



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

Jennifer M. Rauch, AICP, Planning Director



~~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 4th 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~~

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Dublin City Council

Minutes of

Meeting

GOVERNMENT FORMS & SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

April 25, 2022

Page 2 of 12

Held _____ 20 _____

- Arbor Day Proclamation

Mayor Fox invited Mr. Anderson, Director of Public Services, to come forward. She read the proclamation. Mr. Anderson thanked Council for recognizing Arbor Day and mentioned all of the events that will be taking place to celebrate.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no comments.

CONSENT AGENDA

There was no request to remove any of the consent agenda items.

- April 11, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes

Mayor Fox moved to approve the consent agenda items.

Ms. Alutto seconded.

Vote on the motion: Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes.

SECOND READING/PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCES

Ordinance 13-22

Rezoning +/- 35 acres from R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District, Mount Carmel Hospital Northwest to Accommodate up to 314,520 SF of Development in Two Phases consisting of an Inpatient Hospital, Ambulatory Care Facility, and Medical Offices. The site is located northwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road and I-270

Ms. Martin stated that there are no changes from the first reading of this Ordinance. Staff recommended approval.

Joe Miller, Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP, spoke on behalf of Perry Township. He provided the Clerk of Council a copy of a letter provided to Council on April 11. He stated that Mount Carmel lacks legal access to Sawmill Road across the Township property. He stated if approved by Council, this cannot be built as depicted without proper access. A former easement was abandoned and could not support this development regardless. He stated that Perry Township is willing to work with Mount Carmel on a reciprocal cross-easement for access. He is hopeful that Mount Carmel will work this out. He stated that under City Code, Council cannot approve a preliminary plan and rezone to a PUD based upon legal access that does not exist. He asked Council that they condition any approval upon Mount Carmel working this out and getting legal access to Sawmill Road.

Ms. Kramb stated that the final development plan will be going back to the Planning and Zoning Commission so additional details not shown will be worked out. She urged the Commission to reconsider the dry detention basins and find an alternative stormwater solution.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the Commission is also urged to consider mounding and planting to help shield the Inverness properties from the entrance.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

Ordinance 14-22

Authorizing the Provision of Certain Incentives to Mount Carmel Health System to Induce it to Establish a Northwest Healthcare Campus within the City; and Authorizing the Execution of an Economic Development Agreement

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that as discussed at the first reading, the Mount Carmel development is expected to create 342 jobs with the projected payroll of \$32 million annually. The estimated annual payroll withholdings are anticipated to be around \$5.8 million dollars through 2035. The Economic Development Agreement remains largely

the same as presented at the first reading. The proposed incentive is a 15% Performance Incentive for 10 years (2026-2035) on net new withholdings capped at \$913,942 in total, once that threshold is reached within the defined term, regardless of calendar year. Based upon Council feedback at first reading, staff clarified the language in Section 2(f) which addresses "City Land." The City owns approximately 1.5 acres of residual property at 4045 Bright Road, located in the SE corner of Emerald Parkway and Bright Road. The agreement now reads that "From 2022 through 2027, the City of Dublin agrees to make this land available to Mount Carmel at a cost of \$0, contingent upon the commencement of construction of a future phase medical office building located along Bright Road and incorporating PID: 273-008616 within the Development Plan."

There were no public comments.

Ms. Amorose Groomes thanked staff for providing clarity in the language regarding maintenance.

Mayor Fox thanked staff for providing the breakdown by year in the staff report. She was also appreciative of the cost sharing allowing the Bright Road Improvements to be included in this project.

Vote on the Ordinance: Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes.

Ordinance 15-22

Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Infrastructure Agreement with Mount Carmel Health System for the Mount Carmel Health System Project

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that the Infrastructure agreement also remains largely the same as the first reading with changes proposed to Sections 1, 2, and 3. Since the first reading, the Traffic Impact Study was reviewed and approved by the City of Dublin and the City of Columbus. Due to the unique nature of the development with the City's previously studied Bright Road Corridor Improvements, a non-traditional funding approach is being proposed to address the transportation improvements.

- Section 1 Emerald Parkway Main Entry Improvements - Dublin staff have determined the traffic control at this access point will be a roundabout and the language in Section 1 has been revised to reflect this determination. Staff has discussed the determination with the Mount Carmel team and the agreement now outlines the proposed cost sharing for this intersection based upon the determination that it will be a roundabout.
- Section 2 Emerald Parkway Service Drive Entry Improvements - Minor non-substantive edits were proposed to clarify that the language is addressing the entry point as opposed to the access drive.
- Section 3 Bright Road Right-of-Way Access Improvements - Council requested the word "maintain" be added to Section 3 to clarify Mount Carmel will be responsible for designing, constructing, and maintaining the Project's internal drives and Bright Road Access Drive.

Lorraine Lutton, CEO of Mount Carmel, thanked Council and staff for their partnership. She stated that they are committed to being good neighbors.

Ms. Kramb asked Ms. O'Callaghan to summarize what the City is doing on Bright Road so the residents can be aware of what to expect. Ms. O'Callaghan stated that there was a study previously of the Sawmill Road Corridor, which included the Bridge Road Corridor over to Emerald Parkway. That study made some recommendations as it pertains to Bright Road. Those recommendations have been under consideration by staff and they are waiting for an appropriate time for a development to come forward in the area. Staff now feels it is an appropriate time to move forward with the improvements to Bright Road. This project is being designed and led by our Engineering team. These improvements will be brought forward in the upcoming

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Dublin City Council

Minutes of

Meeting

GOVERNMENT FORMS & SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

April 25, 2022

Page 4 of 12

Held _____ 20 _____

Capital Improvement Program (CIP) process. These improvements are needed regardless of development, and it was a matter of timing. Staff will engage with the public as the project is designed and a public meeting will be held for residents when drawings are available to help with discussion.

Mayor Fox asked about Section 6, and whether or not the roundabout will create a need for the acquisition of easements. Ms. O'Callaghan stated that staff does anticipate the need for acquisitions of easements and that will be determined when the roundabout is designed.

Vote on the Ordinance: Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes.

INTRODUCTION / FIRST READING / PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCES

Ordinance 16-22

Amending Ordinance 84-21 Adjusting the Ward Boundaries of the City of Dublin, as Required by Article 9.04 of the Revised Charter

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Mr. Rogers stated that at the April 11 Council meeting, Council agreed with the Franklin County Board of Elections' request and provided direction to Staff to formulate legislation adjusting City Ward Boundaries to align with US Census Enumeration Block Boundaries so that the Franklin County Board of Elections could remain compliant with their requirement under the Ohio Revised Code. Council further directed Staff to seek adjustments from the US Census Bureau that would facilitate the consolidation of the Hawk's Nest and the Bristol Commons neighborhoods into Ward 3 so that neither would be split across ward boundaries in the future. Once those adjustments are implemented by the US Census Bureau, staff will return to Council with new amending legislation that will eliminate any remaining splits of neighborhoods across ward boundaries. This Ordinance amends Ordinance 84-21 per Council's discussion and Franklin County Board of Elections' request. Staff recommended approval at the second reading/public hearing on May 9, 2022.

There were no public comments.

Second Reading/Public Hearing is scheduled for the May 9, 2022 Council Meeting.

Ordinance 17-22

Petitioning the Board of County Commissioners of Union County, Ohio to Adjust the Boundary Lines of Jerome Township so as to Exclude that Territory that, as a Result of Annexation, now lies Within the Corporate Boundaries of the City of Dublin (Roger Warren Gorden, Trustee of the Roger Warren Gorden Living Trust and Denise Ann Gorden, Trustee of the Denise Ann Gorden Living Trust's Annexation of 44.0 +/- Acres – Ordinance 87-17)

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Ms. Readler stated that Dublin City Council accepted, via Ordinance 87-17, the annexation of approximately 44 acres of land from Jerome Township. This annexation was initiated via regular annexation procedures by Aaron Underhill and David Hodge, agents/attorneys for Roger Warren Gorden, Trustee of the Roger Warren Gorden Living Trust; and Denise Ann Gorden, Trustee of the Denise Ann Gorden Living Trust. To ensure that fire coverage remains uniform within the City, it is the practice of the City to file a boundary adjustment petition to transfer the annexed properties from Jerome Township to Washington Township.

This Ordinance would authorize the City Law Director to petition the Board of County Commissioners of Union County to adjust township boundaries in Union County such that the annexed territory would be removed from Jerome Township, and placed in Washington Township. The City has provided both Washington and Jerome Townships at least 10 days' written notice that this boundary adjustment legislation is being introduced and considered by the City.

INTRODUCTION/FIRST READING/PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCES

Ordinance 13-22

Rezoning +/- 35 acres from R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District, Mount Carmel Hospital Northwest to Accommodate up to 314,520 SF of Development in Two Phases consisting of an Inpatient Hospital, Ambulatory Care Facility, and Medical Offices. The site is located northwest of the intersection of Sawmill Road and I-270

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Ms. Martin stated that this is approximately 35 acres of land. Prior to this meeting, Planning and Zoning recommended approval of the Preliminary Development Plan/rezoning on March 3, 2022 and twice reviewed this project as a concept plan. This rezoning is to facilitate the development of a medical campus and will include 6.9 acres of open space. The Community Plan, and specifically the Future Land Use Plan are key documents to consider in rezoning. The proposed project is within the Community Plan's allowance for square footage. A Traffic Impact Study was submitted and reviewed. This project is proposed to be developed in two phases. The first phase will be the hospital with four stories of height with two wings. The medical offices will be two stories in height and also part of phase one. Phase two accommodates additional development with the hospital, additional parking and an additional building.

Ms. Readler stated that a letter was received from a representative of Perry Township and was provided to all Council Members.

Lorraine Lutton, CEO of Mount Carmel Health Systems, expressed her excitement for the project. She shared Mount Carmel's vision which is to serving as a compassionate and healing presence in our community. She described the many professions and facets of the Mount Carmel Health System. She stated they employ 9500 employees, 2000 physicians and about 900 volunteers and she expressed pride in the work they have done throughout the pandemic. They have been requested to come to this area and be accessible to this community over the years. They want to take a holistic approach to recovering at home when possible. She thanked the City Manager and staff for their work and assistance.

Jason Coma, 7587 Tullymore Drive, stressed the importance of being a good neighbor. They have had several meetings with the East Civic Association and the Inverness Condo Association in Dublin and want to be part of the community. The illustration provided showed the evolution of the design and the site plan reflects the collaborative approach and desire to be a good neighbor. They want to provide an environment that contributes to the wellness of their patients.

A resident approached the podium and stated that she lives in Inverness. She has not seen the traffic report yet and is concerned about the traffic. She also is concerned about how much of Bright Road will be taken.

Mayor Fox verified that the traffic study is part of the conditions that must be met. Ms. Martin responded affirmatively.

Mayor Fox stated that she was on the Planning and Zoning Commission when this project was reviewed and the park-like setting details and the healing outdoor environment were discussed and it appears that they have worked hard on that.

Ms. Krumb expressed concern for the residents in Inverness and shielding them as much as possible from this development. She stated that there is a dry retention basin right behind the residences. She would like to see a different solution if stormwater is needed in that location. She also expressed concern for signage and, whether or not lighting is allowed, to be considerate of the neighboring residences to make sure it does not negatively impact their property.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that it will be important to reiterate to the Planning and Zoning Commission the use of plantings and moundings to separate the neighbors and shield them from the development.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

GOVERNMENT FORMS & SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

April 11, 2022

Page 5 of 13

Held _____ 20 _____

Ms. Amorose Groomes sought clarification on whether or not the traffic study was completed. Ms. Martin stated that it was, but that there are off-site and background improvements that have come out of that study that are being reviewed by engineering and mobility.

Ms. Amorose Groomes, referring to the statement from the resident regarding any additional land needed at Bright Road, stated that it did not appear to her that the two traffic solutions being contemplated would require additional easements. Does staff anticipate needing additional easements from the residents of Inverness? Ms. O'Callaghan explained that the Bright Road Corridor improvement project is still being designed. There will be public input opportunities as that project design progresses. Mr. Reiner stated that he agrees with mounding.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she is always astounded by the amount of parking. She asked about the discussion regarding parking at the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). Ms. Martin stated that the applicant provided a parking ratio and the PZC did condition that a parking plan be provided with the final development plan. Mayor Fox stated that she interpreted the PZC minutes as stating that the applicant would be mitigating the larger open parking areas. Mr. Coma stated that they are still working on the parking plan required for the final development plan. He explained that the staff members work a 7-7 shift so there must be enough parking for second shift to arrive and park before first shift leaves. He stated they are looking closely at the parking that is needed.

Second reading/public hearing is scheduled for the April 25, 2022 Council meeting.

Ordinance 14-22

Authorizing the Provision of Certain Incentives to Mount Carmel Health System to Induce it to Establish a Northwest Healthcare Campus within the City; and Authorizing the Execution of an Economic Development Agreement

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that it is expected that the Mount Carmel development will bring substantial economic and social benefits to Dublin, including the creation of approximately 342 new employment opportunities with a projected payroll in excess of \$32 million annually with the first 10 years of operation. The annual payroll withholdings for the new employee positions is estimated to be \$5,802,805 through December 31, 2035.

The proposed incentive is a 15% Performance Incentive for 10 years (2026-2035) on net new withholdings capped at \$913,942 in total, once that threshold is reached within the defined term, regardless of calendar year. The return on investment to the City is estimated to be \$4.9 million. Additionally, the City owns approximately 1.5 acres of residual property at 4045 Bright Road (the SE corner of Emerald Parkway and Bright Road). From 2022 through 2027, the City of Dublin agrees to make this land available to Mount Carmel at a cost of \$0, contingent upon the commencement of construction of a later phase medical office building. The City would execute a Real Estate purchase Agreement at that time. After 2027, this site may be available for sale to Mount Carmel for the appraised value at that time.

Lorraine Lutton, CEO, Mount Carmel, commented on the types of jobs which represent a variety of positions. She thanked Council for the partnership.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that the agreement addresses the construction of the roads associated with the development, but does not mention maintenance. She would like to see the agreement call out the maintenance of the roads specifically. Ms. Kramb sought clarification of the additional property and future development. Ms. O'Callaghan stated that future development refers to development not contemplated in the current plan. Ms. Kramb suggested some language to clarify what is intended. Ms. O'Callaghan will clarify the language for second reading.

Second reading/public hearing is scheduled for the April 25, 2022 Council meeting.

Ordinance 15-22

Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into an Infrastructure Agreement with Mount Carmel Health System for the Mount Carmel Health System Project

Ms. Alutto introduced the Ordinance.

Ms. O’Callaghan stated that the property for the Mount Carmel Health System Project requires rezoning to a Planned Unit Development District for the proposed land use.

Mount Carmel was required to submit a traffic impact study (TIS) performed by a qualified professional engineer to the City for review and approval. As Sawmill Road is within the City of Columbus’ jurisdiction and the site is located near the Sawmill Road and I-270 Interchange, the City of Columbus and Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) are partners in the review of the TIS. The TIS models the traffic on the existing roadways, evaluates impacts of the additional traffic on the surrounding roadway network, and recommends mitigation measures for these impacts.

Mount Carmel submitted a TIS dated January 5, 2022 and amended March 18, 2022 as required for the rezoning application, which has been reviewed and accepted with minor comments by Dublin and the City of Columbus. Due to the unique relationship of the Development with the City’s previously studied Bright Road Corridor Improvements, a non-traditional funding approach is being proposed to address the transportation improvements.

The Infrastructure Agreement addresses certain transportation improvements to the surrounding roadway network to mitigate the impact of the additional traffic generated by the Development, right-of-way and easement dedications, and water and sanitary sewer services. Additionally, the Infrastructure Agreement establishes the cost sharing commitments for Mount Carmel and the City while also determining the timing of the necessary improvements.

Ms. O’Callaghan noted the following improvements identified by Mount Carmel’s TIS:

- Emerald Parkway Main Entry Improvements – City will determine whether it is a signaled intersection or a roundabout;
- Emerald Parkway Service Drive Improvements – Mount Carmel will fund the design and construction;
- Bright Road Right-of-Way and Access Improvements;
- Sawmill Road Access Improvements – Mount Carmel will fund the design and construction; and
- Bright Road and Sawmill Road Intersection Improvements – In 2019, the City engaged an engineering consulting firm to perform preliminary engineering and detailed design for improvements to the Bright Road Corridor and will use this study to inform these improvements. The TIS indicated that the Development’s traffic contributes 3.9% of the traffic at that intersection and that improvements are needed with or without the Development.

As is standard practice, Mount Carmel agrees to donate the right-of-way and easements to Dublin, for land which Mount Carmel is under contract to purchase for the Development, for any offsite improvements as identified in the TIS, at no cost to Dublin.

Mount Carmel will pay 100% of all costs associated with water and sanitary sewer services for the Development.

Ms. O’Callaghan summarized the public input process thus far and stated that the public input process will continue as development continues.

Dublin’s obligations under this agreement will be funded in the upcoming Capital Improvements Program.

Mr. Reiner stated support for a roundabout in the intersection.

Ms. Kramb sought clarification on the funding for the improvement on Sawmill Road outside Dublin City Limits. Ms. O’Callaghan stated that it will be funded by Dublin due to the turn lane.

Mr. Keeler stated that we need to challenge ourselves to think outside the box related to parking and the future of parking lots.

Ms. Amorose Groomes stated that when she was on PZC, there were discussions about the future of parking and as parking needs go down, those parking lots will provide for

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Dublin City Council

Meeting

GOVERNMENT FORMS & SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

April 11, 2022

Page 7 of 13

Held _____ 20 _____

great redevelopment opportunities. Mr. Coma agreed with the parking discussion and Mount Carmel is aware of needs changing for the future.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she would like to see the total number of the cost for the City regarding these improvements. Ms. O'Callaghan will provide that as soon as the cost of either the signaled intersection or roundabout is determined.

Mayor Fox stated that different modes of transportation will be coming into the environment and she expressed appreciation for Mount Carmel's awareness and attention to that.

Second reading/public hearing is scheduled for the April 25, 2022 Council meeting.

INTRODUCTION/PUBLIC HEARING/VOTE – RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 15-22

Approving the Notice filed by the City Manager thereby Dissolving the Designated Outdoor Refreshment Area in Historic Dublin

Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.

Ms. LeRoy stated that this Resolution dissolves the Designated Outdoor Refreshment Area (DORA) in Historic Dublin as part of establishing a single DORA in Downtown Dublin. The new Downtown Dublin DORA will encompass the areas in Bridge Park and Historic Dublin that were previously two separate DORAs, will connect the two existing DORAs via the Dublin Link Pedestrian Bridge and East Plaza of Riverside Crossing Park, and will allow the City to consider future expansion of the DORA as the Bridge Park development grows without the need to submit future applications to the State of Ohio.

There were no public comments.

Vote on the Resolution: Mr. Keeler, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes.

Resolution 16-22

Approving the Application filed by the City Manager thereby Expanding the Designated Outdoor Refreshment Area in Downtown Dublin and Enacting Regulations

Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.

Ms. LeRoy stated that this is the Resolution expanding the DORA as previously discussed. Ms. LeRoy provided a map showing the DORA active areas.

There were no public comments.

Vote on the Resolution: Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Reiner, yes; Vice Mayor De Rosa, yes; Ms. Alutto, yes; Mayor Fox, yes; Mr. Keeler, yes.

Resolution 17-22

Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into a Cooperative Construction Agreement with Union County for the Construction of Improvements to Hyland-Croy Road between Post Road and Park Mill Drive

Ms. Alutto introduced the Resolution.

Ms. O'Callaghan stated that in January 2022, the City of Dublin, the Hyland Glen Developer, and Union County entered into an Infrastructure Agreement. As Hyland-Croy Road is within Union County's jurisdiction adjacent to the new neighborhood, Union County staff were partners in reviewing the Traffic Impact Study (TIS), which was approved in November 2021, and determined needed improvements to Hyland-Croy Road due to the Hyland Glen Development's impacts. The TIS modeled the traffic on the existing roadways, evaluated impacts of the additional traffic on the surrounding roadway network, and recommended mitigation measures for these impacts.

The Infrastructure Agreement addressed regional transportation improvements, the internal roadways in the development, Hyland-Croy Road Improvements, a gateway

RECORD OF ORDINANCES

Ordinance No. 13-22 Passed _____, 20____

REZONING +/- 35 ACRES FROM R-1, RESTRICTED SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, MOUNT CARMEL HOSPITAL NORTHWEST TO ACCOMMODATE UP TO 314,520 SF OF DEVELOPMENT IN TWO PHASES CONSISTING OF AN INPATIENT HOSPITAL, AMBULATORY CARE FACILITY, AND MEDICAL OFFICES. THE SITE IS LOCATED NORTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF SAWMILL ROAD AND I-270 (CASE 22-001Z/PDP)

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Dublin, _____ of its elected members concurring, that:

Section 1. The following described real estate, (see attached legal description, Exhibit A), situated in the City of Dublin, State of Ohio, is hereby rezoned PUD, Planned Unit Development District, and shall be subject to regulations and procedures contained in Ordinance No. 21-70 (Chapter 153 of the Codified Ordinances), the City of Dublin Zoning Code and amendments thereto.

Section 2. The application, including the list of contiguous and affected property owners, and the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission, are all incorporated into and made an official part of this Ordinance and said real estate shall be developed and used in accordance there within.

Section 3. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Passed this _____ day of _____, 2022.

Mayor - Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Clerk of Council



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



~~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 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



RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Tuesday, December 8, 2021 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Mount Carmel Hospital at 3865 Bright Road
21-158CP**

Concept Plan

Proposal: Informal review and feedback for a Concept Plan to develop ±35 acres consisting of a 190,000-square-foot, 30-bed inpatient hospital and ambulatory center. The site is zoned Restricted Suburban Residential District.

Location: Southwest of the intersection of Bright Road with Sawmill Road.

Applicant: Jason Koma, Mount Carmel Health System; and Dan Livanec, Hplex Solutions

Planning Contacts: Nichole M. Martin, AICP, Senior Planner and Christopher Will, AICP, Planner II

Contact Information: 614.410.4635, nmartin@dublin.oh.us and 614.410.4498, cwill@dublin.oh.us


Case Information: www.dublinohiousa.gov/pzc/21-158

RESULT: The Commission was supportive of the revised concept presented. The Commission was appreciative of the applicant’s revisions creating a wellness and health campus organized around a greenway. Based on the Community Plan, the Commission identified the site as a key gateway to the City of Dublin. The Commission noted the Community Plan recommends the location for elevated architecture character that may include curvilinear lines, use of light/reflectivity, and playful design. Additionally, the Commission noted that the success of the project relies on the execution of high-quality design details including landscape and building design.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF CERTIFICATION

DocuSigned by:

 8C8A0F637E3E42F
 Christopher Will, AICP
 Planner II



~~A request for the installation of a 15-square-foot ground sign at an existing office building. The 1.56-acre site is zoned Planned Unit Development District, Llewellyn Farms and is located northeast of the intersection of Frantz Road with Bradenton Avenue.~~

~~Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Supelak seconded approval of the Amended Final Development Plan with the following three conditions:~~

- ~~1) The applicant work with staff to assure landscaping compliance for the new ground sign that will be reviewed as part of the sign permit process;~~
- ~~2) The applicant match the brick base to the existing brick on the building; and,~~
- ~~3) The applicant obtain a sign permit through Building Standards prior to replacement of the ground sign.~~

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

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

NEW CASES

1. Mount Carmel Hospital at 3865 Bright Road, 21-158CP, Concept Plan

A request for informal review and feedback for a Concept Plan to develop ±35 acres for a proposed development of a 190,000-square-foot, 60-bed inpatient hospital and ambulatory center, and a 90,000-square-foot of medical office. The site is zoned Restricted Suburban Residential District and is located southwest of the intersection of Bright Road with Sawmill Road.

Staff Presentation

Mr. Will stated this is a request for informal review of a Concept Plan for a Proposed Planned Unit Development. The site is located at 365 Bright Road, northwest of the interchange of I270 and Sawmill Road. The Community Plan identifies three Future Land Use (FLU) recommendations for the 35-acre site. The primary FLU recommendation of Premium Office/Institution encompasses approximately 28 acres. The two secondary FLU recommendations are Standard Office/Institutional encompassing approximately 3 acres along Emerald Parkway, and Mixed Residential – Medium Density encompassing approximately 4 acres along Bright Road. In addition to Future Land Use, the Community Plan prescribes density recommendations. The Premium Office /Institution use is recommended not to exceed 16,500 square feet per acre; this proposal is for approximately 8,000 square feet per acre. The Standard Office, which does not exceed 12,500 square feet per acre is proposed here for 8,000 square feet. The Mixed Residential-Medium Density is proposed for 5 dwelling units/acre. Cumulatively, the Community Plan would prescribe 487,000 square feet of building space and 20 dwelling units. The cumulative proposal for the site is 280,000 square feet. The Thoroughfare Plan component of the Community Plan also provides recommendations. This is important as this site has frontage on prominent thoroughfares – Sawmill Road, I-270, Emerald Parkway and Bright Road. The Bright Road Special Area Plan component of the Community Plan provides specific design and mobility guidance. The Special Area Plan recommends exploring opportunities for an overpass between Emerald Parkway and the Bridge Street District, as well as continued restricted access along Sawmill Road and the widening of Bright Road between Emerald Parkway and Sawmill Road. Phase 8, the last section of Emerald Parkway, completed the Premium Office Corridor between Tuttle Crossing Blvd and Sawmill Road. This was anticipated to be a key

economic driver for the City and proposed to have income-producing property along the roadway. The City also completed a Sawmill Road Corridor Study in 2019, which indicated the need for infrastructure improvements within the corridor. Two key recommendations were an I-270 crossing study and the Bright Road improvement, which the City is studying and advancing. With a rezoning request for private development, the applicant is required to perform a Traffic Impact Study, which recommends any needed offsite improvements to the regional street network. The Concept Plan, however, looks only at internal site circulation, including vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle connections. Along with the PDP and rezoning, there would be a memorandum of understanding with the TIS documenting the existing and anticipated road conditions, site impacts and recommended mitigations. Finally, an Infrastructure Agreement would define the applicant's responsibilities to construct said improvements.

In November of 2021, the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed and provided non-binding feedback for an initial Concept Plan for the proposed hospital, The Commission expressed support for the proposed hospital and medical uses, but encouraged the applicant to explore a wellness campus concept, integrated greenspaces, physical connections to the site, and to further study building placement and orientation to better leverage the site. Additionally, the Commission expressed a desire to see a full build-out phasing approach for the site. Accordingly, the applicant has provided the phased plan for the site. The first phase will include a central greenspace around which the building campus will occur. The first phase will include a 140,000 square feet, 3-story, 30-bed inpatient hospital, and a 50,000-square foot, 3-story medical office building. The primary site access will be from Emerald Parkway and a secondary emergency entrance from Sawmill Road. In a future phase, a fourth story and a horizontal addition are anticipated, which would add 50,000 square feet to the hospital. An additional 40,000 feet also would be added to the medical office building, as well as a second satellite medical office building and parking lot. In that phase, the emergency drive from Sawmill Road would be connected to Emerald Parkway to provide a secondary access, as well as a Bright Road connection. The full buildout proposal includes: a 190,000-square-foot, 4-story, 60-bed hospital; 90,000-square feet of medical office within two buildings; 1,000 patient and staff parking spaces; a healing garden and shared-use trails. Pursuing a health and wellness campus, the applicant is proposing several types of greenspaces [Descriptions and images depicting the proposed character and landscaping were shown.]

Staff has provided the following discussion questions for the Commission:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed land use based on the surrounding context?
- 2) Does the Commission support the revised conceptual site layout including building, parking, and open spaces locations?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive the proposed building mass and scale?
- 4) Does the Commission support the conceptual architectural and landscape character?
- 5) Other considerations by the Commission.

For clarification purposes, Mr. Boggs reviewed the goals of a Concept Plan review, which is primarily to provide input at the formative stages of design.

Ms. Call requested that as they review the Concept Plan, the Commission members consider how it aligns with the Community Plan recommendations and Code.

Applicant Presentation

Jason Koma, 7587 Tullymore Drive, Dublin, OH, project manager, Mount Carmel Health System, stated that since the first Concept Plan review, they have had a dialogue with the East Dublin Civic Association, have joined the Dublin Chamber of Commerce and have embarked in conversations that they hope will lead to partnership with the Dublin City Schools. They are hiring 16 and 17 year olds, which provides opportunity for students considering health care. They have revised the Concept Plan in accordance with the Commission's previous feedback. Tonight, they have provided a phased approach to full development, and the revised plan now depicts a serene and healing presence on the site. Additional green amenities have been incorporated emphasizing the site and de-emphasizing the parking. Mounding and landscaping have been provided along Sawmill Road, the eastern edge of the site, and the Emerald Parkway access is now more park-like. Careful attention has been paid to the stormwater management component. In regard to traffic concerns that have been expressed, he would point out that a lower site density is proposed than is permitted; additionally, hospital-related traffic is spread evenly throughout the day. They will be submitting a Traffic Impact Study with the Preliminary Development Plan. His colleagues will provide more details on the proposed plan.

Mark Bultman, HDP Architects, 333 East Erie Street, Milwaukee, WI stated that their challenge was to define an overall organizational concept that organized all the key elements. With this plan, they have addressed certain components. They have created greenspaces at the access points on Sawmill Road, Emerald Parkway and Bright Road. This is a 4-sided site, which is unique. The greenspace that runs east to west will tie all the entry spaces together. That integrated greenway assists in separating and breaking down the scale of the parking. The line of sight to the building will be through a greenspace view corridor.

Brian Kinzelman, MKSK, senior principal/landscape architect/city planner, 462 South Ludlow, Columbus, 43215, stated that the green reserve collection of greenspace and landscaping has been key to the site organization. It has informed where the building are placed, massed and oriented. There is no back side to this campus, which is located on a key gateway corner of the City. They have been looking at this corner for 40 years. The landscaping along the I-270 interchange and roadways will be intentional, signature landscaping announcing the special character of the site. The woodlot along the Bright Road portion of the site will be preserved. A future access through it to the site will be strategically located. Most of the stormwater management will be accomplished along the Emerald Parkway frontage in a sculpted, intentional landscape scheme. There will be usable public plaza spaces at the buildings and connected pathways. The character of those spaces will be consistent with that of Dublin, Ohio. [inspirational images shown.]

Commission Questions

Mr. Way complimented the applicant on the revised plan, which is very responsive to the Commission's earlier input. There is now a big idea and a vision. He loves the integration of the open space through a community wellness site. The way the road bisects the site needs to be explored further to better integrate it. The green zone along the Emerald Parkway frontage appears unfinished; the greenspace should encompass the entire frontage. He believes the green zone that extends from the north to the building could better embrace the hospital on the front and east. He has two questions. The massing rendering depicts a 5-story building. Is that a future plan? The applicant indicated the depiction was an error.

Mr. Way inquired about the loading docks.

Mr. Bultman responded that there will a place for deliveries to be made, including at the hospital. There will not be loading docks, per se.

Mr. Way stated that it is important that the loading or service areas be integrated into the site with limited visibility. Additionally, he noted that the previous plan showed the heli-stop location as further out in the site. He understands those cannot be located too close to a hospital. Are they continuing to explore the location?

Mr. Koma responded that they have consulted with a helicopter ambulance service regarding the design and space needed. A helistop experiences minimal traffic – perhaps a couple of flights a year to transport a patient from the facility. The needed space has initially been spec'd out with an air ambulance pilot, and that will continue throughout the planning process.

Mr. Bultman stated that at the end of the building would be an infusion space for cancer patient treatments, near the terminus of the Bright Road greenway.

Public Comments

Kyle Rush, 4143 MacDuff Way, Dublin, OH:

"Thanks for the information. The only comment I have, again, relates to the entrance on Bright Road. The road backs up to the residences in Inverness. A little nature preserve area will not help. Widening Bright Road to accommodate the proposed entrance will only make the area worse for residents of that village and anyone else passing through, as traffic will be increased substantially. The main entrances to the site should be located on Emerald Parkway, away from the residents' homes. If there is insistence for an entrance there, maybe Bright Road should dead end into Sawmill Road. This would force people to use Hard Road and the eventual bridge crossing over I-270 between Tuller Road and Emerald Parkway. Either way, the entrance is not a good idea."

Melinda Todaro, 7325 MacBeth Drive, Dublin, OH:

"I am concerned with the traffic on Bright Road between Emerald Parkway and Sawmill Road. This is an area that experiences congestion. Pre-pandemic, the 5:00pm traffic would back up to the traffic circle. Is a plan being developed to deal with the traffic in that corridor?"

Gina Bray:

"As a local resident, who travels Emerald Parkway frequently, I have many concerns with the proposed Mt. Carmel campus plan, primarily with traffic congestion impacting Sawmill Road. Sawmill Road at I-270 and Sawmill Road at Hard Road are consistently congested, causing multiple collisions per week. Dublin also encourages the support of nature and conservation. I fail to see how an addition to another large-scale industry falls within the long-term vision of protecting our environment. Secondly, there is a free-standing hospital less than seven minutes away and a free-standing emergency site in Powell, off Sawmill Parkway north of this proposed hospital. Not to mention the recent construction and opening of the Rehabilitation Hospital off Sawmill Road in Dublin, Mt. Carmel Hospital currently has a Hilliard campus and a campus off SR23 in Delaware. To expand to Dublin seems unnecessary in an already well-saturated market offering emergent outpatient and long-term medical care. Lastly, I would like to see a community survey distributed to local residents asking if they support the proposed hospital campus. Concretely verifying a need would show the Commission if construction would be serving our Dublin community."

Commission Discussion

Mr. Grimes stated that this plan is a far better fit, orientation and use of the property than the prior plan. The proposed greenspace and stormwater facilities are great; however, the primary issue is

traffic and access. This project could be used to help leverage improvements for everyone in the area. The issues at Sawmill Road will need to be mitigated to get traffic in/out of this facility. He has heard previously a suggestion to terminate Bright Road at Sawmill Road. He would defer that suggestion to Engineering to determine the benefits and advisability of doing so. As more development occurs to the north into Delaware, the traffic issues will only increase. He likes the building and greenspace orientation on the property.

Mr. Schneier inquired if the intended uses have changed since the previous plan.

Mr. Bultman stated that no changes have occurred beyond the evolution of the building organization.

Mr. Schneier stated that the plan indicates approximately 480 parking stations may be required for the hospital, and 471 are provided. What would be the reason to add more parking spaces?

Mr. Bultman stated that design is an iterative process, and the last week or so, they have been looking into scaling back parking spaces to minimize the amount of impervious surface created. He anticipates the number of spaces will further evolve before the next plan review.

Mr. Schneier stated that one diagram showed pedestrian access to the hospital no access looping out on the east side. The lobby area would seem to provide an opportunity to continue the pedestrian access further.

Mr. Bultman responded that the intent was to create a respite space for staff on the other side, separate from the public.

Ms. Fox stated that she was impressed with the revised plan, which takes advantage of the opportunity to create a wellness campus, not just a wellness building. She appreciates the thought invested in the green streetscape and the greenway approaches to the buildings. As a previous Mt. Carmel nurse, she can recall the gardens in front of the old Convent, which were places people visited. She believes that in addition to the medical element, there are also spiritual, faith elements to healing. Additionally, the serenity that emanates from nature - openness, light, water and greenspaces, contribute to healing. Patients often are fearful upon entering a hospital, and the feel of the approach to the campus can benefit the health care the patients will receive. The impression of wellness of both the exterior and the interior will make this campus much more effective. She agrees with Mr. Way that it would be beneficial to wrap the greenway corridor all the way around the site. Staff has encouraged the applicant in the direction of traditional architecture. In Dublin, the use of natural materials is emphasized, but she would not want to discourage the use of curvilinear, light and reflective spaces. There is opportunity for public art, as well. The outdoor space on the campus should encourage people to take a walk – that is a wellness touch on its own. She is confident the traffic issues can be worked out.

Mr. Supelak stated that he would concur that the revised plan is remarkably better than the previous layout. He likes the proposed greenspaces. He concurs with Ms. Fox on the use of architectural materials. The inspirational images depict the use of materials that are not average, and he would encourage pursuing that direction. Slide 15, for instance, "Interstate Experience," has some compelling architecture. There is opportunity here for some fun, compelling architecture, and he would encourage embracing that opportunity. The last slide, "Campus," depicts the use of art pieces and light tendrils, which are elements that encourage people to linger and remember. Continuing in that direction will make this a great plan.

Ms. Call stated that the Commission appreciates the applicant's provision of more detail in the revised plan than may typically be provided with a Concept Plan. The Commission has encouraged the applicant to continue in the direction of interesting architectural ideas, such as the light tendrils. There are transportation issue concerns, but the Concept Plan is not intended to address those in detail. The Commission has indicated that the plan proposes the right direction, and with our combined efforts, we can achieve a development of which all will be proud. We look forward to welcoming Mt. Carmel to the community.

Mr. Koma thanked the Commission for their helpful feedback and staff for their collaboration on the project.

Mr. Way stated that because this development will be located on a gateway site in Dublin, and the architecture will be seen by many, it must be outstanding. He is confident the applicant can deliver accordingly. He is excited to see the plan evolve.

2. 4000 W. Dublin-Granville Road, 21-128CP, Concept Plan

~~A request for a review of a Concept Plan for the construction of a ±6,900-square-foot, one-story, multi-tenant commercial building. The 1.98-acre site is zoned Bridge Street District, Sawmill Center Neighborhood and is located ±500 feet northwest of the intersection of W. Dublin-Granville Road with Dublin Center Drive.~~

Staff Presentation

~~Mr. Hounshell stated that this is a Concept Plan for 4000 W. Dublin-Granville Road. This Concept Plan differs from the previous plan reviewed. Because this site is in the Bridge Street District, a determination of the Commission is requested. Should the Concept Plan be approved tonight, the applicant is also requesting the combination of the Preliminary and Final Development Plans, which is in the purview of the Commission. This is the second time this application has come before the Commission for review. The 1.98-acre site is located in the Sawmill Center Neighborhood zoning district. The site is currently vacant with a number of mature trees along the western property line. There is a low-lying entry feature, decorative wall and sign on the southeast corner. The sign would remain, as it applies to the Lowe's property to the north. The proposed site is identified as one of the Lowe's development outparcels. These outparcels have strict deed restrictions that influence development of the site. Deed restrictions are private agreements between property owners that are completely distinct from zoning regulations. The City is tasked with implementing the Community Plan and administering the Zoning Code incrementally over time. The City does not establish, apply, or enforce deed restrictions. The Lowe's outparcel deed restrictions limits the size of development, number of structures, height of structures, and minimum parking requirements. The review of this application is based solely on the applicable requirements of the Bridge Street Zoning Code. A 50-foot AEP electric easement is located along the west property line. The proposal does include the future development of Village Parkway, which is considered a district connector and principal frontage street on the Bridge Street network map. It is not included with the construction on this site. Should the application move forward, the applicant would be required to continue to work with staff to finalize the implementation and construction of the street extension. [Existing site conditions shown.] This site is located on at the intersection of the future Village Parkway and the current West Dublin-Granville Road, which are both principal frontage streets. To the north and east are private drives – Banker Drive to the north and an access drive~~

MEETING MINUTES

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 4, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Call, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the November 4, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Tonight's meeting can also be accessed at the City's website. Public comments on the cases are welcome. To submit any questions or comments during the meeting, please use the form under the streaming video on the City's website. Questions and comments will be relayed to the Commission by the meeting moderator. The City desires to accommodate public participation to the greatest extent possible.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Call led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commission members present: Rebecca Call, Warren Fishman, Kim Way, Jane Fox, Leo Grimes, Lance Schneier

Commissioners excused: Mark Supelak

Staff members present: Jennifer Rauch, Nichole Martin, Thaddeus Boggs, Christopher Will, Michael Hendershot, Tina Wawszkiewicz

ACCEPTANCE OF DOCUMENTS AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Grimes moved, Mr. Fishman seconded acceptance of the documents into the record and approval of the 9-23-21, 10-07-21 and 10-18-21 PZC meeting minutes.

Vote: Mr. Schneier, yes; Mr. Fishman, yes; Mr. Way, yes; Ms. Fox, yes; Ms. Call, yes; Mr. Grimes, 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. Ms. Call swore in those individuals intending to give testimony at the meeting.

CASES

1. Mount Carmel Hospital at 3865 Bright Road, Concept Plan, 21-158CP

Conceptual development proposal to establish a Planned Unit Development for a 190,000-square-foot, 30-bed inpatient hospital and ambulatory center also providing outpatient services. The ±35-acre site is zoned R-1, Restricted Suburban Residential District and is located southeast of the intersection of Bright Road with Emerald Parkway.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martin stated that this a request for review and consideration of a conceptual plan for the potential future development of a Mt. Carmel Hospital facility within the City. The proposal is to establish a Planned Unit Development for a 190,000-square-foot, 30-bed inpatient hospital and ambulatory center providing outpatient services on a ±35-acre site. A Concept Plan is the first step of the PUD process if the site is larger than 25 acres or does not comply with the Community Plan. The next step would be a Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan. The final step is the Final Development Plan, where final architectural details and landscape, sign and site elements are finalized. This 35-acre site is located southeast of the intersection of Bright Road with Emerald Parkway and has frontage on I-270 and Sawmill Road. The site is in proximity to a number of established single-family neighborhoods, as well as the Perry Township offices and the Village of Inverness. When rezoning is under consideration, the Community Plan is a key guiding document. It includes Future Land Use, Thoroughfare Plan and Special Area Plan recommendations for development. The Community Plan identifies three Future Land Use recommendations for the 35-acre site. The primary Future Land Use recommendation for the site is Premium Office/Institution encompassing approximately 28 acres. The two secondary land use recommendations are Standard Office/Institutional encompassing approximately 3 acres along Emerald Parkway, and Mixed Residential – Medium Density for the 4 acres along Bright Road. For Premium Office, the recommended density is up to 16,500 sq. feet/acre. The recommended density for Standard Office/Institutional is up to 12,500 sq. feet/acre, and the recommended density for Mixed Residential-Medium Density is 5 dwelling units/acre. The cumulative recommended density for this site is up to 487,000 sq. feet of Office or Institutional Use with up to 20 dwellings. This proposal is for 190,000 square feet for Phase One. The Thoroughfare Plan establishes a framework for future connectivity, as well as enhancements to surrounding street networks. Bright Road is designated a collector street, which is the lowest street classification. It provides a connection between a minor arterial street (Emerald Parkway) and a major arterial (Sawmill Road and I-270). Special Area Plans provide a scenario for potential development. The Community Plan also provides mobility and design recommendations. It recommends a consistent landscape treatment along Sawmill Road; limited/restricted access along Sawmill Road; and that any large-scale office be oriented to I-270. It also acknowledges overhead utility easements and exploration of the opportunity for an overpass connecting Emerald Parkway to the Bridge Street District. Along Emerald Parkway, the Community Plan recommends two-story, corporate offices, as well as supporting services, and the future widening of Bright Road. Emerald Parkway Phase 8, which opened December 2014, was the final phase of a connection between Tuttle Crossing Blvd. and Sawmill Road. Emerald Parkway is a premier office corridor, which was intended to open up 115 acres of developable land for economic development.

Ms. Wawszkiewicz reviewed the existing transportation studies completed recently within this region. The first of the two recent studies was completed in 2019. The joint study with the City of Columbus reviewed the Sawmill Road Corridor. The study showed that adding travel lanes only on Sawmill Road would not solve the problem; it would draw more traffic to that corridor, further increasing delays. The study recommended a few "spot" improvements and considered an overpass over I-270 that would connect the Bright Road neighborhood to the Bridge Street District. That opportunity is under additional review. The Concept Plan looks at internal site circulation for all modes. However, a future Rezoning would require a detailed Traffic Impact Study, which would identify any traffic mitigation strategies needed to offset the anticipated traffic impact. Those recommendations

subsequently would be formalized in an Infrastructure Agreement between the applicant and the City.

Ms. Martin reviewed the development proposal concept. The site is relatively flat and undeveloped on the southern portion and contains a tree stand in the northernmost portion of the site. On the eastern side of the site, there is a gravel area to the rear of the Perry Township office (7125 Sawmill Road). A 50-foot wide overhead utility easement traverses the site. This is a request for consideration of Concept Plan proposal to establish a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a 190,000-square-foot medical office and hospital facility on the site with separate emergency and non-emergency drives. The main boulevard entry drive and welcome plaza are accessible from Emerald Parkway, as is a second restricted access for emergency vehicles. Additionally, there is a north-south connection for visitor, patient and staff use. The inpatient, 30-bed care facility is sited adjacent to I-270. A two-story ambulatory center is located centrally at the terminus of the main entry drive and plaza with a medical office outpatient clinic located immediately to the northwest. A healing garden will be located on the site between the clinic, ambulatory center and welcome plaza. Both staff and visitor parking are provided. The 248 employee parking spaces will be located to the rear of the facility, proximate to Sawmill Road. Visitor parking is located to the north (200 spaces) and south (140 spaces) of the boulevard entry drive with a north-south access drive internal to the site. Back of house areas are located along the restricted access drive, including the ambulatory drop-off, the service area, and the heli-pad. The proposed massing has been provided including both detail and overview perspectives [perspective views and inspirational images shown.] The proposed development proposal should be viewed from a regional context. Both Cases 1 and 2 are proximate to one another. The sites include the 35 acres for Mt. Carmel and the 40 acres to the northwest for the Bright Road senior housing development. Additionally, a zone is depicted in which potential I-270 crossings are being contemplated. The following questions have been provided to guide the Commission's discussion:

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed land use based on the surrounding context?
- 2) Does the Commission support the conceptual site layout including building, parking, and open space locations?
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed building mass and scale?
- 4) Does the Commission support the conceptual architectural and landscape character?

Applicant Presentation

Diane Doucette, 6171 Lewis Road, Sunbury OH 43017, president, Mount Carmel Health System, stated that she is the executive sponsor for the project and will be the future president of the project. She is a registered nurse with 30 years of experience in the nursing field. Much has been learned during the past 19 months of the Covid19 pandemic, and that learning will be incorporated into this new health care campus. When Mt. Carmel considered possible sites for a new health care campus, they looked for areas with service gaps, and the east side of Dublin falls within that category.

Jason Koma, 7587 Tullymore Drive, Dublin, OH, project manager, Mount Carmel Health System, stated that this is their first project to be planned with the lessons learned from the Covid19 pandemic. This facility will provide services at Dublin's eastern gateway. The design process is in the early stages, and their intent is to work with all stakeholders throughout that process. Each of their facilities attempts to match the character of the community in which it is located. They intend to be a good neighbor, and although the facility will have emergency services, it is important to point out that emergency vehicle sirens are turned off upon entering the facility site. They have met

with the East Dublin Civic Association and the HOA leadership of the Village of Inverness, and will be working collaboratively with the neighbors.

Commission Questions

Mr. Schneier inquired if the proposed pedestrian crossing would be across Emerald Parkway.

Ms. Martin responded that a potential I-270 crossing would provide for multiple modes of mobility, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Mr. Schneier inquired if anything about this project would interfere or limit the options for that.

Ms. Wawzkiewicz responded that the two project teams are coordinating efforts. The City has a consultant working on the I-270 crossing alternatives, and they have met with the applicant's team to begin discussions regarding how both projects could be the most successful.

Mr. Way stated that this is the initial phase, but there is the potential for future additional development. What is the vision for additional future development, including what else and how large that might be? Is something driving the current design that will allow future expansion over time?

Denny Freudeman, 8564 Pennington Court, Powell, OH 43065, President, Hplex Solutions, Mt. Carmel project manager, stated that the site is 35 acres. Phase one is for approximately 190,000 square feet of development; however, the site is being designed to accommodate potential expansion of the hospital, if warranted, which could be an additional 15,000-20,000 square feet. The development will also include a medical office building for use by independent physician groups identified by Mt. Carmel to bring more health care to the site. There is a potential for primary care and orthopedic specialists to complement the facility. Any hospital expansion on the site would occur to the east. If that expansion were to occur, it is possible that there could be a structured parking facility. To facilitate the vehicular movement on the campus, there will be four different entry points to disperse traffic into and on the site. It is essential that circulation is convenient for visitors and patients.

Ms. Call inquired if the 190,000-square-foot Concept Plan proposal was inclusive of that future development.

Mr. Freudeman responded that it is not inclusive; it covers only phase one.

Ms. Call inquired if he could estimate the size of the full build out.

Mr. Freudeman estimated that the future expansion and medical office building could bring the total square footage to 250,000-275,000 square feet. The medical office building would be approximately 35,000-50,000 square feet in addition to the hospital expansion of 20,000-25,000 square feet.

Mr. Fishman stated that one of the accesses would be at Bright Road. Obviously, that road would require some improvement to handle that access.

Ms. Martin stated that the Community Plan anticipates improvements to Bright Road, and the Preliminary Development Plan and rezoning would study those potential improvements. Improvements are anticipated to mitigate any traffic impacts generated by this user or other users to the north and west.

Mr. Fishman inquired if those improvements would occur in conjunction with this project.

Ms. Martin responded that with the Preliminary Development Plan application and rezoning, the applicant is required to submit a Traffic Impact Study, which looks both at existing pre-development conditions, as well as post-development conditions, and recommends the mitigation needed. That

mitigation could include a number of changes to Bright Road, which would be explored for implementation with this project or in conjunction with other projects.

Ms. Fox stated that there will be two access points on Emerald Parkway, one of which will be restricted to emergency vehicles. What are staff's thoughts on those two accesses?

Ms. Martin responded that at this point the access configuration is conceptual. It is essential to separate the emergency and non-emergency trips, and staff is exploring with the applicant the appropriate control measures to ensure that the site functions and is responsive to the traffic volumes on the surrounding streets, including Sawmill Road and Emerald Parkway. It is important to maintain the medians along Emerald Parkway.

Ms. Fox inquired if the access on Sawmill Road would be a right in/right out only. That is a congested area.

Ms. Martin responded that at this time, that is unknown. The Traffic Study will guide future decision-making on the final access points adjacent to the public right-of-way.

Ms. Call stated that with the Concept Plan, internal traffic circulation on the site is considered. The next step will look specifically at the points of congestion, and an infrastructure agreement will ensure the site and community needs are met.

Mr. Koma stated that there is the operational aspect, as well. In addition to the emergency, service and main entrances, there is also the site wayfinding component. Those accesses have been purposely separated.

Mr. Grimes stated that he is concerned with the amount of traffic in the area, generated not only by this project but the following project on the agenda and future projects. In regard to the right-of-way widths on Sawmill Road, as well as Bright Road – he believes that Bright Road from Sawmill Road to the Bright Road-Emerald Parkway roundabout should be more than two lanes. It must be three to five lanes. There is already a high level of traffic there. Traffic backs up a couple of times a day during peak hours with the nearby school. This has an impact on the residents in the area. There is a need to look at the issue from two perspectives – the traffic in the area and the proposed bridge across I-270. Anything that can be done to make it easier for local traffic to avoid using Sawmill Road will help the circulation in this general area. Where that bridge is located will impact how the Mt. Carmel project is located. Is there a project timeframe for the traffic studies, so better information can be made available for the public and the Commission?

Ms. Wawzkiewicz responded that coordination would occur between all of the studies and the applications. The timing will be determined by the applicant's submission of their rezoning application. The Traffic Impact Study is due at that point. There is no other set date for that study other than the rezoning application submission. The City is hoping to have the alternative study for the crossing over I-270 completed by the end of 2021 or the beginning of 2022. It will be a study only; no funds are programmed for construction. Those steps will follow. There are some recommendations from the 2019 Sawmill Road Corridor Study for Bright Road improvements. They will look at those recommendations again in conjunction with the Traffic Impact Study. Those recommendations could be included in conjunction with any mitigation needed for this site, or they could be developed as an independent CIP project. There is no scheduled timeline for those improvements.

Ms. Martin stated that it is important that the applicant receive the Commission's feedback on whether or not this development is conceptually consistent with the Community Plan, and if the site

design elements are appropriate. The feedback will determine whether the applicant chooses to advance to the next step and complete further study.

Mr. Grimes stated that the following project on tonight's agenda would have more impact on the watershed than this project; however, they are located within close proximity. The stormwater velocity will need to be addressed before it reaches the river; where does the responsibility for that study lie?

Ms. Martin responded that each applicant is required to conduct an independent stormwater analysis. Those studies would be coordinated and reviewed by City Engineering in accordance with the City's Stormwater Management requirements.

Ms. Call invited Mr. Hendershot to respond to the stormwater management concerns expressed.

Mr. Hendershot, City Civil Engineer, stated that stormwater management analysis is not required with a Concept Plan. Should the project advance to the Preliminary Development Plan, submission of those calculations is required. The City would review those calculations against its Stormwater Code requirements. That would include water quality – treating the stormwater on the project site, and water quantity – regulating the release rate of the stormwater flow generated by the projects. The proposed project must not adversely impact downstream properties with flooding, sediment, erosion and silt buildup. The project must comply with the Stormwater Code requirements.

Mr. Way stated that the Concept Plan shows a significant amount of greenspace, which leads to his interest in a future phase. What is the anticipated use for that greenspace? The project narrative indicates it would be open to the community or visitors. Will all that space be available to the community or just parts of it? Walking paths are shown on the site.

Mr. Koma responded that Dublin provides a high level of pedestrian connections. Their intent is to provide active healing space that is available to the community, while preserving the ability for future development, if warranted.

Mr. Way inquired if there would be any dedicated park space on the campus.

Mr. Koma responded that it is too early for them to be able to determine that, while attempting to balance the different aspects of future development and maintaining the overall green amenities for healing purposes. That healing space for patients and the need to provide a buffer between this use and the neighboring residential to the north is important. However, they are interested in exploring the opportunity for pedestrian connectivity.

Mr. Way stated that the emergency drive will be restricted, yet it connects to a staff parking area, and there is a link to Bright Road. Which portions of the internal roadway system will be restricted from public use? Will there be gates?

Mr. Kona stated that the use of purposeful wayfinding should be sufficient; however, the discussion is ongoing.

Mr. Way stated that the initial development would be a 30-bed facility. Is further expansion of the number of beds anticipated; if so, how many might that be?

Mr. Kona responded that conversation would be premature at this time, but there is the potential for expansion on the site, if needed. Current planning is looking at the services needed and determining what facility would fit those services most efficiently.

Ms. Doucette stated that the future of health care is rapidly changing, evolving into more ambulatory care. That includes care of patients while at home. They will be working on that aspect of their service. Due to advancements in technology, future care will be of patients at home. Their service will be assessed in conjunction with the community's needs.

Mr. Way stated that it is difficult for the Commissioners to look at the amount of greenspace on the site, the proposed building occupying a small portion of the site, and evaluate the project. It would be easier to assess this specific proposal if we had some idea of the future vision for the site.

Ms. Call requested Commissioners to focus on the broader concepts of the Concept Plan. More details will be available with the Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat, including the massing.

Mr. Way stated that it is difficult to assess whether the Concept Plan is appropriate without seeing what it really will be and how that would add to the community. This is one of the premier sites in Dublin. If a larger vision could be shared, it would be easier to express support. If there will be other surrounding projects, the site might be quite different.

Mr. Freudeman stated that this would be a small, out-post hospital for Mt. Carmel, allowing them to provide a certain level of service for the Dublin community. It is not intended to serve northcentral Ohio. Future growth likely will be in the area of outpatient versus inpatient.

Mr. Way stated that he is interested in whether this is intended to be a health and wellness campus, as opposed to onsite patient care.

Public Comments

Ms. Call summarized the context of the public comments received regarding the case. These comments were provided in the meeting packet and are accessible to the public online. [Read names of commentators and concerns.] Concerns were expressed regarding: traffic volume and speeds; sidewalks; freeway; watershed; Sawmill Road development; potential for TIF financing for mitigation of traffic issues; additional load on the electrical grid; preservation of the wildlife habitation and natural areas; light intrusion; height of the garages in the residential development (next case); ambulance noise; density and intensity of the use; impact to residences and business, including access.

Amy Kramb, 7511 Riverside Drive, Dublin, OH 43016 stated she speaks on behalf of the East Dublin Civic Association. In August, Mt. Carmel provided an early concept at a civic association meeting. Two weeks ago, she was provided a copy of the updated Concept Plan, which she shared with the civic association membership. Their comments acknowledged that the use is consistent with the Community Plan and appreciation that the buildings were close to I-270. The August Concept Plan included the conceptual location of office buildings on the site, but those locations are not shown on this plan. It would be helpful to know the worst-case scenario, if the project is approved. The residents might be supportive of the current concept, but would not be happy if significant site changes are proposed in the future. There is concern with the potential light pollution from the large staff parking lot, which would back up to The Village of Inverness. Access from this site to Sawmill Road is not guaranteed; the applicant must work with Perry Township on that element. If access to

Sawmill Road cannot be achieved, all access will be from Bright Road, unless Dublin will permit a cut to be made to the Emerald Parkway median. Traffic from the freeway will back up at the turn to Bright Road, creating a significant traffic issue. A Final Development Plan for this project cannot be approved unless there are improvements to Bright Road. This cannot be a stand-alone project with the City fixing the traffic issues later. Access from this site will likely be Bright Road, not Emerald Parkway. Bright Road is two lanes, no curb and gutter, no sidewalks, and the Villages of Inverness backs up immediately to Bright Road. It will be impossible to widen Bright Road, as there is an office building on one side and a residence on the other side of the street. There are many issues that must be considered before this project can have final approval. The Concept Plan for this project must not allow an access on Bright Road without improvements occurring. If that is eliminated, it changes the circulation on the proposed site.

Carla Clifton, 3899 Inverness Circle, Dublin 43016 stated that she lives in the Village of Inverness. Her family has lived there since 1988. It is a beautiful sanctuary in the City of Dublin. With this project, from her window she would see the entrance off Bright Road into the hospital. This project will be very close to them. Access to and from Bright Road is already very difficult; Bright Road cannot handle the proposed project. She is opposed to this project taking part of their condominium community to widen Bright Road. The City has placed a dead-end at Bright Road and Riverside Drive, which has impacted local traffic, as well. In their condominium community, there is a preschool; children are walking in the area. She is concerned about their trees being removed and land taken. She asks the City not to make access to the proposed hospital off Bright Road. Any traffic studies should accurately portray future traffic, as the current traffic volume remains pre-Covid. Their community is part of Dublin; please give them appropriate consideration.

Marcia Barnes, 4150 Bright Road, Dublin 43016 stated that her primary concern is the natural environment, wildlife and pollution. The waterway lies at the back of their home, and daily, they pick up trash coming from Emerald Parkway. The building projects proposed on both sides of Bright Road will impact them, adding even more traffic and noise. What is proposed is health care, yet it will pollute the area for the residents who live here. The significant volume of traffic added will pollute the air and the waterway. Currently, there are deer, birds, etc. here, but they will disappear if these projects occur. She invites the Commissioners to visit her home and view the issues she is experiencing and the concerns she is pointing out.

Commission Discussion

Ms. Call requested Commissioners to respond to the proposed discussion questions.

- 1) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed land use based on the surrounding context?*

Commissioners indicated that they were supportive of the proposed land use with the understanding that the community's stated concerns must be adequately addressed. Mr. Way encouraged a visioning focus as a health and wellness campus.

- 2) Does the Commission support the conceptual site layout including building, parking, and open space locations?*
- 3) Is the Commission supportive of the proposed building mass and scale?*
- 4) Does the Commission support the conceptual architectural and landscape character?*

Mr. Way stated that there is insufficient information with the Concept Plan to be supportive of the building massing, conceptual architecture or landscape character. He would like to see more of what was reflected in the precedents shown; the current proposal does not match those precedents.

Mr. Grimes stated that he would recommend that most of the massing be placed along Sawmill Road and freeway to mitigate the potential noise issue.

Ms. Fox stated that she agrees with Mr. Way's encouragement that this be viewed as a wellness campus. As a former nurse, as well as a Council member and Commissioner, she views developments from the perspective of how that development could create well-being in the community. There is opportunity here to do that. A view of the site itself should foster an impression of health; therefore, the massive amount of parking space shown at the front door is a concern. There is ample ground here to develop a healing park. She would encourage an uplifting architectural concept. The parking area could also be a flexible space used for various health-related focuses, such as education on gardening, yoga, farmers' markets, etc. She would encourage something more creative than walking trails and that the healing garden be enlarged. She is concerned that the stormwater be addressed onsite and not flow downstream; that the increased traffic issues be adequately addressed; and that strong buffers be added for the abutting residential.

Mr. Fishman stated that this is an important rezoning, and Commissioners will be looking closely at the proposed plan. He encourages a spectacular project for this site. He also encourages the parking area be addressed in a creative manner, as it will be very visible; it should not be a traditional parking lot. Unfortunately, the east side of the river has gained the perception that their development concerns are not adequately addressed. This project is on a very important corner; it is a challenge that must be considered carefully.

Mr. Schneier stated that he is supportive of the use; however, he is not supportive of the other elements of the Concept Plan, which at this point, are very underwhelming. There is not another site in the City that is this prominent, so whatever is developed here must "speak" to the entire community. There is an opportunity to make a spectacular project here. As has been pointed out, Bright Road and the increased traffic that will result from the project is the primary issue. At this point, the project is not feasible as conceived. While the use needs parking, the last thing the City needs is to have more visible parking. There is a preponderance of visible parking in the Sawmill Road area.

Ms. Call stated that she compliments the applicant for reaching out to the residents, but she would encourage more dialogue. The applicant stated that their primary consideration with this site was ease of access. As the comments from the Commission and the public have shown, there is significant concern about the traffic, access and the impact on the neighbors. The Commission has provided input about the massing. While there is general support for the Concept Plan, Commissioners are concerned about how it is further developed and will be taking a deep look at those details. Parking areas are necessary, but she would encourage them to look at opportunities for a creative style. The visibility and prominence of this property requires a stellar project.

Ms. Call stated that no vote occurs on a Concept Plan, and inquired if additional clarification is desired.

The applicant indicated they needed no further guidance.