



OHRH, LLC dba OhioHealth Rehabilitation Hospital - Dublin.

Amended Final Development Plan Statement

- 1. Project description describing the proposed Planned Unit Development, outlining the basic scope, character, and nature of the project. Please state how the proposed Planned Unit Development relates to existing land use character of the vicinity, to the Dublin Community Plan, and any other applicable standards such as the Residential Appearance Standards.**

Existing hospital is a recent construction and was completed in December of 2020.

The proposed development is a one story, 20 bed expansion to an existing 40 beds rehabilitation hospital. Upon project completion, the hospital will operate a total of 60 beds.

All of the proposed architectural design elements will match existing hospital which were approved by PZC in August of 2019.

- 2. State how the proposal is consistent with the development plan for the Planned District. For an Amended Final Development Plan, explain how the proposal differs from the approved Final Development Plan**

The adopted PUD for the subject site was approved with a text but no plan so the applicant is following the guidance of the development standards found in the adopted text and the previous development that has occurred within the subarea.

The proposed hospital expansion and its envisions will be consistent with the development standards found within the text with very few divergences to allow construction of the proposed building and ancillary facilities.

- 3. Explain how the proposed development meets the review criteria for Final Development Plan approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission §153.055(B)**

The existing rehab hospital is 46,400 SF. With the 10,936 SF addition, the total would be 57,336 SF of building on a 5.76-acre site, meeting the density requirements.

125 parking spaces provided, meeting the 2 spaces per 1,000 SF requirement.

With new expansion there will be changes to current pedestrian and vehicular circulation within the site as shown on the attached site plan. Pedestrian and vehicular circulation to adjacent properties will remain unchanged as shown as curb cuts have already been established and sidewalk will be connected to existing paths created with previous development in the Subarea.

The proposed hospital expansion will have effect on open space as shown on the site plan. Additional information is provide below in section 4(c)

The development will preserve what natural characteristics there are on the site as put forth in the regulations found in the zoning code. The site will remain flat with

additional landscaping added on the site so the development plan will include new trees and landscaping to meet code requirements.

The development plan will provide additional lighting as needed and meet code requirements

Existing site signage to remain as-is

The landscaping plan submitted with the submitted package will enhance the building and site and preserve the existing trees to the extent possible. The landscaping provided will meet the requirements of the code.

Storm water drainage will be adequately handled on site with the existing retention pond and other treatment facilities to meet the requirements of the City of Dublin and other governmental entities that have control over the retention, treatment and release of storm water flows onto and off the subject site.

The hospital expansion will be built in one phase.

The proposed hospital will be in compliance with all local, state and federal laws and regulations.

4. Additional comments from City of Dublin Planning Department

- a. Is it possible to scale back the addition from the main entry by moving the addition north a little bit? The curb appeal and main entrance are lost from Emerald Pkwy due to the addition covering it up.**
Please provide a couple of additional perspectives from Emerald Pkwy.
Please see the additional perspective rendering views taken from Emerald Parkway and Summer Drive. It is our opinion, that the addition now frames the main entrance, and the unique use of the stonewall and ACM canopy remain a clearly accented main entrance between the new addition and the existing building. It is not feasible to slide the addition farther north on the site due to the limitations of the existing drive location, and the need to provide an efficient floor plan that fits within the site plan density requirements. If the addition was pushed north the connecting corridor area would become less efficient and would require adding additional square footage to the project which would exceed the allowable density on the site.
- b. Planning recommends relocating the north and south exit doors to the east side of the addition to minimize public entrance conflict or confusion.**
This will allow the focus to be on the main entry at the existing building.
Placing the exits from the addition onto the east face of the addition would require adding (2) 8ft wide corridor exits toward the east at the ends of the addition. This would require the building to grow 16ft towards the south of the site. This additional square footage would both exceed the allowed density requirements, and block the view of the main entrance to the building from Emerald Parkway. The proposed exit door locations reflect the design aesthetic of the existing building dayrooms,

which have large glazed exits at the end of the patient wings to allow maximum natural light into the building.

- c. Most of the usable greenspace on the site will be lost with the proposed addition. If you pursue the addition, Planning recommends enhancing existing features throughout the site. The Commission will likely be concerned with losing the existing open space. Please provide justification as to how there is sufficient open space and parking to handle the expansion.**

Please see the attached Landscape plan, which adds walking paths and adds seating areas around the expansion similar to the current built gabion walls and benches. This will allow the patients and staff to continue to enjoy the walkable open spaces around the buildings.

- d. The parking numbers shown do not reflect and match the numbers shown in the civil plan set.**

The parking count numbers have been corrected to match.

- e. Please provide further information and documentation to support the request for additional parking (similar to FDP submission documentation). Looking at historical imagery, the existing parking appears underutilized. How does the addition effect the existing parking? Is additional parking needed because of additional staff, visitors, etc.?**

The previous Owner regularly operated the facility below full capacity. The current Owner plans for the facility to run at full capacity. The city requires a minimum of 2 parking spots per 1000 sq ft of building, which with the expansion will require a minimum of 114 parking spots. The proposed parking count exceeds the required amount due to the Owner's historical parking demand data from their other hospitals, which shows they will need a minimum of 2 parking spots per bed, which is a minimum of 120 parking spots. To ensure enough spaces for staff and visitors the Owner has requested 5 additional spots for any peak overflow needs.

- f. Planning is concerned with the additional parking areas circled. Further documentation is needed to support this parking.**

Please see response to comment 4e