



Memo

Office of the Planning Division

5200 Emerald Parkway • Dublin, OH 43017-1090

Phone: 614-410-4400 • Fax: 614-410-4490

To: Members of Dublin City Council
From: Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager
Date: April 12, 2022
Initiated By: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Director of Planning
Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Re: Residential Development Standards Update

Summary

City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) desire to create more creative and sustainable residential neighborhoods in Dublin, relative to open spaces, amenities, setbacks, and lot coverage. The current Code requirements for single-family, residential design are not achieving the desired outcome, as stated by both groups. In response, Planning staff facilitated a discussion with PZC on several occasions within the last year and then met with the individual Commission members to identify their largest concerns, as well as identify specific residential neighborhoods that capture both preferred and not preferred design elements. Planning staff has synthesized the comments provided by the Commission and have worked with our consultant to formulate a range of design recommendations that potentially address these concerns. The recommended design solutions are outlined below for Council's initial review and feedback prior to proceeding with the development of a final document for implementation.

Background

The topic of residential development standards was initially referred to the Planning and Zoning Commission by City Council on June 22, 2020 following concerns related to the approval of two residential developments at that time, Hamlet on Jerome and Oak Park. The Commission was introduced to the topic at their August 20, 2020 meeting and subsequently discussed it on October 1, 2020. The Commission's discussion centered on defining a holistic intent for future residential developments for quality housing projects that are timeless, provide a sense of community, and maintain the character of Dublin. The members wanted to refrain from being so prescriptive as to limit development and design opportunities. The Commission discussed the opportunity to understand the community's needs and wants for housing, as well as understand what other communities are seeing with regard to residential development. They expressed an intent in retaining the City's existing Code standards for typical, lower density suburban developments with exemptions for pocket of developments of higher density that could be considered if the necessary quality of life attributes are provided.

Since these initial discussions, the Commission and City Council have had further discussions as a result of additional residential projects such as the Dublin Gateway, the Overlook at Tartan Ridge and Ayrshire. These projects have continued to raise the topics of lot coverage, building coverage, setbacks, building materials, open space amenities and connectivity. The topic of residential development standards and recent variance applications at the Board of Zoning Appeals were also discussed as part of the joint meeting between the Boards, Commission and Council on December 14, 2020.

As part of their work plan for 2021, the Commission identified the residential development standards topic as item to cover in the latter part of the year. Staff outlined a comprehensive work plan for the development of the project at the November 4, 2021 PZC meeting and provided an overview of the existing regulations in place that govern residential development (see attached). The Commission supported the proposed plan, provided additional feedback on the topic, and recommended the proposed solution should focus on residential projects as part of the PUD process, given the limited amount of standard zoning districts remaining for residential development.

The work plan included holding a series of workshops in January 2022 for the Commission members and the incoming and outgoing City Council representatives. Staff requested members review a series of discussion topics to provide feedback, which included identifying the different housing types and details to further study, information about housing types, trends and consumer needs to inform the conversation, and specific dimensional standards to require. The members were also asked to provide examples of residential developments (local/national/international) for discussion. A summary of the feedback provided and recommended solutions to address the residential development standards is provided below.

Workshop Results

Staff created a matrix, included as an attachment, of favorite and least-favorite residential developments from around the country and determined the shared design characteristics that could be translated into policies or goals. Further, members also provided feedback on individual topics of concern, which were then ranked based on the number of members that had the concern. Finally, potential solutions were also ranked, based on the comments provided by the members.

The largest overall concerns expressed by members included the desire for neighborhoods of all scales to be organized around a purposeful open space network, a pedestrian oriented streetscape character that is not dominated by garages and driveways, high-quality of building materials, and the need for higher quality in exchange for higher density. Some of the lesser concerns included the need to account for outdoor spaces on private lots at the early stages of the review process, and narrow side yards that are often inconsistent with the proportions of the front façade of various types of housing.

Staff took the feedback and outlined a series of solutions that were broken down into specific topic areas that included setbacks and side yards, narrow lots and density, open space (public and private), architecture and building materials, and review process and implementation. Potential design considerations included the following ideas:

- Obtain commitments for layout, architecture, materials, open space arrangements at Concept Plan and ensure these are not eroded as the project moves through the approval process;
- Use open space to organize a project, while celebrating each site's distinctive features. In instances where a site does not have distinctive features, create a sense of place with new open spaces;
- Allow for pockets of density in appropriate locations;
- Use building envelopes as a tool to clearly delineate both building and private outdoor space locations on each lot;
- Avoid continual garage doors facing public roads.

- Be flexible on PUD setback requirements, if it helps encourage high-quality, creative design;
- Small side yards permitted when offset by larger front and rear yards;
- Allow taller homes to offset lot coverage concerns;
- Allow for accessory dwelling units, co-housing, granny flats, etc;
- Create exceptional and walkable streets through proven design techniques;
- Provide unique, high-quality façade materials; and/or
- Some other feature, approach, or product that the City has not seen before, but will address a stated need.

Proposed Design Solutions

Planning staff and our consultant used the potential considerations outlined above to create a series of design solutions that could be used to evaluate future residential development projects to ensure the City's desired design quality is met. A summary of these design solutions are attached and focus on three categories with specific recommendations included within each. These categories include the public realm in a larger sense or "macro" level, the public realm in a smaller sense or "micro" level, and the private realm, which build upon each other.

Public realm (macro level)

The first category focuses on the public realm in a larger sense and organizing neighborhoods around open space. This includes preserving existing natural features and streetscapes, fronting homes on the open space, sensitively locating open space and not limiting it to the perimeter of the site or areas reserved for stormwater retention.

Public realm (micro level)

The second category focuses on the public realm at a smaller scale and primarily addresses streetscape character. This includes encouraging side and rear loaded garages that are accessed by alleyways, providing a minimum setback for front and side loaded garages, and providing location and size considerations for porches to encourage interaction between the public and private realm. It also addresses building materials and architectural diversity that is sensitive to its surroundings, incorporate a variety of types of units and scale, include architectural themes and allow higher density housing in appropriate areas.

Private realm

The third category addresses how individual lots are developed and includes considerations for building location, identifying areas for buildable area, private open space, and vehicular areas. It also addresses setbacks and yard requirements including front build-to zones, side yards that are proportionate to the building mass, and the incorporation of unique lot arrangements.

Recommendation and Next Steps

Planning staff recommends City Council review and provide feedback on the attached proposed design solutions. Following City Council's input, staff will develop a formal document with the solutions, including graphics to illustrate the desired outcome and bring it forward for review and acceptance. Staff has outlined the following questions to facilitate the discussion.

- 1) How do the proposed design solutions address the concerns raised about the quality desired for single-family residential development?

- 2) Are there additional solutions that should be included and addressed?
- 3) Does City Council support the approach that these requirements apply only to PUD projects?
- 4) Does City Council have a preference regarding the review process for the final document? Should it be forwarded to the Commission for recommendation to Council, or retained at the Council level?
- 5) Other considerations or concerns of City Council.

Proposed Residential Development Standards 041222 DRAFT

Demonstration of all of these objectives would be considered mandatory for all new residential development projects within the PUD process.

Neighborhood Organized Around a Framework of Open Spaces/Natural Features ("Macro" Public Realm)

Criteria:

- Preservation of existing natural features into open spaces and streetscapes.
- Creation of new open spaces as focal points and gathering areas within neighborhood.
- Homes front onto open spaces and preservation areas.
- Open space is not limited to outer perimeter of neighborhood or behind lots.
- Open space is not limited to areas occupied by stormwater management facilities.
- Connections are provided to contextual sidewalk and shared-use path systems

Streetscape Character ("Micro" Public Realm)

Garages and Driveways

Criteria:

- Alley-accessed rear and side loaded garages strongly encouraged.
- Street-accessed front and side loaded garages set back 20' minimum from front façade of home.
- Driveway 20' maximum width at right-of-way.

Front Façade of Home

Criteria:

- Porches and stoops sized for useable front porches or stoops
- Front façade of home sited for conversational distance between public sidewalk and porch or stoop.
- Front façade of home (entry door façade) must be located within build-to-zone is measured to façade of home with main entrance--porches and stoops intended to encroach toward sidewalk.
- Garage presence is minimized on front façade of home (see Garages and Driveways).

Building Materials

Criteria:

- Architectural style and exterior materials are 'of the place', or based on local building traditions and material resources.

Architectural Diversity

Criteria:

- Incorporation of a variety of home types and sizes in same block for large scale proposals
- Creation of unique architectural themes with diverse facade designs for small scale infill proposals
- Allow for pockets of higher density housing within appropriate areas of large scale development proposals, with the average density consistent with the Community Plan and other adopted area plans and policies.

Building Sites (Private Realm)

Building Envelope/Buildable Area

Criteria:

- Identify buildable area limits of lot (home, structures with foundations), private open space limits (patios, decks, pools, etc.), and vehicular use areas (driveways and garages) on all proposed lots and for all proposed dwelling unit types.
- Define maximum extents of private open space limits as a proportion of the buildable area limits, while ensuring a minimum area of functional private open space is provided in all instances.

Minimum Setbacks and Yard Requirements

Criteria:

- Front build-to-zone dimensions established to facilitate conversational distance between sidewalk and front porch or stoop.
- Minimum side yard dimensions based on proportions of proposed building at the build-to-zone (height and width)
- Incorporate unique yard arrangements to respond to innovative building plans, such as zero setback side lot line where rear-loaded, narrow deep house plans are proposed in order to provide private open space along opposite side of home.

Summary of Favorite/Least Favorite Examples of Residential Development
(italicized are staff clarifications)

	Favorite Examples	Least Favorite Examples
PZC 1	<u>El Dorado Hills, CA</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Notice a lack of cul-de-sacs. 'Organic grid' street network responds to topography</i> 	<u>Craughwell Village</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nice project overall, but poorly integrated to nearby Perimeter Center
	<u>Killilea-Cardinal</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good relationship between adjacent land uses. 	<u>Most Neighborhoods along Hyland-Croy Road</u>
PZC 2	<u>Upper Arlington</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smaller homes, but with brick look great 	<u>None Specified</u>
PZC 3	<u>Muirfield Village</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Curvilinear streets ▪ Buildings and materials mutually enhance each other ▪ Variety of housing types ▪ Golf course is the placemaking piece, along with country club 	<u>Cottages at Ballantrae</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Houses too close together ▪ No outdoor space ▪ Higher density would be okay with useable open spaces nearby.
	<u>Edwards Neighborhood Launch at Gay Street</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Walk-up project with stoops connecting right to the street ▪ Visually beautiful architecture ▪ Planting beds adjacent to brick sidewalks 	
	<u>Robert A.M. Stern</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kiawah Island, SC Residence. Timeless architecture (<i>Shingle Style</i>) ▪ NYC--Affordable Housing Concept 	
	<u>Pocket Neighborhoods/Empty Nester Homes</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site plan is important ▪ Co-housing concept with different age groups ▪ Shared maker space and support amenities 	
	<u>Villas at Ballantrae</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall layout with alleys with entry features ▪ Close together homes 	
PZC 4	<u>Greystone Mews</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Twin singles with rear loaded, alley accessed garages</i> 	<u>None Expressed</u>
	<u>Village at Coffman Park</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>SF Detached 1-story to 1.5 story homes</i> 	
PZC 5	<u>Bungalow Heaven, Pasadena, CA</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Historic district of turn of century craftsman-style bungalow homes</i> ▪ <i>Centrally located park within a gridded street network</i> 	<u>None Expressed</u>
	<u>Modern Home Neighborhoods--Nashville, TN</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Narrow lots with tall, narrow, and deep 2-story homes.</i> ▪ <i>Facades composed of Intersecting 'boxes' with flat or shed roofs and deep overhangs</i> 	
	<u>Pocket Neighborhoods</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>See book for examples</i> 	
PZC 6	<u>Windsor—New Albany, OH</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No garages, homes close to street 	<u>None Expressed</u>
	<u>Bristol Commons—Dublin, OH</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wide yards/lots with few front facing garages ▪ Most garages are side loaded ▪ High quality driveway materials 	

	<u>Rosemary Beach—Seaside, FL</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dense, intense, close to street, high lot coverage Context of green space matters 	
	<u>Asherton of Dublin</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green space around fingers of development as a conservation-ish design to buffer from single-family development Lots of lakes and paths, mounds at perimeter 	
PZC 7	<u>Village at Coffman Park</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Units front onto open space Pond, porches, detached garages, adjacent to mixed uses (school, park, work) <i>SF Detached 1-story to 1.5 story homes</i> 	<u>None Expressed</u>
	<u>New Albany, OH</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common open spaces Good examples overall Denser portions controlled by development company 	
PZC 8	<u>Muirfield</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall density is good High quality materials and architecture—garage doors are managed well 	<u>None Expressed</u>

Common Characteristics of Favorite and Least Favorite Residential Developments	
Favorite Examples	Least Favorite Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variety of unit types within the development Few cul-de-sacs. Street networks are gently curvilinear interconnected 'organic grid' Neighborhoods integrated with nearby schools, parks, workplaces. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-family poorly integrated with nearby complementary commercial uses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Garages side-loaded or rear-located and often accessed via alleys Front elevations feature large useable porches and stoops connected to the streetscape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Front loaded garages dominate front elevation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smaller units and higher densities are okay ONLY IF high quality site plans, unit design, and materials 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Useable, common open space integrated into the development with units facing open space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unuseable open spaces in residual, undevelopable portions of site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrow lots but with taller units close to street and garages at rear of lot accessed via alley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrow lots with little space between units and front yard dominated by driveway, garage doors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cohousing concept with shared community house and other facilities 	

Summary of Residential Development Concerns and Potential Solutions										
Overall Concerns	Stakeholder/Interviewee									
	BZA	PZC 1	PZC 2	PZC 3	PZC 4	PZC 5	PZC 6	PZC 7	PZC 8	TOTAL
▪ Streetscape character and place-making suffers when dominated by Garage Doors —put them on side or in back		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8
▪ Quality of Building Materials & architectural details		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8
▪ Need for Higher Quality in exchange for Higher Densities		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	7
▪ Narrow Lots result in Garage and Driveway comprising majority of house frontage, developers resistant to alleys		X	X		X	X	X	X		6
▪ Setbacks and Buildable Area —eliminate need for variances for outdoor spaces	X	X	X				X	X		5
▪ Small Sideyards , no room even for AC Units, Side Windows adjacent to side windows			X				X	X		3
▪ Homes are built to maximize lot coverage; subsequent owner has No Room for Outdoor Space	X							X		2



Office of the Planning Division
5200 Emerald Parkway • Dublin, OH 43017-1090
Phone: 614-410-4400 • Fax: 614-410-4490

Memo

To: Members of Dublin City Planning and Zoning Commission
From: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Director of Planning
Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner
Date: October 7, 2021
Re: Guidance on General Residential Development Standards

Summary

The Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council have expressed interest in creating more creative and sustainable residential neighborhoods in Dublin. There have been additional comments and concerns expressed about setbacks and lot coverage, along with an overall desire to create more meaningful open spaces and amenities. The topic of residential design patterns have been discussed over the course of several meetings in 2020 and 2021, but given the Commission's workload this topic had been deferred. Planning staff has provided background information, history and next steps to address the topic knowing the scope of this investigation needs to be comprehensive. Planning has outlined a phased approach to tackle this project with solutions that will address the variety of concerns, from the most specific architectural details to the overall layout of an entire neighborhood. A work plan is outlined below.

Background

The topic of residential development standards was initially referred to the Planning and Zoning Commission by City Council on June 22, 2020 following concerns related to the approval of two residential developments at that time, Hamlet on Jerome and Oak Park. The Planning and Zoning Commission was introduced to the topic at their August 20, 2020 meeting and subsequently discussed it on October 1, 2020. The Commission's discussion centered on defining a holistic intent for future residential developments for quality housing projects that are timeless, provide a sense of community, and maintain the character of Dublin. The members want to refrain from being so prescriptive as to limit development and design opportunities. The Commission discussed the opportunity to understand the community's needs and wants for housing, as well as understand what other communities are seeing with regard to residential development. They expressed an intent in retaining the City's existing Code standards for typical, lower density suburban developments with exemptions for pocket of developments of higher density that could be considered if the quality of life attributes are provided.

Since these initial discussions, the Commission and City Council have had further discussions as a result of additional residential projects such as the Dublin Gateway, the Overlook at Tartan Ridge and Ayrshire. These projects have continued to raise the topics of lot coverage, building coverage, setbacks, building materials, open space amenities and connectivity. The topic of residential development standards and recent variance applications at the Board of Zoning

Appeals were also discussed as part of the joint meeting between the Boards, Commission and Council on December 14, 2020. Staff sees all of these concerns, including appearance standards, as one large project with multiple facets and potential solutions.

Current Code Analysis

There are a number of existing Zoning Code regulations and design standards that apply to residential developments. Staff has summarized how each applies below for the Commission's reference.

Residential Appearance Standards (Code Section 153.190)

- Applies to single-, two-, and three-family dwelling units.
- Applies to all residential districts, including PUDs where a PUD is silent on the topic. New PUDs are required to comply with these as minimum requirements.
- These are the only design standards that apply to properties with standard district zoning, which account for 21% of land (3,414 acres out of 16,019 total acres), and of that 7.5% is undeveloped.
- Regulations outline materials, foundation exposure, four-sided architecture, and minimum required design elements.
- Garage door placement and size are discussed in detail.
- Vinyl-clad homes have additional requirements: shutters, mantels, gingerbread, masonry water table/plinth, and/or gable vent.

Lot and Yard Space Requirements (Code Section 153.071)

- Apply within all districts, including PUDs. Requirements may vary with PUDs depending on the desired character of the neighborhood.
- Open yards are required, except for fencing, per code; some encroachments are permitted.
- Maximum lot coverage in R-12 (Urban Residential District) is 70%; maximum lot coverage for all other residential districts is 45%.
- Defines maximum lot coverage includes all hard surfaces beyond structures (driveways, pedestrian areas, patios, etc.).
- When a PUD is silent, buildings and hard surfaces have a maximum coverage of 45%.

Planned Unit Development (Code Section 153.055)

- Allow greater design review and site response than required in standard zoning districts through creative design and proper relationships between buildings and the land.
- General development criteria include: percentages of lot coverage and building setbacks; sizes of yards and other spaces; arrangement of developed areas relative to open spaces; transitional areas; and bulk and height of buildings.
- Open space is specifically described, in order to: create large, usable areas; preserve the natural environment; connect to other natural/open areas.
- Pedestrian, bike, and vehicular circulation is described in detail, including requirements to preserve natural features and minimize cut and fill requirements.
- Recent standard language in PUDs has stated that these projects shall comply with the Residential Appearance Standards, unless altered by the City. The intent of the Residential Appearance Standards is to provide a minimum standard, and in PUDs the expectation is an increased design character.

Conservation Design (Resolution 27-04)

- Stresses creative site planning, design flexibility to assure quality of life and retention of business.
- Applies to PUDs, based on guidance from the Community Plan, specifically relating to buffers along stream corridors and the creation of a rural edge along the western city boundary.
- City recommends cluster residential development adjacent to the new metro park (now Glacier Ridge North and South) on the western edge.
- Acknowledges that previous residential subdivisions have similar layouts and appearances and desires to avoid repetition.
- At least 50% open space is required for new development adjacent to river corridors, metro parks, or at the outskirts of the city.
- Requires “clustering of available density onto smaller, grouped, individual building areas”. 75% of houses should be adjacent to open space, dwelling units are clustered, detention/retention basins are part of common open space, open space shall meet specific aspect ratios.
- Requires submittal of a “conservation design layout” with concept plans.

This information provides the Commission with a starting point from which to provide further direction for residential development. Additionally, the specific tasks and homework below will build upon that direction to inform our future residential design standards.

Work Plan

Staff has identified a number of tasks to help breakdown the discussion and make progress on the residential design standard topic. The proposed work plan includes tasks initiated by staff, and, importantly, tasks completed by the Commission to provide detailed direction to staff moving forward.

Staff Tasks

Planning staff has begun working on gathering information and background on potential solutions and discussion topics related to residential development standards. Planning staff has contacted Building Standards to identify any new materials that ought to be included with a Residential Appearance Standards update (i.e. extruded foam architectural details), which can add greatly to a structure’s character. Staff also requested feedback on currently permitted materials that are not performing as expected (i.e. general discussions about removing vinyl as an approved material in all applications). Additionally, staff recommends a discussion with the Building Industry Association to understand the perspective of local residential developers. The results of these findings will be added to the results of the Planning and Zoning Commission tasks and included in the proposed deliverables.

Planning and Zoning Commission Tasks

Staff anticipates continued active discussion with the Commission on this topic. In order to help facilitate the discussion, staff requests the Commission review the following discussion items as part of a future conversation. Staff will schedule time to meet with the Commissioners to understand their reactions and thoughts.

- a) Different housing types have different lot coverages, setbacks, and overall appearances. What housing types should be studied further (i.e. patio homes vs. large lot houses) to understand and learn about the standard definitions and practices specific to these types?
- b) What types of background and information would be helpful to understand the current housing types, development trends, and/or customer desires in the state/nationally? Note that this will be part of the upcoming Dublin Housing Study, ETA TBD.
- c) Are there specific lot coverages, setbacks, and overall appearances that we want to hold fast, regardless of housing type? The maximum percentage of lot or building coverage in Historic Dublin might be a model to examine.
- d) What other topics/areas of concern should be discussed?

In addition to understanding the Commissioner's input on the questions above, staff requests the Commission provide examples (local/national/ international) of what is preferred or not, with an explanation of why. This information will be used to help the Commission and staff discern areas of agreements and areas of divergence. Specific instructions on this exercise and meetings with staff will be forthcoming.

Following the collection of this information, staff will be hosting a workshop with the Commission and provide an opportunity to conduct a visual preference survey. This will allow staff and Commission to review the material together and discuss how to move forward.

Potential Solutions and Deliverables

Based on the outcome of staff's research and the Commission's input on the above topics and homework, Staff's will outline a series of solutions that address the outcomes. These could include:

- Consider updates to Residential Appearance Standards or General Development Standards.
- Consider creation of a policy document/resolution to provide greater guidance for overall residential development.
- Consider an update or repeal of the Conservation Design Resolution.
- Consider any additional identifies tools (resolutions, guidelines, policies) that will meet the goals and intents identified by the Commission.

Request

Staff requests the Planning and Zoning Commission affirm the recommended approach.



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 4, 2021 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

5. Residential Development Standards 21-152ADM

Administrative Request

Proposal: An introduction to consider updates to the residential development standards including the minimum requirements applicable to new residential development.

Applicant: Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager, City of Dublin

Planning Contacts: Sarah T. Holt, AICP, ASLA, Senior Planner and Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Director

Contact Information: 614.410.4662, sholt@dublin.oh.us and 614.410.4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-152

RESULT: Introduction to updates to the Residential Development Standards regarding lot coverage, building coverage, setbacks, building materials, open space and connectivity. The overview identified the complexity of the standards, along with a proposed work schedule and next steps. A discussion of how this initiative fits with the upcoming Housing Study also ensued. Discussion included how many potential acres would really be affected by changed residential appearance standards, rather than Planned Unit District standards. Based on the answer being "very few", the Commission encouraged Staff to focus on infill and PUDs and not concentrate so much on the Residential Development Standards.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Mark Supelak	Absent
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes
Kim Way	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

89A2885342A048D...
 Sarah Tresouthick Holt, AICP, ASLA
 Senior Planner



5. Residential Development Standards, Administrative Request, 21-152ADM

Consideration of updates to the residential development standards including the minimum requirements applicable to new residential development.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Holt provided a brief presentation. The topic of residential development standards was initially referred to the Planning and Zoning Commission by City Council on June 22, 2020 due to concerns related to the approval of two residential developments at that time, Hamlet on Jerome and Oak Park. The topic was introduced to the Planning and Zoning Commission at their August 20, 2020 meeting, and the Commission subsequently discussed it on October 1, 2020. They expressed a desire to define a holistic intent for future residential developments, for quality housing projects that are timeless, provide a sense of community, and maintain the character of Dublin. Since those initial discussions, the Commission and City Council have had further discussions concerning certain residential projects. Those projects raised the issues of lot coverage, building coverage, setbacks, building materials, open space amenities and connectivity. Residential development standards and recent Board of Zoning Appeals variance applications were discussed at the joint Council and Board and Commission meeting on December 14, 2020. A balance is needed between the high quality Dublin expects and its Dublin character. At the same time, there is a need not to be too prescriptive, which would limit opportunities. There is a need to maintain the lower density design for which Dublin is known, while also allowing for pockets of higher density where warranted. There are a number of existing Zoning Code regulations and design standards that apply to residential developments. Those include the Residential Appearance Standards (Code Section 153.190); Lot and Yard Space Requirements (Code Section 153.071); Planned Unit Development (Code Section 153.055); and Conservation Design (Resolution 27-04). A work plan for consideration of this topic is introduced tonight, with continued discussion anticipated. In order to help facilitate the discussion, staff requests the Commission review the questions provided for a future conversation. Staff will schedule time to meet with the Commissioners to understand their thoughts. In addition to the Commissioners' input on the questions provided, staff requests Commission members to provide examples (local/national/ international) of what is preferred or not, with an explanation. This information will be used to help identify areas of agreements or divergence. Specific instructions on this exercise and meetings with staff will be forthcoming. Following the collection of this information, a workshop will be scheduled to provide Commissioners an opportunity to conduct a visual preference survey. After review of the material, steps for moving forward will be determined. The City also is undertaking a Housing Study. Although a separate project, that study will dovetail with this one. Staff would like to ascertain if the Commission is satisfied with the proposed approach.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier stated that the information indicated all the places in the Code where this issue arises, and that is problematic for applicants, as there are too many places within the Code that they must go to find the requirements for lot size, setbacks, etc. Those references may not be conflict, but if it were possible, it would be desirable to provide clearer pathways for applicants to find the information needed.

Mr. Way stated that there are many resources available that address housing. The National Association of Homebuilders has resources and case studies regarding many types of housing

occurring across the nation. It would be beneficial to tap into that information and learn what is happening nationally and within the Midwest Region. Developers are testing unique ways of achieving more density, and there are opportunities for different housing types in Dublin. Perhaps a speaker for the National Association of Homebuilders might be scheduled to share information on this topic with the Commission.

Ms. Fox stated that instead of looking at what has been developed in the City, we should look for other development options. Great housing developments are occurring outside the City, and the Commission needs to have more information on those. Pocket neighborhoods, for instance, provide a higher density within an attractive environment that also offers social connections. She would be interested in hearing from real estate agents, who can share homebuyers' interests.

Mr. Way stated that there is also a need for affordable homes, which are becoming more difficult to find in Dublin. We do not want to price ourselves out of a market that keeps this community diverse.

Ms. Fox stated that she is interested in knowing what areas and how many acres that are zoned Residential remain in the City. Additionally, Dublin has the reputation of being a green community, and the relationship between homes and the natural environment is paramount. Therefore, it is essential to identify inventive housing opportunities without losing Dublin's green environment. If we can do that, the product will be timeless.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission does not necessarily view developments in the past tense. We need to have more encompassing, conceptual views of those developments to compare with new applications. Applications for small townhomes often cost the same as single-family homes on larger lots. Having a "30,000 foot overview" of our developments would be helpful. Most homebuyers prefer a larger lot, if available. Availability does not always drive desirability.

Mr. Fishman stated that he would rather see smaller homes with high quality construction that are affordable. There are some communities in some cities, such as Chicago, which have very small houses. However, people want to live there because of the quality and setting. Small, quality and affordable homes are preferable to large homes with slim brick and fiberglass siding, which deteriorate. Concrete or brick driveways also are preferable to asphalt driveways. Cheap construction ages quickly. It is essential to maintain our standards for quality building products. He agrees with Ms. Fox that the setting is also important.

Ms. Fox stated she agrees. There are new materials available, however, which the Commission could investigate that may offer opportunity to reduce the building costs. Concrete and brick driveways, for example, are expensive. Council member Keeler recently restored his older home and installed a beautiful shoot and chip driveway. It is attractive but much less expensive.

Ms. Call inquired if there was any additional guidance Commission members wished to provide. There was none.

Ms. Holt stated that she has noted the Commissioners' comments. She believes many of the items on which the Commissioners have expressed interest will be identified in the housing study. In regard to Ms. Fox's earlier comment – she has done a quick calculation based on recent GIS mapping. The Residential Appearance Standards apply to the City's remaining undeveloped acres with straight zoning. Out of 16,019 acres, only 256 acres remain of undeveloped straight zoned residential.

Mr. Fishman observed that amount is essentially the size of a golf course.

Ms. Fox stated that in that case, we are primarily dealing with infill, mixed use and higher density. There is no need to spend much time addressing the 256 acres; it can remain straight zoning with 45% lot coverage. Instead, we need to focus on the increasing infill projects and the PUDs that are seeking rezoning.

Mr. Boggs stated that much of the City's acreage is PUD, and many of the older PUDs refer to the Code's Appearance Residential Standards. The text for those earlier PUDs does not provide the current level of detail. The infill component will be substantial.

Ms. Holt stated that if the Commission's direction is not to spend much time on residential appearance, but focus on the infill and the PUDs, she would suggest Commissioners complete the questions and identify examples. The focus should be on how to make future PUDs more unique and responsive to the natural environments.

Mr. Way stated that sustainability should be included in that focus in terms of materials and preservation of the natural environment.

Ms. Holt thanked Commission members for their input.

Public Comment

No public comments were received on the case.

COMMUNICATIONS

No communications were shared.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:23 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 1, 2020 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

3. Residential Development Standards Code Update Administrative Request – Discussion Only

Proposal: An informal discussion regarding recent trends in residential developments pertaining to lot sizes, side yard setbacks, lot coverage, and density.

Applicant: Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager, City of Dublin

Planning Contacts: Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Director; and
Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner, Current Planning Manager

Contact Information: 614.410.4690, jrauch@dublin.oh.us
614.410.4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission provided additional feedback regarding recent trends and discussion related to residential development standards. The Commission wanted to define a holistic intent for future residential developments for quality housing projects that are timeless, provide a sense of community, and maintain the character of Dublin. The members wanted to refrain from being prescriptive so as not to limit potential opportunities. The Commission discussed the opportunity to survey Dublin residents about their housing needs and wants, and survey other communities nationally and internally regarding the types of higher density developments with quality of life attributes. They expressed an intent to retain the City’s existing Code standards for typical, lower density suburban developments with exemptions for pocket of developments of higher density that could be considered, if the quality of life attributes are provided. The Commission also discussed that the Dublin 2035 Framework would consider trends, demographics, and the future of housing.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Jennifer Rauch
C68B79E6958D44D
Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Director



taken up by a sign and drawing attention from their business signs. She would be in favor of limiting the sign to 16 square feet for up to 200 feet of frontage; for frontage 200 feet or greater, a 32-square foot sign could be permitted. For a typical nonresidential parcel with 100 feet of frontage and lot coverage of 50-60 percent, what size building and permanent sign would be anticipated? A temporary sign should not be larger than the permitted permanent sign.

Ms. Rauch stated the maximum size permitted a ground sign would be 50 square feet. That is not based on the site frontage, so 32 square feet would be less than what a permanent ground sign is permitted.

Ms. Call stated that a for sale/lease sign would be in addition to the permanent sign for an existing building however. She inquired fellow Commissioners' opinions.

Ms. Fox stated that the intent is to reduce visual clutter but not to reduce the ability for a property owner to have a for sale/lease sign. Her suggestion would be to reduce the size of the sign to 16 square feet, and not be based upon the amount of frontage. In addition, the property owner is permitted only one of three sign options.

Ms. Call inquired if a large parcel, such as Cardinal Health, should be limited to 16-square-foot signs. Although that site has two frontages, 55-70 mph traffic passes it quickly.

Ms. Fox stated that the large signs on commercial sites along I-270 are not an issue; the problem is with the commercial sites on arterial streets.

Consensus of Commission members was to reduce the size from 32 square feet to 16 square feet for nonresidential for sale/lease signs.

Ms. Fox referred to Section 153.151 – Permit Required, which states that "...Fees may be paid by cash, check, or money order." That sentence should be deleted.

Ms. Rauch suggested that this item be tabled to permit staff to make the requested changes and provide the additional information discussed; the revised amendment would be scheduled at a future meeting for the Commission's recommendation.

Ms. Kennedy moved, Mr. Grimes seconded to table the proposed amendment to Section 153.050 of the City of Dublin Zoning Code (Temporary Signs).

Vote: Ms. Fox, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Kennedy, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

[Motion passed 7-0]

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

3. Residential Development Standards, Administrative

Ms. Call stated that this is a continuation of an informal discussion regarding recent trends in residential developments pertaining to lot sizes, side yard setbacks, lot coverage, and density.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Husak stated that this is a continuation of the Commission's August 20 discussion on Residential Development Standards. Staff has had difficulty finding the requested development standards for neighboring or regional communities. Therefore, this discussion will focus on the City of Dublin. One remaining developable area where development could occur is north of US33. There is a significant amount of vacancy in that area, and staff frequently receives inquiries regarding the type of development acceptable there. Several pages of the Community Plan, including a map of the Southwest Area, were provided in the meeting packet. Development in that area is difficult, as there are plans for the future extension of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard to the west. Although that project is not programmed in the

current CIP, it makes development difficult because the large parcels in that area will be impacted by the future road extension. The other issue is utilities. It is not financially feasible for most developers to extend utilities for a 20-30-acre parcel -- only a developer of a master development could afford to do so. That type of master development has occurred previously, i.e. the Ballantrae development, with the assistance of the City. There is no active proposal, other than the one Informal Review the Commission reviewed at its last meeting, although some developers are working on preliminary analyses. In the Southwest Area Plan, the designated density is low -- 1.5 units/acre. Within the Amlin area, where Cosgray and Rings roads meet, the Community Plan projects a town center with a surrounding higher density of up to 5 units/acre. That level of density has piqued the interest of some high-end, empty-nester developers, but to date, no applications have been submitted. This area is where future development pressure is anticipated, particularly a joint effort of several developers. In view of the fact that an update of the Community Plan is planned within the next couple of years, what type of development would the Commission foresee in this area? City Council has requested the Commission to provide recommendations on preferred residential development patterns and strategies that should be employed to encourage them. Should those be addressed by the Community Plan or in updated PUD standards?

Commission Questions/Discussion

Mr. Grimes inquired the age of the Southwest Area Plan.

Ms. Husak responded that it was included in the 2007 Community Plan and was not changed in the 2013 update.

Mr. Grimes inquired if the cost of constructing the infrastructure is the main challenge.

Ms. Husak responded that in addition to the infrastructure, the railroad that extends diagonally through the area is also a significant challenge. It would be necessary to extend Tuttle Crossing Boulevard over/under the railroad to provide a connection from both sides of the railroad, and the cost of that project would be astronomical.

Mr. Grimes stated that the Amlin area would present an opportunity to develop a subarea, which could act as a catalyst, drawing support for the needed infrastructure and perhaps annexation of a larger area. The Commission has been considering areas that would be appropriate for a higher, affordable density, and a higher density there could support the needed infrastructure. He assumes an underpass for that railroad, which he believes is a double-track rail, would be quite expensive – perhaps \$25 million.

Ms. Husak responded that it is a double track and quite busy.

Mr. Grimes stated that he is unaware of any studies that may have been done, but it is difficult to provide an opinion without first looking at the costs and benefits, including the standards and expectations of the surrounding community.

Ms. Husak stated that City Engineering previously advanced plans for the extension of Tuttle Crossing Blvd. from Wilcox Road to Avery Road, and even with tentative funding from MORPC, there was a \$7 million funding gap. These road projects are very costly, particularly the extension of Tuttle Crossing Blvd., which would be similar to Emerald Parkway. Because the West Innovation District and OSU project became a higher priority, the funds were shifted to that area instead.

Ms. Call stated that the following questions were provided to guide the Commission's discussion:

- Provide further discussion and direction regarding preferred residential development strategies;
- Identify additional materials and/or history needed to guide the discussion; and
- Other comments.

Ms. Kennedy stated that as she has mentioned previously, it would be helpful to have an indication of resident preferences on the topic. If no data exists, would it be possible to survey Dublin residents to obtain their opinions to help fuel this conversation?

Ms. Husak inquired if she would be interested in having feedback from a certain demographic or a cross section of different neighborhoods.

Ms. Kennedy responded that a cross section survey would be beneficial. Recent discussion has focused on empty-nester communities, but she would also like to know the opinions of the age 20+ group. Is that group looking for permanent or next step residency? Each of us tend to evaluate the topic based upon our own mindsets; it would be beneficial to learn the viewpoints of other groups of residents. In addition, perhaps it would be possible to obtain case studies from communities similar to Dublin, which also have limited parcels available for development. Obtaining that information would provide Commissioners a better understanding for discussion purposes.

Mr. Fishman stated that he was involved in earlier discussions regarding the area around the railroad track and Amlin. In his opinion, the City should not be in a hurry to accept any deals solely for the purpose of developing. He agrees with Ms. Kennedy that it is essential to know first what our residents want. Because it is important to maintain the character of Dublin, we must wait for the right developments. Perhaps the area on the other side of the railroad could become another hospital or it could be rezoned for an unforeseen development. Those types of developments also would be able to contribute funding for extending the roadway across the railroad tracks. The Village of Amlin has been quite adamant about its desire to remain a village and have surrounding high-quality development. It also is important to maintain the City's standards and ensure that the areas around Tuttle Crossing Blvd. do not become high-density development. There is a demand for, and he is supportive of, having some high-density residential development, if it is done while also maintaining the City's high standards.

Mr. Schneier stated that he would prefer to step back and consider this topic critically. In view of the Muirfield development that occurred in the 1970s, he believes it is better to be less prescriptive. Rather than trying to force a particular outcome, let it evolve. There is always ability to tailor ideas. He would be concerned with stating that we want something that no one else is interested in having. Perhaps a hospital or a very unique, currently un contemplated use will come along. When the concept of Muirfield arose, primarily the Township Trustees and the Village Council were involved.

Mr. Supelak stated that Council has charged the Commission with consideration of this issue. The SW Special Area map indicates a large developable area, and the question is whether we should re-think how to approach residential developments. He agrees with Mr. Fishman that it is important to maintain the character of Dublin. Dublin is largely residential with some pockets of commercial uses and a few exceptions for higher-density, empty-nester communities. While there is merit to having some of those communities, how frequent and how large should they be, and is the resulting product an acceptable complement to the rest of the City? In the SW Area, should the residential development that occurs be comparable to the rest of the City and consistent with its existing Residential Code? He believes the remaining developable area in the Southwest Area should be consistent with the City's standard Code, which provides for the typical suburban lots. That does not preclude certain exemptions occurring for higher-density, quality empty-nester communities; however, they should be complementary pockets of a limited scale.

Ms. Husak stated that when the 2007 Community Plan was drafted, Dublin was aware that the City of Columbus had plans for high-density, alley-loaded lots within the adjacent area. The City intentionally decided that type of development would end where Columbus's jurisdiction terminated. Dublin would provide heavy buffering along the border between the two jurisdictions and the prevalent rural character of the Dublin area would provide a distinction between the two communities.

Ms. Fox stated that the Southwest Area is a large, developable area of land, and the area around the US33 Corridor and University Boulevard will be developed with some residential. We are attempting to balance the needs of the developers versus the desires of the community. She believes the community's consistent message has been that an aesthetically pleasing neighborhood with a natural environment is desired that will meet housing needs, increase property values, and provide a sense of community and quality of life. We should begin with those principles in determining how future residential developments should be built. She agrees with Mr. Schneier; if the City had focused on the footprint, setback and height

of the homes, Muirfield Village with all its connectivity and beautiful landscaping would not have occurred. As a Council member, she does not know what the community's housing needs are. We need to look at the community's demographics and identify how much of the different housing types are needed. In addition to that data, she agrees that it would be helpful to learn our residents' housing desires. She has been told by some residents moving into empty-nester communities that they contain elements that improve their quality of life; the environment is important to them. She has been told that the desired land use balance in the City is 60% Residential/40% Commercial. Are we striving for that balance? It is not possible to define a development pattern without knowing what is needed and desired. To the west of the City is farmland; perhaps some of that will be annexed, and if so, what development pattern should occur there? There are other types of residential patterns available, including pocket neighborhoods with interior, social greenspaces. There is a need to research residential development trends nationally and internationally, and define holistic standards for our future residential developments.

Ms. Husak stated that at this time, Council has requested the Commission's feedback on the details, such as lot coverage, setbacks and density. However, many of the other issues mentioned, including demographic trends and future housing needs, will be discussed at great length as part of the coming Dublin 2035 Plan.

Ms. Fox stated that density was listed as one of the items on which the Commission's feedback is desired. We have said we want reduced density. For a variance to be considered to permit more density, what must the tradeoff be? Who is responsible for encouraging that type of development – the developer or the City? If we do not know what tradeoff is desired, a variance should not be granted. Having provided a variance in the past is not sufficient reason to grant another such proposal, unless there is a significant quality of life tradeoff.

Ms. Call stated that when businesses desire to locate within the City, the requirements are high; we do not seem to require the same of residential developers. Recently, we have received several applications for empty nester developments or single-family homes with minimum setbacks and maximum lot coverage. Although residential developers claim their proposed product is what the market is demanding, they should also be required to provide a high quality product. If a survey of residents is conducted, it would be helpful to inquire how difficult it was to find their desired home in the City. She agrees that the requirements should not so restrictive that opportunities are discouraged, but there is no need to accept less than what is desired. We are looking for the right fit for Dublin.

Mr. Supelak stated that there are many cities in Arizona comprised largely of retirement communities built as Ms. Fox described, providing quality of life amenities. Dublin's Code dictates our residential development, and for the Commission to consider an exemption to that for an empty-nester pocket community, the developer should be required to "sell" the development to the Commission.

Summary of the Commission's feedback is as follows:

- Define holistic intent for future residential developments for a quality housing product that is timeless; provides a sense of community; and maintains the character of Dublin.
- Refrain from being prescriptive so as not to limit potential opportunities.
- Survey Dublin residents re. housing needs/desires; survey other communities nationally and internationally regarding types of higher density developments with quality of life attributes.
- Current intent is to retain the City's existing Code standards for typical, lower density suburban developments; exemptions for pocket developments of higher density can be considered if quality of life attributes also are provided.
- The Dublin 2035 Plan project will consider trends in-depth, including demographics and future housing.

Ms. Husak stated that staff had received sufficient direction from the Commission's informal review of Ayreshire Farms last month and tonight's discussion. A summary thereof would be provided to City Council.

Staff also will obtain feedback from HOAs and the younger demographic of homebuyers regarding housing needs and desires.

4. Specialty Hospitals Code Update, Administrative

Ms. Call stated that this is an informal discussion regarding recent trends in medical care facilities and how to best address the uses in the Zoning Code.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Rauch stated that staff is working on a proposed amendment to the City's Zoning Code that will provide clearer requirements for in-patient specialty care facilities. In recent years, the City has received a number of inquiries regarding permitted locations for specialty hospital facilities, such as behavioral health hospitals. Provision of these facilities within the community is important, but they need to be located appropriately. The Commission's feedback is requested regarding any use specific standards that should be included with this potential Code amendment.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Grimes inquired if the primary concern is the number of applications received for specialty care hospitals or their appropriate fit within the City.

Ms. Rauch responded that the concern is not with the number. However, there is the potential for an in-patient facility that is classified as a hospital to be located within close proximity to residential uses. Should there be some site considerations or distance requirements? Specialty care hospitals typically have longer patient stays; they are not the quicker turnover type of hospital, nor a medical office use.

Mr. Grimes responded that if an applicant is able to put together the needed capital to provide this type of resource for the community, it is a good thing, and typically, it is better for them to be readily accessible to the community. Close to home facilities can be accommodated appropriately within the community.

Mr. Fishman stated that he believes this will be a situation of changing uses. Some office buildings and retail space will become vacant and could be converted to small, specialty care medical facilities. We will have to wait until those offers come to the City, but there would already be zoning for the site that would control parking and access.

Ms. Call stated that the definition of hospital is somewhat broad. The parking needs are very different for traditional hospitals and specialty hospitals, such as rehabilitation, mental health or substance abuse facilities. The Commissioners' questions may depend upon the definition of specialty hospital.

Mr. Fishman stated that there is a need for those type of facilities, and space will be available due to opportunity for conversion of uses. However, the needs will be different, so the Code would have to address those needs.

Mr. Supelak stated that specialty care hospitals do not fit within the Code's current definition of a traditional hospital; so the Code definition should be updated to include types and specialties. Different specialties have different behaviors, however, and those behaviors will dictate the standards.

Ms. Fox stated that in the past, neighbors have complained about health care facilities locating in residential areas. There are concerns about the type of specialty behaviors being addressed within their neighborhood. Pompano Beach had shopping centers that were vacant, and health care services began to locate in the available space. Unfortunately, there were no zoning regulations in place. In addition to updating the definition for a hospital, there is a need to define where specialty hospitals or medical facilities may be located, in consideration of their impact on the neighborhood. Some specialty hospitals are open 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., but others are open 24 hours with associated traffic flow. What is the distance that should exist between any type of hospital and the neighborhood?



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 20, 2020 | 6:30 pm

The Planning and Zoning Commission took the following action at this meeting:

3. Residential Development Patterns Informal Review

Request: An informal discussion regarding recent trends in residential developments pertaining to lot sizes, side yard setbacks, lot coverage, and density.

Applicant: Dana L. McDaniel, City Manager, City of Dublin

Planning Contact: Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner/Current Planning Manager

Contact Information: 614.410.4675, chusak@dublin.oh.us

RESULT: The Commission discussed the topic and advised Staff to continue to bring forward examples and discussion topics.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jane Fox	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Kristina Kennedy	Yes
Mark Supelak	Yes
Rebecca Call	Yes
Leo Grimes	Yes
Lance Schneier	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:
Claudia D. Husak
B3FD32A7AD0C439

Claudia D. Husak, AICP, Senior Planner
Current Planning Manager



Ms. Noble stated that staff would like to continue to use AO 8.5 for flexibility in administering the enforcement process. Does the Commission have any objection to doing so?

Mr. Supelak responded that if the AO provides an adequate escalation path and equips the enforcement arm appropriately, he has no objection to the AO serving that purpose.

Mr. Boggs responded that the AO sets forth the path that a typical complaint will follow from the initial Notice of Violation to enforcement. The notice can contain significant detail -- after the internal process ends, the case would proceed to Mayor's Court for citation, or potentially to Environmental Court. Mr. Jones has indicated that Code Enforcement receives 98% compliance on these issues; very few proceed to court.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the escalation path is sufficient for addressing those cases on which compliance is not reached in the first step.

Mr. Boggs stated that he anticipates the amended Code will address those cases. There are a few, limited cases where it was necessary for the City to demolish nuisance houses, mow lawns and invoice the property owners, remove debris and bill the property owner. If enforcement staff does not receive the response requested of the owner, Legal staff directs a letter to them, which typically results in compliance.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the timeline in the AO is clear to the citizens making the complaints.

Mr. Boggs responded that the sequence is embedded in the AO; the timeline is not. Different repairs take different time to complete, and the number of days to complete is typically provided in the notice. He is unsure if the complainant is made aware of that.

Ms. Noble stated that Mr. Jones inquires if the complainant wishes to remain anonymous. If not, he will follow up with them. They are provided Code Enforcement officers' names, should they wish to follow up.

Mr. Boggs noted that if the complainant wishes to remain anonymous, it is not advisable to send them a letter, which would become a public record that a property owner could request. Any updates are provided via phone.

Ms. Fox stated that she receives many complaints about vacant properties. Although 98% compliance is received, it is the remaining two percent that need to be adequately addressed in the enforcement process. Residents need to be confident that the City's regulations have "teeth." Commission members indicated that the AO 8.5 is satisfactory for administration of the enforcement process.

3. Residential Development Patterns, Informal Review

Ms. Call stated that this is a request for an informal discussion regarding recent trends in residential developments pertaining to lot sizes, side yard setbacks, lot coverage, and density.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Husak stated that in recent discussions about proposed residential developments, the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council have expressed concerns regarding trends in development patterns, particularly in terms of side yard setbacks and lot coverage. At their June 22, 2020 meeting, Council referred the subject to the Commission for discussion and a recommendation for potential changes. Background information has been provided on a few approved residential developments to assist the Commission in its discussion. The issue is the reduced setbacks and larger home footprints, particularly for empty-nester homes. The homes tend to be ranch-style, which comprise a larger footprint. Oak Park is one of the developments that was the most concerning to the residents within that neighborhood. Oak Park has a minimum

lot size of 6,900 square feet; minimum lot width of 55 feet; and a side yard setback of six feet. Many of the homes are at that distance, so there are only 12 feet between the homes. The permitted lot coverage is 60%. Oak Park was developed as part of the Conservation Design Resolution, which clustered the homes and provided 50% open space. The Overlook at Tartan Ridge, recently approved, will have a minimum lot size of 100 square feet; minimum lot width of 52 feet; minimum side yard of 6 feet; lot coverage up to 60 square feet.

Ms. Fox inquired the amount of open space.

Ms. Husak responded that she believes it is 30%; in Tartan Ridge, overall it is 40%. The development that triggered this conversation is The Hamlet on Jerome. The minimum lot size is 5,000 square feet; minimum lot width of 45 feet; minimum side yard setback of 5 feet; and lot coverage of 70%. At the time of review and approval of this development, the Commission was concerned about these numbers, particularly in regard to the ability to provide maintenance and parking. [Review of developments continued.]

Public Comments

Jon Melchi, 445 Hutchinson Avenue, Suite 280, Columbus OH 43235 (BIA of Central Ohio):

"Dear Members of the Dublin Planning Commission:

On behalf of the Building Industry Association of Central Ohio (BIA), you are to be commended for your interest in reviewing and considering the circumstances of the current housing market and residential development in Dublin. The interests of your residents, our customers, do evolve, and we applaud communities when they consider changing demands of residents in the context of the regulations that are in place to reflect community values. The BIA represents over 800 members in Central Ohio who develop, build and provide all of the essential support services for the residential housing market in Dublin and our region. In general terms, demographics (e.g. smaller household sizes, later in life household formation, varying age cohort sizes) combine with personal preferences (e.g. walkability, time allocation changes, "work-from-home") to cause changes in the concepts of "home" that residents desire."

Jim Lipnos, Homewood Corporation, 2700 E. Dublin Granville Road Suite 300, Columbus, OH 43231:

"This is a great idea to conduct an informal discussion on Residential Development Patterns. I am a local developer and builder, both in and out of the City of Dublin, and have first-hand accounts of what potential homeowners desire. Quite simply, it is not the same home or lifestyle that we grew up in, and it takes a bit of perspective to understand the new lifestyle. Fifteen years ago, it was the McMansions and 2-story great rooms; however, today's buyer is much more particular in their wants and needs. Today's lifestyle is demanding. Typically, both adults in the home will be working and time is valuable. Large yards are a burden and not integral to their lifestyle. Maintenance free exteriors are in high demand. Today's buyers are willing to spend their money on things they value, and that is typically on the interior of the home. Home offices are in high demand, and since the pandemic, are almost mandatory. There is a high probability that more and more people will be working from their homes, and filing their taxes as such. From my experience, and I know everybody says, we are not against density, but the fact remains that the buyers value what will make their life more convenient and free up more of their time. By allowing smaller lots/setbacks and increasing lot coverage, the cost of the lot will decrease, the amount of burden on the service department will decrease and the buyer will put that money into the home,

particularly the interior, where they live. I appreciate your willingness to gather feedback from builders and developers and would be happy to discuss any of these topics with you individually.”

Commission Discussion

Mr. Fishman stated that he has served on the Commission accumulatively for 40 years, and has witnessed many changes during that time. As the earlier public comments indicated, it is true that homeowners are looking for different things. However, through the years, Dublin made some unfortunate mistakes, a couple of which were developments shown earlier. Dublin is known for being green. Dublin has received many positive comments from visitors regarding its greenspaces. There is nothing wrong with having some denser development. That has been tried, and in some cases, it has succeeded; in others it has not. Previously, the City adopted a “Wow” ordinance, which provided for very large setbacks. Along Brand Road, there are 100-foot or greater setbacks, and the lots are smaller. The problem now is that developers want to continue to build on smaller lots, but they are unwilling to give the greenspace. Small lots can work if the greenspace is provided. Open areas and spaces are very important in those developments. The developers say that homeowners do not want the burden of maintaining a yard, but it isn’t necessary that they do so; it can be open space that is controlled by the homeowner association. In many parts of the country, particularly the south, that is very common. The development has the beauty and the feel of open space without burdening individual homeowners with yard maintenance. Dublin has done a good job through the years in controlling residential development. Although there have been some changes today in what people desire, changes should not be based upon economics. Developers want smaller lots, so they can crowd more houses on the land. Because he has seen some of the earlier mistakes that were made, he voted against The Hamlet development. Dublin must continue including greenspace in these developments, as it always has. Dublin’s greenspace is a big reason that people move here. In his view, having smaller lots must also include more open space.

Ms. Kennedy stated that she is in agreement with Mr. Fishman’s comments. This Commission needs to maintain the Dublin character, and that character is green open space. A homeowner should not be able to reach out and touch his neighbor’s house; most of our residents do not want that. In her view, a first-floor master does not equal an empty nester home. Generally speaking, she is not in favor of the higher-density residential developments, some examples of which were shown in the earlier slides. Looking at those, she will be more focused on ensuring greenspace in future proposed developments. It is important to ensure that outdoor space and feel. This pandemic has changed our values and perspectives. Our backyards and patios are much more important to us. She values greenspace and believes the City’s residents do, as well.

Mr. Grimes stated the Riviera development has a good balance. He is reluctant to see houses jammed together on a large scale. Although beautiful, the houses in Oak Park are spaced too close. Personally, he needs more elbow room than that! We have to be sensitive to what today’s homebuyers want, but there is enough land to provide a diverse range of products in different areas. It is important not to have too much of one type and be unable to provide people the choices they desire. He loves greenspace, but understands there is some tradeoff.

Ms. Fox stated that the American Planning Association indicates that today that there is a need to retrofit suburbia. People are changing their lifestyles; they want to move to more urban areas, walk and know their neighbors. The theory is that the single-family home on a quarter-acre lot will not be popular in the future. There may be some credibility to that view. However, the existing

dense development gives us some concerns; there is something about it that we do not like. The developers may indicate that is what is wanted, but we feel uncomfortable with the denser developments already existing on Hyland-Croy Road. She believes part of that reason may be that the public realm, the area around the homes, does not invite walkability and connectivity. Although the City has required greenspace, it is not necessarily functional. In the Historic District, the homes are close but the neighborhoods are walkable. The public realm is active, working and connected with treescaping and streetscaping. In comparison, the open spaces in the developments farther out seem constrained and unnatural. We need to encourage public realms that would make neighborhoods nurturing and more livable. We are giving the developers the density they want, but, in return, we are not getting anything that makes living there enjoyable. People may want to live in homes on smaller lots, but they value the community feel. What does "community" look like in the design of a development?

Mr. Supelak stated that the letter sent by the BIA member alluded to macro demographic shifts that are happening in the world. Do we subscribe and commit to making a substantial change in regard to increasing density in the City, or do we remain consistent with who Dublin is and has been? If we were to cut up our land and build a different density on it, it would be a permanent change. He agrees with Mr. Fishman that retaining the greenspace throughout the community is important. While the idea of Conservation Design is good, it is not his favorite method of ensuring greenspace in the City. If we were to consider the macro demographic trends, how do we obtain a good sense of those – from BIA or from other sources, as well? Considering what the trends are may not, however, change who we want the City to be. If developers were to tell New Albany the trend for picket fences is out, New Albany either could subscribe to making changes or stay the course with who they are. Trends can come and go. Is there merit to looking at examples of a more dense residential development style? Then, perhaps, we could draw some conclusions. At this point, he has no position on the matter. Empty nester communities warrant a different amount of lot coverage, and there is a need in Dublin for some pockets of those developments, but what is enough but not too much? Like Oak Park, the context of those developments is good, but sitting out in the middle of a field, they do not make much sense. There is much to consider in this discussion; at this point, we cannot identify a new trajectory.

Mr. Schneier stated that we all bring our experiences and biases to the conversation. He is in the process of downsizing from 2.7 acres in Muirfield to .25 acres in downtown Dublin, so he sees both sides of the topic. One of the attributes of Dublin that we all recognize is its diversity of housing, from very large to small starter homes. One characteristic of most of it is the quality of the housing stock. Small lots do not necessarily mean inexpensive homes. Some homeowners do not want the hassle of lot maintenance, but they do want quality homes. His concern is that altering the setback and lot coverage requirements too much may preclude the ability to have very nice homes on them. The right balance may be permitting smaller lots with a greater lot coverage but compensate with a dedicated greenspace, creating a suburban walkability versus urban walkability. Perspective homebuyers wanting quality homes would be willing to pay a pro-rated share of the greenspace, and that will create many exciting possibilities. He would love to see some examples of best practices. In Naples, Florida, for example, there are pocket areas with very nice homes on small lots but with dedicated greenspace within the development; it is a lifestyle choice. He is not aware of anything similar in central Ohio, but seeing examples would be educational. Other communities are facing similar questions, but Dublin has the flexibility to deal with this issue as it should choose, not to have it pushed on it by a large land developer.

Ms. Call stated that she agrees with fellow Commissioners' comments. Previously, in another state, she served on a City Council that was where Dublin was 30 years ago. That City experienced tremendous growth every year, and had the ability to carve its environment. What they heard from developers was exactly the same as what we have heard tonight – that lifestyle choices were changing and homebuyers were looking for a different housing product. Then, as a result, the city ended up with too much inventory of one type of housing stock. She appreciates fellow Commissioners' comments that there may be a place for some higher density residential developments, but as Ms. Fox noted, higher density and clustering works only when it engages with the surrounding area. Building a clustered housing development on Hyland-Croy Road with a large amount of unused open space is not engaging. It is important to identify the right place for that type of residential development. What we build today will exist for many years before it could, potentially, be redeveloped; commercial development may never occur there. We have an identity in Dublin that we want to, for the most part, preserve. While we may want to preserve the greenspace, we also need to have a variety of housing products reflective of the changing demographics. It is the Commission's responsibility to provide diversity of housing while also maintaining and even elevating Dublin's identity. From her perspective, she likes the "and" condition of a combined side yard setback. She agrees that it would be helpful to view successful examples of denser developments. She can speak for fellow Commission members, that we find Mr. Fishman's previous experience in this area very helpful.

Mr. Fishman stated that it is important to have a Commission that has the interests of Dublin at heart. However, developers are quite smart at what they do. Their job is to make money in developing. Therefore, when we hear from developers that homebuyers want small lots, no greenspace, that is because it is the most profitable way to build a residential development. On another note, he rides his bicycle approximately 3,000 miles/year through many subdivisions. Since the pandemic changes on the community, the bicycle paths are crowded; our residents are using the available facilities. While he agrees that some cluster home developments with surrounding open space areas are not that attractive, we can encourage developers to be creative and integrate that greenspace. What he has seen, however, is that Dublin's residents are using the greenspaces within their developments and connecting with their neighbors.

Ms. Fox clarified that she is not a proponent of abandoning greenspace. The Dublin Convention and Visitors Bureau has said that visitors have commented that what they love about Dublin is its naturalness, greenspace and friendliness. What homebuyers want is a beautiful, natural environment, social connectivity, and a refuge when they go home. While we consider diversifying our housing product with some higher density communities, we must focus on integrating attractive greenspaces with amenities in every development. Every development we approve must achieve that balance so that the people who live there will find it worthwhile. We cannot just look at whether the building requirements were met, but also at whether the development provides the complete picture of a place to live. Is it a place in which we would all like to live, because it is so well designed?

Ms. Call inquired if the Commission has provided sufficient direction to staff for them to proceed. Ms. Husak responded that staff would be able to provide examples of residential developments that would be worthy of discussion. Mr. Supelak has mentioned that he would be interested in hearing from the BIA or developers on this topic -- would other Commissioners also be interested? Mr. Supelak stated that he does not know who the right sources would be, but there are likely experts who would be willing to share their perspectives with the Commission.

Ms. Call stated that greenspace, density, clustering, etc. are fundamentals of a PUD. Dublin is a suburban area and many of our developments have larger lots with single-family lots. However, we already have diversified our housing with some condominium developments. Some of those are good; others are not. PUDs provide flexibility to allow for larger homes on smaller lots, increased lot coverage, reduced setbacks, etc., but it is important to ensure that they have the necessary balance. She believes the fundamentals of a flexible PUD will achieve the right product.

Ms. Kennedy stated that if we want to hear from an expert, it should be someone who has the expertise but is unbiased – someone who does not have a vested financial interest in pushing an agenda. That could be a faculty member at OSU, who studies economic development. She believes a missing piece in the discussion tonight has been that there were no public comments from our residents. She would be interested in hearing if they have views on the different types of housing products. Has the pulse of the community been taken on this topic recently, which we could consider? It would be good to have the resident perspective.

Ms. Husak responded that she is not aware of such a survey.

Ms. Kennedy stated that it would be helpful to obtain that type of feedback.

Ms. Fox stated that she agrees. Some of our residents who have moved from a large home to a denser community could share what they love/do not like about the different housing product. We could learn from their experience.

Mr. Fishman stated that it is possible to build a smaller, yet quality house. In Upper Arlington, there are four-sided architecture, 1,500-square-foot, 85-year-old homes that are beautiful. There is room in Dublin for a variety of residential communities, all of which can be integrated into open, usable greenspace.

COMMUNICATIONS

- Ms. Husak reported that the next regularly scheduled PZC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 17 at 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Rebecca Call

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Judith K. Beal

Deputy Clerk of Council

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

June 22, 2020

Page 13 of 14

Held _____

Public Services Committee: Ms. Fox offered to call a meeting to discuss the DORA topic if needed. Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that if a committee meeting is needed, then Public Services was the appropriate committee for it.

COTA: Vice Mayor De Rosa reported that COTA has partnered with Columbus City Schools to use the buses that are not in service right now as internet hot spots for students so they have the access they need.

MORPC: Mayor Amorose Groomes stated that conversations are happening regarding the economic restarts and what that will look like with the balance of the money allocated to the State of Ohio. She thanked Mike Schadek from Mayor Ginther's office for convening a regional conversation.

LUC: Mr. Keeler stated that he continues to be astounded by the pace of development on our western border. 60-80% of the cases they are hearing are on our doorstep. He reported that he looks forward to a dialog for collaboration.

Board of Education: Mr. Peterson noted he has had ongoing discussion with Dr. Hoadley..

Dublin Bridges: Ms. Fox stated they have a new project every month.

Complete Count Committee: Ms. Alutto stated we are at 78.7% completion. The City provided additional signage to try to raise our participation. She encouraged everyone to participate.

COUNCIL ROUNDTABLE

Mr. Keeler stated that:

- with the redistricting and the busing issues within the district, specifically by Jerome, he would like to see additional improvements for crosswalks so students can safely walk to school;
- traffic noise is becoming disruptive with drivers accelerating their vehicles through town and by Bridge Park; and
- unlawful fireworks restrictions need to be enforced.

Ms. Fox stated that:

- Would request that Council refer to Planning and Zoning Commission the discussion of setbacks and lot coverage issues that were brought forward during the Oak Park discussion;
- Would also like Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss connectivity and bike paths before discussions occur regarding the Dublin 2035 Framework/Community Plan.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that:

- She would like clarification regarding what advisory body would best be able to discuss and provide feedback regarding the six feet setback – CDC or PZC? Ms. Rauch stated that it is Council's discretion which body would discuss these topics.

Mayor Amorose Groomes believes the appropriate body is PZC.

Ms. Rauch stated that PZC has discussed this topic, but the issue is a lot of the residential developments are within a planned district. Therefore, a code change would not address this globally. It is a larger policy discussion. She is happy to take this back to PZC.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she is fine with PZC discussing it and bringing recommendations to Council.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of _____

Dublin City Council

Meeting

BARRETT BROTHERS - DAYTON, OHIO

Form 6101

June 22, 2020

Page 14 of 14

Held _____

- o She thanked Mr. Earman and congratulated him on the Recreation Center opening in the current environment. She was very impressed with the tremendous job everyone was doing of disinfecting and cleaning.
- o She would appreciate a quick financial update. Mr. Stiffler stated that income tax revenue as of today (June 22) is down 8.5% from 2019. A significant portion of that will be recovered in July when the tax deadline occurs. The withholding revenue is up 2.4% and is holding steady. Overall year-to-date, there is a \$4 million decrease from 2019. Income tax revenues are looking stronger than previous discussed. Hotel-Motel revenue is down as expected.

Mayor Amorose Groomes:

- o Asked for an update on the S. High Street Trees. Mr. Earman stated that staff will be meeting with Mr. McDaniel soon about costs and can bring an update to Council after that.
- o Asked Ms. O'Callaghan about the crosswalk improvements. Ms. O'Callaghan stated that a report has been prepared for Council detailing the results of the enhanced crosswalk study that was just completed; benchmarking best practices; and laying out guidelines for the future. The report will be provided to Council tomorrow (June 23) in the City Manager Update packet.
- o Asked Chief Paez what is being done in response to Mr. Keeler's concerns regarding traffic noise. Chief Paez stated that the Police have been working the Riverside Drive area to reduce speeding and reckless operation.

Mr. Keeler asked if there was a decibel level regarding a noise ordinance. Chief Paez stated that the ordinance itself prohibits excessive or unusual noise, but has no decibel limit per se. He added that it is difficult for officers to cite a driver for that because often times they do not witness the loud exhaust first hand. He stated they will continue to try to enforce the ordinance where possible.

- o Stated that Ms. Fox's concerns regarding e-bikes and scooters are best left as a Committee discussion. Vice Mayor De Rosa stated it will likely be part of the Dublin 2035 discussion also.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:41 p.m.



Mayor – Presiding Officer



Deputy Clerk of Council