

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, Nuvo 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 in 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 Wawzkiewicz, 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