

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Hounshell reported no communications other than the next scheduled meeting on February 26th. He noted they had no cases at present but would notify the Board in coming weeks whether that meeting would be held.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:26 p.m.


Chair, Board of Zoning Appeals


Deputy Clerk of Council