

# RECORD OF ACTION

## Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 12, 2024 | 6:30 p.m.

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

### 2. Mount Carmel Health System 24-146AFDP

### Amended Final Development Plan

Proposal: Amended Final Development Plan to modify previously approved signs and new chapel building uplighting. The +/-35-acre site is zoned PUD: Mount Carmel Hospital Northwest and is located.

Location: Northwest of the I-270 and Sawmill Road interchange.

Request: Review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan (AFDP) under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.055(B).

Applicant: Kyle Maiser

Planning Contact: Christopher Will, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4498, cwill@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/24-146

**MOTION:** Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Consent Case.

**VOTE:** 7-0

**RESULT:** Motion carried 7-0

#### RECORDED VOTES:

Rebecca Call	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Gary Alexander	Yes
Jason Deschler	Yes
Dan Garvin	Yes

#### STAFF CERTIFICATION

Signed by:  
  
 000A0F037E3E42F...

Christopher Will, AICP  
Senior Planner



# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 12, 2024

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Call called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chamber and welcomed everyone to the December 12, 2024 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, Jason Deschler, Kathy Harter, Dan Garvin, Jamey Chinnock, Kim Way, Gary Alexander

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell

### ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING DOCUMENTS

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Deschler seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 11-07-24 and 11-14-24 meeting minutes.

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

Ms. Call stated that two cases were eligible for the Consent Agenda, Case 24-138CU and Case 24-146AFDP, and asked if any Commission member wished to move one of the cases to the regular agenda for discussion.

No member requested that a Consent Case be moved to the regular agenda.

### CONSENT CASES

- **24-138CU – Central Irrigation Supply, 6091 Enterprise Court, Conditional Use**

~~Request for review and approval of a Conditional Use to allow a wholesale and distribution use in an existing building. The 3.33-acre site is zoned TF, Technology Flex and is located northeast of the intersection of Innovation Drive and Enterprise Court.~~

- **24-146AFDP – Mount Carmel, 4105 Emerald Parkway, Amended Final Development Plan**

Request for review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan to modify previously approved signs and add new chapel building uplighting. The ±34.5-acre site is zoned PUD: Mount Carmel Hospital Northwest and is located northwest of the 1-270 and Sawmill Road interchange.

Mr. Alexander moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the Consent Cases:

24-138CU – approval of the Conditional Use with no conditions;

24-146AFDP – approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with no conditions

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

[Motion carried 7-0.]

## **CASE REVIEW**

- **24-141CP – Bridge Park, Block J – Concept Plan**

~~Request for review and recommendation of approval of a Concept Plan for the development of an office building, condominiums and parking garage. The 5.37-acre site is zoned BSD-SRN, Bridge Street District, Scioto River Neighborhood, and is located southeast of the intersection of Dale Drive and Bridge Park Avenue.~~

### **Applicant Presentation**

~~Russell Hunter, Crawford Hoying, 6640 Riverside Drive, Dublin, provided an overview of their Concept Plan proposal for an additional expansion of Bridge Park. Cenovus Energy will be their lead tenant, taking half of the office space in a new office building. Although the office market is not flourishing in the City of Columbus, it remains resilient in Dublin. He believes it's a testament to the work of Crawford Hoying, the City and the Planning and Zoning Commission. They continue to create spaces that people want to be in. The development will also include two condominium buildings, one in Phase 1 and the other in Phase 2 on the existing COTA lot. Phase 2 condominiums will be similar to The Theodore condominiums in G Block; Phase 1 condominiums will be somewhat larger. Crawford Hoying is presently in discussions with COTA regarding a permanent solution for the existing Park and Ride and associated spaces, but also a temporary solution while the site is under construction. Their open spaces in the various block developments have been somewhat similar – urban and dense, but they have the opportunity to do something different on this site. Although there is an existing tree grove, the arborists have determined that few of the trees are worth saving. On the COTA lot, however, there are wonderful tree specimens that could be relocated elsewhere in the development and hopefully, create an urban arboretum. He invited MKSK to provide more details.~~



# RECORD OF ACTION

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 6, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

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

Proposal: Development of a 150,000-square-foot, 30-bed, in-patient hospital on a 35-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District, Mount Carmel Hospital – Northwest.  
Location: Southeast of the roundabout of Bright Road and Emerald Parkway.  
Request: Review and approval of an Amended Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.066.  
Applicant: Timothy Scanley, HGA  
Planning Contact: Christopher Will, AICP, Planner II  
Contact Information: 614.410.4498, cwill@dublin.oh.us  
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-134

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

**VOTE:** 6 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Amended Final Development Plan was tabled

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Lance Schneier Yes  
Rebecca Call Yes  
Mark Supelak Yes  
Kim Way Absent  
Warren Fishman Yes  
Jamey Chinnock Yes  
Kathy Harter Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

DocuSigned by:  
*Christopher Will*  
8C8A0F837E3E42E  
Christopher Will, AICP, Planner II





# 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.~~

~~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.



# RECORD OF ACTION

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 3, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Mount Carmel Health System Northwest Campus at 3865 Bright Road  
22-001Z/PDP Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**

Proposal: Rezoning ±35.05 acres from Restricted Suburban Residential District to Planned Unit Development District. The development consists of a 230,000-square-foot, 30-bed, inpatient hospital and ambulatory center.

Location: Southwest of the roundabout at Bright Road and Sawmill Road.

Request: Review and recommendation of approval to City Council under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.050.

Applicant: Jason Koma, Regional Director of Advocacy & Regional Development, Mount Carmel Health System; and Dan Livanec, Senior Project Manager, Hplex Solutions

Planning Contacts: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us

Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-001

**MOTION:** Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded, to recommend approval to City Council for Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan with 11 conditions:

- 1) That the applicant continues to work with the City of Dublin to develop a development/infrastructure agreement for consideration by City Council to be submitted in conjunction with the rezoning application to City Council;
- 2) That the applicant continues to work with the City of Dublin, the City of Columbus, and ODOT to complete the traffic impact study to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and each jurisdiction's designee, prior to submitting the rezoning for consideration by City Council;
- 3) That the applicant coordinates proposed site and off-site improvements between the preliminary development plan (including phasing), traffic impact study, and development/infrastructure agreement to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 4) That the applicant continues to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the City of Dublin Code of Ordinances;
- 5) That the applicant continues to work with ODOT and the City of Columbus to obtain any necessary approvals/permits for utility work within their respective jurisdictions;
- 6) That the applicant realigns the Bright Road access drive further west to provide additional separation and buffer from the Village at Inverness, subject to Staff approval, prior to submitting the rezoning for consideration by City Council;



**1. Mount Carmel Health System Northwest Campus at 3865 Bright Road  
22-001Z/PDP Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan**

- 7) That the plans be updated to provide the shared-use path along the west side of Sawmill Road in Phase 1 of the development;
- 8) That the applicant updates the Preliminary Development Plan to remove or relocate all conceptual ground signs that do not meet the minimum 8-foot setback from the right-of-way, prior to submitting the rezoning for consideration by City Council;
- 9) That the development text be updated to require the applicant to submit a Parking Plan for review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Final Development Plan, and the development text be updated to match the Preliminary Development Plan drawings ratio for staff parking;
- 10) That the applicant continues to work with the City’s Landscape Zoning Inspector to provide adequate screening along I-270 by providing view shed analysis with the Final Development Plan submittal; and
- 11) That the applicant continue to work with Staff to refine the architectural character and landscape architecture character with the FDP in alignment with the Community Plan and the Commission’s discussion.

**VOTE:** 7 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Rezoning with a Preliminary Development Plan was recommended for approval and forwarded to City Council.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

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

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

DocuSigned by:  
  
294AB0C63635490  
 Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner



# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, March 3, 2022

### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the March 3, 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, both from meeting attendees and from those viewing at the City's website. Remote viewers could submit questions or comments during the meeting by using the form under the streaming video at the website. Their comments would be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City is interested in accommodating public participation to the greatest extent possible.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Kim Way, Lance Schneier, Mark Supelak, Leo Grimes, Warren Fishman

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nicole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Zachary Hounshell, Taylor Mullinax, Michael Hendershot, Tina Wawszkiewicz

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded acceptance of the documents into the record.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes.~~

~~[Motion approved 6-0.]~~

~~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. She stated that there is one case eligible for the Consent Agenda, Case 2, Nuve Church at 4199 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 22-024CU, Conditional Use. She inquired if any Commissioner member would like to move the case to the regular agenda for discussion.~~

~~Mr. Fishman stated that he visited the site and observed that the rear of the site is in need of significant clean up. Could a condition be added that before occupation, the site be cleaned up? The existing site conditions could pose a danger.~~

~~Ms. Call responded that this is typically one of the existing criteria that must be met for project completion. She requested staff to respond as to whether the current criteria address the situation described, or if an additional condition is needed.~~

~~Mr. Boggs responded that given the existence of procedures to address the site cleanup and the condition that has already been added requiring the removal of the grease dumpster, his recommendation is that no further conditions be added.~~

~~Mr. Fishman stated that the language indicates the property owner would work with staff to ensure the site cleanup, but no time is stated for its completion. From the safety perspective, it is important to ensure the cleanup is completed before the church is occupied.~~

~~Mr. Boggs responded that all conditions and site compliance criteria must be satisfied before occupation.~~

~~Mr. Fishman indicated that would be satisfactory.~~

~~No request was made to move the case from the Consent Agenda to the regular agenda.~~

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **2. ~~Nuvo Church at 4199 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 22-024CU, Conditional Use~~**

~~Request for a Conditional Use permit to allow a Religious/Public Assembly Use in an existing building zoned Bridge Street District, Commercial. The 2.59-acre site is located on Sharp Lane, southwest of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with Shamrock Boulevard.~~

~~Mr. Fishman moved, Mr. Grimes seconded approval of the Conditional Use with six (6) conditions:~~

- ~~1) That the existing abandoned and non-conforming ground sign be removed upon erection of a new permanent sign for Nuvo Church;~~
- ~~2) That the applicant apply for Sign Permits for any permanent or temporary signs, if applicable;~~
- ~~3) That the grease dumpster on the property be removed prior to occupying the site and building;~~
- ~~4) That the applicant provide a Trip Generation Memo as part of the tenant fit-up when applying for building permits, subject to staff review and approval; and~~
- ~~5) That the applicant apply for Building Permits as necessary for interior tenant improvements.~~

~~Vote: Mr. Grimes, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Supelak, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Ms. Call, yes.~~

~~[Motion approved 6-0.]~~

## **NEW CASE**

### **1. ~~Mount Carmel Health System Northwest Campus at 3865 Bright Road, 22-001Z/PDP, Rezoning/Preliminary Development Plan~~**

~~Ms. Call stated that this is a request for rezoning ±35.05 acres from Restricted Suburban Residential District to Planned Unit Development District. The development consists of a 230,000-square-foot, 30-bed, inpatient hospital, ambulatory care facility, and medical office building. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Bright Road with Emerald Parkway, north of I-270 and west of Sawmill Road.~~

~~Ms. Call explained meeting sequence for case review to those in attendance and swore in individuals wishing to testify on the case.~~

## **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Martin stated that this is a request for a recommendation of approval to City Council for a rezoning of ±35.05 acres from R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District, to PUD, Planned Unit Development, for a 230,000-square-foot, 30-bed inpatient hospital, ambulatory care facility, and medical office building. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Bright Road with Emerald Parkway, northwest of I-270 and west of Sawmill Road. The site has frontage on I-270, Sawmill Road, Bright Road and Emerald Parkway and is located within the Bright Road Special Area Plan. There are a number of established single-family neighborhoods in the area, as well as a recently developed school. The Bridge Street District is located to the south of I-270.

The Commission previously reviewed a Concept Plan for the project on November 4, 2021 and a revised Concept Plan on December 8, 2021. Following City Council approval of the proposed rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan, a Final Development Plan would be reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission to ensure compliance with all of the rezoning standards. The neighborhood has been engaged throughout this development process. The East Dublin Civic Association has met with the Mt. Carmel team several times between August 2021 and February 23, 2022. The civic association provided comments for tonight's meeting, and those comments have been addressed in the conditions.

Proposed rezonings are evaluated against the Dublin Community Plan, which provides recommendations for future land use and development. This site is primarily designated Premium Office and Institutional, which has a recommended land use density of up to 16,500 square feet of development per acre. There are other supporting land uses within the area, including Mixed Residential, Medium Density, and Standard Office and Institutional. This application proposes a density not to exceed 314,000 square feet, which is consistent with the Community Plan allowance and the surrounding development character. The site is also located within the Bright Road Area Plan, which provides both design and mobility recommendations for sites. The Community Plan designates this site as a key gateway having an opportunity for signature architecture with large scale offices and institutional uses along I-270. There is also an opportunity for two-story offices that support these primary uses as well as strong recommendations for robust landscaping along the Sawmill Road corridor and the Emerald Parkway corridor. The mobility recommendations emphasize the importance of connectivity and exploration of items the City is currently studying in conjunction with this development.

The proposal before the Commission reflects the Commission's previous feedback. From the outset, there has been support from the Commission and the community for a hospital and medical use on this site. At its first review, the Commission encouraged an organizing campus framework, which was reflected by the health and wellness campus presented for the second review. The proposal before the Commission tonight provides the next iteration with additional architecture and landscape details.

The health and wellness campus will be developed in multiple phases. Phase 1 proposes a development of 230,000 square feet. It will include a 4-story, 30-bed, 153,000-square-foot hospital wing located along I-270. It also includes a 2-story, 52,000-square-foot medical office building located to the north and connected to the hospital by the main entry, and a chapel feature. The parking for Phase 1 includes two primary parking lots and two secondary parking lots west of the building, with a total of 780 parking spaces.

Phase 2 proposes an additional development of 84,520 square feet for a total square footage of 314,520 square feet. The hospital's fourth floor, consisting of 25,000 square feet, will be completed adding 30 additional beds. A 35,000-square-foot hospital addition will result in a total finished hospital area of 213,000 square feet. A detached, 40,000-square foot Medical Office Building and 160 additional parking spaces will be added, bringing the total parking spaces to 998 spaces. Phase 2 also will add vehicular connection to Bright Road and additional pedestrian connection along Sawmill Road. The Permitted Uses in the development text are intended to be medically oriented, as well as accessory or critical for support of the primary permitted uses. The only Conditional Use proposed for consideration, should it be necessary at some future point, is a drive-through pharmacy. The prohibited uses include all other drive-through facilities. The maximum building coverage is 25%; the maximum lot coverage is 75%. The 4-story building will include an additional mechanical screened penthouse with maximum building height not to exceed 65 feet. Consistent setbacks are provided along all public rights-of-way. The architectural details will be confirmed with the Final Development Plan. The building is required to have 4-sided architecture, contemporary in design, clad in traditional building materials. Landscaping will be the primary organizing form of the development, with a total of 6.9 acres of open space. There are several wellness greens. Significant tree preservation and buffering will be provided along the Bright Road portion of the site, adjacent to existing residences. The proposed parking spaces exceed the amount permitted by Code. The Development Text permits 4 building signs, 3 site entry ground signs, and 6 building entrance signs, which will be reviewed in detail with the Final Development Plan (FDP). As required, the applicant has provided a Traffic Impact Study. Currently, a traffic signal is proposed at the front entrance, although that could be replaced with a roundabout at some point in the future. The City is currently studying potential corridor improvements between the Bright Road roundabout and Sawmill Road. Those improvements would occur in partnership and in conjunction with this development. This development will create a need for a left turn into the site. An existing access along Sawmill Road will continue to be shared with Perry Township. A service and emergency drive will connect Emerald Parkway to Sawmill Road. Staff has reviewed the proposal against the review criteria and recommends approval with 11 conditions.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Jason Koma, Regional Director of Advocacy & Regional Development, Mount Carmel Health System, 7587 Tullymore Drive, Dublin, stated that some requested changes have been made to the plan, such as moving the entrance drive further to the west, in the interest of being a good neighbor. They are working with Dublin City Schools and will have a representative at the School's Job Fair on April 12. It is anticipated that Dublin City School students will be among the first students 16 and up to be employed in the hospital, beginning this June. This is one of the few hospitals in Central Ohio that has been planned within the context of the Covid 19 pandemic.

Mark Bultman, Vice President, HGA Architects, 333 East Erie Street, Milwaukee, WI, stated that they have taken the Commission's previous feedback seriously and improved the design. This health and wellness campus will have significant greenspace, buildings with 4-sided architecture, visibility from I-270 and Sawmill Road, a main entrance from Emerald Parkway and a future access from Bright Road. [Displayed the Phase 1 site plan and Phase 2 full buildout]. Tonight, they will be showing how the conceptual massing will be developed.

Tim Scanley, Design Architect, HGA Architects, 333 East Erie Street, Milwaukee, WI, stated that each Mt. Carmel hospital campus was developed within context of the community in which it is located. He reviewed the architectural massing and materials. Their design team has attempted to: establish

a patient experience that is warm and welcoming; create an expression of a place of healing; emphasize it as a place of wellness and connection to nature. The central focus of the campus design is the chapel. Its dynamic form with steeple-like qualities will not only foster inspiration and hope in the patients, but also serve as a visual landmark on the campus. [Described the site layout, building elevations and approaches to the campus.]

### **Commission Questions**

Mr. Way stated that there is a central green at the front entrance, but a road cuts through it. What is the purpose of that connecting road? It is not a fire lane.

Mr. Bultman responded that roadway provides a connection between the two parking lots.

Mr. Way inquired if it is necessary, as it disrupts the beautiful concept.

Mr. Bultman responded that it is functionally very important. It provides a relief valve between the two parking lots and serves as a pedestrian connection across the greenspace.

Mr. Way stated that it will be important to design it as part of the park and not as a parking lot connector.

Mr. Bultman agreed that the design will be important to the success of that greenspace. The Fire Department did request ability to move between the two parking lots.

Mr. Koma stated that the ability to have that fire lane connection improves the functionality.

Mr. Way stated that the connection is not reflected in the fire lane diagram, so that is confusing. He requested clarification as to whether it is a fire lane connection.

Chris Fleming, Civil Engineer, 1650 Watermark Drive, Columbus, OH stated that the Fire Department has requested ability to circulate through that area to reach the building. We do not want this connector to look like a main drive, yet there is need for the Fire Department to have access between the two parking spaces. The challenge is to make a clean connection while maintaining the aesthetics of the space.

Mr. Way stated that there is a significant amount of stormwater retention on the site. Some of the renderings indicate those as water retention ponds.

Mr. Fleming responded that the three basins at the front will retain water. The middle basin in the rear courtyard will be a dry basin. It has not yet been determined whether the basin near Sawmill Road will be wet or dry. The site does not have a good outlet, so adequate stormwater detention on site is important.

Mr. Hendershot, staff engineer, stated that Mr. Fleming is correct. The three basins along Emerald Parkway are proposed to be retention basins (wet) basins. Currently, the plans show the basin along Sawmill Road as a wet basin, but that potentially could change.

Ms. Call inquired what the City requires in regard to stormwater quality and quantity.

Mr. Fleming stated that this project, as all others in the City, is required to meet both water quality and quantity requirements. The applicant has submitted calculations that show they are meeting both, so they are demonstrating compliance. This is the Preliminary Development Plan stage, so there will be further refinement as the project progresses.

Mr. Way stated that the oncology garden provides a purpose to the greenspace on that side of the campus. Does the greenspace at the north entry have any purpose other than to accommodate a road and pathway, or could that entire environment be considered parklike and have amenities or artwork? Is there a purpose for the space other than access?

Brian Kinzelman, Senior Landscape Architect, MKSK, 462 South Ludlow Street, Columbus, OH 43215, stated that the area described is currently a very substantial woodlot. The intent is to very strategically weave the driveway through the area. It is a great community asset for open space with the potential for routing a trail system through there. There is an opportunity for respite places to be included. On the approach from Bright Road, little of the building will be seen due to that substantial woodlot. The oncology garden is a significant component of the indoor-outdoor function of this facility. There are other gardens more intimate and closer to the building, but this is the quiet side of the site. He envisions the Bright Road Park as leading up into the oncology garden, then branching off into the other two open space areas. This area would become park space.

Mr. Way stated that he points out an important point. This is an existing wooded space, while the rest of the site is not wooded. This environment offers the opportunity for something unique and different to be achieved. The space needs to have a purpose, and that needs to be explored further.

Mr. Schneier requested the parking slide to be shown. Phase 1 provides 780 parking spaces. Phase 2 indicates 985 required spaces, but notes a total of 998 parking spaces would be provided. He requested clarification.

Ms. Martin responded that based on the requirements of the Development Text, the applicant is providing more parking spaces than required. A second number indicates the Code requirement. With Phase 1, Code requires 546; with Phase 2, Code requires 791.

Ms. Call inquired how the total number of 998 spaces factors into the equation.

Ms. Martin responded that the applicant has chosen to provide more parking than their Development Text would require. In Phase 1, the Code requires 780 parking spaces, and they are providing 780 spaces. In Phase 2, the Code requires 985 parking spaces; however, the applicant would like to provide 998 parking spaces.

Mr. Schneier inquired the reason for the deviation. Why does the applicant want to provide more than the Code requires. What number would be approved with the Preliminary Development Plan?

Ms. Martin responded that should the Commission recommend approval of the Preliminary Development, the ratio provided in the Development Text would be approved. However, staff is requesting that the text be revised to require the applicant to provide a parking plan substantiating the need for more spaces with the Final Development Plan. The Preliminary Development Plan would approve at least 780 spaces in Phase One and 985 spaces in Phase 2.

Mr. Schneier requested the applicant to explain the need for additional spaces.

Mr. Bultman stated that they design many hospital campuses and often find that the real demand of the hospital is different than Codes require in different communities. They use benchmark numbers from many other projects, which indicate the number of cars needed per bed and the number of parking spaces per square foot. There are two factors considered – the peak demand and the shift change demand. During those times, the parking lots are full. The number of parking spaces is essentially a peak demand issue.

Mr. Schneier stated that the City would like to see as much greenspace and as little blacktop as possible. It is important to find the right balance.

Mr. Bultman responded that they have the ability to model the exact demand that will be experienced based on the anticipated staff and patient arrival times. That is used to confirm the benchmark numbers used. They would be happy to share that methodology. They are not interested in providing more parking than absolutely necessary, as there are associated costs. Investing money in asphalt is not a priority.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the helistop was necessary for the functionality of the hospital or a useful feature for the hospital and community. It is important that the usage be sensitive to the neighborhood.

Mr. Bultman responded that the heliport is required for the functionality of the hospital. It is primarily for outgoing patients; it is a helistop not a helipad. It is anticipated that it will be used infrequently, perhaps once or twice/month to transport patients from the hospital to a facility that can provide a higher level of care for that patient. It is not for the purpose of Life Flights to this facility. They met with the FAA and the Ohio Department of Transportation within the last week, and both have confirmed that they have no issues with the proposed location or the associated flight paths.

Mr. Koma clarified that the frequency would likely be only once or twice a year for this type of hospital.

Mr. Fishman inquired if there was any consideration for locating it on the hospital roof, which would reduce the amount of greenspace impacted.

Mr. Bultman responded that placing it on the roof has certain complexities. It would be essential to get fuel up to the roof to re-fuel helicopters. That has a significant cost associated with it. Given the infrequency of use, it is typical in a community hospital setting to place it on the ground. It is also adjacent to the Emergency Department, which is important.

Diane Douchette, 16171 Lewis Road, Sunbury, OH stated that she is a nurse and has been involved with the development of this project. She would like to comment on this issue. An example of when this helistop could be used would be for a major motor vehicle accident in which severe injuries were experienced. The patient would enter the Emergency Department, be stabilized, and the hospital would call for a Life Flight to transport the patient to a trauma center. It is critical not to waste time taking a patient through the hospital and up to the roof to a helicopter. From a patient safety standpoint, the helistop next to the Emergency Department enables a quicker response.

Mr. Bultman stated that for sensitivity purposes, it is also as far from residences as possible.

Mr. Fishman requested clarification of the parking spaces. When the hospital is built, will only the number permitted by Code be provided, or also the additional spaces?

Mr. Bultman stated that the additional 13 spaces would occur with the subsequent expansion of the parking lot, but that would be addressed with staff.

Mr. Grimes inquired if, from a flight safety standpoint, the emergency department lighting and the high power lines on the other side dictate where the helistop must be placed. There does not seem to be much room for lighting this space.

Mr. Bultman responded that the FAA has very well described requirements for lighting of the helipad itself, including in-ground lights around its perimeter. The lighting would not be visually intrusive. The lighting is essential to guide the pilot coming into the spot. They must see the helipad and its perimeter.

Mr. Grimes inquired if nothing additional is needed in regard to the power lines or on the building itself to aid the flight operations.

Mr. Bultman responded that the FAA describes the Flight Approach takeoff of planes. There is a specific angle from which helicopters take off. As long as the obstructions are below that angle, they do not need to be lit. They reviewed those elements with the FAA and the plans are satisfactory.

Mr. Supelak stated that at this point the building is not intrusive to any building setbacks, but as the site develops and other buildings are added, will the building setbacks be sufficient? He believes the setback is 59 feet along Emerald Parkway and Bright Road.

Ms. Martin responded that there is both a pavement and a building setback. The building setback along Emerald Parkway is 100 feet, but the pavement setback is 50 feet. The Sawmill Road setback is 100 feet. That provides a generous landscape buffer consistent with the Emerald Parkway corridor. The 50-foot Sawmill Road Corridor is required by ODOT and is consistent throughout Dublin.

Mr. Way stated that the site plan provides very large parking lots without much landscaping within. He would like to see more green areas included in the parking lots, which means they would offset some of the parking spaces. He stated that the penthouse is actually another story. Is that included in the 65-foot height maximum?

Ms. Martin responded that the 65 feet is measured to the top of the fourth story, the occupied story. The penthouse, while it has the presence of an additional story, is not accessible, usable space to the public. Its primary purpose is to screen mechanicals, therefore, is not counted in the total height of the building.

Mr. Way stated that hospitals have large mechanicals, so their penthouses are much larger than what otherwise might be typical. The footprint of a penthouse is almost a full floor height. In essence, it creates a 5-story building, making it taller than 65 feet.

Ms. Martin stated that there was significant discussion on this issue with the applicant, considering how it has been handled with other hospitals. There are really two approaches. One is to make the overall number significantly higher. For instance, Ohio State buildings are permitted to be 118 feet in height. This is significantly shorter, so it would seem to be too permissive. They have attempted to ensure through stories and maximum height something that is compatible with the community. The penthouses are probably about 20 feet in height, however.

Mr. Way stated that he would encourage that it be presented clearly that the penthouse would create a more massive building height. In regard to signage, this site is very unique in that there are three very separate arrival points. The proposed signage language must be supportive of this site and the use that will be here.

Ms. Martin responded that the Final Development Plan will address the signage in detail. At this stage, only the parameters for it are established. There are 13 potential permanent signs. The sign standards contemplated for this development provide sufficient flexibility for further design with the Final Development Plan. From the City's perspective, there will be adequate site wayfinding.

Mr. Way inquired if crosses could be considered signs.

Ms. Martin responded that there is a category regarding additional signage, such as emergency signs. The cross, which is a graphic illustration of the mission, would be considered additional signage.

Mr. Schneier requested clarification of the proposed materials on the penthouse elevation, beginning at the base.

Mr. Scanley responded that along the base of the hospital, a dark iron spot brick will be used. The brick tone is similar to that of the brick paver intersections within Bridge Park. The plum and charcoal color is a unique, more modern brick. The orange tone seen next to that is the natural wood veneer panel, which is an exterior product. A buff-tone stone will be used on the stair tower, chapel and medical office building. They are currently accumulating information on the commodity prices and availability for the white metal panel, which will reflect a subtle tone shift. This panel potentially could be a cement panel. Shown on the penthouse elevation is a profile panel that would coordinate with the white metal panel. It could be a louvered, metal system to accommodate airflow.

Mr. Scheneir stated the Medical Office Building is to the left of that.

Mr. Scanley stated that there would be a screen wall. There are fresh air requirements, so this would probably also be an open louvered system to allow airflow.

Ms. Call inquired if the retention basins along the Emerald Parkway area of the site are contemplated to incorporate water movement, such as fountains.

Mr. Kinzelman responded that is not contemplated at this juncture. That entire frontage is considered one large landscape composition, not three separate ponds. The entire area will be sculpted with earth forms and robust plantings. Water movement probably is not needed. If it were to be incorporated, it would be low bubblers, not fountains.

Ms. Call inquired if any type of water element is contemplated within the oncology garden.

Mr. Kinzelman responded that they would be taking a close look at incorporating human qualities in that space, which could include moving water.

Ms. Call responded that her interest was in achieving a peaceful quality within the space. It is not a densely treed area, but water could contribute a more peaceful quality.

Mr. Kinzelman noted that this would be the quieter side of the campus.

Mr. Way inquired if the applicant was working with Dublin Arts Council concerning the potential to integrate public art into the site.

Ms. Douchette responded that they would be doing so. They are interested in working with a local artist on an opportunity for this site.

Mr. Way stated that at this point, there is only an overall concept for the landscaping. He is looking forward to landscape renderings, which will provide more detail.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Rauch noted that two public comments were received earlier, and those were included in the meeting packet. The following additional public comment was received online during the meeting.

Gerald Kosicki, 4313 Wyandotte Woods Blvd., Dublin, OH 43016:

"The project fits the Community Plan well, will provide needs services to community, and we appreciate the collaborative efforts you have engaged in with East Dublin Civic Association. The contemporary buildings are attractive. I understand the need for parking, but do you have figures for how many of these spaces will be used regularly by staff vs. for visitors or patients? Will some lots be used exclusively by staff or will some close to the buildings be reserved for patients and visitors? Does all parking have to be in large parking lots? Could some of it be under the buildings or maybe in structured parking? This is partly a matter of aesthetics, but also to make parking more convenient for users. How many minutes will it take to walk from the farthest reaches of the parking lots to the buildings? Will any of the parking have chargers for Electric Vehicles? Regarding the landscaping, which is generally attractive, what proportion of the site is taken up with these water retention ponds? Did you consider putting any of those ponds underground to make more usable open space?"

Ms. Call noted that some of the questions raised in the public comments would be addressed by the Final Development Plan. She noted that the staff parking lot depicted in the site plan is the one located closer to Sawmill Road.

Meeting Attendee Comments:

Carla Clifton, 3899 Inverness Circle, Dublin, OH 43016, stated that she has attended all three Commission reviews of this project and has not heard what the traffic study revealed and the proposed mitigation measures for Bright Road. She is concerned because she lives in the condominiums located there. Additionally, has the Commission considered how the large construction vehicles, often equipment and beams, would have site access. Will they be travelling down Bright Road, traveling through the roundabout, to enter from Emerald Parkway, or will they travel through downtown Dublin to Emerald Parkway? Additionally, the project application identifies the hospital address as Bright Road. The Bright Road development of the hospital site is in Phase 2. Should the hospital address be on Emerald Parkway instead, so that GPS directions will lead to the Emerald Parkway access?

Ms. Martin responded that she would respond to the question concerning the address. Currently, the 35.5-acre site has the same address of an earlier demolished home that was sited along Bright Road. However, City Engineering will work with the applicant to identify a new property address, which likely will be a round number Emerald Parkway address.

Mr. Koma stated that in regard to Ms. Clifton's question concerning construction traffic – they would work out the least intrusive method for construction access. He does not have a more specific answer at this time, but should any issues arise during the construction process, he can be called at any time and will attempt to address the issue.

Tina Wawszkiewicz, Civil Engineer, stated that in regard to the traffic impact study – that study was performed by the applicant to understand the mitigation required to address the site traffic. Additionally, the City is taking a look at the Bright Road corridor, specifically, the intersection of Sawmill Road and Bright Road, recognizing that even today, those conditions are not ideal. The City is coordinating those two projects with the applicant. Those details will be provided in an agreement that will go to City Council for approval.

Ms. Call inquired about the timing and current objective concerning Bright Road.

Ms. Martin stated that she is not able to respond to the timing question; perhaps another staff member can follow up with that information. In regard to the current objective, the Traffic Impact Study recommends traffic control improvement at the main entrance, a full access point on Emerald Parkway. The type of improvement identified in the Preliminary Development Plan is a traffic signal. Although the smaller service drive on Emerald Parkway will also be a full access point, it would not be signalized. That entrance would be limited to emergency and service vehicles only. The traffic study also indicates that the Sawmill Road access should continue to be a restricted access point. On Bright Road, there will be a left turn lane into the development. That lane would occur in conjunction with the City's study, currently underway.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Schneier stated that the evolution of this project has been enlightening, and he appreciates the applicant's responsiveness. His questions, excluding parking, have been answered at this point. He understands the parking plan will be addressed in a future review. He is supportive of this project and looks forward to its development.

Mr. Fishman stated that he concurs with Mr. Schneier's comments. His only concern is the number of parking lots. When the next phase is developed, could a parking garage be considered? Typically, hospitals have parking garages, which would reduce the elimination of more greenspace.

Mr. Bultman stated that the growth from 780 parking spaces to 985 parking spaces in Phase 2 can be accommodated with surface parking. The total buildout of the campus does not trigger a need for a parking structure. That does not mean that it could not happen in the future, but currently, that is not part of the long-term development plan.

Mr. Fishman stated that this is a welcome project. He anticipates a beautiful project.

Mr. Supelak stated that this project is developing nicely. There is some ongoing consternation about the parking lots. Could they be tightened up or supplemented with more greenspace? He encourages them to keep the human factor in mind with their planning. He is generally supportive of the project. He applauds the design on the west and south sides. On the east side, which will be seen from I-270, more attention is needed in regard to the aesthetics. He likes the chapel design element, making that a special gem in that pocket. He wonders if one of those walls could be canted, instead of being vertical. He would encourage them to not only continue this design direction, but take it further. The white panel picture box on this façade could be improved with the addition of depth, perhaps through an architectural skew or bend. He would encourage them to focus further on opportunities to improve the architecture. The canopies are very flat, not particularly dynamic, and blend into the horizontal character of the building; there is opportunity for improvement there. Some of their earlier inspirational images depicted underbellies/undersides that were wood clad and more compelling. The canopies could be activated in some compelling ways. He understands a greater level of detail would be added in the next stage; that level of detailing is impactful. The mechanical screens on the lower building essentially appear as a block, because there is not much of a parapet. From one view, it looks like a flat roof. Perhaps that is not the final architecture, but addressing those architectural opportunities would make this project more compelling. What has been presented already is very nice, however.

Mr. Grimes stated that this is an amazing project, and he is looking forward to its completion. The associated traffic issues will need to be mitigated; we have yet to see what those measures will be. There has been discussion about widening Bright Road to improve the traffic flow. This is not a long road. When a hospital shift change occurs, traffic will load that roadway quickly. If it is possible to design the project in a manner to discourage use of Bright Road, he would recommend that occur. Perhaps traffic could be directed to Hard Road or Emerald Parkway. Even the addition of five lanes here could not address the issue, as the traffic will find it difficult to exit onto Sawmill Road. That is a problem today, and significant consideration must be given to this issue to avoid having it negatively impact this project long-term.

Mr. Way noted that he is concerned about the dark ironspot brick. He thought of that brick color as dark gray, but as depicted in the drawings, it appears purple. He does not believe the intent is to match the Mt. Carmel logo. The proposed material, as shown, it is making him uneasy. The current renderings do not include vehicles in the parking lot. He would request that when the next iteration of the project comes before the Commission for review, that the vehicles are honestly depicted. Adding that detail to the views would make it easier to identify where landscaping could be added to screen the parking lots. In the final review, the images should show what will be seen when the project opens.

Mr. Supelak stated that he understands the parking and peak traffic is a part of the function of this site. Could there be any merit to staggered shift changes? Perhaps that is not plausible, but there

would be merit to the hospital finding a way to provide future parking without building a great number of parking lots.

Mr. Way stated that the Commission is expressing some real angst about the parking lots. Parking is becoming a real issue, and we are interested in building a community that is not driven around parking, but about people. They recognize there will be a large number of cars, but the Commission would prefer the site not be dominated by cars. It is important to achieve a balance, either less parking or more landscaping to soften and mitigate the parking impact on the site.

Ms. Call stated she believes the applicant is attuned to the sensitivities of the Commission and community about this project located at this particular intersection. Concern about the traffic has been expressed repeatedly by many. A public comment was shared about charging stations. If there is an opportunity to include those in the project, she would encourage it. She understands the peak traffic with shift changes. Because consistent patient coverage is critical, that cannot be avoided. However, there are some opportunities to mitigate the parking demand, and she would encourage them to think creatively about those. There was some difference in the parking space count in the development text from the drawing. As Mr. Way suggested, perhaps those extra parking spaces could be replaced with greenspace. The landscape must be integrated in such a way to lessen the visual impact of the asphalt. Mr. Supelak remarked on the need for improvement to the Sawmill Road building elevation. On the other sides, all three colors are represented on three levels. On this elevation, there is nothing in the second plane; there is only the dark color and glass. Integrating an element of the lighter color would add variety. Even though there is articulation, because of the materials, the articulation is not apparent. The addition of a vertical element or blank massing to break up the architecture and the dark colors would add variety. The Commission appreciates all the efforts invested. She encourages the applicant to continue to work with the community, the Commission and staff as the project moves forward.

Ms. Call requested Commission members to review the 11 conditions for approval.

Mr. Way inquired about the refining of the landscape architecture for the FDP.

Ms. Rauch responded that Item #11 would include a reference concerning that item.

Mr. Fishman encouraged the heavy use of evergreens to provide green landscaping year round.

Ms. Call inquired if the City parking standards address snow stacking.

Ms. Rauch responded that is not addressed in the City Code.

Mr. Supelak encouraged that the service area screening not look like a screened industrial area.

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded a recommendation to City Council for approval of the Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan with the following 11 conditions:

- 1) The applicant to continue to work with the City of Dublin to develop a development/infrastructure agreement for consideration by City Council to be submitted in conjunction with the rezoning application to City Council.
- 2) The applicant continue to work with the City of Dublin, the City of Columbus, and ODOT to complete the traffic impact study to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and each jurisdiction's designee, prior to submitting the rezoning for consideration by City Council.
- 3) The applicant coordinate proposed site and off-site improvements between the preliminary development plan (including phasing), traffic impact study, and development/infrastructure agreement to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

- 4) The applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance in accordance with Chapter 53 of the City of Dublin Code of Ordinances.
- 5) The applicant continue to work with ODOT and the City of Columbus to obtain any necessary approvals/permits for utility work within their respective jurisdiction.
- 6) The applicant realign the Bright Road access drive further west to provide additional separation and buffer from the Village at Inverness, subject to Staff approval, prior to submitting the rezoning for consideration by City Council.
- 7) That the plans be updated to provide the shared-use path along the west side of Sawmill Road in Phase 1 of the development.
- 8) The applicant update the PDP to remove or relocate all conceptual ground signs that do not meet the minimum 8-foot setback from the right-of-way, prior to submitting the rezoning for consideration by City Council.
- 9) The Development Text be updated to require the applicant to submit a Parking Plan for review and approval by the PZC with the FDP, and the Development Text be updated to match the PDP drawings ratio for staff parking.
- 10) The applicant continue to work with the City's Landscape Zoning Inspector to provide adequate screening along I-270 by providing view shed analysis with the FDP submittal.
- 11) The applicant continue to work with staff to refine the architectural character and landscape architecture character with the FDP in alignment with the Community Plan and the Commission's discussion.

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

[Motion approved 6-0.]

Ms. Call thanked everyone who contributed to making this a better project. The Commission is looking forward to the Final Development Plan where additional details will be provided.

## COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rauch reported that the annual APA National Conference will be held in San Diego, April 30-May 3, 2022. Commission members should notify staff if they wish to attend the event.

The next regular meeting of PZC is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Thursday, March 17, 2022.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Clerk of Council



# RECORD OF ACTION

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 4, 2022 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Mount Carmel Hospital, Northwest at 4111 Emerald Parkway 22-094FDP** **Final Development Plan**

Proposal: Construction of a 230,000-square-foot, 30-bed inpatient hospital and ambulatory center on a 35.0-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District, Mount Carmel Hospital Northwest.  
Location: Southwest of the roundabout of Bright Road and Sawmill Road.  
Request: Review and approval of a Final Development Plan with Minor Text Modifications under the provisions of Zoning Code §153.050.  
Applicant: Mount Carmel Health System – Diane Doucette, COO  
Planning Contact: Nichole Martin, AICP, Senior Planner  
Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us  
Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/22-094

**MOTION 1:** Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded, to approve a four (4) Minor Text Modifications:

1. Section II(D)(2)(e): To permit a minimum pavement setback of 10 feet is permitted from the west property line for the shared use path connection to Bright Road.
2. Section II(G): To permit the Planning and Zoning Commission to approve an alternate parking ratio with a Parking Plan and to eliminate staffing information from the development text.
3. Section II(H)(4): To permit two off-premise signs for Perry Township Administrative Offices to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Final Development Plan. No sign permits shall be required.
4. Section II(J)(2)(8): To permit existing tree preservation to be used to meet the Internal Driveway tree requirement.

**VOTE:** 6 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Minor Text Modifications were approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Lance Schneier	Yes
Rebecca Call	Absent
Mark Supelak	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes



**1. Mount Carmel Hospital, Northwest at 4111 Emerald Parkway  
22-094FDP**

**Final Development Plan**

**MOTION 2:** Mr. Way moved, Mr. Schneier seconded, to approve a Final Development Plan with 44 conditions:

General

- 1) That Perry Township rectify records with Franklin County regarding the designation and ownership of the 0.309-acre tract of land along Sawmill Road;
- 2) That prior to issuance of the Building Permit for Perry Township site modifications, all Township land be combined into one parcel; and the applicant must obtain a Site Permit through Building Standards for any site modifications to the Perry Township site;
- 3) That the applicant update all site plans to correctly depict property lines, right-of-way lines, easements, and parcel ownership for land along Sawmill Road;

Engineering

- 4) That the applicant update all engineering drawings to accurately reflect zoning standards including building coverage, lot coverage, parking, and square feet of development;
- 5) That the applicant execute their obligations set forth in the Infrastructure Agreement accepted by City Council per Ordinance 15-22;
- 6) That the applicant dedicate right-of-way and easements to the City of Dublin in accordance with the Infrastructure Agreement accepted by City Council per Ordinance 15-22, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 7) That the applicant coordinate proposed site and off-site improvements with the Emerald Parkway Roundabout Project, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 8) That the applicant coordinate the proposed ground sign location along Emerald Parkway with the proposed guardrail as part of the Emerald Parkway Roundabout Project, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 9) That the applicant work with the City of Dublin to establish ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the proposed guardrail along Emerald Parkway, including the dedication of easements if necessary, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;
- 10) That the applicant coordinate proposed site and off-site improvements with the Bright Road and Sawmill Road Intersection improvements to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the City of Columbus' designee;
- 11) That the applicant continue to work with the City of Columbus on proposed modifications to the Sawmill Road access point and median to the satisfaction of the City of Columbus' designee;
- 12) That the applicant continue to work with ODOT and the City of Columbus to obtain any necessary approvals/permits for work within their respective jurisdiction;



**1. Mount Carmel Hospital, Northwest at 4111 Emerald Parkway  
22-094FDP**

**Final Development Plan**

- 13) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance for both site and off-site improvements to the satisfaction of the City Engineer in accordance with Chapter 53 of the City of Dublin Code of Ordinances;
- 14) That the applicant provides ADA compliant curb ramps at the Emerald Parkway service drive access point, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer;

Architecture

- 15) That the architecture be updated to provide a brick parapet to terminate the roofline of the Medical Office Building (MOB), the connector and the lower level of the east wing, subject to Staff approval;
- 16) That the louvered vent inserts on the east and west elevations maintain a consistent appearance across the entire fifth floor, whether inactive (ornamental) or for active ventilation;
- 17) That the applicant further articulate the connector to break the building base and differentiate the entry along the east elevation, subject to Staff approval;
- 18) That the applicant provide the decorative brick detail located on the east elevation of the hospital and north elevation of the MOB, subject to Staff approval;
- 19) That all service yard screen walls be constructed of brick to be architecturally integrated with the building;
- 20) The applicant provide installation details for the metal panels and wood panels (Prodema), prior to submitting for building permits, subject to Staff approval;

Parking

- 21) That the parking plan be updated to maintain the reduction of 52 parking spaces in Phase II for a total of 946 parking spaces;
- 22) That the applicant update the parking plan and civil drawings to reflect the number of bicycle parking spaces provided;

Landscaping

- 23) That the applicant revise the landscape plans to demonstrate conformance to the requirements of the development text, prior to building permit submittal;
- 24) That the applicant update the plans, prior to building permit submittal, to provide quantities for all plants in the plant list, subject to Staff approval;
- 25) That the applicant revise the tree survey and tree preservation plans to ensure consistency with the information in the table;
- 26) That the applicant update the plans to clad the base of all light poles with stone that are not located within a landscape island;



**1. Mount Carmel Hospital, Northwest at 4111 Emerald Parkway  
22-094FDP**

**Final Development Plan**

- 27) That the applicant update the plans to specify a crushed granite aggregate for all gravel walks and plazas, and that the applicant demonstrates the gravel is of a high quality and compaction, subject to Staff approval;
- 28) That the applicant update the landscape plans to provide a maintenance schedule for the no-mow grass for the first 5 years;
- 29) That the applicant provide a low hedge atop the I-270 mound to fill any screening gaps; and the applicant work with Staff to identify a species with a mature height compliant with all FAA regulations;
- 30) That the steel pipe bollards only be permitted within the service yard and decorative bollards be required in all other installations;
- 31) That the applicant install trees along both sides of all internal drives in Phase I;
- 32) That the parking lots be redesigned to establish landscape islands that provide protected and shaded pedestrian connections to the greenways thru each parking lot, subject to Staff approval;

Fire

- 33) That 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;

Lighting

- 34) That the physical extents of each area of the site be defined in the Statistics Table to be provided to Planning for verification of the foot candle data, prior to submitting for Building Permits;
- 35) That the foot candle levels along the main entry drive be reduced to fall within the average range of one to three foot candles;
- 36) That the average light levels the main entry drive, service yard, and staff entrance be reduced to fall within a 4:1 ratio;
- 37) That the applicant update the Luminaire Schedule to provide missing information and correct conflicting specifications for Planning review, prior to submitting for Building Permits;

Signs

- 38) That the raceways be prohibited for all building mount signs, and all letters and logos be individually mounted;
- 39) That all ground mounted signs, exclusive of DR-03, be updated to provide dimensional push-through letters and logos at a minimum dimension of 1.0 inches for the primary site entry sign and 0.5 inches for all other signs;
- 40) That the building mounted, Medical Office and Main Entrance sign designs be revised to be fabricated of clear anodized aluminum letter, individually pin-mounted, and halo illuminated;



**1. Mount Carmel Hospital, Northwest at 4111 Emerald Parkway  
22-094FDP**

**Final Development Plan**

- 41) That the applicant update the Sign Quantities/Parameters Table to accurately reflect square footage for BE-01 and BE-02;
- 42) That the applicant update the sign plan for the service drive sign to state "authorized emergency and service vehicles only";
- 43) That the applicant update the plans to confirm and dimension the minimum 8-foot setback from the right-of-way on all Civil and Landscape drawings; and
- 44) That the approval of the Perry Township signage is expressly contingent upon Perry Township dismissing Franklin County Case No. 22 CV-05-3590 against the City of Dublin, in full settlement of all claims made regarding any and all Mount Carmel applications, no later than August 17, 2022.

**VOTE:** 6 – 0.

**RESULT:** The Final Development Plan was approved.

**RECORDED VOTES:**

Lance Schneier	Yes
Rebecca Call	Absent
Mark Supelak	Yes
Kim Way	Yes
Warren Fishman	Yes
Jamey Chinnock	Yes
Kathy Harter	Yes

**STAFF CERTIFICATION**

DocuSigned by:

*Jennifer Rauch*

C08B79E0958D44D

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Director





# MEETING MINUTES

## Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 4, 2022

### CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Supelak, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the August 4, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. He 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

Mr. Supelak led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Kim Way, Lance Schneier, Warren Fishman, Kathy Harter, Mark Supelak, Jamey Chinnock

Commission members absent: Rebecca Call

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Tammy Noble, Thaddeus Boggs, Michael Hendershot, Tina Wawskiewicz

### ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS

~~Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the minutes of the 06-16-22 meeting.~~

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

~~[Motion approved 6-0.]~~

~~Mr. Supelak 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. Mr. Supelak swore in meeting attendees who anticipated testifying on the evening's cases. He stated that there was one case eligible for the Consent Agenda, Mango's Place Amended Final Development Plan, and inquired if any member wished to move the case to the regular agenda for discussion. No member requested that the case be moved to the regular agenda.~~

### CONSENT CASE

~~4. Mango's Place at 5600 Rings Road, 19-125AFDP, Amended Final Development Plan~~

~~Request for Minor Text Modification to permit LED lights for a ±7,900-square-foot daycare facility on a 2.2-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development, Thomas Kohler, Subarea E, located northeast of the intersection of Emerald Parkway with Rings Road.~~

~~Mr. Way moved, Mr. Fishman seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with one Minor Text Modification:~~

- ~~1. General Development Standards for all Subareas, Section (3)(d): Parking lot lighting shall be high pressure sodium or LED.~~

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

~~[Motion approved 6-0]~~

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

~~Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded to adjourn into Executive Session for the discussion of a pending ligation matter.~~

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

~~[Motion approved 6-0]~~

### **MEETING RECONVENED**

~~Mr. Supelak moved, Mr. Way seconded to reconvene the meeting.~~

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

~~[Motion approved 6-0]~~

~~Meeting reconvened at 6:52 p.m.~~

### **NEW CASES**

#### **1. Mount Carmel Hospital at 4111 Emerald Parkway, 22-094FDP, Final Development Plan**

A request for approval of a Final Development Plan for the construction of a 230,000-square-foot, 30-bed inpatient hospital and ambulatory center on a 35.0-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District, Mount Carmel Hospital Northwest, located southwest of the roundabout of Bright Road and Sawmill Road.

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Ms. Martin stated that this a request for review and approval of the Mt. Carmel Hospital Final Development Plan (FDP). The 35.0-acre site, located at 4105 Emerald Parkway, is 750 feet southeast of the intersection of Bright Road and Emerald Parkway. The site has approximately 700 feet of frontage on Emerald Parkway, 250 feet of frontage on Bright Road, 450 feet of frontage on Sawmill Road, and 1,500 feet of frontage along I-270. The site is primarily cultivated land and heavily wooded in the northern portion of the site. The Final Development is the final step of a PUD review. The FDP provides final design details, including building architecture, landscape and

sign design for approval prior to ability to apply for Building Permits. This is the FDP for Phase 1 of the Mount Carmel Hospital, and includes 230,000 square feet of development in a 4-story, 30-bed hospital, sited along I-270 with an emergency department. It also includes a 52,000-square-foot medical office building (MOB) located north of the hospital and 728 parking spaces. Staff parking is located to the rear of the building along Sawmill Road; visitor and patient parking is located forward of the building along Emerald Parkway. The main entrance to the healthcare and wellness campus is located at the Emerald Parkway roundabout with secondary entry points occurring along Bright Road and Sawmill Road. A service only drive connects Emerald Parkway to Sawmill Road and is located south of the building along I-270. The site also includes a service area and helistop. The PUD and rezoning establish site and building development standards, all of which have been confirmed to be compliant with the FDP. All building and pavement setbacks are met with this proposal excluding one request for a Minor Text Modification, to permit a reduced setback for the shared use path. Additionally, the lot and building coverage and maximum building height requirements are met. The applicant has submitted a parking plan, which contains operational details. As part of their parking analysis, they have identified the need for 52 fewer parking spaces in Phase 1 than the 780 spaces originally proposed. Staff recommends the 52 fewer spaces in Phase 1 be provided in Phase 2 for a total of 914 parking spaces. The building has four-sided contemporary architecture; natural building materials are used, which include 38 percent glazing, 12 percent wood/stone accents, and 43 percent brick and metal panel. The total amount of brick and metal panel is 2 percent shy of the 45 percent requirement, which staff has determined to be approximate and compliant. The material specifications are: 1) brick – dark iron spot; 2) stone – natural limestone (full bed dimensional coursing in an ashlar pattern); 3) metal panel – white flat panel with dry joints; 4) wood – Prodema phenolic wood veneer (Onix color); and 5) windows – PPG Night Sky color. As required, the applicant has provided the installation details for the metal and Prodema panels. Staff recommends concealed fasteners be used for installation. Staff has recommended a number of conditions, which are consistent with the Commission’s feedback provided in the previous Commission meetings [Condition details provided.]. All sign details have been provided for the Commission’s review and approval. Staff has reviewed the application against the applicable criteria and recommends approval with 42 conditions, many of which are for clean-up purposes.

### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Diane Doucette, COO, Mount Carmel Health System - St. Ann, Lewis Center, 16171 Lewis Road, Sunbury OH 43074, stated that she is the executive sponsor for the project and will be the future president of the facility. Mt. Carmel desired to locate in Dublin, providing services close to home for the residents within this area. The project review process has been lengthy, and she thanks the Commission for its meaningful feedback into the project’s design. With every element of this design, they have prioritized the patient and customer experience. The Commission expressed a desire for this project to be more than a healthcare campus, a place where the community could gather. A community room on the first floor has been added for the purpose of providing education and guidance related to certain health topics. They have extended great efforts to make this a beautiful, efficient and welcoming campus.

Mark Bultman, Landscape Architect, HGA Architects, 333 East Erie Street, Milwaukee, WI, shared the site plan progression in developing this hospital and wellness campus. The idea of a green ribbon was introduced as a campus unifying element, creating a great patient experience from the initial entrance into the site up to the front door. The building has four-sided architecture and has been sited in a manner to take advantage of being a gateway element within the community. The

final Phase One site plan reflects the full realization of the combined efforts of the Commission and their team to craft a wellness experience throughout the campus. The concept of a green ribbon allowed them to create walking trails to invite the community in, diminish the scale of the parking and wrap the building. That green ribbon terminates at the chapel garden on the right side of the building, framing the view for those within the chapel. The Bright Road landscape plan details have been developed, which include moving the Bright Road connector to the left in order to save more trees. This area now serves a dual purpose of being not only a visual termination but also a space for oncology patients who are receiving infusions at the end of the Emerald B building. Oncology patients, who can be onsite for 1/2 day or longer, will now have a semi-private respite area for their use.

Tim Scanley, Design Architect, HGA, 3114 West Juneau, Milwaukee, WI, 53208 stated that conceptual design was provided with the Preliminary Development Plan, but today they are able to provide more developed architectural character and design. The architecture attempts to provide expression of the space as a place of wellness in both its exterior and interior spaces. [Building materials described in detail.]

Mr. Bultman stated that staff has recommended 42 conditions for approval. They have no objection to 29 of the conditions; however, they do have objections to the other 13 conditions and would like to explain the original intent of those design elements.

### **Objections to Conditions:**

#### Condition #15: Brick Parapet

*"That the architecture be updated to provide a brick parapet to terminate the roofline of the MOB, the connector and the lower level of the east wing, subject to staff approval."*

#### Response:

1. Dramatic design impact that changes the contemporary design language of the façade.
2. PZC has requested that the building design be forward thinking, not tied to the past.
3. Said condition will create a traditional aesthetic.

#### Condition #17: Surgery Windows

*"Revise the four single windows at the second floor of the east elevation to match the other windows on the elevation."*

#### Response:

1. Reflects the condition of the Operating Rooms at this section of the building.
2. The smaller width provides daylight and some connection to the exterior for staff, but limits visibility of patients on stretchers and Operating Room equipment.
3. Various sized openings create visual interest and break down the scale of the Sawmill Road elevation.

#### Condition #19: Service Screen Wall

*"All service yard screen walls to be constructed of brick to be architecturally integrated with the building."*

Response:

1. The current design, with a combination of brick and profile metal panel, specifically integrates with the base of the building tying directly into the language of the louvers along the Central Utility Plant.
2. Changing to an all-brick design negatively impacts the material balance of the building, resulting in too much brick.

Condition: #20: Concealed Fasteners

*"Provide installation details for the metal and wood panels (Prodema)...subject to staff approval."*

Response:

1. Exposed fasteners are color coated and blend well with the panel.
2. When stepping back even 30 feet from the building, the fasteners become virtually imperceptible.
3. Concealed fasteners involve a more complicated installation.

Condition #21: Reduced Parking

*"The parking plan be updated to maintain the reduction of 52 spaces in Phase II for a total of 946 parking spaces."*

Response:

1. Reduction of 52 stalls in Phase 1 is required for the proposed square footage in Phase 2.

Mike Davis, Landscape Architect, MKSK, 709 Crosby Street, Akron, OH 443302, addressed the next condition:

Condition #23: Landscape Design

*"The applicant revise the landscape plans to demonstrate conformance to the requirements of the development text prior to building permit submittal (items noted are foundation plants, tree requirements and site distance triangles)."*

Response:

We believe we are in compliance with the zoning requirements.

Mr. Davis stated per their conversations with staff, they will be meeting the required tree counts, some via the Minor Text Modification related to Bright Road, where existing trees will be preserved, and some through the potential reassignment of some trees in the southern portion of the site.

Condition #27: Granite Aggregate

*"The applicant update the plans to specify a crushed granite aggregate for all gravel walks and plazas, and demonstrate that the gravel is of a high quality and compaction, subject to staff approval."*

Response:

We will provide stabilized limestone with an ODOT-level specification; it is a highly durable material. However, if the Commission prefers granite to limestone, their preference would be to use concrete for those areas, which provides long-term durability and is less costly.

Condition #26: Stone at Light Poles.

*"Update the plans to clad with stone the bases of all light poles that are not located within a landscape island."*

Response:

1. Not required in the development text or City Code.
2. Ongoing maintenance due to continuous car impacts.

3. Unique request that is not required of surrounding developments. They would be willing to move the light poles into the landscape islands if that would avoid the need to add stone bases.

Condition #27: Helistop Hedges

*"Provide a low hedge atop the I-270 mound to fill any screening gaps."*

Response:

1. New 6-foot high landscape mounding meets the requirement for perimeter screening.
2. Existing I-270 tree line and elevation restricts all views to the helistop.
3. Additional landscape within the flight path is restricted by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

Without adding those trees or hedges, they still will maintain the visual privacy and desired sight barrier. It would be a safety issue to place plantings within that zone, and is not permitted by the FAA.

Condition #31: Fire Access

*"Provide heavy duty pavement for all fire apparatus access drives and fire lanes to the satisfaction of Washington Township Fire Department."*

Response 4:

1. Will confirm with the Fire Department the paver system will support the fire apparatus.
2. Design intent is to discourage public from using as a through route; will lead to confusion with vehicles entering the drop-off area going the wrong direction.

Anthony Prince, Environmental Graphic Designer, MKSK, 321 East Capital Street, Columbus, OH 43215 responded to the next two conditions.

Condition #37: Ground Mounted Signage

*"All ground mounted signs, exclusive of DR-03, be updated to provide dimensional push-through letters and logos at a minimum dimension of 1.0 inches for the primary site entry sign and .5 inches for all other signs."*

Response:

The impact of this requirement will produce halation, which creates a fog-like effect around the edges, reducing the sign's legibility.

Condition #38: Canopy Signage.

*"The building-mounted Medical Office and Main Entrance sign designs be revised to be fabricated of clear anodized aluminum letters, individually pin-mounted, and halo-illuminated."*

Response:

1. The design is intended to be individual illuminated letters.
2. Halo-illuminated lettering significantly reduces the legibility of the signage from a distance.
3. Halo illumination would require a deeper canopy profile to act as a backdrop for the light.

Mr. Prince stated that the halo illumination would reduce the legibility of the sign's message and not be consistent with how information is communicated across all entrances to the site. The Emergency Department and Ambulance Entry are identified in the same manner as they have proposed.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The following two public comments were received prior to the meeting:

Maureen Rush, 4143 Macduff Way, Dublin, 43017

"I am still extremely concerned about the increased traffic this will cause on Bright and Sawmill roads. I believe the solutions and timeline for solutions are inadequate. Do we know what the expected daily number of visitors to the site will be? Has this been considered, especially during times when school is in session at Hopewell Elementary? Do we have the potential to back up into two different roundabouts now? I also am concerned how this will impact the local wildlife population in this area. Has any study been done on what wildlife will be displaced and where they will go? Will this cause an increase in wildlife-related accidents on Emerald, Bright, or Sawmill roads? Finally, reading the list of plants for landscaping, I did not see many native plants/trees/shrubs. We have plenty of local nurseries dedicated to providing these; why weren't any of them chosen?"

Carl Gleditsch, 7001 Grandee Cliffs Drive, Dublin 43016

"I've been working with the City of Dublin for the last year to get higher standards for landscaping within the city. We need to not only make sure the landscaping is aesthetically pleasing to people, but also benefit the more natural inhabitants that we share the land with since insect, bird and mammal populations have plummeted over the years. To this end, we need to replace land disrupted by development with native trees, shrubs and perennials. I'm excited to read about the no-mow area and would only ask that plants native to Ohio be used. When done right, this area will provide a great place to walk and enjoy the beauty of nature. I would also ask that Ohio native trees and shrubs be used in the other green spaces, parking lots and foundation areas. I would be happy to meet and talk to the developer, landscape architect and/or owner about ideas for a more wildlife friendly area and the very real need for a better stewardship of our green spaces."

## **COMMISSION QUESTIONS**

Mr. Schneier inquired if staff had seen the applicant's presentation with their objections to the conditions and reasons therefor subsequent to the staff report. Ms. Martin responded that the presentation was provided subsequent to staff's report and shared this afternoon.

Mr. Schneier inquired what was staff's position relative to their presentation.

Ms. Martin responded that this has been a collaborative process throughout. Staff appreciates their perspective. However, staff's recommendations remain the same and they do not recommend any alterations. Staff recognizes that the Commission now has the benefit of the additional testimony from Mount Carmel as well as any public testimony in its deliberation. Staff is open to any modifications the Commission may believe appropriate.

Mr. Way stated that this will be a great project. However, the following issues still need some work:

#1 - Accuracy of Renderings: The ironspot brick looks very red, while the sample provided in the meeting looks gray. It is concerning if the renderings do not represent accurately what the building would look like. Does the landscape illustrated in the renderings accurately reflect the proposed landscape plan?

Mr. Bultman inquired which brick Mr. Way preferred – that reflected in the rendering or that which is represented with the sample.

Mr. Way responded that he likes the sample, which differs from the red-on-red look in the rendering.

Mr. Bultman responded that the sample is an accurate representation. The color in the presentation and rendering is inaccurate. In regard to the landscape rendering, the placement of trees along sidewalks is consistent with the landscape plans. They have not invested significant effort in an accurate depiction of the chapel garden, for example. There are no renderings of the oncology garden.

Mr. Way stated that there is not sufficient landscape information to know if the plan reflects 1,000 trees. He assumes a significant amount of lower plant material, such as grasses and shrubs would be included, as well.

#2 - Alignment of the Bright Road Entry Drive: The alignment of this entry drive looks very circuitous. He assumes the intent was to avoid eliminating some trees, but he is concerned about the safety issue. That road must provide a safe and comfortable entry into the site. If necessary, a couple of trees might have to be sacrificed to reduce the amount of back/forth of the roadway.

Mr. Bultman responded that the road was previously more right justified. Moving it all the way to the left would have made it straight, but the need for tree preservation resulted in a more circuitous roadway. That type of layout also slows down traffic, creating a much better patient experience. He would interpret Mr. Way's comment as that it has become overly circuitous.

Mr. Way stated that because of his previous experience with designing health care environments, he is aware that people coming to this type of facility are often anxious. There is advantage to them having to make fewer decisions in their approach. He is not advocating for the roadway to be straight; attempting to create a sinuous road is the right approach, but it is perhaps too much so. There was conversation at the previous meeting about this attractive wooded area of the site and the need to preserve those trees. However, the pedestrian walkway has ended up right on the property line, which would require a variance. He understands the tree preservation, but he does not believe the pedestrian experience looks positive. There appears to be only the one walkway on one side of the road. Is there a parallel path on the other side, resulting in a loop and a full wooded walk experience? This area has not come together as was discussed at the previous meeting.

Mr. Way continued with concerns:

#03 - Parking Lots: This also was discussed at the previous meeting. The Code emphasizes the need to avoid large expanses of paving. The proposed parking lots do not achieve that goal. Perhaps it is due to the light poles, which may need to be within landscaped islands, which would also eliminate the concern about the light pole bases. A long-term development plan was provided in the meeting materials, which depicts trees within all of the rows. Is it a long-term plan to put trees within the parking lot, or is that an inaccurate depiction?

Mr. Bultman responded that he does not believe the intent is to add trees to the parking lot later.

Mr. Way stated that as discussed at the previous meeting, the lack of landscaping within the parking lot is an issue. What is the reason that more trees were not added to the parking lot?

Mr. Bultman responded that he believes there were two motives that influenced the way in which trees were allocated within the parking lots. The first would be the associated operating costs for the hospital, including storage of snow. The more landscaped islands introduced, the greater the destruction from snow plowing, a maintenance issue for the hospital. The second motive is related to deliberate aggregation of the trees to the outside of the parking lots to provide a visual screen of the parking lot.

Mr. Way stated that he asks from the perspective of the patient experience, who would: park in the parking lot, walk through the cars through an unshaded environment, looking for a sidewalk

that will lead to the desired entrance. A large number of people, patients and staff, will be required to walk through many parked vehicles within a very large parking lot before reaching a safe environment. That is not a great patient experience.

#04 - The future Medical Office Building (MOB): The MOB site will be defined by roads that will be built in this phase. There are no trees along those roads. Although the rendering shows trees along the campus drive, the plans do not show any trees along those roads. Why aren't trees being installed along those roads from the outset? It is not known when the MOB will be built, and in the interest of the patient experience, the drives should be created with landscape trees.

Mr. Bultman responded that the road to which he refers is a service road. Their prioritization of the green ribbon was to create an experience as patients navigate the site. Mr. Way is referring to an edge condition. They have made a specific effort to screen that edge condition from the patient experience. In their compliance for the required number of trees in Phase 1, their priority has been to place the trees where they will add the most value for that patient experience. His questions relate to balance, and they are trying to balance the operational needs against the patient experience, preserving flexibility for what happens in Phase 2.

Mr. Way responded that he does not have understanding of the operational component. He requested confirmation that the trees along the campus drive as shown on the illustration are not proposed, as they are not included in the site plan.

Mr. Davis stated that the trees along the campus drive would not be included until Phase 2. There is a street curb very near the drive curb of the future MOB. The street curb is where the MOB will be located. They want to avoid cutting through the roots of any new trees that may have just been established. They prefer not to plant the trees at this time, knowing that sidewalks and curbs will be installed close to those trees. It would be preferable to plant them later.

Mr. Way stated that the sidewalks could be installed now, which would permit the plantings to be established sooner.

Mr. Davis responded that the sidewalks function directly to the MOB; they do not connect elsewhere.

Mr. Way requested confirmation that there will be no trees along the campus drive nor the service drive adjacent to the MOB future development site.

Mr. Davis responded that the site plans are correct; the renderings are not.

Mr. Fishman stated his concern is the parking lot. He would prefer to see much more landscaping in the parking lot and a walkway leading from the far end of the parking lot to the hospital without traversing the parking lot. He agrees with most of staff's recommendations; for instance, the brick that staff recommends would give the building a much more finished look.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he agrees. He requested the applicant to address the public comment regarding the use of native trees.

Mr. Davis responded that in regard to native plantings, in addition to the no mow turf, the plans do contain a series of meadow mixes. The meadow mixes are expansive along the perimeter of the site to create a natural appearance, which will enhance the site throughout the seasons. They have specified many native trees, including oaks and maples, which are important to the existing animal life within the community. The trees and shrubs used are on the City of Dublin approved plant list, most of which are native cultivars.

Mr. Chinnock stated that in regard to the architecture, there is a significant amount of spandrel; he assumes that does not exceed the permitted amount.

Ms. Martin responded that the development text does not include a maximum percentage for spandrel material.

Mr. Chinnock requested more detail regarding the rooftop metal screening material used on the MOB.

Mr. Scanley responded that it is a profiled metal panel, an open-air screen wall.

Mr. Chinnock inquired if it would match the louver look used on the hospital building.

Mr. Scanley stated that is a 5-inch, corrugated profiled metal panel, a common horizontal panel.

Mr. Chinnock stated that it is very prominent and visible along the roof. Did they explore any other material options?

Mr. Scanley responded that the desire was to tie into the penthouse of the hospital, which uses the same material. Therefore, they did not explore many other materials.

Ms. Harter referred to the applicant's request regarding Condition #17 related to the surgical unit windows. Very few surgical units have windows. She understands the applicant's desire to break up that façade. However, she concurs with the recommendation to use brick versus thin brick. She believes there also is a need for more green spaces in the parking lot, as well as a landscaped walkway.

Mr. Fishman stated that he does not like to see renderings that do not match the plan drawings, as is the case with the landscape rendering. Is the applicant willing to include the number of trees depicted in the rendering?

Mr. Supelak inquired which document is an accurate representation of what is proposed.

Mr. Scanley responded that the rendering is fictitious. The landscape site plan documents exact plant species and spacing.

Ms. Martin clarified that the illustrative site plan does not reflect the proposed landscape plan. She believes Mr. Fishman's question is whether the applicant would be willing to provide the trees on the west side of the campus drive in Phase 1 as depicted on the illustrative site plan.

Mr. Fishman stated that his other concern is the lack of landscaping in the parking lot and lack of pedestrian ability to navigate from the back end of the parking lot to the hospital without dodging vehicles. He would prefer the parking lot landscaping to closely match the rendering. What we see is what we should get.

Ms. Martin clarified that the Commission reviews and approves the technical civil drawings and landscape architecture drawings as well as the architectural elevations. The illustrative plans are intended to convey intent. However, if there is something on the illustrative plans that the Commission would like to add as a condition, that is possible.

Mr. Way stated that the illustrative landscape plans do not show the ground plane plant materials. He inquired if the applicant is not recommending pedestrian path gravel paving...what he refers to as decomposed granite paving, but, instead, an item that ODOT recommends.

Mr. Bultman responded that it is decomposed limestone that is compacted per the ODOT detail. It is not granite, but is limestone.

Mr. Fishman inquired why the pedestrian pathway is not paved.

Mr. Bultman responded that part of the reason is the experience of a paved walking path or a granite path. A crushed limestone path is more natural. Another reason is the need to achieve an economic and operational balance in developing this project.

Mr. Way noted that the surface is also permeable, permitting water infiltration, which is environmentally better.

Mr. Way stated that one-foot high concrete bollards are proposed. Where would those be located? Mr. Davis responded that they would be located at the canopy columns of the main entrances of the hospital and the MOB.

Mr. Way inquired if it would be possible for a vehicle to easily drive over them.

Mr. Davis responded that they are a heavy-duty concrete material, a precast material, which is a Mt. Carmel standard. The bollard height actually is 32 inches.

Mr. Way stated that in the drawing key, there is a symbol for brick paving; however, he cannot find brick paving in the drawings.

Mr. Davis responded that it may be located in the fire lane or the ADA warning pavers.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the glass exterior material is a mix of glass that contains both translucent and spandrel.

Mr. Scanley responded that the exterior mix contains both transparent and spandrel, no translucent material.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the limestone coursing is of varied heights.

Mr. Scanley stated that they are using a coursed ashlar, which are linear bands of certain patterns extending the vertical height of the wall.

Mr. Supelak inquired if a gold color would be mixed in with the gray and the buff colors.

Mr. Scanley responded that the majority of the material would be light buff and both light and dark grays.

Mr. Supelak inquired if exposed fasteners are proposed for both the horizontal and vertical planes.

Mr. Scanley responded affirmatively.

Mr. Supelak inquired if they have used exposed fasteners in previous projects.

Mr. Scanley that they have done so in multiple projects, with a significant level of success.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the level of wear. If the wrong fasteners are used, could discolorations leak down the side of the façade, showing wear over time?

Mr. Scanley responded that he has never seen streaking with the Prodema product. He has not observed negative weathering with the product.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the tones of the white panels would be randomized.

Mr. Scanley responded that the white tones would be randomized across the façade.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the view of the MOB entry drive. In regard to the vertical mullions -- is the glass in the picture frame a heavier piece that appears to be a vertical fin of greater depth.

Mr. Scanley responded that it is a 10-inch deep mullion extrusion, which extends the dimension of a patient room. The fin is offset on the lower floor, creating movement across the façade. Levels 3 and 4 are misaligned, providing texture and visual interest.

Mr. Supelak inquired if a flat panel is currently proposed for the ground-mounted signs.

Mr. Prince responded that the signs would be flush-faced; the white opaque sign face and the acrylic letters are flush.

Mr. Supelak inquired about the removal of landscaping to accommodate the helistop.

Ms. Martin responded that there is existing vegetation along I-270 within the right-of-way. The City's purview is limited to private property outside that right-of-way; therefore, it is not able to guarantee any long-term existence of vegetation within the road right-of-way. Staff's recommendations are related only to the site landscaping to determine appropriate screening.

Mr. Way inquired if the FAA requires that the existing vegetation within the ODOT right-of-way be removed in order to accommodate the helistop.

Mr. Bultman responded that the flight path from the helistop begins on the ground plane at the corners and progresses upward at a defined angle, and the requirement is that there be no obstructions that penetrate that angle. New trees on the applicant's side of the property line would penetrate that. Within the ODOT area, it is clear; no removal of landscaping there is required.

Mr. Way inquired if staff's recommendation for a low hedge along the top edge would violate the FAA required height. A hedge would not seem to be restrictive, so would be a reasonable expectation. Perhaps the FAA will need to respond regarding that element.

Mr. Bultman stated that at some point, they would be having follow-up reviews with the FAA. However, because there already is a visual screen of I-270, they question the value of adding a hedge there. They would prefer to avoid any issues with the FAA.

Mr. Way responded that it appears this issue would be determined by the FAA.

Mr. Supelak stated that the applicant has indicated that they believe they are in compliance with Condition #23; however, staff's position is that they are not in compliance.

Ms. Martin responded that staff has found the proposed internal drive tree requirements not to be in compliance. They have recommended approval of the 4<sup>th</sup> Minor Text Modification to accommodate the existing trees along the Bright Road access drive, and that the requirement be met along the emergency access drive, however, which the applicant has indicated they can achieve by reallocating the distribution of trees on the site. The other landscaping requirements not met are the foundation plantings on the southwest corner of the building. Additionally, in areas where the perimeter screen landscaping cannot be provided due to FAA requirements, staff recommends a low perimeter hedge be provided.

Mr. Bultman referred to Condition #20, which concerns the termination of the brick (actually a wood panel); there were concerns regarding the finish detail at the top. He showed images of the appearance of the finish detail, noting that it is carefully constructed with a refined termination of the window plane and brick plane at the metal coping at the top.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the panel fasteners would be located in places where the public would be able to see them.

Mr. Bultman responded that the material would be used on the underside of the canopy, which is an area where the public would interface with the product.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the product would be located near a sidewalk or the entrance.

Mr. Bultman responded that is located at the building approach, in an area integral to the window openings [image shown].

Mr. Way inquired what would be the alternative to the exterior fasteners.

Mr. Scanley responded that it would be a concealed fastener. However, concealed fasteners require the use of thicker panels. On the backside of the panel, the fastener is core drilled halfway through

the panel, inserted and leveled. Due to the thickness of the panel and need to level it, it is a much costlier process.

Mr. Fishman inquired if the fasteners would be a steel material.

Mr. Scanley responded that they are galvanized steel, color matched to the selected veneer.

Mr. Fishman inquired about their ability to rust over time.

Mr. Scanley responded that galvanized steel prevents rust from occurring.

Mr. Bultman stated that the lifetime of the panels and fasteners results in less maintenance but more durability than brick.

Mr. Scanley noted that they would be willing to provide photographs of existing projects built some time ago, so that the Commission can view the weathering characteristics of the product with exposed fasteners.

Mr. Bultman noted that there are hospitals that have had this product in place for nearly 20 years, and the product looks as good today as the day those hospitals opened. It is a very durable material.

### **Commission Discussion**

Mr. Supelak stated that general comments would be provided first, followed by Commissioners' responses to the requested Condition exceptions.

Mr. Schneier thanked the applicant for listening to the Commission and the time and effort invested. Their presentation this evening with their responses to certain Conditions was very helpful.

Mr. Fishman stated that the exterior fasteners are low on his list of concerns; high on his list is the parking lot, specifically the ability to walk safely through it and the lack of greenspaces within it. He disagrees that trees would hide the architecture. Most people who come to Dublin admire its greenspaces and landscaping. He agrees that the presentation was excellent, providing clarity of staff and applicant's positions.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he also appreciates the amount of work the applicant has invested in the project, their attention to the Commission's concerns, and their excellent presentation providing clarity of their responses to the conditions. He believes for the most part, however, he is supportive of staff's recommended conditions.

Ms. Harter stated that she appreciates the applicant's time and their outreach to the community.

Mr. Way stated that although he has had many questions and has found the renderings frustrating, as they do not accurately reflect the landscape plan, as a landscaper, he can look at the landscape plan and recognize the quality of what is proposed. It is more difficult for his colleagues to recognize, however, when the renderings do not reflect that. The spaces that have been created, such as the chapel garden, will be gems; the greenspace will be fabulous. There are some fundamental issues remaining that need more work, however, such as the patient arrival experience. Patients arriving by car would park in a large, unshaded parking lot, which does not provide a clear route to a pathway leading safely to the hospital. He believes that element should be addressed in the next phase of the project to make it feel as though it fits. Putting street trees along the streets would help it to look finished. He also believes more work is needed on the Bright Road entry drive area where there is an opportunity to provide a sense of place and a woodland walkway. The present treatment of the walk is simply to push it out of the way. He understands

the need to achieve a balance between tree preservation and accomplishing the right feel but believes more work is needed in that area.

Mr. Supelak complimented the applicant on a great project. This will be a wonderful campus. The project design is well done, and is sensitive to the community and the hospital users. He concurs on the issue of the patient experience accessing the hospital from the parking lot. Although a great greenway leads to the hospital, people are not funneled well to it. It should be an easy fix and provides opportunity to address other issues, such as the light poles. The concern with incomplete phases is that sometimes they remain incomplete. There is merit to addressing that concern in an intermediate manner. He likes the "shadow box" high on the building, but the element needs more depth, more separation. He would advocate for finding another 12 inches to provide better separation. He remains concerned about the east façade, which is the one that is lacking. It is a lengthy ribbon extending left to right. The mass in the back is disconnected, so it does not work together. He might advocate for addressing the elbow or junction on that facade, which is currently lost in that long, continuous ribbon. Perhaps stone or ProdeMa could be used at that elbow to activate and break up the long façade.

Mr. Way stated that is the Sawmill Road, east elevation. He had the same impression – that it is one long look; breaking it up in some manner would make it more successful.

Mr. Supelak indicated that the Commission would now proceed to addressing the applicant's requests to eliminate specific conditions.

*Condition #15 - Brick parapet. "The architecture be updated to provide a brick parapet to terminate the roofline of the MOB Connector and the lower level of the east wing."*

Mr. Schneier and Mr. Chinnock expressed support of the applicant's request.

Mr. Way requested clarification of the location of the recommended brick parapet.

Ms. Martin clarified that the example shown by the applicant is not an area where staff is recommending the brick parapet. If the condition is removed, Commission would be indicating support of the architecture as submitted.

[Location shown on presentation; discussion continued.]

Due to the clarification, Commission members, including Mr. Chinnock and Ms. Harter, were supportive of Condition #15, requiring the brick parapet.

*Condition #17 – Surgery windows: "Revise the four single windows at the second floor of the east elevation to match the other windows on the elevation."*

[Discussion regarding the recommended condition.]

Mr. Way stated that staff is advocating for a wider window, but this area is a surgical unit. He agrees with the applicant that it should be possible for people to look into the area; However, it is possible add glazing to the window so it is not possible to see into the building.

Ms. Doucette stated that those windows are aligned to the surgical room door, and where the brick facing exists, there are alcoves for equipment. An alcove must be 50 square feet. That is where operating room tables, CR arms for radiology, and equipment that will support the cases are stored, so that those items are immediately available to the operating room. This is a functional design. If

the windows are widened, functional space for equipment will be lost. The issue is more than one of privacy; it is also an operational concern.

The Commission members were supportive of the applicant's request to eliminate Condition #17 requiring revision of the surgery windows.

Mr. Supelak noted that he would advocate for adding a fin on the horizontal mullion at the ceiling line. Adjusting the fins, depth and wrapping around the building could be compelling.

*Condition #19 – Service screen wall: "All service yard screen walls to be constructed of brick to be architecturally integrated with the building."*

The Commission was supportive of staff's recommendation.

*Condition #20 – Concealed Fasteners: "Provide installation details for the metal and wood panels...subject to staff approval (concealed fasteners)."*

The Commission was supportive of staff's recommendation.

Mr. Boggs noted that, although referenced, the condition as written does not require concealed fasteners. It does not foreclose that exterior fasteners may not be used.

*Condition #21 - Reduced Parking: "The parking plan be updated to maintain the reduction of 52 parking spaces in Phase II for a total of 946 parking spaces."*

The Commission was supportive of staff's recommendation.

*Condition #23 – Landscape Plan: "Revise the landscape plans to demonstrate conformance to the requirements of the development text prior to Building Permit submittal (items noted are foundation plants, tree requirements and site distance triangles.)"*

Discussion regarding the requirements for the perimeter drive aisle trees (some of the existing trees along the perimeter would count) and the foundation plantings at the corner of the hospital. Ms. Martin clarified that it would also include the trees along the emergency access drive, but the applicant indicated they could do so through reallocation of trees on the site.

Mr. Way inquired if it also would include some of the other concerns discussed tonight.

Ms. Martin responded that if the Commission desired to require plantings along the campus drive, that would be an additional item.

Mr. Schneier inquired about landscaping along a parking lot pathway.

Ms. Martin responded that landscaping there is not required by the development text, so it would not be covered under this condition. If the Commission wanted to require something more than has been depicted, it would be an additional condition.

*Condition #27 - Granite aggregate: "Update the plans to specify a crushed granite aggregate for all gravel walks and plazas, and the applicant demonstrate the gravel is of a high quality and compaction..."*

Four Commission members were supportive of staff's recommendation.

Condition #29 – Helistop hedges: *"Provide a low hedge atop the I-270 mound to fill any screening gaps."*

Mr. Chinnock stated that ODOT could potentially remove the landscaping within its right-of-way, so he is supportive of staff's recommendation.

Mr. Supelak suggested the language be revised to require applicant to work with staff and that the landscaping be compliant with FAA regulations.

Mr. Boggs indicated the language would be revised accordingly for final consideration.

Condition #31 – Fire access: *"Provide heavy duty pavement for all fire apparatus access drives and fire lanes to the satisfaction of Washington Township Fire Department."*

Mr. Supelak stated that the applicant has indicated the proposed material is agreeable to the Fire Department.

Mr. Way noted that if it is not, the Fire Department would not approve the project.

Mr. Chinnock stated that he is supportive of the applicant's request. If they can prove it meets the requirements, he likes that it is a different material.

Mr. Supelak suggested the word pavement be revised.

Mr. Boggs responded that the word "material" would be used rather than "pavement."

Condition #37 – Ground mounted signage: *"All ground-mounted signs, exclusive of DR-03, be updated to provide dimensional push-through letters and logos at a minimum dimension of 1.0 inches for the primary site entry sign and .5 inches for all other signs."*

The Commission was supportive of staff's recommendation.

Condition #38 – Canopy signage: *"The building mounted, Medical Office and Main Entrance sign designs be revised to be fabricated of clear anodized aluminum letters, individually pin-mounted and halo-illuminated."*

The Commission was supportive of staff's recommendation.

Additional condition:

Mr. Supelak inquired if Commissioners' had indicated an interest in adding an additional condition related to landscaping along the campus drive.

Mr. Way responded that he would advocate for street trees along both sides of the campus and service drives.

Mr. Schneier suggested revising the language to all internal drives.

Ms. Martin noted the condition has been added.

Condition #26 - Stone at Light Poles: *"Update the plans to clad the base of all light poles with stone that are not located within a landscape island."*

Mr. Supelak stated that the Commission has expressed interest in having landscape breaks within the parking lots, which might be coupled with the light pole condition.

Mr. Fishman advocated for the use of real stone for the light pole bases. Stucco stone would fall off.

Mr. Boggs noted that there are only seven (7) free-standing light structures. If landscape breaks will be incorporated in the parking area, there might be opportunity to incorporate the light structures into the pedestrian landscape breaks, in which case the base material would be of less consequence.

Mr. Way noted that there is a third related issue. The pedestrianways within the parking lot should lead to a perimeter sidewalk leading to the front entrance. There are three (3) parking lots that need the additional landscaping incorporated; integration of the light structures; safe pedestrian connectivity to adjoining walkways.

Mr. Boggs stated that these seem to be three inter-related items. A synthesis of which could solve all the concerns, including the applicant's concern about the cladding of the base of the light structures. They could craft the language appropriately.

Discussion continued regarding the poles and the pedestrian friendly parking lots. Consensus was to retain Condition #26 regarding the light poles separate from the parking lot pedestrian-friendly items.

The Commission was supportive of Condition #26.

*Additional Condition:*

Discussion continued regarding the additional condition related to pedestrian landscaped areas and connection.

Mr. Boggs clarified that if the seven (7) light poles associated with Condition #26 were to be incorporated into the landscaped areas, they would be treated as other light poles within the landscape. No stone bases would be needed.

Mr. Supelak agreed. Condition #26 would become moot.

The Commission was supportive of the additional condition.

Mr. Way noted that his remaining concern is the Bright Road entry drive, specifically the wooded area in which the walkway is located and currently pushed up against the property line. He would advocate for a parallel route to be provided on the east side, creating a walking loop.

Mr. Supelak stated that he is supportive of the idea, but the question is if it should be made a condition.

There was not a consensus of the Commission to make the item a condition for approval.

Mr. Boggs noted that the Commission also expressed a concern about the architecture of the east elevation and had suggested breaking up the façade with either massing or material.

Consensus was to add the condition regarding the east elevation architecture.

The revised list of conditions were reviewed by the Commission.

Mr. Supelak inquired if the applicant had any objections to the revised conditions.

Dennis Fruedeman, President & CEO, Hplex Solutions, 65 Hidden Ravines Dr. #100, Powell, OH 43065, stated that they have been managing the project for Mt. Carmel Health. He thanked the Commission for their time and consideration; however, they are faced with a significant dilemma. They came to the meeting tonight with 12 contested items, which would have increased their costs by \$.5 million. The additional conditions added tonight will increase their costs significantly more. They are fighting inflation and increased construction costs, and this project is over budget. If the Commission approves the project, at this point Mt. Carmel will need to reevaluate the project to see if there are ways in which they can mitigate some of these costs. Although Mt. Carmel is

interested in being a good steward in the community, offering health care at affordable prices, unfortunately, with today's market and the costs of this building in Dublin, they will need to step back and reevaluate the project. On behalf of Mt. Carmel, he thanks the Commission for the time they have invested.

Mr. Supelak stated that there is the option to table the case. Is the applicant prepared to have the Commission vote?

Mr. Fruedeman responded that they have been meeting with the staff every week since last September. Last Wednesday they spoke with staff to prepare for this meeting, and they were given 12 conditions. The first time they saw the 42 changes proposed tonight was last Friday when the meeting materials were distributed. They had very little time to react. If the case were to be deferred, they would lose their subcontractors. In this market, subcontractors hold their prices a limited length of time. They have the site and subcontractors, but the subcontractors have told them that if they do not start construction by August 29, they will walk away from the project and go to Intel, who is taking this market. Their next bidder is \$1.5 million higher. With the changes and associated increases in costs, they are in a quandary. They were surprised and taken aback with the additional changes tonight, but they understand the Commission's reasoning.

Mr. Boggs recommended that the Commission proceed with their vote on the project tonight, which would give the applicant the approval they need to proceed from a business and operational standpoint.

Mr. Schneier moved, Mr. Way seconded approval of the following four (4) Minor Text Modifications:

1. Section II(D)(2)(e): To permit a minimum pavement setback of 10 feet from the west property line for the shared use path connection to Bright Road.
2. Section II(G): To permit the Planning and Zoning Commission to approve an alternate parking ratio with a Parking Plan and to eliminate staffing information from the development text.
3. Section II(H)(4): To permit two off-premise signs for Perry Township Administrative Offices to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with the Final Development Plan. No sign permits shall be required.
4. Section II(J)(2)(8): To permit existing tree preservation to be used to meet the Internal Driveway tree requirement.

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

[Motion approved 6-0.]

Mr. Way moved, Mr. Schneier seconded approval of the Final Development Plan with the following 44 conditions:

#### General

- 1) Perry Township rectify records with Franklin County regarding the designation and ownership of the 0.309-acre tract of land along Sawmill Road.
- 2) Prior to issuance of the Building Permit for Perry Township site modifications, all Township land be combined into one parcel; and the applicant must obtain a Site Permit through Building Standard for any site modifications to the Perry Township site.
- 3) The applicant update all site plans to correctly depict property lines, right-of-way lines, easements, and parcel ownership for land along Sawmill Road.

### Engineering

- 4) The applicant update all engineering drawings to accurately reflect zoning standards including building coverage, lot coverage, parking, and square feet of development.
- 5) That the applicant execute their obligations set forth in the Infrastructure Agreement accepted by City Council per Ordinance 15-22.
- 6) That the applicant dedicate R/W and easements to the City of Dublin in accordance with the Infrastructure Agreement accepted by City Council per Ordinance 15-22 to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- 7) That the applicant coordinate proposed site and off-site improvements with the Emerald Parkway Roundabout project to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- 8) That the applicant coordinate the proposed ground sign location along Emerald Parkway with the proposed guardrail as part of the Emerald Parkway Roundabout project to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- 9) That the applicant work with the City of Dublin to establish ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the proposed guardrail along Emerald Parkway, including the dedication of easements if necessary, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- 10) That the applicant coordinate proposed site and off-site improvements with the Bright Road and Sawmill Road Intersection improvements to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the City of Columbus' designee.
- 11) That the applicant continue to work with the City of Columbus on proposed modifications to the Sawmill Road access point and median to the satisfaction of the City of Columbus' designee.
- 12) That the applicant continue to work with ODOT and the City of Columbus to obtain any necessary approvals/permits for work within their respective jurisdiction.
- 13) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate stormwater management compliance for both site and off-site improvements to the satisfaction of the City Engineer in accordance with Chapter 53 of the City of Dublin Code of Ordinances.
- 14) That the applicant provides ADA compliant curb ramps at the Emerald Parkway service drive access point to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

### Architecture

- 15) That the architecture be updated to provide a brick parapet to terminate the roofline of the MOB, the connector and the lower level of the east wing, subject to Staff approval.
- 16) That the louvered vent inserts on the east and west elevations maintain a consistent appearance across the entire fifth floor, whether inactive (ornamental) or for active ventilation.
- 17) Further articulate the connector to break the building base and differentiate the entry along the east elevation, subject to Staff approval.
- 18) That the applicant provide the decorative brick detail located on the east elevation of the hospital and north elevation of the MOB, subject to Staff approval.
- 19) That all service yard screen walls be constructed of brick to be architecturally integrated with the building.
- 20) The applicant provide installation details for the metal panels and wood panels (Prodema) prior to submitting for Building Permits.

### Parking

- 21) The parking plan be updated to maintain the reduction of 52 parking spaces in Phase II for a total of 946 parking spaces.

- 22) The applicant update the parking plan and civil drawings to reflect the number of bicycle parking spaces provided.

#### Landscaping

- 23) That the applicant revise the landscape plans to demonstrate conformance to the requirements of the development text prior to Building Permit submittal;
- 24) The applicant update the plans, prior to Building Permits, to provide quantities for all plants in the plant list, subject to Staff approval.
- 25) That the applicant revise the tree survey and tree preservation plans to ensure consistency with the information in the table.
- 26) The applicant update the plans to clad the base of all light poles with stone that are not located within a landscape island.
- 27) The applicant update the plans to specify a crushed granite aggregate for all gravel walks and plazas, and that the applicant demonstrates the gravel is of a high quality and compaction, subject to Staff approval.
- 28) The applicant update the landscape plans to provide a maintenance schedule for the no-mow grass for the first 5 years.
- 29) The applicant provide a low hedge atop the I-270 mound to fill any screening gaps; and the applicant work with Staff to identify a species with a mature height compliant with all FAA regulations.
- 30) Steel pipe bollards only be permitted within service yard, and decorative bollards be required in all other installations.
- 31) The applicant install trees along both sides of all internal drives in Phase I.
- 32) The parking lots be redesigned to establish landscape islands that provide protected and shaded pedestrian connections to the greenways thru each parking lot, subject to Staff approval.

#### Fire

- 33) 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.

#### Lighting

- 34) That the physical extents of each area of the site defined in the Statistics Table be provided to Planning for verification of the footcandle data prior to submitting for Building Permits.
- 35) That the footcandle levels along the main entry drive be reduced to fall within the average range of one to three footcandles.
- 36) That the average light levels the main entry drive, service yard, and staff entrance be reduced to fall within 4:1 ratio.
- 37) That the applicant update the Luminaire Schedule to provide missing information and correct conflicting specifications for Planning review prior to submitting for Building Permits.

#### Signs

- 38) Raceways be prohibited for all building mount signs, and all letters and logos be individually mounted.
- 39) All ground-mounted signs, exclusive of DR-03 and DR-04, be updated to provide dimensional push-through letters and logos at a minimum dimension of 1.0 inches for the primary site entry sign and 0.5 inches for all other signs.

- 40) The building mounted, Medical Office and Main Entrance sign designs be revised to fabricate of clear anodized aluminum letter, individually pin-mounted, and halo-illuminated.
- 41) The applicant update the Sign Quantities/Parameters table to accurately reflect square footage for BE-01 and BE-02.
- 42) The applicant update the sign plan to sign the service drive for "authorized emergency and service vehicles only".
- 43) The applicant update the plans to confirm and dimension the minimum 8-foot setback from the right-of-way on all Civil and Landscape drawings.
- 44) Approval of the Perry Township signage is expressly contingent upon Perry Township dismissing Franklin County Case No. 22 CV-05-3590 against the City of Dublin, in full settlement of all claims made regarding any and all Mount Carmel applications, no later than August 17, 2022.

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

[Motion approved 6-0.]

Mr. Supelak stated that the Commission understands that Conditions for Approval can be difficult at times. The Commission sincerely appreciate all the work they have put into this project. It is a wonderful hospital. The Commission is hopeful that this project can work and will work out well for the applicant.

[Brief break. Meeting resumed at 9:54 p.m.]

Mr. Supelak stated that Cases 2 and 3 would be heard together.

### **~~2. Hyland Glen at 7270 Hyland-Croy Road, 22-078FDP, Final Development Plan~~**

~~A request for review and approval of a Final Development Plan for the construction of 102 single-family homes on a 42.5-acre site zoned Planned Unit Development District, Hyland Glen, located northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road with Post Road.~~

### **~~3. Hyland Glen at 7270 Hyland-Croy Road, 22-079FP, Final Plat~~**

~~Subdividing a 42.5-acre site to create a 102 single-family lot with the dedication of open space and rights-of-way. The site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Hyland Glen and is northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road with Post Road.~~

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

~~Ms. Martin stated that this a request for review and approval of the Hyland Glen Final Development Plan and Final Plat for a new residential neighborhood. This is a Planned Unit Development. The rezoning was approved by City Council in December 2021. The Final Development Plan provides final details including landscape design and signs. It is important to note that the architecture for individual residential development is not reviewed and approved by the Commission as is commercial architecture. The construction of 102 single-family homes is proposed on a 42.5-acre site located northeast of the intersection of Hyland-Croy Road with Post Road and zoned Planned Unit Development District, Hyland Glen. This is on the western boundary of the City of Dublin, and~~