



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 6, 2022

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the October 6, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She stated that the meeting also could be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases were welcome from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Lance Schneier, Kathy Harter, Mark Supelak, Warren Fishman, Jamey Chinnock
Commission members excused: Kim Way
Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Chris Will, Thaddeus Boggs, Michael Hendershot, Tina Wawzkiewicz

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Supelak moved, Ms. Harter seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the minutes of the 09-01-22 meeting.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Fishman, abstained.

[Motion approved 5-0 with one abstention.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory board to City Council when rezoning and platting of property are under consideration. In such cases, City Council will receive recommendations from the Commission. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call swore in meeting attendees intending to provide testimony on the cases on the agenda.

Ms. Call noted that the applicant for the first case scheduled on the agenda, Cardinal South Development at 6775 Dublin Road, 22-135INF, Informal Case Review, requested that the case be postponed, so that case will not be heard tonight.

Ms. Call stated that there are three cases eligible for the Consent Agenda, Towns on the Parkway, Section 1, 22-075PP, Preliminary Plat; 22-076FP, Final Plat; and 22-119AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan, and inquired if any Commission member wished to move the cases to the regular agenda for discussion. No member requested that the cases be moved.

CONSENT CASES

2. Towns on the Parkway, Section 1 at PID: 273-013211, 22-075PP, Preliminary Plat

Subdivision of a 2.19-acre site to create a 39-unit residential development zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, on a site located northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.

3. Towns on the Parkway, Section 1 at PID: 273-013211, 22-076FP, Final Plat

Subdivision of a 2.19-acre site to create a 39-unit residential development zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, on a site located northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.

Request to recommend Council approval of the Preliminary Plat and approval of the Final Plat with two (2) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant make any minor technical adjustments to the plats including any discrepancies in open space square footage, prior to submission for acceptance to City Council; and
- 2) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to dedicate necessary easements via warranty deed or another acceptable conveyance mechanism on the Tuller Flats PL1 LLC property, prior to commencement of construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Request for approval of the following four (4) Code Waivers:

1. §153.064 (G)(4)(e)(2) – Fully Enclosed Structures and Table 153.064-A.
Required: Enclosed accessory structures are not permitted within open spaces.
Requested: Permit an enclosed structure within an open space - pocket park.
2. §153.062 (B)(3)(e) – Accessory Structures.
Required: Accessory Structures are permitted within the buildable area of a lot not occupied by principal buildings, located to the side or the rear of the principal building and outside of the Required Building Zone (RBZ).
Requested: Permit an accessory structure within the front Required Build Zone (RBZ).
3. §153.074 (6)(a) – Required Location in Residential Zoning Districts.
Required: Accessory Structures are required to be located to the side or rear of the principal structure.
Requested: Permit an accessory structure forward of the principal structures in Block B.
4. §153.065 (D)(3)(a) – Street Trees.
Required: One street tree per 40 linear feet of frontage. McCune Avenue – 23 street trees (per north/south side of the street); Holcomb Street – 14 street trees (per east/west side of the street).

Requested: To permit 11 street trees on the north side of McCune Avenue and 9 street trees on the west side of Holcomb Street.

**4. Towns on the Parkway, Section 1 at PIDs: 273-008811 & 273-013211
22-119AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan**

Amendment of the street tree requirements, residential building locations, and construction of two booster houses for the approved residential development on an 11-acre site zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, on a site located northwest of the intersection of Village Parkway with John Shields Parkway.

Request for approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with two (2) conditions:

- 1) That the applicant dimension the building separations between buildings 28 and 29 and between 26 and 27 in Block D to confirm the separation requirement is met, subject to staff approval; and
- 2) That the applicant submit revised plans to Building Standards for any applicable building permits related to the modifications in the AFDP.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Consent Case actions as requested.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes.

[Motion approved 6-0]

NEW CASES

**5. Mount Carmel Hospital - Northwest at 3865 Bright Road, 22-134AFDP,
Amended Final Development Plan**

Request for approval of the development of a 150,000-square-foot, 30-bed, inpatient hospital on a 35-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District, Mount Carmel Hospital – Northwest. The site is located southeast of the roundabout of Bright Road and Emerald Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Will stated that this 35.0-acre site located at 4105 Emerald Parkway is 750 feet southeast of the intersection of Bright Road and Emerald Parkway and northwest of the I270 interchange at Sawmill Road. This is an application for an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP), which provides opportunity for the applicant to propose changes to the Final Development Plan (FDP) approved on August 4, 2022. Tonight's presentation will highlight the proposed changes and how the prior Conditions of Approval were addressed.

The following changes have been made to the FDP in the proposed AFDP:

- (1) Of the total 728 parking spaces, only 424 will be provided in Phase 1 of the project, the remainder in future phases.
- (2) One of the four (4) accesses -- the restricted access from Sawmill Road has been removed from Phase 1 to be provided in a future phase.
- (3) Only 3.0 acres of the total amount of 6.9 acres of open space will be in the first phase of the project, which now has a modified west entry green and a reduced east staff green.
- (4) The attached Medical Office Building (MOB) will be provided in a future phase.
- (5) Changes in the green ribbon are proposed, including moving the oncology garden and respite areas to a future phase.

- (6) Other changes in this first phase include: adjustments in the internal site circulations; interim adjustments in the shared-use path alignments; a reduction in tree plantings and landscaping; and signage.

[Continued description of the proposed changes within the AFDP.]

Staff has reviewed the proposed AFDP against the applicable criteria and recommends Commission approval with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant update all site plans to correctly depict property lines, right-of-way lines, easements, development standards and demonstrate consistency between engineering and landscape plans prior to submitting for Building Permits.
- 2) The applicant update plan drawings to reflect the number of bicycle parking spaces provided; dimension sign placement; specify steel pipe bollards only be permitted within the service yard; decorative bollards be required in all other installations; and prevent excessive lighting along the main entry drive prior to submitting for Building Permits.
- 3) The applicant return to PZC for approval of future phases of the development plans.
- 4) The applicant coordinate proposed site and off-site improvements with the Emerald Parkway roundabout project to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, including the proposed ground sign location along Emerald Parkway with the proposed guardrail, and to establish ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the proposed guardrail with the dedication of easements if necessary.
- 5) The applicant refine the entry wellness green Phase I design to include a path loop, additional respite areas, and additional landscaping, subject to staff approval.
- 6) The applicant refine the staff green Phase I design to provide additional staff seating, landscape the dry basin to the northeast of the staff green, and provide landscape between seating areas and the temporary fire lane, subject to staff approval.
- 7) The applicant revise the tree survey and tree preservation plans to ensure consistency with the information in the table.
- 8) The applicant update plans to provide quantities and sizes for all plants in the plant list, confirm plants are properly identified, and that tags do not overlap prior to Building Permits.
- 9) The applicant update the tree replacement plan to show the Bright Road utility area trees as utility screening trees not replacement trees.
- 10) The applicant work with staff to identify a tree species with a mature height compliant with all FAA regulations to provide in the highway buffer landscape.
- 11) The applicant provide all 54 required highway property perimeter trees in Phase I and provide a planting plan for a more thorough coverage of trees in the highway buffer landscape.
- 12) The applicant update the plans to provide heavy duty pavement material for all fire apparatus access drives and fire lanes to the satisfaction of Washington Township Fire Department.

- 13) Raceways be prohibited for all building mount signs, and all letters and logos be individually mounted.
- 14) The applicant update the Sign Quantities/Parameters table to accurately reflect sign area and quantities in the updated Phase 1.

Commission Questions for Staff

Mr. Fishman inquired if the proposal is to eliminate the access point at Sawmill Road in Phase 1. Mr. Will responded affirmatively.

Mr. Chinnock stated that this proposal is substantially different than the previous plan reviewed and approved by the Commission. How does that factor into the requested review?

Mr. Will responded that some large, comprehensive changes in the phasing are proposed. The purpose of this review is to gain the Commission's feedback.

Ms. Call stated that the applicant already has an approved Final Development Plan and could proceed with construction with that construction. However, they now want to offer a different plan, not consistent with the previously approved plan.

Mr. Boggs stated that is correct.

Mr. Chinnock stated that nothing is being proposed tonight for future phases. This proposal includes Phase 1 only.

Mr. Boggs stated that is also correct; one element of a FDP approval cannot be deferred to a future phase.

Ms. Harter requested clarification of the changes related to the emergency entrance.

Mr. Will stated that because the emergency drive will no longer connect to Sawmill Road, the Emergency Only access sign was not needed.

Ms. Call inquired if the revised site circulation would accommodate emergency vehicles.

Mr. Will responded that the Fire Department has reviewed and confirmed that the proposal would accommodate their vehicle turning movements.

Applicant Presentation

Diane Doucette, 16171 Lewis Road, Sunbury, OH provided an overview of the reasons for the proposed changes. Inflation has significantly impacted construction costs. It will be very costly to develop Phase 1, not just the building but also the site development and required infrastructure. They have retained the part of the plan that includes the hospital, emergency room, procedure areas, the operating rooms and diagnostic areas in Phase 1, but remain very committed to the future development of Phase 2.

Tim Scanley, Design Architect, HGA, 3114 West Juneau, Milwaukee, WI, 53208 reviewed the design changes made in the site and building, a number of which were responsive to the previously approved FDP Conditions of Approval. As the campus grows, Phase 2, including the Medical Office Building will occur.

Commission Questions for the Applicant

Mr. Supelak inquired about the plan for phasing.

Ms. Doucette responded that as the campus grows and is successful, the intent is to bring more physicians on site. The original plan was to locate their existing primary care offices located elsewhere within this area closer to the hospital. That will continue to be the plan, as the campus grows. Unfortunately, at this time they cannot define a timeline for providing the remaining site elements. It was necessary to prioritize the hospital services only.

Ms. Harter observed that all other Mt. Carmel hospital sites include both hospital and medical offices; that is their model. As proposed, a significant component of their model is missing. Ms. Doucette stated that they are not concerned. Their medical staff currently located elsewhere within the northwest quadrant is committed to coming to this hospital for surgical procedures.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant is willing to accept the 14 recommended conditions of approval. Mr. Scanley responded that they have no objection to the conditions, with the exception of a request to modify the language of Item #3.

Mr. Chinnock inquired about the applicant's vision for the greenspace, specifically the maintenance.

Mike Davis, Landscape Architect, MKSK, 709 Crosby Street, Akron, OH 443302 stated that the green lawn would be comprised of no mow grasses. The greenspace would be left somewhat naturalized with a mown edge along the roads where there will also be street trees. Landscaping will be provided along the walkway in the wellness green near the chapel.

Ms. Call stated that earlier discussions pointed out the need to provide parking for staff near the building. In the revised plan, the staff parking is the furthest from the building in Phase I. Mr. Davis stated that in the prior plan, staff parking was provided on the east side of the campus. Where the medical office building was proposed on the northwest, additional staff parking was provided. Now that the Sawmill access has been removed, the emergency access drive and parking must be kept open. Hospital staff will be able to access the site through either the main entrance or the Bright Road entrance.

Ms. Call inquired if the MOB addition to the hospital is foreseen at the same size in Phase 2 as in the original plan. In the drawing, it appears that a corner of that building would extend over the wellness path.

Mr. Scanley responded that the intent is that the MOB would be identical to what was shown in the previous plan. At this time, the MOB has been removed at the knuckle connection with the hospital. No geometric change has been made in the plan.

Ms. Call inquired about its relationship to the wellness path, which appears to be changed in shape. Previously, the path meandered; now the corner of the building sits on the wellness path.

Mr. Davis stated that in order to retain the community connection from the loop drive from Bright Road to the MOB, it was necessary to include a temporary path. When the MOB is added, a permanent path would replace the temporary path.

Ms. Call inquired if the temporary path would be comprised of the same material as the permanent solution.

Mr. Scanley stated that the permanent solution would extend along the front of the hospital and into that green. The alignment would be the same as that reflected in the previous plan. The path materials would be the same.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission understands that the cost implications have caused the applicant to look at the project creatively and determine how to build some, but not all of the components now. However, the Sawmill Road connection is very important. Was there any discussion regarding how to improve pedestrian connectivity in that area without the vehicular connection?

Ms. Doucette responded that it was discussed at length. The bus stop is located north of Bright Road, so it was important to extend the Bright Road pedestrian path, as it would be the closest to the bus stop.

Mr. Fishman stated that he was very concerned about elimination of the Sawmill Road connection in Phase 1. Nothing is certain in the future. While the assumption may be that Mt. Carmel Health will construct the MOB later, something different could occur. In the past, we have seen hospitals sell part of their property to another party to build the office building. It is possible that second party could claim that the Sawmill Road connection should have been built with the hospital and argue that it was too great a hardship for them to build later. He would prefer this piece not be developed without the Sawmill Road entrance to the site. He is supportive of the hospital project, but constructing the hospital without that important access would be a great concern. He also has concerns about the no mow grass. It is important to ensure that area looks pristine; he would recommend installing the landscape reflected in the previous plan in this phase.

Mr. Supelak stated that the Commission has already approved an application for a Final Development Plan for this project. There are reasons the applicant would prefer not to proceed on some of the approved construction in phase one, and is proposing phasing. An Amended Final Development Plan would vacate what had been approved for some components of the plan, with the hope that those items would be done at a later time. He has a question related to phasing. At this point, Planning Commission approval is needed. That is followed by the need for Building Standards approval of the building permits. Phasing of a Final Development Plan project is possible in association with the building permits process. The applicant indicates they are committed to the project, but there is a need to "buy time" due to the necessary financial outlays. Is there a way to leave the Final Development Plan in place and handle the necessary phasing via the building permits? There are extensions that can be granted in the permitting process. He requested Legal response.

Mr. Boggs stated that he believes the challenge in proceeding with the route he has proposed is that the expiration date of the Final Development Plan approval could occur before the construction and building permits are obtained. He would have to check on the length of that expiration period, but he believes it is 24 months. Because it is a finite period of time, that would present a challenge to continue with the currently approved Final Development Plan, and stagger out the acquisition of building permits over a potential 2-5 year period of time.

Mr. Supelak stated that if there is a finite period of time in which the applicant must apply for the building permit; the opportunity exists with the construction period for phasing. The duration of the construction period buys more time. It is possible to apply for extensions of building permits. Mr. Boggs responded that he is not well versed in the Ohio Building Code that would govern the duration of building permits, but it is his understanding that they, too, must be closed out within a designated period of time. While there is the ability to apply for extensions, he is not aware if they can be unlimited or indefinite.

Mr. Schneier stated that the question may be if this is the right use for this parcel, irrespective of what may have already been approved. Is that within our purview to consider, or is that subjective? Mr. Supelak responded that approval of the proposed Amended Final Development Plan would replace the currently approved Final Development Plan. The Code does not provide ability to require that subsequent phases ever be completed.

Mr. Schneier stated that, essentially, an Amended Final Development Plan would disregard everything previously approved in the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Call pointed out that it is normal to see some changes between a Preliminary Development Plan and the Final Development Plan, and essentially, we are now looking at a different Final Development Plan. The Commission is challenged to determine if the proposed plan is the right plan for executing the project with the understanding that the MOB could occur later. The project we approve must be able to stand alone.

Mr. Boggs confirmed that if the proposed Amended Final Development Plan is approved, the previously approved Final Development Plan is null.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is attempting to clarify how much time the applicant potentially could buy, if the currently approved Final Development Plan remained in place. There may be a finite period of time in which the applicant must submit for a building permit, potentially 24 months; however, as long as the project remains under construction, the permit remains active. There is no finite amount of time, as long as the applicant continues to request inspections on a regular basis. Inspections provide a trigger point; there are stipulations associated with those. We need to understand those, as the construction period buys the applicant time, as well. Additionally, there is the ability to apply for a permit extension, if the project has remained dormant too long. Those extensions have the ability to buoy the project for an extended period of time.

Ms. Call stated that there is a need for an executable plan, either the currently approved Final Development Plan or the Amended Final Development Plan. There is no option for a hybrid of both.

Mr. Supelak stated that he does not believe that option exists either. What he is saying is that there is a potential to remain with the currently approved Final Development Plan, if the intent of the applicant is to buy time and defer/pace the associated financials. At this point, he is attempting to understand that potential, not advocating for it.

Mr. Fishman stated that when he looked at the proposed Amended Final Development Plan, he considered whether he ever would have voted to approve a plan without the MOB building and the Sawmill Road connection. He would not have. The Sawmill Road connection, in particular, is incredibly important. We have to look at this plan as a Final Development Plan, which does not include the necessary landscaping, medical building and roadway access. The applicant could decide never to build the other components or a completely different plan. Three weeks ago, would we have approved this plan as proposed tonight?

Mr. Boggs corrected his previous statement. The expiration period he was thinking of is only for applications under the Bridge Street Code. There is no expiration period for Final Development Plans under the City's Planned District Code, under which this project falls. The approved Final Development Plan is valid indefinitely. In line with Mr. Supelak's line of thinking -- this project could be built in stages under the existing Final Development Plan; the hospital could be built first, but there would be no approved FDP for only the hospital to be built without the medical office

building. The applicant would not be able to obtain a building permit for just the hospital under the existing approved plan.

Mr. Supelak agreed. However, the applicant can submit for a phased permit. Their construction drawings can consist of Phase 1 and Phase 2, all under a single permit. The construction duration of the first phase provides continuing inspection and the permit remains live; phase two of the project continues that permit. Between the phases, the applicant can extend that permit, if inspections have remained dormant too long. Construction projects do not have a finite timeline; they could involve years of development. He believes this project could be executed in phases within the Building Permit process, and buy the needed time.

Mr. Boggs stated that the only issue is that there is no exterior treatment of the wall where the MOB building would not occur in Phase 1.

Ms. Call stated that there would need to be a third Amended Final Development Plan that would contemplate the constructions of those buildings within phases.

Mr. Supelak expressed disagreement. The applicant already has approval to proceed in phases; the only caveat is the incomplete wall.

Ms. Call requested staff confirmation of the applicant's ability under either the existing FDP or the AFDP to obtain a permit for the phased construction.

Mr. Hendershot responded that he believes staff would be challenged to approve a permit not conforming to the approved FDP.

Ms. Rauch stated that she believes in regard to phasing of site improvements versus building permits, phasing is not permitted to complete only sections of a building in an approved FDP.

Mr. Supelak stated that architecturally, there are construction drawings for the entire building, which denote Phase 1, and there are notes associated with that phase, and for Phase 2, and notes associated with that phase. Only one building permit is obtained for a building to be constructed in phases. In this case, a building permit could be obtained in alignment with the already approved FDP, with some notations included about the phasing, something which is inevitable in every construction project.

Mr. Hendershot stated that what Mr. Supelak is suggesting is that the applicant would submit a request for a building permit for a plan that conforms to the approved FDP. However, the applicant would initially build only what is proposed tonight. The difficulty is that Building Standards cannot approve an occupancy permit for that portion of the construction only, as it does not conform to the approved set of plans for the permit.

Ms. Call stated that staff might not have that ability if there is no approved plan that gives them that option.

Mr. Supelak stated that he disagrees because he has done just that. He has stamped drawings similar to these, and the plans have proceeded through zoning approval and to Building Permitting. There is a reason for phasing relative to current operations. Partial occupancy permits are obtained for the buildings as they are completed. The Buildings Standards department provides reviews for all the phases, per the rules and stipulations. However, he would not belabor the point further at this time.

Aaron Greene, Senior Vice President, H Plex Solutions, 7522 Lotten Street, Galena, OH 43021 stated that if it is possible to remain with the original Final Development Plan approved by the Commission

in August 2022, for which they have met all the conditions, and then phase construction of that FDP, they would have no objection. The only reason they have requested the AFDP is because of the costs. They want to build the entire project but are unable to do it today because of the cost factor. If there is ability to phase the previously approved FDP, they are happy to do so.

Ms. Call stated that there are a couple of options available today. We can proceed with consideration of the proposed AFDP, looking essentially at what would be Phase 1. There is also the option for the applicant to proceed with the approved FDP and submit for building permits tomorrow, if desired. Additionally, the case could be tabled, and the applicant could work with staff on a second AFDP that contemplates phasing of the original FDP.

Lorrain Lutton, President and CEO, Mt. Carmel Hospital Systems, 807 City Park, Columbus, OH 43206 suggested that they would not need to return for additional plan review if the additional statement, *"unless it is identical to the plan approved in August 22 with the 44 conditions,"* could be added to the current Condition #3 language that, "The applicant return to PZC for approval of future phases of the development plans." The additional language would provide them the certainty that when the time comes for them to proceed with Phase 2, they can do so without concern about potential future conditions that might be added. They want to construct the entire project, but it is not good stewardship of resources to do that at this time. They do not want to delay initiating construction of the project until winter; any delay will add to the costs.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant wished to proceed with deliberations on the proposed AFDP.

Ms. Lutton responded affirmatively.

Public Comment

No public comments were received.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Schneier expressed his concerns with the AFDP. [Microphone not working.]

Ms. Harter stated that Mt. Carmel is a great opportunity for this area. However, she prefers the hospital's history of developing their MOB's with their hospitals. She is not comfortable approving the proposed AFDP, which is missing that important component. She also believes eliminating the very important Sawmill Road access is an issue. She wants this project to proceed, but what is proposed today is not in the best interest of the community.

Mr. Fishman stated the Commission is very sympathetic with the applicant's situation regarding increasing construction costs. However, the Commission never would have approved a plan for just the hospital without the critical Sawmill Road access. Many residents expressed concerns about this development, but their concerns were somewhat eased because of the addition of the Sawmill Road access. The Commission also would not have approved a hospital surrounded by no mow grasses. The property must be landscaped and maintained appropriately. He cannot support this proposal, which does not abide by the original plan. He has no objections to phasing that project, but the first phase must include the Sawmill Road access.

Mr. Chinnock stated that the project does not work as proposed in a silo. The missing Sawmill Road access and field of unmown grasses are serious concerns. The approved plan provides a beautiful

building and a great site design, but he finds it difficult to consider half a development on such a prominent site in Dublin.

Mr. Supelak stated that the applicant had proposed a compelling development, and that compelling factor caused the Commission to be flexible with the Community Plan provisions for the site. The amended FDP, however, would only half complete the site. The critical elements that drove the Commission to approve the project are now absent, and there are limited assurances the remainder of the plan would come to fruition. He, as well, would not have been supportive of the AFDP if it had it been submitted as the Preliminary Development Plan. He has attempted to find a method with the currently approved FDP that would buy the applicant time to defer some of the financial commitments. He would not be supportive of the AFDP, as proposed.

Ms. Call stated that 18 of the 44 conditions on the approved FDP have already been met by the applicant, and the conditions with the proposed AFDP were intended to address the remaining conditions. The applicant has indicated they have no objections to the conditions, which evidences a spirit of partnership and commitment to the project. However, she also has significant concerns with the proposed AFDP. The Commission has seen phased projects before. She has attempted to identify the elements that are critical to make this project succeed. The circulation and the "feel" of the parcel are concerns. The building is well designed and articulated, but it does look incomplete. The green ribbon has lost some of its identity and the staff green tie-in to that area has been deleted. Essentially, we are presented with a building that is complementary and framed well on one side of the site with some introduction to the Bright Road entrance, but the remainder of the site is void. In addition to the absence of the Sawmill Road access, the parcel also would be developed without the pedestrian connectivity with which parcels must be developed. For her to approve an AFDP, it would need to provide significant improvements on the Sawmill Road side of the site; provide landscaping around the eastern side of the hospital; and improve the green ribbon and the area for which the applicant has proposed no mow grasses. Unfortunately, this plan is not where it needs to be. A second AFDP with a phased solution, which contained the features of the previously approved FDP, would be a possibility.

Ms. Call inquired if the applicant desired additional clarification; would like the Commission to proceed with a vote on the AFDP; or would like to table the application and return with a different application.

Mr. Scanley inquired if the AFDP were to be tabled, the previously approved FDP would remain in place.

Mr. Boggs responded affirmatively.

Ms. Doucette requested that the project be tabled.

Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Fishman seconded to table the Amended Final Development Plan.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes.

[Motion approved 6-0.]

Mr. Fishman inquired if the Commission would be willing to hold a Special Meeting to review a second AFDP to expedite the application approval.

Commission consensus was to schedule a Special Meeting, if needed to facilitate the project.

COMMUNICATIONS

Staff indicated there were no Communications items for discussion.


Mr. Supelak requested that clarity on the item he raised earlier be provided to the Commission. As he has stated, he believes the applicant has exactly what they need to proceed. The Commission does not need to see a phasing plan relative to the building permit. However, it is important to clarify the timeline, duration and finite elements of that process.

The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, October 20, 2022.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission



Assistant Clerk of Council