

**DUBLIN CITY COUNCIL
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 2025 – 5:00 p.m.
5555 PERIMETER DRIVE
COUNCIL CHAMBER**

Meeting Minutes

Mr. Reiner called the April 15, 2025 Community Development Committee meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Members present: Ms. Fox, Mr. Keeler, and Mr. Reiner

Staff present: Ms. Rauch, Ms. Mullinax

Others present: Michelle Mundy, Coventry Woods HOA; Lisa O'Brien, Cramer's Crossing HOA; Jay Wellman, Lowell Trace HOA; David Lakin, Tartan Ridge HOA; Amanda Levell, Wexford Woods, HOA.

Minutes of the September 17, 2024 Meeting

Mr. Keeler moved to approve the minutes of the September 17, 2024 CDC meeting. Ms. Fox seconded the motion.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Fox, yes

2025 Beautify Your Neighborhood Grants

Ms. Mullinax reviewed the requests for recommendation to City Council of the 2025 Beautify Your Neighborhood Grant applications. She shared a map indicating the neighborhoods that are requesting grant funds. The total budget dedicated to the Beautify Your Neighborhood Grants is \$32,000 for two grant cycles. There were six requests for a total of \$21,666.46. The remaining budgeted amount for fall grant applicants is \$10,333.54. Planning recommends the Community Development Committee review and make a recommendation of approval to City Council for both spring 2025 Beautify Your Neighborhood Grant applications.

- Brandon – Request: \$3,463.50
Ms. Mullinax reviewed the grant application. She noted that mulch was included in the cost estimate, which is ongoing maintenance and ineligible for grant funds; so a condition of the approval would be to remove the mulch cost from the estimate. She stated the Grant Review Team is supportive of this project. Mr. Keeler asked about the selection of a White Pine and whether that was the best choice in this application. Mr. Reiner provided some history on using White Pines for developments in Dublin and suggested replacing the White Pine

selection with a Norway Spruce. The representative from the Brandon HOA acknowledged the suggestion and thanked the Committee for the recommendation.

Ms. Fox moved to recommend approval of this application of Council.

Mr. Keeler seconded.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes.

- **Coventry Woods – Request: \$5,000**

Ms. Mullinax reviewed the grant application. She stated the Grant Review Team is supportive of this project.

Mr. Reiner invited forward a representative from Coventry Woods. Michelle Mundy, HOA representative, came forward to speak about the condition of the stone wall and the repairs that need to be made. In response to Ms. Fox's question regarding whether the stones on the wall that had fallen were synthetic, Ms. Mundy stated that they were real limestone. Another representative joined Ms. Mundy and explained that they did analyze how water was penetrating the walls thus weakening them and the steps they are taking to remedy these issues.

Mr. Reiner moved to recommend approval of this application of Council.

Mr. Keeler seconded.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes.

- **Cramer's Crossing – Request: \$5,000**

Ms. Mullinax reviewed the grant application. She stated the Grant Review Team is supportive of this project.

Mr. Reiner invited forward a representative from Cramer's Crossing. Ms. O'Brien came forward to answer any questions of the Committee. Mr. Reiner thanked everyone for taking on these projects. Ms. Fox reiterated her thanks to the community members. Mr. Reiner stated that he noticed Shasta Daisies are part of the plan as a likely deer repellent. He suggested using Walker's Catmint instead of the Shasta Daisy that the applicant had proposed. He added that Walker's Catmint is a good option when trying to deter deer from eating the plants and it looks nice. Ms. O'Brien noted the suggestion and stated their intention to replace the daisy with catmint.

Mr. Reiner moved to recommend approval of this application of Council.

Ms. Fox seconded.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.

- **Lowell Trace – Request: \$1,702.96**

Ms. Mullinax reviewed the grant application. She stated the Grant Review Team is supportive of this project.

Mr. Reiner invited forward a representative from Lowell Trace. Mr. Wellman, Lowell Trace HOA, stated that they are including Catmint in their plantings as well. They will be using volunteers as this is just plantings and mulch. He stated his understanding that mulch was not included in the grant funds.

Ms. Fox moved to recommend approval of this application of Council.

Mr. Keeler seconded.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Fox, yes.

- Tartan Ridge – Request: \$1,500

Ms. Mullinax reviewed the grant application. She noted that this also includes mulch which is ineligible for grant funding so a condition of the approval would be to remove the mulch cost from the estimate. She stated the Grant Review Team is supportive of this project.

Mr. Reiner invited forward a representative from Tartan Ridge. Mr. Lakin, Tartan Ridge HOA, stated that this application is pretty straight forward. He did mention the small building has hail damage on the roof and would like to know if the City has insurance to repair the roof since it sits on City-owned property. Ms. Rauch stated that the City owns the reserve, but the HOA maintains the property, so she would have to look into who is responsible for the roof.

Mr. Keeler moved to recommend approval of this application of Council.

Ms. Fox seconded.

Vote on the motion: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.

- Wexford Woods – Request: \$5,000

Ms. Mullinax reviewed the grant application. She stated the Grant Review Team is supportive of this project.

Mr. Reiner invited forward a representative from Wexford Woods. Ms. Levell, Wexford Woods HOA, came forward and discussed the project. Mr. Reiner complimented them on the plan.

Mr. Keeler moved to recommend approval of this application of Council.

Ms. Fox seconded.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.

Mr. Reiner thanked staff for working with each group on their projects. He reiterated his gratitude for everyone that applies for the grant funding and stated that these applications will be moved forward to Council for approval.

Roof Aesthetics

Ms. Rauch stated that this topic came forward after pictures of green roofs were shown during previous Council meetings. There was interest in having staff research how these might be incorporated in Dublin. She referenced the background information that was provided in the Committee's packet as well as information regarding the different types of green roofs. She began with the definition. Green Roofs are also known as

living roofs and involve the installation of vegetative layers on building rooftops. They typically consist of waterproofing, root repellent systems, drainage, growing medium and vegetation. There are two main types of living roofs: Extensive, which is lightweight, low maintenance systems; and Intensive, which have deeper soil profiles that support a wider variety of plant types and even trees or recreational spaces. In terms of sustainability, green roofs offer a range of environmental and community benefits such as:

- Stormwater management: green roofs retain rainfall, helping to reduce runoff volume;
- Urban Heat Island Effect: vegetated rooftops reduce ambient temperatures;
- Air Quality Improvement: vegetation filters pollutants;
- Energy Efficiency: green roofs provide insulation, which reduces heating and cooling demands;
- Biodiversity: they create habitats for pollinators and birds; and
- Noise Reduction: soil and plants can buffer sound, particularly useful in high-density environments.

The draft Sustainability Plan includes opportunities to pilot some green building methods. A number of U.S. and international cities have implemented green roof policies through their building codes or incentive programs. For reference, staff provided examples of cities that have green roof policies. In Dublin, the Dublin Methodist Hospital has a green roof component and there is also one on top of the Riverside Crossing Park Pavilion. There is also an application of a green roof on the Dublin Community Recreation Center (DCRC). The City invests approximately \$12,000 annually in maintenance for the two City-owned green roofs.

Ms. Rauch stated that there are also artificial green roofs, which mimic the appearance and function of natural green roofs without live vegetation. These systems typically use synthetic materials, and while they can provide some aesthetic and minor insulation benefits, they generally do not offer the same environmental advantages as living green roofs. For reference, staff provided some examples of cities that have artificial roof regulations. Ms. Rauch provided the Committee with some thought-provoking questions to facilitate the discussion, including:

- What types of materials should be encouraged (live versus artificial)?
- How should green roofs be incorporated?
- In what areas of the City should these be permitted?

Mr. Reiner provided additional photos for comparison of visible rooftops that do not have a green roof (live or artificial) that he referred to as missed opportunities.

Mr. Reiner asked about the requirements regarding rooftop utilities, such as air conditioning units. Ms. Rauch stated that if it is visible, then a parapet may be required to shield them from view.

Mr. Reiner stated that with all the new rooftops coming in (referencing the West Innovation District and Metro Center), it is time to have a roof ordinance. He stated he

was not sure it was fair to require a live roof because of the expense and complexity. He suggested that there could be a choice of live or synthetic, but it should be required. Mr. Keeler stated that he is supportive of green roofs and reiterated the environmental benefits of them. He stated that the starting point would be to determine whether it is mandated or optional and how, if at all, it is incentivized. His hope is that the City would not have to incentivize a program like this because the developers that would partner with the City would be innovative and forward thinking. Mr. Keeler stated that he prefers the intensive type green roof similar to Restoration Hardware, which has a rooftop restaurant with gardens. He stated it makes sense to recommend these but is unsure if requiring it is fair.

Ms. Fox stated that in an ideal world, the roof needs to be aesthetically pleasing if it is seen. She stated she loves the look of the green roof on the pavilion in Riverside Crossing Park. She asked how intensive the maintenance of these roofs is. Ms. Rauch stated she was not sure what all goes into the maintenance of these roofs, but can bring that information back to the Committee. Ms. Fox stated that even \$6,000 per roof for maintenance is a lot of money. She added that as neighborhoods are developed with living spaces overlooking other living spaces, it would be a worthwhile exercise to explore different rooftop designs because rooftops can be used in a number of ways (rooftop restaurants, work-out areas or gardens). She stated that especially in areas where the rooftop will be within the line of sight, the City could communicate its desire to have rooftops of interest where appropriate. She also suggested that incentivizing for environmental benefits is also a possibility. Her concern with the live green roofs is making sure that they thrive and stay healthy.

Ms. Rauch stated that existing buildings may have an issue with being retro-fitted for a green roof requirement. She asked if the intention was to suggest green roofs moving forward or trying to retro-fit some existing rooftops.

Ms. Fox suggested considering the following as a way forward: coming up with areas where green roofs would be needed/appropriate, what options exist (green roof, paint color etc.), and see what resources other communities are utilizing to make their roofs more attractive.

Mr. Keeler stated that he would like to know if the maintenance cost for the green roofs that we have is \$6,000 more than the maintenance cost of a regular rooftop, because no roof maintenance is free. Artificial turf over a flat roof may increase the lifespan of it. It is worth exploring and he stated that he noticed from the reference materials that Chicago offers an expedited permitting process for developers. He stated that he is supportive of offering incentives. He stated that Metro Center is the perfect environment for this.

Ms. Fox stated that, regardless, it would be nice to create a list of rooftop options for developers to look at in consideration of improving a roof. It would be an opportunity to set expectations and see what incentives could be offered.

Ms. Rauch stated that she agrees that Metro Center is a perfect consideration to explore this further, and those conversations will likely happen as we continue the guidelines and Code considerations. Ms. Rauch stated that staff will look at what

incentives could look like and how this could be incorporated into the Code and bring information back to the Committee.

Mr. Reiner stated that there are different materials that can be used to build outdoor spaces on roofs. He stated that there have been advancements in materials that work well. He stated that the minimum should be green turf and go up from there to living roofs with amenities. He asked if there was a formula that could be used to require areas of the roof to be green space, useable space for sitting or entertainment, etc. He added that the City could establish that a certain portion of the roof must be hard surface, a portion of it plantings, etc. He stated that the minimum should be astro-turf. He encouraged staff to look at existing ordinances in other cities that have these examples.

Mr. Keeler stated that it seems there should be an incentive that could be given to a developer who takes an impervious roof and makes a pervious roof based on the type of roof they create (more incentive to the higher standards). Pervious roofs could open more land because it could reduce the retention requirements.

Mr. Reiner reiterated that he would like this to move along in a timely manner.


Ms. Fox agreed with the discussion but it is important to remember what is practical and affordable. She stated that if the expectation is to do more with the rooftops in certain parts of the City, then we need to show that there is a practical, sensible way to do it using reasonable materials. She added that it is important to show environmental incentives to doing this. She reiterated that the first step is to gather more information and be able to state what environmental impacts there could be as a selling point to doing this.

Ms. Rauch thanked the Committee for their feedback. In response to Ms. Fox's question on her thoughts, Ms. Rauch stated that the incentives could be interesting and determining what that looks like could be interesting. She stated the biggest challenge that she foresees is determining what to do about existing buildings and rooftops. She stated that she is also interested in exploring the areas in the City where this would be appropriate. She stated that she needs to understand the building standards perspective as well as the economic development perspective and maybe even talk with the development community more to understand all sides of the issue.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 6:18 p.m.



Chair, Community Development Committee



Clerk of Council