



DRAFT

**READY FOR APPROVAL AT THE
NEXT MEETING. SEPTEMBER 30TH.**

MEETING MINUTES

Board of Zoning Appeals

Thursday, July 22, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Deschler, Chair, called the July 22, 2021, meeting of the City of Dublin Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted this is the last in-person meeting of the BZA to be held in the Council Chamber at 5200 Emerald Parkway. This meeting was live-streamed on the City's website; public participation and comments relayed to the Board by the meeting moderator using an online form. Beginning in August, all the Board and Commission meetings will be held at 5555 Perimeter Drive in the new Council Chamber in City Hall.

ROLL CALL

Board Members present: Mr. Deschler, Mr. Nigh, Ms. Herbert, Ms. Miller, and Mr. Clower
Staff present: Ms. Noble and Mr. Hounshell

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Clower moved, Ms. Miller seconded, to accept the documents into the record and approve the meeting minutes from April 29, 2021.

Vote: Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Nigh, yes; Ms. Herbert, yes; Ms. Miller, yes; and Mr. Clower, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

CASE PROCEDURES

The Chair briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) and swore in staff and any members of the public who planned to address the Board during the meeting.

CASES

1. Price Residence at 8120 Trails End Drive, 21-096V, Non-Use (Area) Variance

A Non-Use (Area) Variance to Zoning Code §153.190(E)(1)(g) to allow a 3:12 roof pitch that does not meet the minimum roof pitch of the Residential Appearance Code. The 1.29-acre site is zoned Restricted Suburban Residential District and is east of Trails End Drive, ±300 feet north of the intersection with Summit View Road.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Noble presented an aerial view of the site with larger lots in this Scioto Estates neighborhood, platted in the early 1970's; many of the lots have been subdivided. Photographs were shown from a recent site visit – a wooded area with rural roads without curbs and gutters. The architectural styles in this neighborhood are vast. A Residential Appearance Code predates when these 20 plus homes were built. A 3:12 roof pitch is proposed; the requirements are a 6:12 roof pitch for the main roof and a 4:12 roof pitch for secondary architectural features - dormers or porches. The proposed character [shown] is modern with

sharp edges and contrasting colors and building materials. A roof pitch for this architectural style is subtle, entrance ways are not prominent, and the interior space is less identifiable.

This application was reviewed against the Non-Use Variance Review Criteria and staff determined the Special Conditions had been met. It is not a typical suburban subdivision as it is heavily wooded and without a special architectural theme. These conditions are not a result of Applicant Action or Inaction and there is no Substantial Adverse Effect on the surrounding community. The proposal includes high quality materials, and design, and visual interest. Other similar Variances have been granted with conditions consistent with the applicant's proposal so this would not permit Special Privileges to the applicant. Variance requests are extremely rare and Not Recurrent in Nature. The granting of this Variance will not impact the Delivery of Governmental Services such as emergency services, postal delivery or refuse collections and there is no Other Method Available for the applicant or the style of this design would be significantly different. Therefore, staff recommends approval of this Non-Use (Area) Variance to allow a 3:12 roof pitch where a minimum of 4:12 roof pitch is required.

Applicant Presentation

Alan Price, 314 Siebert Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43026, stated they configured the footprint of the house to keep as many trees on the site as possible to construct something unique while keeping traditional natural stone and asphalt shingles.

Board Questions for Applicant

Mr. Deschler asked if the floor plan was already designed with specifications.
Mr. Price answered affirmatively, pending approval of this Variance.

Public Comment

There were no public comments received. Ms. Noble confirmed the neighbors were notified and no comments were received.
Mr. Price said he approached the neighbors on either side of this property and the neighbors that resided across from them and they were supportive.
Ms. Herbert added neighbors' support is not a requirement.

Board Discussion

Ms. Herbert supported the proposal that met the Code requirements and is beautiful.
Mr. Nigh agreed.
Mr. Clower said he visited the area and this house, as proposed, would not look out of place.
Ms. Miller was supportive as the site is appropriate. The home is modern and unique but also ties back to the stacked stone that is prevalent in Dublin.
Mr. Deshler was supportive.

Ms. Herbert moved, Mr. Clower seconded, to approve a Variance to Zoning Code §153.190(E)(1)(g) to allow a 3:12 roof pitch that does not meet the minimum roof pitch of the Residential Appearance Code.

Vote: Mr. Nigh, yes; Ms. Miller, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Clower, yes; and Ms. Herbert, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

2. Shaffer Residence at 6813 Sagestone Drive, 21-099V, Non-Use (Area) Variance

A Non-Use (Area) Variance to the Bishop's Run Section 1 Setback Requirements (Code Section modified by Planning Staff) to allow a pergola to encroach 5 feet into a 32.5-foot rear yard setback. The 0.30-acre site

is zoned Planned Low Density Residential District and is located south of Sagestone Drive, approximately 100 feet west of the intersection with Caraway Avenue.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Hounshell presented an aerial view of the site, located within the Bishop's Run Subdivision with specific requirements to this neighborhood. Zoomed in aerial highlighted the home built in 2007 by the Shaffer's. A patio was approved in 2008, which is 10 feet in depth by 35 feet in width. Photographs of the existing conditions of the rear of the home were shown; the current patio is very narrow.

A Variance is requested for alleviation from the requirements for the rear yard setback. The requirement is 25% of the depth of the lot = 32.5 feet from the rear property line. This would allow a five-foot encroachment into the rear yard setback for the construction of a new pergola over the current patio footprint that encroaches five feet that was permitted for at grade patios and decks. Pergolas do not apply (considered an accessory structure) and are not considered 'open and uncovered'.

The applicant provided a number of items in their statement for the Board's consideration. The applicant was not aware of the rear yard setback requirements when purchasing the property but were aware of the 25-foot, no-build zone (NBZ). A 35-foot building set back in the front eliminates five feet in the rear yard. The neighbors on either side have a 30-foot building setback in the front allowing them an additional five feet in the back. The side-loaded garage pushed the footprint of the building further into the rear of the lot, eliminating any space for development to the rear of the home.

Staff found the site to be typical in terms of its dimensions and configuration on a rectangular lot, with little conditions to it that can be found on similar platted lots. There are no natural features on the site that would impact the design or development to the rear of the lot.

This application was reviewed against the Non-Use Variance Review Criteria as follows:

No Special Conditions specific to this site. Across the City, five-foot setbacks can be staggered to allow for variation in the lot footprints - not all in a straight row.

The Applicant Action/Inaction was not met.

The Impair the Intent and Purpose of the Requirement was not met.

If the accessory structure would be permitted, it would provide the applicant with Special Privileges over adjacent properties that have a similar layout and site dimensions.

Variances for pergola encroachments are not Recurrent in Nature and do not necessitate a Code Modification, meeting the criteria.

This Variance would not affect the Delivery of Governmental Services.

Other Method Available was not met. The applicant prefers to achieve shade of an outdoor area from a permanent structure and did not want to consider other temporary options such as sun sails, umbrellas, or retractable awnings.

Based on the Criteria, Staff recommends disapproval.

Questions for Staff

Ms. Herbert asked for the meaning of 'a visual corridor'.

Mr. Hounshell answered "for the impairment and intent for the purpose of the requirement, a vertical structure/building mass would block the view of the corridor."

Ms. Herbert said the requirement is not in the Code.

Ms. Noble clarified it is meant to create an uninterrupted space in the rear of properties and a building mass would be anything that disrupts that but is not defined in the Code.

Ms. Herbert suggested awnings and landscape could interrupt vistas.

Ms. Noble interprets a structure/building mass as an actual structure.

Ms. Herbert asked staff if this would have an Adverse Effect on the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Hounshell answered affirmatively based on the understanding of the intent of the rear yard setback and how it is to eliminate any visual impairment, in terms of verticality.

Ms. Herbert walked the neighborhood and found many houses with pergolas on Sagestone and some on surrounding streets. She asked if those pergolas would all have a negative impact.

Mr. Hounshell answered those do not encroach into the setbacks.

Ms. Herbert said the pergolas she found were larger than what is proposed, which is very narrow and long. There were only two permits in the Dublin system. There are not many open, visual corridors here. The five foot setback stagger dispels any open corridor.

Ms. Noble said the setback would apply to every other lot.

Mr. Clower asked if the neighborhood was allowed to plant trees in their back yard.

Mr. Hounshell answered landscaping is not prohibited.

Mr. Nigh inquired where the intent is derived from.

Ms. Noble answered staff participates in the writing of these Codes to reflect what the objectives are and they are very common requirements. The "intent" is "why" we put these Codes in place.

Applicant Presentation

Jody Shaffer, 6813 Sagestone, Drive, recounted the restrictions: 12-foot easements, 20-foot NBZ, and 32.5-foot rear yard setback. The neighbor is limited to the same setback (25%) but they have five more feet. They were not aware of this restriction until one year later when they put in a patio and were only permitted five feet. Now, she and her husband are moving forward with adding a pergola.

Ms. Shaffer argued the requirements have been met as follows:

Special Conditions – This is a similar size lot to adjacent properties but additional drainage basin not found in any other yards. The house was built two feet back from the five-foot setback; two feet are lost. There are four past cases whereas the side-load garage pushed the home into the rear yard, resulting in "a unique condition for the site" - Variance granted. The garage is side-loaded. Additional findings from four past cases stated they backed up to a reserve space, making them unique. This is the same. All these cases involve patios, patios with walls (above ground) and they currently exist in this neighborhood. One case was for a sunroom, not just a patio.

Applicant Action/Inaction – The builder determined the location on the lot; we were not involved in that process. For a similar case it was determined "the residence was constructed by a builder in its current location without leaving adequate space for a covered pool." That is the same situation.

Impair the Intent & Purpose of the Requirement – A pergola, for over an existing space, would not extend beyond what is in place and not create an adverse effect. Two neighbors, which support this Variance, have trees blocking the view and would not see the pergola. There is a reserved space behind their lot and there is no development. On two cases, the Boards were quoted as stating "The patio does not affect the surrounding community based on its proximity to an adjacent reserve space." The patio is surrounded by landscape on all sides and have no visual impacts on the surrounding community. Therefore, she believes they would fall within that criteria. In two previous cases, "although there are adjoining side yards to the property, no rear yards are adjacent to the property and the improvements will not expand further to any adjoining neighboring lots. Therefore, this proposal should not provide adverse effects. Ms. Shaffer argued her property has the same conditions. Mr. Hounshell stated earlier the rear yard setbacks are to create open, visual corridors and yet in the last year, one case received a 7.5-foot Variance for a sunroom, which is a structure that goes beyond ground level, has a roof, and four walls approved under a condition on a basis that the improvements would not extend any further towards either neighboring lots. This should be applicable to us; met that condition.

Special Privileges – Denying this Variance would deny the family enjoyment shared by many in the neighborhood and adjacent neighborhoods. She counted five patios, one with an added roof, three to four pergolas, countless patios and patios with walls beyond the setback. The Board was quoted as saying “There are previous cases, which have been approved to allow necessary structures such as patios and decks, which are above ground to encroach into the rear yard setback.” On another case, “The Board granted Variances for similar lot conditions, based on its proximity to a land that is undevelopable, such as a NBZ and open space reserves. Previous cases have been approved to allow accessory structures such as patios that encroach into a rear yard setback. Special privileges would not be granted and the 25-foot NBZ would be maintained.

Other Options – The applicant considered: a roof covered structure but would not meet Code; a small structure could not be built based on the small amount of space between the windows; an awning was not an option as there must be 12 inches of non-obstructive height to attach to the awning and the applicant only has six inches; and wind sails would not be an option as they are considered permanent and require poles that would then encroach.

For all those reasons, the applicant would like the Variance approved.

Board Questions for Applicant

Ms. Herbert asked if this was built by a production builder and not a custom-built home.

Ms. Shaffer stated they had originally planned to purchase a home in another neighborhood but saw this builder was building the house the applicant wanted (on this lot) so they changed neighborhoods.

Mr. Nigh asked what step of the process this house was in when the applicant decided upon this lot.

Ms. Shaffer confirmed the basement was built; they were not asked where they wanted the house placed on the property.

Mr. Clower asked if the applicant considered adding foliage and trees. The neighbor next door basically has an arboretum; their patio is completed surrounded by trees.

Ms. Shaffer answered no because they had a concern putting trees and their root systems that close to the patio that is close to the house.

Ms. Herbert agreed and added there is no visual corridor in the next door neighbor’s yard.

Ms. Herbert inquired about the drainage in the applicant’s back yard.

Ms. Shaffer confirmed they would not be able to plant there.

Mr. Hounshell confirmed the NBZ is consistent along these properties.

Ms. Noble added NBZs are usually placed for the periphery of neighborhoods but no matter where a house is located in this subdivision, the setback requirements apply.

Mr. Deschler asked Ms. Shaffer if she was provided a document when evaluating the purchase of the home.

Ms. Shaffer did not recall any documents prior to closing and only remembers those because they are in a closing binder. Any reference to the 32.5-foot setback not found.

Ms. Noble said all residential neighborhoods have those types of setback requirements and 25% is typical.

Mr. Nigh confirmed it is not the responsibility of the City to provide this information, it is on the builder.

Mr. Hounshell found the NBZ is a requirement throughout the neighborhood - included internal and periphery lots on the plat.

Public Comment

There were no public comments received. Mr. Deschler stated Ms. Shaffer had submitted comments with her application from her neighbors that were supportive of her request for a Variance.

Board Discussion

Ms. Herbert stated land use regulations can be arbitrary. Served on this Board for five years having practiced Land Development Law as an attorney, and disagreed with this particular Planning Staff Report for being arbitrary. In this case, Special Conditions are met due to the drainage engineered into this property, prohibiting use of part of the yard, making it special, different, and unique. She also disagreed with the visual corridor argument. The patio is very narrow, right next to the house. In the past, the Board has consistently determined side-loaded garages are a special condition, especially against an open space, to which this property has. Arbitrary decision opens this Board up to a decision to overturn.

Applicant Action/Inaction – Not convinced. A case in the past, a home was purchased while it was in the process of being built; the Board did not find action/inaction with those cases. To find the opposite here, would be arbitrary. In another case, the contractor had made the mistake. The Board's task is to review in the vein of reasonableness and this does not seem reasonable. Substantial Adverse Effect – Rear yard setbacks and the visual corridor argument sounds like a design principle. Building mass and visual corridor is not in the Code and does not cause adverse effects on the neighborhood. There are a substantial amount of cases with similar circumstances and the Board held the other way. She would be supportive of this Variance request.

Mr. Nigh said trees in the corridor blocked visibility. This pergola would be placed over the narrow patio and would not block views. Two of the members were not on the Board for several of the past cases referenced this evening. It is difficult to say this application is that much different. Adverse Effect does not apply. Applicant Action/Inaction - This home was already under construction.

Mr. Clower stated planting a stand of trees would have more impact on the visual corridor. The Shaffer property is the barest out of all in that entire stretch of housing. Adding a pergola like proposed is not going to change the corridor. Action/Inaction –The applicant purchased the house on the site, partially built. Special Conditions – Not as clear. As the newest member of the Board, leaning on other's expertise.

Ms. Miller agreed with where they have landed on Criteria 2 & 3 but undecided on the first - Special Conditions; the lots are very uniform. Concerned with setting a precedent where everybody claims "they have a special condition".

Mr. Nigh said further discussion regarding the Special Condition is warranted to determine what is unique about Ms. Shaffer's property that sets her apart from the other properties.

Ms. Shaffer answered it would be a combination of things. Yes, many back up to a reserve but only a portion of that number are smaller; fewer lots with the five-foot versus not condition; even fewer with side-load garages. She found only one other property in the entire development that had all those conditions (including a patio with a roof). In addition, her property has a drainage basin. In the past, the Board has determined just one of the conditions noted above was enough to grant a Variance.

Mr. Nigh asked Mr. Hounshell, if after hearing that list of conditions from the applicant and knowing the record of the Board from the past two – three years, if that makes him think this is more unique than originally considered.

Mr. Hounshell answered for the cases from the last nine months to one year that have been brought up this evening, many applied to the builders' not bringing these issues to the attention of the homeowner. Staff notifies homeowners with non-compliant patios. The homeowners in turn claim they did not know – as they had assumed the contractor obtained a permit, for which there was none, and some of those played into Special Conditions.

Mr. Nigh noted past cases where Special Conditions were determined for side-loaded garages.

Ms. Herbert was convinced there are Special Conditions and restated those. When decision-makers like this Board are on the fence, the Supreme Court advises to side with the applicant/property owner. Walked the

neighborhood and counted a minimum of seven pergolas; some include televisions and bars but only found two permits for pergolas filed.

Mr. Deschler asked how the wall on the property is compliant, if everything permitted is flat, as in 2008. Staff stated low walls at the end of a patio of 36" in height or less have been permitted for a decade, only as a practice.

Mr. Deschler said none of the Oak Park cases can be considered as examples of similar cases as those setbacks were significantly different than any other neighborhood in Dublin.

Ms. Herbert said a court looks at those that are so close to this one (Oak Park) when deciding arbitrariness. Mr. Deschler stated testimony in the Oak Park cases where the homeowners were lied to. He was supportive there is no Adverse Effect in this case. Action/Inaction - The applicant had the ability to see what was available at the time and could have asked questions about zoning setbacks or NBZ and a builder is not going to offer that information.

Mr. Clower said the applicant did ask, according to documents submitted.

Ms. Shaffer stated from the very beginning, they made it clear to the builder they would want some sort of outdoor space. The builder told them on numerous occasions that they were only limited to the 25-foot setback so capable of building.

Ms. Herbert believed recent cases match better and are more persuasive than the precedent case provided by staff.

Mr. Clower's understanding was staff used a case as an example in this neighborhood and the intent was to have all the houses as close to the road as possible. That house was willingly built all the way back to the setback.

Mr. Nigh clarified there was a run on Variances in Oak Park.

Ms. Miller was concerned about a precedent that would allow everyone to come forward to state "they had a Special Condition, too", which defeats the purpose of having a Code.

Mr. Clower asked the Board to accept an argument of certain mitigating factors.

Ms. Herbert added courts will review practical difficulty factors and reasonableness.

Mr. Nigh said the courts say it is reasonable not to know these things ahead of time but one cannot omit reading their documents and then claim they did not know.

Ms. Herbert said there are a series of factors reviewed for practical difficulty; basically, buying the property knowing that this restriction is there, is not a factor, if you can believe it; that defeats practical difficulty.

Mr. Deschler noted that when the patio was sought in 2007, the homeowner learned the limitations.

Mr. Deschler asked the applicant, if she considered a Variance on a larger patio at the time with regard to the primary purpose of having a sun-blocked outdoor space.

Ms. Shaffer answered no; they just built the house and did not have the funds to do more.

Mr. Hounshell said the applicant could build a pergola, within the setback with a Certificate of Zoning Approval, but in this case, the pergola then would need to be only 5 feet in depth, which is not usable. He confirmed if an awning or sunshade was sought, they would also need a Variance.

Mr. Clower said literal understanding of the Code would create practical difficulties. A five-foot pergola is falls under practical difficulty.

Ms. Miller agreed.

Mr. Nigh said if the homeowner was permitted the patio in a five-foot area, it is unfair to say they cannot have a pergola in the same space and a five-foot pergola cannot be conceived. Literal enforcement would involve practical difficulty.

Ms. Herbert said the Board would want it to look nice too, and a five-foot pergola would be ridiculous.

Mr. Clower said the only option would be - a temporary tent like one used for tail-gating, which would look a lot worse than a pergola but would not be a problem per the Code. He and Ms. Miller were supportive.

Mr. Deschler said to approve this Variance when the City rejected every criteria, a clear distinction needs to be made.

Ms. Noble said a motion could be made and approved based on the Board determining all the criteria had been met.

Summary of the Board's Comments

Mr. Nigh summarized how the Board found the applicant to have met all three criteria for a Variance request approval:

Special Conditions – A side-loaded garage as there is a small footprint that allows for this patio to be put into place, including five extra feet that is permissible under of the Code; there is an unused area behind it; and there is a drainage area. Other homes do not have all these conditions combined.

Applicant Action/Inaction - The home was selected after the basement was dug.

Adverse Effect – The open-air structure of this nature will not impact the surrounding neighborhood.

Two of the four criteria have been met for the Non-use Variance.

Mr. Nigh moved, Ms. Herbert seconded, to approve a Variance to the Bishop's Run Section 1 Setback Requirements to allow a pergola to encroach 5 feet into a 32.5-foot rear yard setback for the reasons all the criteria have been met based on their findings during review.

Vote: Mr. Clower, yes; Ms. Miller, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Mr. Nigh, yes; and Ms. Herbert, yes.
[Motion carried 5-0]

3. Dublin 2035 Framework

The Chair said this is an overview of the Dublin 2035 Framework visioning process and a facilitated discussion with the Board to provide their transformative ideas for the future of the City of Dublin.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Noble explained what, why, and how this vision plan project for the City will move forward through the next 15 years. City Council will prioritize how this will be completed, which will translate to Community Plan Updates and all the big policy documents. Dublin 2035 was started prior to February of 2021 when it was officially initiated by City Council. There are three major milestones: 1. Initial generation of 'Big Ideas' at the City Council level. The Council committees engaged the Department Directors through two rounds of discussion in April and May, furthering ideas; 2. Additional Ideas, Research, and Insights is the milestone they are currently operating, incorporating additional stakeholders (residents, business communities, and schools) for expert perspectives along with the Board and Commission Members; and 3. Refinement and Priorities derived from all this public engagement to refine the initial 'Big Ideas' based on key findings. A preliminary list was created for Council's review to determine which initiatives should move forward [shown.] Ultimately, the goals will be adopted and implemented through Council's direction starting in 2022.

City Council identified 10 Guiding Principles and the action associated with each [shown.] They divided the 'Big Ideas' into four themes: Quality of Life; Infrastructure; Land Use; and Economics. A significant number of topics were interrelated, providing opportunities for overlap, ultimately coming together as one group of 'Big Ideas'. These were listed in the Potential, Elevated Big Ideas Matrix [shown], and organized under the four themes. No ideas from the initial list have been discounted but have been preliminarily identified as primary or secondary ideas. Additional ideas from the community and committee will be added to this list throughout the process.

In June 2021, Council engaged an expert, Futurist – Nik Badminton, for a work session and a robust discussion. Public Engagement, which is active now (July and August 2021) in staffed and unstaffed

locations (plazas, farmer's market, etc.) gather input or answer questions through the engagement of the public and stakeholders; a 2035 Questionnaire, web presence and social media push; postcards to all residents; the Dublin business community and Township; Dublin City Schools; and the Boards and Commission. There have been over 500 responses in just a couple of weeks. The Board Members were asked if they have had time to consider transformative big ideas of their own with no concern for cost or how the ideas could become a reality. No idea is too big or too small to share and encouraged the Board to include inspirational pictures to help tell their idea for how they envision the Dublin Community in the future.

Ms. Herbert stated Blazer Parkway corridor could use a facelift similar to Bridge Park that is walkable, has entertainment, restaurants and retail, etc. The City is doing that somewhat on the corner of Blazer and Rings Roads.

Ms. Noble clarified the Dublin Corporate Area Plan highlighted that area.

Ms. Herbert said there is a lot of vacant space back there that could use walkable options. Companies in general want to go to the suburbs. Dublin is one of the great suburbs to have a big business because people want to be here, live here, and be in close proximity to work. There is a re-imagining of the office; there is a huge opportunity in that corridor to bring in a lot of revenue. People desire walkability, connectivity, and bike paths, etc.

Ms. Miller said changes in technology are not woven enough through all of the categories in the Matrix. The Code will need to be changed and should be worked on right now as electric cars are going to need to be charged at home. Some of the big ideas have almost passed in the sense of everyone gets it lets pull it off the list and start immediately. There is a lot of older stock here, which is going to need rehabilitation. Start thinking about infrastructure through economics. What incentives are, how we can support people coming into the area taking an older home, bring it up to a current code, including electrical and so on. More options and incentives for homeowners to opt in for green choices are needed. Need coordinated effort to make it easier for builders and homeowners to get solar panels. We know where it is going and might as well get in front of it. Go back to older office parks and add them to the blends of Bridge Park. Beyond bike access in green areas, consider alternative delivery vehicles (golf carts) and construct areas appropriate.

Mr. Clower suggested affordable housing for young people, without having to drive everywhere, like Bridge Park.

Lesson the amount of parking in parking garages.

Lesson restrictions like single-family zoning to allow small, row-type houses to be built on relatively skinny lots (Netherlands or London) in very dense, walkable areas with three or four levels with built-in commercial on the bottom. Consider significantly thinner streets with space for only two cars and a parking space and use that as additional space for bike lanes and sidewalks to slow speeds through neighborhoods.

More transit options.

A dense node within a mile and a half of each other that have train networks connecting them. Build that little node and reserve the outside area of the node for 10 years, sell after that and everyone that wants to develop in that area means they already have this core little node connected to a little tram connected to all the other little nodes. Space those nodes out and allow them to grow together. Blazer Parkway for example, diagonally from the Field of Corn, there is a big open field that could be one neighborhood, allowing a tram network to loop through. There are two or three other relatively small fields we could fit five different commercial areas and 20 or 30 households connected via a tram system, incentivising people to be in all those areas and then you significantly restrict the amount of parking that residents are allowed to have – maybe build one parking garage at the end. The only roads people would be allowed to use are for bicycles, delivery vehicles, and emergency services. Neighborhoods within a quarter mile of a mobility

hub with transit that loops through. Add a commercial hub because there are so many areas within Dublin that requires a 10 – 15 minute drive to get to the closest restaurant. Provide one or two little commercial activities at the end.

The other members agreed Mr. Clower would be a valuable resource for this project as he has many ideas.

Ms. Herbert asked how the committees were selected.

Ms. Noble answered the committees were formed by City Council and function on a regular basis, comprised of Council members and city staff.

Ms. Herbert suggested a focus group could work with some of these committees.

Mr. Clower volunteered to help these committees. There is a whole generation of people like him who watch planning videos on YouTube.

Ms. Herbert suggested trams are needed to accomplish ideas. The Big Idea Matrix raises an excellent point about connectivity. There are a lot of neighborhoods that do not even have sidewalks and there are a lot of kids in Dublin that use the bike paths making it a very unique neighborhood.

Mr. Clower added there are a lot of great trails. With a city-wide greenway, he can just about get anywhere he wants to in Dublin via a bike path but it takes 15 - 20 minutes to get to a restaurant or grocery store.

Ms. Noble thanked the Board for their participation and appreciated the comments and suggested the Board continues to send thoughts offline to Jennifer Rauch the primary contact or herself as the secondary.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Hounshell stated packet materials will be loaded to OneDrive once again, instead of being emailed. Training can be provided. Three new interns have started in Planning: Madison Richard, Madeline Capka, and Nicole Hall. Ms. Richard and Ms. Capka are here tonight and also attended the Architectural Review Board meeting, the night before. The next regular meeting of the BZA is scheduled for August 26, 2021, and will be held in-person at the new, City Hall Council Chamber at 5555 Perimeter Drive.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Chair, Board of Zoning Appeals

Administrative Assistant II, Recorder