



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 9, 2017 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. PCD, Tuttle Crossing West Corridor – Motel 6 5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Blvd
17-072FDP Final Development Plan**

Proposal: A three-story, 42,000-square-foot hotel with 100 guest rooms for an approximately 2.8-acre parcel in the Tuttle Crossing West Corridor Planned Commerce District.

Location: North side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Emerald Parkway.

Request: Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Gregory Briya, Moody Nolan.

Planning Contact: Logan Stang, Planner I.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant pay a tree replacement fee for outstanding caliper inches prior to filing for building permits; and
- 2) That the applicant revise the ground sign to meet the requirements of the development text and provide a design that is in keeping with the character established by the existing adjacent developments, subject to staff approval, prior to filing for sign permits.

VOTE: 0 – 7.

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was disapproved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	No
Stephen Stidhem	No
Amy Salay	No
Cathy De Rosa	No
Robert Miller	No
Deborah Mitchell	No
Warren Fishman	No

STAFF CERTIFICATION


Logan M. Stang, Planner I



**1. PCD Tuttle Crossing West Corridor – Motel 6 5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard
17-072FDP Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is a proposal for a three-story, 42,000-square-foot hotel with 100 guest rooms for an approximately 2.8-acre parcel in the Tuttle Crossing West Corridor Planned Commerce District. She said the site is north of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Emerald Parkway. She said this request is for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Logan Stang reported this case was first reviewed at the August 24th PZC meeting and again at the September 21st PZC meeting. During the meetings, he said, the Commission expressed concerns regarding the proposed building materials, overall architectural character, and a number of conditional approval items. He stated the Commission had recommended the applicant look at alternative site layouts with the building shifted to the east and that they refine the architecture to correspond to the existing character established by the properties to the east.

An aerial view of the site was presented as well as the proposed site plan. Mr. Stang said the applicant has kept the site layout as reviewed previously with the building located on the western edge and parking oriented towards the center of the site. He said the proposal is consistent with the requirements of the development text and provides sufficient landscaping to buffer the perimeter of the site.

To provide some context, Mr. Stang presented some photos of the existing development character for Extended Stay America and the Holiday Inn Express to provide examples of how these regulations have been met with other proposals.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed elevations from the meeting on September 21, 2017, to show the architecture included stone on the ground story with gable features to separate the masses of the building. A 'Mahogany' fiber cement siding was shown in brown, he noted, with the remainder of the building clad in a tan fiber cement siding.

Mr. Stang indicated the applicant refined the architecture to extend stone from the ground story to the upper stories and has replaced the 'Mahogany' fiber cement siding with brick accents. He said details have been provided for the architectural features and a sample board of the exterior materials is available for review.

The applicant has provided a ground sign design, which Mr. Stang presented for the entry feature; however, he stated the proposal does not meet the requirements of the development text as the character is not in keeping with the existing development. He reported staff has added a condition of approval that the applicant revise the sign to meet the requirements of the development text and revise the design to create a more consistent character with the development to the east, subject to staff approval.

Based on the Final Development criteria, he reported, staff is recommending approval with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant pay a tree replacement fee for outstanding caliper inches prior to filing for building permits; and
- 2) That the applicant revise the ground sign to meet the requirements of the development text and provide a design that is in keeping with the character established by the existing adjacent developments, subject to staff approval, prior to filing for sign permits.

Mr. Stang reported that staff held a public meeting the night before with the residents of the Tuttle Crossing Corridor to discuss the development character of that area. He said discussions revolved around existing zoning and development applications, such as this case, along with the Community Plan recommendations for the area. That concluded his presentation and he stated he was available for questions.

Victoria Newell inquired about the ground sign. She asked how staff anticipates it will be modified to meet the requirements of the text. Mr. Stang answered the height needs to be lowered and both of the logos proposed for the design exceed what is permitted by Code so those cabinets would need to be decreased in addition to reworking the overall design.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Greg Briya, Moody Nolan, 300 Spruce Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43215, presented the development standards and highlighted several to explain the changes they have made to meet those standards. He presented an exhibit to show building movement and rotation and shape of building. He explained the existing hotels and their properties are quite large, which dictates the L-shape of those buildings. He said the position of the hotel is important because when they go to a front service lot, it serves as a safety feature by keeping the lot nice and open. He pointed out there is almost 50 feet of buffer space provided by vegetation. He reported they met with the Fire Marshal and he is comfortable with the fire apparatus maneuverability.

Mr. Briya presented a colored landscape plan that shows a lot of trees, perennials, annuals, and ornamental shrubs. A photometric plan was presented to show the light levels on the site and he noted the zero foot candles on the residential side and how the light overall was contained within the site.

Before and after elevations were presented to show the amount of work the applicant has put in toward changes to make everyone happy. Mr. Briya said they considered the L-shaped plan and flipping the building but did not gain any value. He highlighted the final elevation and noted the amount of brick elements and a decorative truss that replaced the flat canopy. He said they had some black out windows previously and changed those to vision glass. He indicated they are definitely willing to work with staff on the sign as this was the first draft.

Bob Miller complimented Mr. Briya on an outstanding presentation. He said one of the problems the Commission had was that the building looked like an aircraft carrier. He said the visuals for the hotels next door were very helpful but the massing of the building continues to be a problem as well as the location. He asked why the west positioning of the building is so important. Mr. Briya answered they have the detention going in the corner so when the building is flipped, it causes challenges to the parking lot layout and drainage. He said they also tried to bump the building over as much as possible but then it was outside the property line. He said they were facing constraints for what Washington Township Fire needed for drive aisles and maneuverability.

Mr. Briya said there were renderings to demonstrate how the hotel does not appear as a battleship like it may have originally. He explained that was achieved by bumping facades out and changing materiality, which made a big difference to relief. He concluded, they thought that was the way to attack it while maintaining the same site plan.

Cathy De Rosa asked for confirmation that when they moved the building they were short parking spaces. Mr. Briya stated they would be 10 parking spaces short of the requirements, overall.

Ms. De Rosa asked for an explanation for why the L-shape was not an option. Mr. Briya restated that if they were to break the shape of the building down to an L-shape the parking lot layout would be a problem for fire access. He reiterated that an L-shape would not provide any value. Ms. De Rosa

indicated she did not understand why Washington Township would be fine with the L-shape for the other two hotels and not this one. Mr. Briya restated the other two buildings are on lots larger in size and they still had to deal with the stream behind so that was the only place for a detention pond. He summarized, with an L-shape they could only get three of the four pieces to work together.

Ms. Newell asked if the detention area was all above grade. Mr. Briya answered the detention area is proposed to be below grade. She suggested stormwater could also be managed under the pavement. She confirmed that the applicant is using part of the green space for detention above grade as opposed to expanding detention below grade, to which Mr. Briya agreed was the plan.

Ms. De Rosa went back to the first comment about flipping the building to the other side. Mr. Briya restated they would be at least ten parking spaces short.

Steve Stidhem asked if shifting the building to the other side would increase the light pollution to the west, which Mr. Briya answered affirmatively.

The Chair called for public comment.

Linda Childs, 5382 Crossing Lane, indicated the applicant is using the document not linked to the City's website and the document is still in effect from 1995 before most of the homes adjacent to the property were built. She said the applicant may have upped their plan from the requirements 25 years ago but they do not mesh with the Southwest Area Plan. She said these properties were meant to provide for the transition from regional nature to local, and a Motel 6 is not local; it is a legal use of that property but it is not serving local uses. She indicated that in order to maintain real estate values, the quality and type of development should be controlled with standards and be as restrictive as possible.

Ms. Childs noted the wall facing the west is only going to be 15 feet from the existing residential home next door. She said if this hotel is filled to capacity, there will be 300 – 400 people staying with 100 cars for 100 rooms. She said she disagrees with the assessment that lighting is better for the west.

Ms. Childs said she did not hear the word "impossible" when alternative layouts were suggested, she just heard "no".

Ms. Childs said this property is in Dublin and serves as an entrance to Dublin; the nail salon and tire place are in Columbus, where there is more crime. On a personal level, she said, she is concerned about traffic as well. She said she would prefer to see more low-impact businesses go in there. She concluded if they are permitted to build this Motel 6 and it is going to look as proposed, it needs to be moved over. She added that she has noted the Commission's request for changes and hopes that they stick by those.

Dianne Kennedy, 5854 Lochbury Lane in the Villages of Tuttle Crossing, said Motel 6 is not only a joke for those in Dublin but it is also nationwide. She said the neighbors have said they do not want Motel 6 there. She said companies are not looking for the cheapest place to stay for their employees. She said even though the applicant has made changes, they are still trying to put a Motel 6 in Dublin. She indicated Worthington, New Albany, and everybody else will start laughing about it.

Ms. Kennedy thanked Claudia Husak and Logan Stang for the presentation they gave the day before for her area.

Kate Bremer, 5361 Crossing Lane, said her concern is with the placement of the building and there being less lighting in the back because as a mom, she is afraid things will happen where areas are not well lit because the building is obscured by a lot of trees. She concluded Motel 6 is not the most reputable hotel chain.

Sam Stille, 5590 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, said he is the neighbor directly next door to the proposed hotel. He indicated he wished Dublin would consider what is in the plan because this does not fit. He asked the Commission to consider future use of his property to the west as well as this property. He stated the lighting from the existing hotel shines right into their bedroom window now and this proposal will be considerably closer. He suggested the lighting be shadowed, covered somewhat, and aimed directly at its target. He said he would prefer to see offices for doctors and lawyers in the back that would have rear entries. He indicated there will be a significant amount of traffic with this but hopes the roundabout planned for Wilcox will at least slow down the traffic.

Mr. Stille said he has been a resident of Dublin for 30 years and asked how long the Commissioners have been residents of Dublin. In that time, he noted, they must have seen a lot of changes. He said he was told he would never see a building in Dublin over three stories high. He brought up noise pollution and how this development will not quiet the area. He said there are trees and hedges but not sure they will do a whole lot to diminish noise.

Mr. Briya said the Juniper hedge is 10 – 12 feet high.

Mr. Stille added there is an increase in the number of pets. He asked what is being done towards personal protection for existing residents and new alike. He concluded by thanking the Commission for their time.

The Chair called for more public comments [Hearing none.] She closed the public portion of the meeting.

Bob Miller indicated he is still struggling with the position of the building. For the residents that are here tonight, he emphasized the Commission cannot be prejudicial towards the brand or the company. He said there are rights the property owner has, there is certain zoning in place, and the Commissioners, who are representative of the community have to be very cognizant of that. He said he has had trouble with this structure from the very beginning in that it is too close to the western property line and would like to see some sheltering for the property to the west. He said the building's massing is still a big box. He sees that the applicant has added some ornamental elements on it but the architecture is still not there. He thought an L-shape would break up the mass of the building and be more pleasing to the residents and fit better into the overall theme of the area directly adjacent to the east.

Mr. Miller restated how well done the presentation was from the applicant and how it put the size of the building in perspective compared to the other hotels but he sees too much building in too small of an area. He suggested turning the building, repositioning it, or changing the shape might be helpful for him.

Cathy De Rosa said her comments echo Mr. Miller's. She indicated she did not hear the word "impossible" either when the L-shape was suggested. She asked staff if there were other alternatives presented to them and discussed. She said she would still like to see what other possibilities there are on that property and the Commission did not get that this evening; they got the same one back again. She said she does not know what the Commission has to do to be able to see what the variations would look like and what challenges would come from them. For example, she noted site layout, stormwater management, and fire safety.

Mr. Briya explained, for an L-shape building, corridor efficiency is lost and the footprint of the building would essentially get longer to add back in rooms. He said this is a very compact plan, making the building as small as possible. He recalled they started with a four-story building before ever getting to the PZC.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the applicant could bring that plan back because if the building is a little longer and bigger but it has a change in shape, and laid appropriately on the property, she could then see the trade-offs.

Mr. Briya emphasized keeping the buffer on the back end for those residents. He said he did not want to create dead space back there by having parking back there like the other hotels. He said more people could loiter there, which seems to also be a concern of the residents.

Warren Fishman noted the stucco/stone, stucco/brick. He said the vertical siding does not even age as well as the fake brick and stucco, which looks better to him. He suggested earth tone colored gutters and trim would provide a much more sophisticated look. He said the other two hotels look better than this proposal. He said he agreed with his fellow Commissioners that the building would be more interesting if the shape was changed. He said the colors used for the proposed sign is obnoxious where other colors were used for different cities. He encouraged the applicant to make the sign meet Code and be more sophisticated in appearance.

Deborah Mitchell said she would echo many of the comments already made about the shape. She said she wanted to see other options for drainage so the building could be closer to the east side. She indicated the most important component of the brand logo is the number "6" so it would be really easy to modify the sign to have a script "6", like Holiday Inn Express did. She said the sign does not have to be an exact replica of the logo. She encouraged reviewing the design and the size. She said she understands how the people in the corporate world are very protective of their logos but they also understand with a slight modification, it can become much more attractive given the surroundings.

Amy Salay said she feels the same way as the other Commissioners. She recognized this is an improvement and that the presentation brought up some good points she had not considered but she is still not convinced. She emphasized the Commission cannot be prejudicial but they have an obligation to look out for the community. She said this design does not really fit and appears like the hotel does not know exactly what it really wants to be but rather to save money. She stated the vertical board and batten does not weather very well, which requires constant upkeep or it is not going to look good.

Ms. Salay said all of the neighbors are saying this is not what they want. She said she is irritated because the Commission got the same building back when they had asked for something different at the last meeting. She said she does not understand needing three hotels in such a close proximity to each other and they are not the gems of the community. She restated that she is concerned with extended-stay hotels that they become de facto apartments. Therefore, not only does fire apparatus need maneuverability but a school bus needs to get in and out. She said the sign appears to be 100% logo and it is not acceptable. She concluded she could not be supportive of this proposal and it is not what she was hoping for.

Mr. Stidhem said he scoured the Master Plan from 1995 for a specific reason why there cannot be another hotel right here and he could not find anything. He indicated he is torn on the placement of the building because he sees this placement not allowing the light to leak into the west neighbor's house and a parking lot on the west side would be a detriment. He said he is also frustrated that the applicant did not provide any kind of other design or layout options. He said the building looks better than before but it is not appropriate for that location as it does not seem to work. He said he would like to see the Commission address this area as an entry to the west. He concluded that not being an architect, he cannot speak to the specifics of the materials proposed.

Ms. Newell said she went through the review criteria and the proposal fails #1 for consistency with the development text. In the text under architecture, she said it lists specifically 5 components and the one she always gets stuck on is #3 – consider overall, the architecture shows quality in keeping with the surrounding multi-family, office, commercial and single-family development. She said the site plan is meeting the setback but it is not providing additional or sufficient screening for the residential property right next door. In terms of testimony, she pointed out the guests this evening made comments about the existing hotels' lights coming through the windows on their property under the current conditions. She said we do not regulate trespass of the light into those windows so the closer the building is set up

to the residential property there needs to be more of a buffer. She said she compared the improvements of the architecture and the building materials to the other two hotels and this does not have the depth in façade or better massing she was looking for. She suggested the entry be more prominent and more care given. She noted in the applicant's testimony, some of the issues they are struggling with is the number of units and she said the Commission is struggling with this application because the applicant is fully maxing out the site, every bit they can use and this is not allowing for proper screening. She suggested if the applicant proposed less units, less parking spaces would be needed, and the building would be smaller to better fit the site. She said this fails other development standards such as "the development preserves the sensitivity to natural characteristics while complying with the applicable regulations".

The Chair asked the applicant how they would like to proceed and they responded they would take a vote.

Motion and Vote

Mr. Stidhem moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the Final Development Plan with two conditions:

- 1) That the applicant pay a tree replacement fee for outstanding caliper inches prior to filing for building permits; and
- 2) That the applicant revise the ground sign to meet the requirements of the development text and provide a design that is in keeping with the character established by the existing adjacent developments, subject to staff approval, prior to filing for sign permits.

The Chair asked the Commissioners that if they provide a no vote, to please state how the review criteria does not meet the regulations.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, no, based on the proposed signs and architecture, landscape buffering, and not being sensitive to adjacent properties; Mr. Miller, no, because it fails to meet criteria numbers 1, 4, & 6; Ms. Newell, no, because it fails to meet criteria #1 for the proposal not being consistent with the approved Preliminary Development Plan; fails #4 that the development does not preserve and is not sensitive to the natural characteristics of the site complying with applicable requirements; fails #6 for the signs; and fails #7 because the development does not have appropriate landscaping; Ms. De Rosa, no, because it fails to meet criteria numbers 4, 6, and 7; Mr. Fishman, no, based on criteria numbers 1, 4, and 7; Ms. Mitchell, no, per it failing to meet criteria numbers 1, 4, 6, and 7; and Mr. Stidhem, no, per criteria numbers 1, 4, 6, and 7. (Disapproved 7 – 0)

2. BSD-SCN - Infiniti 17-085CU

3890 Tuller Road Conditional Use

~~The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for a 1,000-square-foot expansion of an existing auto-oriented use in the Bridge Street District - Sawmill Center Neighborhood. She said the site is north of Tuller Road, approximately 750 feet north of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.066 and 153.236. She said the Commission has final authority on this case and witnesses will have to be sworn-in.~~

~~The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.~~

~~Nichole Martin asked if a full presentation was being requested. Bob Miller said he just needs to see the building addition. Steve Stidhem said he wanted to see where the dumpster was relocated to. Cathy De Rosa said she was interested in traffic flow.~~

~~Ms. Martin clarified that the Conditional Use is for review this evening and the Minor Project Review component was previously approved by the ART on November 2, 2017. She noted that all of the site~~



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 21, 2017 | 6:30 pm

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

**1. Tuttle Crossing West Corridor PCD – Motel 6 5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard
17-072FDP Final Development Plan**

Proposal: A three-story, 42,000-square-foot hotel with 100 guest rooms for an approximately 2.8-acre parcel in the Tuttle Crossing West Corridor Planned Commerce District.

Location: North side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Emerald Parkway.

Request: Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

Applicant: Gregory Briya, Moody Nolan.

Planning Contact: Logan Stang, Planner I.

Contact Information: (614) 410-4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Stidhem seconded, to table the Final Development Plan.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

RESULT: The Final Development Plan was approved.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Salay	Yes
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION

Logan M. Stang, Planner I



Motion and Vote

Mr. Miller moved, Ms. Mitchell seconded, to approve the August 10 and August 24, 2017, meeting minutes. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Mr. Miller, yes. (Approved 5 - 0)

Mr. Stidhem explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated cases 3 – Game U and 4 – Pins Mechanical were eligible for the Consent Agenda this evening. He determined the order for the cases to be heard would be: 3, 4, 1, 2, and 5 but the minutes will reflect the order on the Agenda.

1. Tuttle Crossing West Corridor PCD – Motel 6 5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard 17-072FDP Final Development Plan

Steve Stidhem said the following application is for a three-story, 42,000-square-foot hotel with 100 guest rooms for an approximately 2.8-acre parcel in the Tuttle Crossing West Corridor Planned Commerce District. He said the site is north of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Emerald Parkway. He said this is a request for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050. He stated the Commission has final authority on this case and we will have to swear-in.

Steve Stidhem swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Logan Stang said this was a Final Development Plan for Motel 6. He reported this case was first reviewed at the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) meeting on August 24th, whereas, the Commission expressed concern regarding the proposed building materials, the architectural character, and the number of conditional approval items. He said the Commission had recommended the applicant address the conditions listed in the previous Planning Report and revise the architecture to correspond to the existing character that has been established by the properties to the east.

Mr. Stang presented an aerial view of the site and the proposed site plan that is substantially similar to the previously reviewed layout with the building located to the west and the parking area in the center of the site.

Mr. Stang indicated the applicant has worked to address the conditions regarding the site plan, which included adding landscaping to meet screening requirements along the western and northern property lines, preserving trees near the entry feature in the southeast corner, combining the three properties, and providing sufficient space for fire apparatus maneuverability.

During the review, he recalled, there was also discussion on the proposed setback for Motel 6 from Tuttle Crossing Boulevard in relation to the context of the existing development. He noted the right-of-way line and the approximate setback measurements for each of the developments: Motel 6 has proposed 115 feet, Extended Stay is 155 feet, and Holiday Inn is 82 feet. He said this proposed setback is appropriate as it matches the context of Extended Stay to the east and locates the structure towards the rear of the existing residential home that lies on the west as opposed to being directly adjacent to that home.

Mr. Stang said the other main focus of discussion was around the architectural context and ensuring a consistent character is established along Tuttle Crossing Boulevard. He presented three photographs of context photos of the Extended Stay and the Holiday Inn Express to provide a sense of the development pattern. He said the previously proposed architecture, which he presented, comprised of two color schemes and included materials such as brick for the ground story, fiber cement siding for the upper

stories, and cedar siding accents above the main entrances. He recalled the Commission had recommended the applicant use materials that are consistent with the adjacent properties and break up the overall massing of the structure.

Mr. Stang presented the revised architecture to replace the brick with stone on the ground story and has provided additional gable features to separate the massing of the building. The cedar siding has been replaced with a 'Mahogany' fiber cement siding, he said, and the proposal addresses the conditions related to architecture from the previous review.

Mr. Stang reported that staff is conditioning that the mahogany fiber cement siding be replaced with stone to complement the neighboring properties and retain the architectural character intended by the development text.

The applicant has provided a ground sign design, which Mr. Stang presented, to be located in the entry feature; however, not enough information was included to verify that the sign meets the requirements of the development text and Zoning Code. Therefore, staff is conditioning that the applicant file an Amended Final Development Plan application, he said, for the review and approval of the sign package.

Based on the Final Development Plan criteria, staff is recommending approval with four conditions:

- 1) That the applicant replace the 'Mahogany' fiber cement siding with the proposed stone, prior to filing for building permits;
- 2) That the applicant pay a tree replacement fee for outstanding caliper inches prior to filing for building permits;
- 3) That the applicant provide an updated photometric plan meeting the requirements of the development text with the building permit submittal; and
- 4) That the applicant file an Amended Final Development Plan for the review and approval of the sign package.

Bob Miller asked where staff is specifically recommending stone on the façade. Mr. Stang pointed out that anything that is shown in the brown color, staff is recommending replacement with stone.

Cathy De Rosa asked what happened to old condition #5, which is the protection of those Norway Spruce trees that were along the front. Mr. Stang explained the applicant has revised the plans to preserve those trees so that is why the condition has since been removed.

Steve Stidhem asked what color of stone staff is recommending. Mr. Stang answered they recommend using the stone that the applicant applied to the ground story and to the main gable features on the east and south façade to create a more complementary architectural design and to match the Holiday Inn and Extended Stay.

Amy Salay recalled discussing hotels and the number of hotel rooms so she is still questioning the need for another extended stay hotel in this location in particular. She said her concern is that this will become a defacto apartment building and not necessarily in a good way. She asked if we have spoken to the CVB about the need for more hotel rooms. Mr. Stang reported he had a conversation with Scott Dring with the CVB and he had said the reason we are starting to see more of these hotel proposals is that Dublin has a high demand for hotel rooms right now. He had quoted some numbers to Mr. Stang and depending on a couple months from now when they review that again it may be a little different but there is definitely a high demand in the area.

Deborah Mitchell asked if those numbers have been broken out by extended stay, which can be up to 30 days, compared to regular hotel rooms. Mr. Stang indicated they have but he did not receive that specific information but he could request it.

Claudia Husak said, from a Zoning Code perspective, a hotel, is a hotel, is a hotel and a permitted use on this particular site so whether or not the hotel programming is longer or shorter stay, we have no regulatory authority over that.

Vince Papsidero said the Zoning Code does not allow us to require market study analysis that would determine the demand.

Ms. Salay stated she agreed with staff on the need for more stone.

Mr. Stidhem invited the applicant to speak.

Miguel Gonzalez, 2501 Bristol Road, asked the Commission to further discuss the addition of materials. He said one of the reasons they use the texture of fiber cement is to add some color and differentiation to the building. As it is proposed, he said, it meets the Code requirements and it is a long enough building to actually break it up more with the differentiation of material that would add more character and it would help their client to better differentiate their brand from the neighbors.

Ms. Salay asked what materials he would consider replacing with stone. Mr. Gonzalez answered his preference would be to leave the textured fiber cement alone but if there is more discussion, perhaps they can meet on a middle ground. He said the standard material, base material, would stay the same, regardless. He explained where they have the accents and the stone on the gables they project out so it is three-dimensional. Ms. Salay indicated it is hard to visualize per the drawings submitted because it is flat and the colors are off. She emphasized she is looking for more stone so they appear more like the Holiday Inn as it has a lot more character with a mix of high quality materials.

Victoria Newell arrived at 6:45 p.m.

Mr. Stidhem asked the public to speak with regard to this case.

Linda Childs, 5382 Crossing Lane, asked to see the graphic that included the setbacks, again. She noted where she lives in relation to this project and stated she is really concerned. She thanked Ms. Salay because she made her points, exactly. She indicated she had heard that there is a 40% vacancy rate. She noted there are 17 hotels in the City that she could count using Google and that does not include the new AC Hotel or any others not yet open for business and most of them are extended stays. She indicated it is easy for someone to live there permanently. She said if occupancy rates have any influence to please check those.

Ms. Childs said ever since she moved in to that neighborhood, she has been using the Commission as reassurance of what they are going to get. She mentioned the difference between the developments in Bridge Park to this; they expected something along that line and quality. If we are going to have the 'great wall of china', she asked why it has to sit on the western edge of the property. She said she would prefer that it back up to the other hotels and have parking and trees facing west so that there will be an extra buffer between the building and the existing residences. She asked that the applicant flip the design.

Diane Kennedy, 5854 Locbury Lane, said she is president of The Village of Tuttle Crossing; they are the dead end of Wilcox Road, next to the park. She indicated that whenever someone says Motel 6, people

snicker. She understands, she said, she even tells her friends they live in lower Dublin – 43016. She said she did not believe the Commission would allow a Motel 6 on Muirfield Drive, so why would it be acceptable here. She stated she hates the sign as it implies a lot of different things and wants something different there.

Mr. Stidhem asked if there was anyone else from the public that wished to speak on this case [Hearing none.]

Deborah Mitchell said she is very sympathetic to the concerns voiced by the citizens. She explained Planning and Zoning cannot really weigh in on the kinds of issues that have been raised. In terms of the appearance of the building, she said, at a minimum we should have the kind of stone placement that staff and Ms. Salay have recommended. She indicated that breaking up the expanse of this building entails more than just color and texture. She noted the Holiday Inn Express has a nice variety of texture that provides an upscale type of experience when one sees it. To be consistent with what is already in the neighborhood, she emphasized that is needed with this proposal and does not see that yet. She said she agreed with staff's recommendation about stone and she would also like to see what else could be done to provide visual cues of quality around this property. As proposed, she noted there is so much sameness about the building. She indicated the use of materials, landscaping, and changing the roofline could potentially relieve some of these concerns.

Cathy De Rosa inquired about the placement of the building on the lot. Mr. Stang explained the development text only requires a minimum 15-foot side yard setback. He said the challenge of flipping the building with the parking lot is that on the east side of the property, where the tree area is, is the stormwater detention system that the applicant is using with underground storage that would connect an outlet to the stream that runs on the northern side. He said even if the applicant reworks this to flip the building, they will still need to demonstrate they can meet the requirements. He explained the shape of this lot on the northeast corner is a little tricky because the 15-foot setback would push the building a little bit further to the west from this side. Ms. De Rosa asked if the 15-foot setback would solve the stormwater problem. Mr. Stang answered there is no way to determine that right now without totally reworking the site. He said the other concern would be fire access.

Claudia Husak added, without Fire or Engineering staff present we are in no position to say if this would be okay or not. She said applications are not brought to the Commission without first being reviewed by Engineering and Fire. She emphasized decisions cannot be made here on the spot.

Various Commissioners suggested changes to the building's orientation and shape.

Mr. Stidhem said at a minimum, the entry needs to be revised and could not support this proposal as presented.

Bob Miller said the applicant has made great strides and he is empathetic to the residents. He said this project is not quite there yet and does not meet the criteria so he would have a hard time passing this application. He suggested the applicant bring the proposal up to Dublin standards; the building needs more pizzazz and spiff to it.

Ms. Salay noted the Commission's hands are tied with respect to a hotel on this site as it is a permitted use.

Ms. Mitchell referred to the Holiday Inn Express sign. In terms of cues for quality, she said, the bright red and blue colors used for Motel 6 could be subdued so that it does not shout but rather whispers.

Benjamin Miller, 5120 Pleasant Chapel Road, Newark, Ohio, said he is the Civil Engineer for the applicant. He noted there were questions regarding options for the site layout. He said the issue with flip-flopping the building and parking lot would place a lighted parking lot (that was sitting between the existing building and the proposed building) on a residential side. He said there the light from the parking lot would be much more impactful than some lighting from some rooms.

Ms. Salay said there are lighting guidelines that prevent light from leaving the site. In addition, she said there would be a lot of opportunity to save a lot of trees. Mr. Miller said they did the tree survey for the project and by putting the building on the east side, it would impact the same number of trees. He said they already proposed adding more trees to the west side. He indicated a lot of the trees that are getting cut down are in poor condition. He said the applicant has reached capacity for the site in regards to replacement trees in the landscape plan without promoting healthy trees they are going to plant. In terms of stormwater management, he explained that the stream that is behind and the 50-foot Stream Corridor Protection Zone, that area has to be preserved and new trees cannot be planted in there.

Mr. Miller said the proposal meets the PUD per the Zoning Code requirements, with the exception of the architectural concerns already discussed.

Mr. Bob Miller asked Mr. Benjamin Miller what his opinion was as an engineer to have the building in the middle and parking on both sides. He answered the efficiency of the parking lot would be lost and the parking requirements would not be met. He added that the ditch for the stormwater is very shallow, which is why stormwater management was placed on the east side and switching it to the west side would cause more ponding in the parking lot.

Victoria Newell suggested underground storage.

Mr. Bob Miller asked if there were still options in terms of creating an L-shape with this building, softening the architecture, or rearranging the building somehow on the site. Mr. Benjamin Miller answered anything is possible but whether it fits within the program the owner has established is a concern as far as the number of rooms and parking spaces available.

Ms. Newell noted all the architectural details on the adjacent buildings, which are not being provided with this proposal. She recommended the applicant provide more interest to bring it to the level the development text is asking for.

Mr. Gonzalez said, aside from the massing consideration and the shape of the building, he would like to get a better understanding and clarity on the lack of quality detailing. He said he thought there were a lot of things being missed such as capstone headers, thick window frames on the upper floors on every window, added divided lights to the windows in general, horizontal lap siding and board and batten styles.

Ms. Newell said there are two things that she looks at in the text, which she is basing her opinion on – the architectural section, "...considered overall, architecture shall reflect a quality in keeping with the surrounding multi-family, office, commercial, and single-family development..." She noted that is where the applicant is falling short. "...All projection and mechanical details such as louvers, exposed flashings, vents, gutters and downspouts should be recognized as architectural features and treated to match or complement the color of the adjacent surfaces..." She noted this was done on the Holiday Inn Express. Again, she said this is where the applicant is falling short. She added the proposal is not rising to the level of detail of what has been constructed in the area.

Ms. Salay quoted a past Planning Director who said “A hotel is never as beautiful as the very first day it opens.” She emphasized the materials have to be of very high quality to be timeless; someday this building will be something else and it has to stand the test of time. She concluded the applicant needs to be a good neighbor and fit in to everything that is around them.

Mr. Stidhem asked the applicant how they wished to proceed. Mr. Gonzalez decided to table the application.

Mr. Miller encouraged the applicant that if they choose to bring this back to the Commission, they should bring all the details forward so the Commission can clearly see it more visually and maybe make it idiot proof for those that are not architects or engineers.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to table the Final Development Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; Ms. Mitchell, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Tabled 6 – 0)

2. BSD O - Echo, Neighborhood Hospital 17-081BPR/CU

**PID: 273-009147
Basic Plan Review/Conditional Use**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for an 18,000-square-foot, 24-hour hospital facility for emergency and inpatient care on the south side of West Dublin-Granville Road, approximately 500 feet west of the intersection with Dublin Center Drive. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Conditional Use under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.236, and a review and approval of two Waivers and a Basic Plan Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066. She said the Commission is also required to determine the required reviewing body for future applications for this project. She stated the Commission has final authority on this case and speakers need to be sworn-in.

The Chair swore in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site, and noted it is unique as a number of constraints are placed on this property. The first being a 100-foot AEP high-tension powerline easement that runs along the western property line that he pointed out. He said the second is a neighborhood street connection shown in the Street Network Map, which connects W. Dublin-Granville Road to Stoneridge Lane and is located along the eastern property line. This requires 50 feet of right-of-way from the existing property line, he explained, and reduces the buildable area further.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed site plan and stated the applicant is proposing two access points from the neighborhood street with a vehicular canopy for emergency drop-off located at the northeast corner. He said a service entrance and ambulance entrance are on the south façade of the building with the mechanicals and trash enclosure proposed in the southwest corner. He said a total of 34 parking spaces are proposed throughout the parking lot and Code requires any parking for a hospital facility be approved through a Parking Plan. He pointed out that the neighborhood street will provide connections to the eastern properties and would allow for a continuation once the property to the south of this site redevelops.

Mr. Stang said the proposed architecture is modern and provides a mixture of materials such as stone, brick, glass, and metal panels. He presented proposed elevations. He said this Civic Building Type is slightly different than other types used in the district thus far to allow for more flexibility in design based



RECORD OF ACTION

Planning & Zoning Commission

Thursday, August 24, 2017 | 6:30 pm

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

**2. Tuttle Crossing West Corridor PCD – Motel 6 5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard
17-072FDP Final Development Plan**

Proposal: Development of a three-story, 42,000-square-foot hotel with 100 guest rooms on an approximately 2.8-acre site.
Location: North side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Britton Parkway.
Request: Review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.
Applicant: Gregory Briya, Moody Nolan.
Planning Contact: Logan Stang, Planner I.
Contact Information: (614) 410-4652, lstang@dublin.oh.us

MOTION: Ms. Mitchell moved, Mr. Miller seconded to table the Final Development Plan.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

RESULT: This Final Development Plan was tabled.

RECORDED VOTES:

Victoria Newell	Yes
Amy Saláy	Absent
Chris Brown	Absent
Cathy De Rosa	Yes
Robert Miller	Yes
Deborah Mitchell	Yes
Stephen Stidhem	Yes

STAFF CERTIFICATION



Logan M. Stang, Planner I



~~different but complement the other building. She concluded she loves to take her large dogs to the dog park and but the current dog parks are mud pits. She recommended the applicant consider using synthetic turf instead of putting in grass which turns to mud that the dogs will track through. She explained synthetic turf has anti-microbial properties to them. She said they use this material in Arizona in their dog parks because they can clean it and replace it and move it periodically. She said it is good for the dogs and it would be good for the development; it will also look nicer in the long term in a very public setting.~~

~~Mr. Yoder said they want to make sure they get the massing right so if there is more feedback you would like to share, please contact staff and they will be in contact and try to factor that into their design process as they go along.~~

**2. Tuttle Crossing West Corridor PCD – Motel 6 5550 & 5570 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard
17-072FDP Final Development Plan**

The Chair, Victoria Newell, said the following application is for the development of a three-story, 42,000-square-foot hotel with 100 guest rooms on an approximately 2.8-acre site. The site is on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Britton Parkway. She said this is a request for a review and approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.050.

The Chair swore in anyone intending on addressing the Commission in regard to this case.

Logan Stang presented an aerial view of the site for context and noted it is on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection with Emerald/Britton Parkway. He pointed out the site is heavily wooded and contains an existing residential dwelling on the southwestern property. He explained the proposal includes a total of three properties amounting to approximately 2.8 acres. The zoning for this property is unique, he said, as the planned district encompasses the majority of the properties on the north side of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard with the exception of one. As such, he said the Development Text speaks to a lot of cross access between the sites due to the existing design of Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and the only full-service intersection being located at the southeastern corner of the site.

Mr. Stang presented the proposed site plan for the three-story, 100 guest room hotel. The hotel, he highlighted, is on the west side of the property with the main covered entrance on the east façade. He said the site is served by a single shared-access point with Extended Stay to the east with a cross-access easement being established from the existing entry to the western property line to allow for future connections. He stated 112 parking spaces are proposed in the center of the site, which meets Code, with a small storage shed and dumpster enclosure located in the northeast corner of the parking lot. Running along the northern property line is a Stream Corridor Protection Zone, he said, that prohibits development to ensure preservation of the natural features within this area.

Mr. Stang presented the tree preservation and landscaping plan and explained that due to the existing conditions of the site, the applicant is removing a total of 34 trees, which amounts to 549 caliper inches. The proposed landscaping plan, as shown, he noted, replaces 26 trees or 65 caliper inches, leaving the remaining amount of 484 inches to be paid for with a Fee-in-Lieu. He indicated that Staff is conditioning that a cluster of evergreen trees be preserved along the Tuttle Crossing Boulevard frontage to aid in enhancing the treatment and an existing landscape feature located at the access point will be incorporated. He added the plan provides for buffering along the north and west sides from the neighboring residential but will require additional plantings to sufficiently meet the Code requirement. Staff has also made some substitution suggestions in the staff report, he said, for plant materials that will need to be addressed with the building permitting review.

Mr. Stang presented graphics of the proposed elevations and described the architecture as consisting of a hip-style roof with gable accents above the entrances. He said the proposed materials consist of fiber cement siding used in a board and batten style for the middle structure and a horizontal style for the northern and southern masses, brick masonry on the first level, cedar siding accents above the entrances, and dimensional asphalt shingles for the roof. He reported the Development Text requires that materials be in earth-tones and at least 25% of each facade is comprised of brick or stone. He said the applicant has provided two color schemes for review tonight as shown: color scheme one has a dark grey fiber cement board with light brick while color scheme two has a light grey fiber cement with a darker red brick. He stated the text also states that architecture shall reflect a quality in keeping with the surrounding development to provide for a cohesive architectural theme.

Mr. Stang indicated staff is conditioning that the applicants move forward with Color Scheme 2 and in addition that the brick be replaced with a complementary stone, subject to staff approval, to match the architectural theme of the existing development established to the east.

Mr. Stang indicated the applicant has not provided any sign details for review but as stated in the Planning Report, would be eligible for either a ground or wall sign meeting the standards of the Development Text. He added staff is conditioning that the applicant file the appropriate zoning application for the review and approval of the sign details but the applicant has indicated the approximate location for where the ground sign would be placed, if and when they do get that reviewed.

Mr. Stang presented photographs of the Extended Stay America and Holiday Inn for context as they were designed under the same development standards.

Mr. Stang concluded approval is recommended for a Final Development Plan as it meets the criteria with nine conditions:

- 1) That the applicant use "Color Scheme 2" as submitted with this application when filing for building permits;
- 2) That the applicant replace the proposed brick with complementary stone, subject to staff approval, prior to filing for building permits;
- 3) That the applicant combine the three properties included in this application, prior to filing for building permits;
- 4) That the applicant adjust the interior landscape islands to meet maneuverability requirements for the largest fire apparatus to the satisfaction of the Fire Marshal, prior to issuance of a building permit;
- 5) That the applicant revise the landscape plans to preserve trees #15013-15018, subject to staff approval;
- 6) That the applicant provide an updated photometric plan meeting the requirements of the Development Text with the building permit submittal;
- 7) That the applicant file the appropriate zoning application for the review and approval of the sign package;
- 8) That the applicant update the landscape plans to address the comments outlined in this staff report with the building permit submittal; and
- 9) That the applicant continue to work with Engineering to demonstrate compliance with water quality stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Victoria Newell confirmed the front building line is at the 60-foot setback.

Cathy De Rosa asked about the setbacks for the Extended Stay America next door. Mr. Stang said the parking matches the location of Motel 6 and thought both the Extended Stay America and the Holiday Inn are at the minimum requirement but said he would verify.

Deborah Mitchell clarified the applicant could have a ground sign or a wall sign but not both. Mr. Stang added that there are more requirements for the ground sign than the wall sign in the Development Text. He indicated the applicant is leaning towards the ground sign to achieve the best visibility.

Steve Stidhem said he was concerned about the amount of light that could be radiating out on the west side of the hotel into the residential area. Mr. Stang reported the applicant is preserving a number of trees along that western property line and they are supplementing that with more landscaping to provide a nice buffer.

Mr. Stidhem indicated the landscaping would provide a buffer for the first floor but was concerned about the amount of light that might stream from the upper floors. Mr. Stang said many of the trees the applicant is preserving are mature.

Ms. Newell asked if the parking layout could be adjusted to save more landmark trees that could reside in islands. Mr. Stang said some of the trees located in the site are in poor condition but he is not sure which ones line up with their proposal.

The Chair invited the applicant to come forward.

Miguel Gonzalez, Moody Nolan, 300 Spruce Street, Suite 300, Columbus, Ohio

Max Paton, America Structure Point, 452 W. First Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

Vishal Patel, Next Hotels, LLC, said he resides at 5572 Queens Park Drive, Dublin, Ohio.

Mr. Gonzalez said he had material boards to present and schemes to discuss. He explained that both architectural schemes are essentially equal except for the colors. He said there is brick for the base and fiber cement for the upper stories in a board and baton design with horizontal lap siding on the ends. A synthetic wood is being used, he said, as an accent above the entry and facing Tuttle Crossing Boulevard on the south elevation to provide a pop of color and texture. He said the shingles are asphalt, the windows are trimmed in white, and more transparency is provided for the lower story on the south elevation where a meeting room is located.

Bob Miller inquired about the cedar siding. Mr. Gonzalez said the Allura product is a synthetic cedar, similar to a fiber cement product.

Mr. Miller said he was not familiar with the product so he asked staff for guidance on the appropriateness of the material. Mr. Stang indicated staff would want to see some additional details with the building permit to verify the type of product that it is and to ensure it is a high quality and durable material. Mr. Gonzalez said he could provide that information.

Ms. De Rosa recognized that staff is recommending a stone base instead of a brick base and requested comments. Mr. Gonzalez answered a cultured stone would be acceptable, similar to what is used in the vicinity.

Ms. De Rosa asked if the applicant is considering the ground sign, which Mr. Gonzalez answered affirmatively. Mr. Gonzalez said ground signs were used at the neighboring buildings so another ground sign would be compatible.

The Chair invited public comment.

Mr. Paton proposed that Condition #5 would be eliminated because the Norway spruce trees are different than the other trees on Tuttle Crossing Boulevard and if those were to remain, there would not be a very

good site line to the hotel from the street. He added those trees are also very close to their access drive. The Chair said the Commission would take that into consideration.

Linda Childs, 5382 Crossing Lane, said her residence is right behind and slightly west of this property. She indicated she does not have a problem with a hotel going into this location but the pictures do not make it appear like something that would belong in Dublin, due to the look and feel of a lesser quality product. She inquired about fiber cement siding. Ms. Newell answered fiber cement board siding is used all over the City. Ms. Childs said she only sees stone and stucco repeated on Emerald Parkway and said she would hope this product would not look inferior. Ms. Newell said she was an architect and fiber cement siding is a prevalent product used in residential housing. She explained it is made with cement and paper and is very durable; it does not rot unlike wood siding and comes in a variety of textures. She reported a lot of it is used in the Bridge Street District because it comes in siding, trim boards, and very large panel sizes.

Ms. Childs voiced her concern about the 15-foot setback between the building and the property line and how the lights from the third floor may cause an issue for the residents on the west side.

Ms. Childs indicated this is a high-crime area for Dublin and she does not want to see another hotel possibly add to the current problems. She asked how long someone is permitted to stay in an Extended Stay America suite. Vince Papsidero indicated those rules would fall under state law.

The Chair closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Patel said they worked with Structure Point to make sure that the building setback is the approximately the same as Extended Stay America and the Holiday Inn. He explained a portion of the building is an extended stay and only half of the property is on maid service. He said based on franchise codes, guests are not permitted to stay longer than 30 days. He said most of the people stay Monday through Friday; an average guest would be staying five nights per week.

Mr. Stidhem recalled Ms. Salay had asked during one of the previous meetings if a hotel study had been conducted and how much hotel space is needed in the City. He posed the same question. Mr. Papsidero said the City does not study that. He indicated the Visitor's Bureau may have that market information but he knows that the market is strong and Dublin competes with downtown Columbus in terms of the number of rooms, which he has heard from our Economic Development Department.

Mr. Stang reported he spoke with the President of the Convention and Visitor's Bureau and they agree there is a demand for additional hotels of certain types in Dublin.

Mr. Stidhem said he does not have a problem with the style of the building but is not impressed by the architecture either. He said he trusts staff will ensure the setback will not allow for light pollution to the adjacent residents.

Ms. Mitchell said the substitution of stone instead of brick makes a big difference and the ground sign with stone will help a lot. She said since she is not an architect, she asked if other things could be done with the architecture for more consistency with the surrounding area.

Ms. Newell reported she visited the surrounding architecture and while some of the materials are similar, the text about architecture states "considered overall architecture should reflect the quality in keeping with the surrounding multi-family, office, commercial, and single-family development." She said this proposal is lacking aesthetic detail; they are not complying with the Development Text. She noted that everything on the review criteria is met with conditions so while reading the conditions without working with staff through all the issues, the proposal does not comply with those criteria, either. She said the building has poor massing, the breadth and length of the building are extremely long in proportion to its

identifying entry feature, which needs to be wider, more prominent, and with more detail added to the building to match the similar characters of the other buildings.

Ms. Mitchell agreed as that is how it felt to her; it is very flat and lacking detail.

Mr. Gonzalez said that is certainly something they can revisit. He said a story had to be removed, so that is why the hotel became so long. Ms. Newell confirmed there is a limit in the text for the maximum height permitted.

Ms. De Rosa concurred this design is one-dimensional in its look and feel compared to those surrounding it. She asked to see graphics again showing the setbacks. Mr. Stang pointed out the Holiday Inn and the Extended Stay America locations in context. Ms. De Rosa indicated the setback in the back of those hotels appears greater than 15 feet. Mr. Stang said the rear would be greater than 50 feet as there is a Stream Corridor Protection Zone. He indicated the Extended Stay America may have been developed before that zone was established. He explained the 15 feet is in reference to the side yards. He said the Holiday Inn has a 75 to 80-foot setback in the front; Extended Stay America is probably a little bit further back. He said this one will be 10 – 12 feet closer to Tuttle Crossing than the Holiday Inn.

Ms. De Rosa said when one drives down that road, with the landscaping in the front and the setback, it is important to make sure architecturally it feels like the surrounding community as well as keeping the same setbacks. She emphasized she wanted the same consistency of the surrounding area. As for Condition #5, she would not be in support in removing those trees as requested by the applicant.

Mr. Paton noted their location aligns with the Holiday Inn in terms of setbacks.

Mr. Miller referred to the analysis criteria and said it is causing him quite a bit of concern.

Ms. Newell said if the Commission goes through the review criteria, #1 states the proposal is to be consistent with the approved Preliminary Development Plan. She stated the applicant has to meet all criteria in order to have the Commission's approval. She said to her, the applicant does not meet that one because their building is not coming to the same quality in terms of surrounding development given the care and details provided. Nearly all of the other staff recommendations, while they say criteria met with conditions, she said normally that occurs just occasionally and generally they are minor issues compared to the applicant not complying with the Basic Development Text here. To begin with, she indicated, they fall short if they have to keep negotiating with conditions throughout. She finds this proposal has come before the Commission before it was fully developed.

Mr. Miller said his concern with this building is that it is architecturally boring and needs some pizzazz; it needs to be broken up, needs character, and needs to come alive. He said he would have a hard time supporting this proposal as presented today. He said that might be due to the length of the building in the sense that it feels like a typical low-rise apartment complex built in the late 70s or early 80s. He said he believes it can be brought to life without blowing the budget all apart.

The Chair asked the applicant what they would like to do this evening. Mr. Gonzalez requested to table the case.

Motion and Vote

Ms. Mitchell moved, Mr. Miller seconded, to table the Final Development Plan. The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. De Rosa, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Stidhem, yes; and Ms. Mitchell, yes. (Tabled 5 – 0)