



MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 7, 2025

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the August 7, 2025 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: Gary Alexander, Rebecca Call, Jamey Chinnock, Jason Deschler, Dan Garvin, Kathy Harter, Kim Way

Staff members present: Thaddeus Boggs, Bassem Bitar, Taylor Mullinax, Josh Reinecke

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the July 17, 2025 Regular Meeting minutes and the July 22, 2025 Joint Training minutes.

Vote: Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Harter, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0.]

Ms. Call stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) 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 and make the decision. In other cases, the Commission has the final decision-making responsibility. The Rules and Regulations of the Planning and Zoning Commission state that no new agenda items are to be introduced after 10:30 p.m. Anyone who intends to address the Commission on administrative cases must be sworn in. Ms. Call explained the hearing process that would be followed.

Ms. Call swore in staff and audience members who anticipated providing testimony.

CASE REVIEW

Case #25-051AFDP

Dublin Methodist Hospital Tower Expansion – Amended Final Development Plan

Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan for the construction of an addition and associated site improvements to the OhioHealth Dublin Methodist Hospital. The 45-acre site is zoned PUD, Ohio Health and is located at 7500 Hospital Drive.

Applicant Presentation

Doug Scholl, OhioHealth, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus stated that he was part of the original hospital project. This project is an expansion of Dublin Methodist. It is currently a busy place. The northwest Columbus area is growing and demand for patient services is high. This expansion will meet those needs. The capacity will address timely care and keep people close to home. The new addition will add 96 beds. With the addition, they will clear out other support space in the building for increased surgery, labs, and imaging. The project consists of a new six-story tower on the back corner of campus with 96 beds and renovations throughout the hospital. The front parking lot was an interesting landscape experiment when originally installed. It attempted natural draining but created limited pathways for patients and visitors to get into the building. They felt increasing density of parking in front of the hospital would make a better experience for patients. The requested text modifications are related to the addition placement as it crosses the property line to the north. The text needs modified to accommodate that subarea change and the parking requirements on the campus. A parking study has been done, and the current required parking is not necessary. A temporary helipad has been approved on which construction will begin in fall 2025. As soon as that construction is completed, they will begin this project with projected completion in early 2028. This tower will be six stories rather than existing four stories, which is accounted for in the development text. The existing parking area has the bio retention which will be changing to a more traditional storage for stormwater. They are working with engineering staff on that. They are also working on the site plan to resolve the tree replacement requirement. This site plan creates better wayfinding, more consistent flow and a single entry into the hospital. All the same materials are being used. They are trying to create a six-story version of the campus that exists today. 20 years ago, all air handlers and equipment were placed on the roof. There were no mechanical penthouses. As more equipment is added, putting it in a penthouse is a huge improvement. They are working with the City to fine tune that design. Mr. Scholl expressed his appreciation of staff for their report and the work that has been done. Regarding staff's recommended conditions, OhioHealth cannot agree to Condition #2 regarding the incorporation of a green roof. Having biological materials that could end up in a roof leak is a risk. If that condition were modified to consider a decorative roof, they would be happy to accept working with staff on that. OhioHealth agrees with the other conditions.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Call thanked Ms. Mullinax for her time and service to the Commission and the City as this will be her last meeting.

Ms. Mullinax stated that this site is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD) Dublin Medical Campus. Approval of a PUD is a three-step process that starts with a Concept Plan, moves into a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and ends in a Final Development Plan (FDP). This site has gone through that process and this evening changes to the FDP are under consideration, which is done through an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP). Text modifications are also

considered at this stage. PZC shall make a determination based on their findings this evening. The 45-acre site contains an existing hospital, medical office building, and energy plant surrounded by parking. In July, staff administratively approved the transfer of 1.78 acres from 6805 Perimeter Drive to accommodate the proposed addition. The development text permits up to 950,000 square feet of building area, and the proposed addition would bring the total to 702,750 square feet, well within the limit. Ms. Mullinax noted that the proposal met all minimum building and pavement setbacks and stayed within the 70% maximum lot coverage limit at 52%. Based on the submitted parking study, the applicant was requesting a text modification to reduce the parking requirement for Subarea 1 from 2,155 spaces to 1,455 spaces, which aligned with City goals to minimize over-parking. The project included the removal of 564 caliper inches of protected trees, of which 381 inches were required to be replaced.

Ms. Mullinax stated that while the proposal met general architectural standards, staff had concerns about its integration with the current hospital facility. Staff recommended adding detailing seen in other parts of the hospital to reduce the perceived mass of the new tower and the mechanical penthouse screening. She highlighted the need for design improvements that would better align with the existing architecture, particularly in reducing the visual impact of the mechanical penthouse. Additionally, there was a recommendation to incorporate a green roof, textured roof material, or rooftop sculpture on the first and second stepped levels to align with the existing hospital's green roof and rooftop gardens.

Staff recommended approval of the two minor text modifications and approval of the amended final development plan with four conditions:

1. The applicant continues to work with staff to ensure the addition's architecture is complementary to the existing hospital, including options to minimize the perceived massing of the mechanical penthouse enclosure.
2. The applicant incorporates a green roof, textured roof material, or sculpture on the roof east of the six-story addition.
3. A landscape plan addressing the remaining outstanding tree inches is required prior to building permitting.
4. The applicant addresses all Engineering comments to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Ms. Call asked if all inches of removed protected trees are required to be replaced. Ms. Mullinax stated that all inches that are noted in the report would be required to be replaced. Ms. Call asked why the City is requesting a green roof. Ms. Mullinax stated that there are other green roofs present in other portions of this hospital and the direction comes from Council to be thinking about and being proactive regarding such features on new buildings.

Commission Questions

Mr. Garvin inquired about the roof recommendation that the applicant objected to. Mr. Scholl explained that OhioHealth had moved away from green roofs due to safety concerns, particularly

the risk of biological materials causing leaks that could drip onto patients. He suggested they could work with staff on a textured roof alternative. Mr. Garvin asked what the total removal of green space will be. Mr. Scholl stated that there will be green space removed because of the additional parking but the design will be more advantageous for patients. Mr. Garvin asked about the construction timeline as the approval for the temporary helipad is up until 2030. Mr. Scholl stated that two years is more accurate. They wanted to ensure ample time in the request.

Mr. Deschler asked if there have been issues with current green roofs. Mr. Scholl indicated that while not necessarily on their campuses, there had been problems elsewhere with green roofs and leaks. Mr. Deschler asked what City would be willing to concede to. Ms. Mullinax stated that the condition is worded to allow flexibility. They would be comfortable with textured rock, a painted mural, etc., as long as something interesting is incorporated into the design.

Mr. Alexander asked if intent with the green roof is to reduce energy consumption or aesthetics. Ms. Mullinax stated that it is both. Mr. Scholl stated that they want the project to be as energy efficient as possible. Mr. Alexander recommended a master plan for the site to ensure architectural continuity over time. He questioned the parking design with head-in spaces near the high-traffic drop-off area.

Amy Nagy, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, stated that it is an existing condition and includes ADA parking. She explained that the 36-foot-wide drive aisle would allow enough space for cars to safely back out.

Mr. Alexander asked if the doors on the new addition will be for ingress or egress or both. Mr. Scholl stated that they will be egress only. OhioHealth is trying to limit ingress.

Mr. Way expressed concern about the tower's design, noting that while he appreciated the continuity with the existing campus, the new element would be more prominent as a taller building. He suggested the design could incorporate more contemporary elements while respecting the campus aesthetic. He also questioned whether the mechanical penthouse could be better integrated architecturally. Mr. Way asked what programming the lower roof is over.

Kristine Bartocchi, Design Group, 515 East Main Street, Columbus, stated that the tallest part is the extension of existing surgery area. The part of the building that drops down is for mechanicals. Mr. Way asked if the applicant would be willing to install a green roof over mechanical spaces. Mr. Scholl stated that OhioHealth does not do green roofs any longer.

Mr. Harter asked if the applicant is amendable to stone on the roof. Mr. Scholl stated yes, they would do a ballasted roof with stone. She asked if containers with trees would be possible. Mr. Scholl stated that makes the ability to maintain the roof much more difficult. Ms. Harter asked if they have had any state agencies express concern. Mr. Scholl stated that they have not. Ms. Harter asked about lighting on the roof. Mr. Scholl stated that there will be no lighting on the roof as light spillage is a concern for patient bedrooms. Ms. Harter asked if they are satisfied with the installation of materials. Mr. Scholl answered affirmatively and stated that they are standard materials. Ms. Harter asked if there is a pedestrian connection to Kroger. Mr. Scholl answered affirmatively. Ms. Nagy stated that there is a sidewalk near the staff lot and a pedestrian crossing to provide staff crossing.

Mr. Chinnock asked if there are additional site amenities being added with the project. Mr. Scholl stated that within the parking lot, they have added pathways and safer crosswalks to focus on safe ways in and out of the hospital. Mr. Chinnock asked if the reduction in parking would cause future shortages. Mr. Scholl stated that is not a concern. Mr. Chinnock asked how height is delineated when mechanical screening adds a seventh story. Ms. Mullinax stated that this is regulated by a standard in the development text to architecturally screen mechanicals. Mr. Bitar stated that it is not habitable space. Mr. Chinnock stated in terms of aesthetics, we are adding a seventh story. Ms. Call asked if there is a maximum building height in the development text. Ms. Mullinax stated that the development text allows a maximum of six stories but allows for additional height for the screening of mechanicals.

Ms. Call asked if there has been discussion about retrofitting existing towers with additional height. Mr. Scholl stated that is not structurally possible. Ms. Call asked if on the north elevation where a green roof has been the subject of discussion, there was any consideration given to a vertical green element in that area. Mr. Scholl stated that there was not.

Mr. Way asked if there was any consideration for sunshades on the west side. Mr. Scholl stated that they offer a negligent advantage.

Mr. Chinnock asked what staff considers the primary elevation. Ms. Mullinax stated the west elevation and south elevation.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Commission Discussion

Mr. Chinnock raised concerns about the architecture and the mechanical penthouse, which he felt added a seventh story to the building. He is generally supportive of the location on the site and the parking. There still seems to be much to be worked out.

Ms. Harter agreed with Mr. Chinnock. She is supportive of the parking lot but has concerns with programming of green space. She feels there needs to be more discussion.

Mr. Way stated that he is supportive of the project and adding more beds. He encouraged the applicant to think about creating the best environment possible for patients. There are opportunities to think about this as a healing environment. There are many things to work out regarding architecture.

Mr. Alexander stated that he is supportive of the text modifications and the parking. This is a thoughtful approach to reducing parking. He shares some of the concern that the architecture is extremely deferential to the existing building. The mass could have been mitigated if the light color brick was held at the same elevation as the other towers. However, this is not an architectural review. He agrees with Mr. Chinnock's comment about the mechanical penthouse. If it were pulled in, it would have a big impact on how it is perceived. The language around roof is flexible enough to meet the intent of City Council. He is generally in support of the application.

Mr. Deschler stated that he has no issue with the text modifications. He asked how much obligation the Commission can assign to staff. Mr. Boggs stated that the development text is the zoning that applicable to this site. The objective of having conditions of approval on an AFDP is to direct revisions to what has been submitted to bring it into compliance with that development text. The point is to get enough guidance from PZC to direct staff and the applicant. Sometimes that is done with specific conditions, if that is helpful to staff and the Commission to provide direction on the body's will. Staff and the applicant need enough guidance to get to building permit submission without coming back before the Commission. In terms of this application, it is a site that has development text. Available options would include tabling the application to come back with drawings and other specifications that respond to the discussion tonight.

In response to a question from Ms. Call, Mr. Boggs stated that hypothetically, an applicant can build to what is approved in an FDP.

Commission members continued to deliberate about whether to approve the application with conditions or to request that the applicant return with revised plans. Four commissioners (Deschler, Way, Harter, and Chinnock) indicated they would like to see the application again before approving it. The Commission provided feedback for the applicant to address in a revised submission, including:

1. **Architecture and design** - adding articulation, avoiding blank walls, and incorporating interesting design elements.
2. **Mechanical penthouse** - minimizing, integrating, or masking its appearance through size reduction or material/color changes.
3. **Roof treatment** - considering alternatives to a green roof that would still provide visual interest.
4. **Landscape plan** - addressing not just tree replacement but also wayfinding, mobility, and the treatment of the west elevation.

Consensus of the Commission was for revisions that would enhance the architectural integration of the new tower with the existing hospital campus while addressing practical concerns raised by the applicant and staff. Mr. Scholl expressed appreciation for the feedback and requested to table the application to incorporate the Commission's feedback rather than proceeding to a vote.

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Garvin seconded approval of the following text modifications:

1. Text Modification to amend the Dublin Medical Campus development text to change the Subarea 1 acreage to 61.87-acres. Additional minor text amendments correct old parcel numbers.
2. Text Modification to amend the Dublin Medical Campus development text to lower the parking space minimum to 2.25 spaces per 1,000 gross square feet of buildings on site.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Ms. Call, yes.

[Motion carried 7-0]

Mr. Way moved, Ms. Harter seconded tabling the Amended Final Development Plan at the applicant's request.

Vote: Ms. Harter, yes; Mr. Alexander, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Garvin, yes; Mr. Chinnock, yes; Mr. Deschler, yes; Ms. Call, yes.
[Motion carried 7-0]

COMMUNICATIONS

- There were no communications from staff.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 pm.



Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

Deputy Clerk of Council