



---

# REPORT

---

Planning and Development Dept.

**To:** Chair and Members of the Design Review Subcommittee  
Chair and Members of the Oberlin Planning Commission

**From:** Gary Boyle, Director of Planning and Development

**Subject:** Revised Site Plan Application  
Proposed Gateway Hotel Complex  
Oberlin College  
7 North Main Street

**Date:** June 13, 2014

## **I. BACKGROUND:**

The Planning Commission will recall that an application for site plan approval for the proposed "Gateway Hotel" complex was considered at the Commission's meeting on October 23, 2013. After reviewing that application, the Commission moved to grant partial site plan approval of this proposal subject to compliance with a number of conditions including the need to address all City department requirements (please see "Appendix A" of this report).

The Planning Commission will also recall that a "revised" building design for this proposed hotel complex was subsequently submitted for this project. That "revised" building design was considered by the Design Review Subcommittee at its meeting on December 4, 2013, and the Subcommittee recommended to the Commission that it be approved. The Commission subsequently considered that "revised" design at its meeting on December 4, 2013 and moved to approve the same subject to conditions (please see "Appendix B" of this report).

The applicant has also submitted an application for site plan approval for a proposed stand alone bank building on property at 52 East College Street (east of Willard Court). That proposed building design was recommended for approval by the Design Review Subcommittee at its meeting on March 19, 2014, and the site plan and building design was subsequently approved by the Planning Commission on that date subject to compliance with conditions. The Commission also reviewed and granted approval of a "Conditional Use Permit" for a drive through lanes associated with that proposed bank building on March 19, 2014 (please see "Appendix C" of this report).

**Oberlin Planning Commission – Staff Report**  
**Revised Site Plan - Proposed Gateway Hotel Complex - 7 N. Main St.**  
**June 13, 2013**  
**2 | Page**

At the Planning Commission’s meeting on April 2, 2014, the applicant presented a “preliminary” concept plan illustrating a “revised” parking lot design for the proposed parking areas associated with this hotel complex and located on either side of Willard Court. Such a “preliminary” review is provided for under Section 1357.03(a)(3) of the Zoning Code. Staff noted that such a “preliminary” review provided the applicant with the opportunity to discuss possible revisions to the site plan layout previously granted partial site plan approval on October 23, 2013. This “preliminary” concept included the reconfiguration of the parking area to the west of Willard Court including a shift in the location of the bio-retention area and landscaping within the parking field, the addition of a landscape island within the parking area to the east of Willard Court, the inclusion of compact vehicle parking spaces within the overall parking design, etc.

**II. REVISED SITE PLAN SUBMITTAL:**

Please be advised that the applicant has submitted a further “revised” site plan for review and approval. The applicant’s most recent submittal includes a revised site design for the subject property, a proposed landscaping plan and planting details, some site lighting details, etc. A copy of that “revised” plan submittal is attached to this report as “Appendix D.”

**III. STAFF COMMENTS:**

The applicant’s most recent site plan submittal was received on June 13, 2014. This “revised” site plan submittal continues to propose the redevelopment of the Oberlin Inn complex as the first phase of the overall “Green Arts District” which “District” includes the overall block bounded by Main, Lorain, Pleasant and College Streets. The Planning Commission will recall that the applicant has previously advised the Commission on July 17, 2013 that no specific concept or development plan for that block has been prepared to date.

The Planning Commission will also recall that it has discussed issues related to urban design, building siting and design, building materials/colors/textures, on- and off-site traffic circulation of all types (pedestrian, bicycle and motor vehicle), utility requirements, landscaping, exterior lighting, etc. with the developer and its design team on a number of occasions. The subject “revised” site plan submittal is an attempt to address such site development requirements for this project. Staff, however, notes that a number of site development matters still need to be addressed and could conceivably be addressed through conditions of final site plan approval by the Planning Commission.

Staff further notes that site development details related to construction phasing, staging areas for construction equipment and materials, contractor and construction parking areas, etc. still need to be provided by the applicant.

Lastly, it is noted that preliminary information or reports from the parking consultant engaged by the applicant related to the review of parking supply and demand, etc. in downtown district has not as yet been submitted to the City.

**IV. DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:**

The most recent “revised” plan set has been forwarded to City officials for review. To date, the following comments have been received:

**(a) Chief Building Official:**

The proposed redevelopment project will require the issuance of building permits under the Ohio Building Code. In this regard, the applicant’s architect has submitted a building permit application for the proposed hotel complex. That application and plans are now under review for compliance with the Ohio Building Code.

The applicant has also submitted an application for a demolition permit. That submittal seeks a permit for the demolition of the south wing of the hotel (7 North Main Street) and the business building along the north side of East College Street (22-40 East College Street). The latter demolition permit also proposes the construction of a wall to accommodate the continued use of the east portion of that building by its current tenant (Lorain National Bank). That building permit application is also under review for compliance with City requirements and the Ohio Building Code.

**(b) Fire Chief:**

The Fire Department has conducted another review of the above proposed project. The revised site plan depicts a building complex consisting of a two-story administrative office, a three-story hotel over first floor retail, hotel services and restaurant/bar. A full basement is provided under the hotel including mechanical, storage, and future assembly use. The proposed structures are bordered by East College Street, North Main Street and Willard Court.

The designer has attempted to address some Fire Department critical issues. However, there remain some areas not approved by the Fire Department, to wit:

1. Fire Apparatus Access.

- a. The proposed site depicts direct access from East College Street and an east-west parking/access road into the property from Willard Court. It is our continued position that the Fire Department expects to respond to this facility and arrive at the main entrance on East College Street and operate (for best access to hotel and retail areas) from the College Street side of the structure. **It is expected that all fire protection, water supply, system connections, fire alarm panels and fire command center access will be located in approved vicinity of this location.** The Fire Code requires that:

D102.1: Facilities, buildings or portions of buildings hereafter constructed shall be accessible by way of an approved fire apparatus access road with an asphalt,

concrete or other approved driving surface capable of supporting the imposed load of fire apparatus weighing at least 75,000 pounds.

D103.1: Where a fire hydrant is located on a fire apparatus access road, the minimum road width shall be 26 feet.

D105.3: At least one of the required access routes meeting this condition shall be located within a minimum of 15 feet and a maximum of 30 feet from the building, and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building. This PRECLUDES parking on East College Street, similar to the requirements applied to the East College Street project. **The applicant's revised drawing depicts no parking in this area, but continues to depict the original indented curb with striped (paint) markings. This remains UNACCEPTABLE as the presence of indented space presents the impression that vehicles are welcome.**

All approved and designated fire apparatus access roads must be provided with markings and signage per Fire Code requirements.

- b. Information provided for the proposed configuration of the north parking lot will support access by emergency vehicles. However, due to limited access to the building, as stated above, this will not be the primary access for Fire Department operations. Since the designer continues to submit proposals depicting 'Fire Truck Through Site' access, we believe it is impractical to expect these vehicles to negotiate the extreme turn near the north building entrance, especially with an overhanging canopy. However, due to their persistence, we will now invoke the requirements under IFC section D105.2 Width, as follows:

D105.2 Aerial fire apparatus access roads shall have a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet (7925 mm), exclusive of shoulders, in the immediate vicinity of the building or portion thereof.

**Since the proposed parking lot design has a 24 foot aisle width, this design must be increased to a minimum aisle width of 26 feet for Fire Code compliance. It is our conclusion that current revision is now noncompliant and therefore unacceptable.**

- c. Considering potential vehicular and delivery truck traffic, the drawing depicts the widening of Willard Court from East College Street to the proposed parking lot entrance. However, since there is a high probability that this traffic will travel northbound on Willard Court, the entire length of the road should be widened along with provision of sidewalk for pedestrian use to avoid accidents. **This still has not been addressed by the owner.**

Based on these requirements, the **proposed site would NOT meet the access criteria as parking is depicted along the north curbside of East College Street.** There remains a safety concern about the amount of access traffic, the numerous configurations of driveways and parking lot entrances, and the limited width/lack of development of Willard Court. This roadway should be improved throughout its length.

2. **Water Supply/Fire Hydrants.** Proposed water supply line is depicted with an 8" water connection at East College Street, directly into the structure. A fire hydrant location was depicted on the north curb of East College and another proposed hydrant inside the north parking lot area.
  - a. The proposed building complex shall be protected by an automatic sprinkler system, likely supplied by a fire pump system. Aside from riser supply in the stairwell for this system, a riser shall be required in every stairwell, supplied with an approved 2.5" gated valve for Fire Department use.
  - b. The Fire Department Connection (FDC) shall be located on the East College side of the building, within 50 feet of a fire hydrant. The FDC shall consist of a single free-standing 5" Storz type connection; not the typical double 2.5" style. The existing fire hydrant (East College St) shall either remain or be relocated as approved by the Fire Code Official. IFC 912.2. **The Fire Department has indicated that it expects to arrive at the main entrance on East College Street, and the proposed FDC location must reflect that.**
  - c. **A new hydrant has been relocated from North Main to East College Street, in proximity of the main hotel entrance on East College, where the Fire Department Connection is required per item (b) above. This is acceptable.**
  - d. The fire pump test connection shall be at an approved location on the north side of the building, to avoid interruption of vehicle traffic on the street during testing.
  - e. Although a fire hydrant is proposed for the north side of the building, there still remains a lack of water supply along Willard Court. Considering the unknown future development along Willard Court and the lack of water for fire protection to all existing structures, it is the recommendation of the Fire Code Official to install a water supply line along the entire length of Willard Court. (IFC 507.5.1)

The proposed fire hydrants do not address future development in this area.

3. **Elevations.** Elevation plans were reviewed to ascertain any obstruction or special access needs by the Fire Department. No unusual or unique design features were identified that may affect the placement of fire apparatus and the requirements for accessibility.

**Oberlin Planning Commission – Staff Report**

**Revised Site Plan - Proposed Gateway Hotel Complex - 7 N. Main St.**

**June 13, 2013**

**6 | Page**

4. **Fire Command Center.** Per the proposed design, access to the Fire Command Center requires that personnel travel through the lobby-atrium area. To avoid exposure to personnel, at least one additional access shall be provided directly to the exterior of the building as approved the Fire Code Official. **IFC 508.1.1.A cursory review of the building plans indicate this may have been addressed.**
5. **Storage.** It remains the fire department's contention that there is insufficient storage for furniture/fixtures (tables/chairs) used in the event room on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the occupancy. Designers contend that this storage is in the basement. However, it is the Fire Department experience that these items are seldom moved to/from the basement storage and generally accumulate in unapproved areas on the event room floor, most often obstructing occupant egress. This problem should be addressed.
6. **Unidentified Room.** The use of the south basement area has not been identified on the drawing. Previous discussion with the architects indicated that this room would be used for storage or a future "Jazz Night Club." Considering the impact of storage versus assembly use, the proposed drawing should be labeled to indicate its intended use, to facilitate proper review and/or approval by the City.
7. **Radio Coverage.** The proposed building complex shall comply with the requirements for emergency responder radio coverage or wired communication system per IFC Section 510.1, as approved by the Fire Code Official. The system shall meet the technical requirements of Section 510.4 and the radio operational needs of the Fire Department.
8. **Parking.** There is a deep concern on the lack of parking for this proposed project. There are only 194 parking spaces proposed for a combination of the hotel guests, employees, a banquet room that could accommodate 350 people, and retail stores. Additionally, their proposal uses 44 existing spaces that are needed by employees/staff for the Art Building, Hall Auditorium and the Allen Art Museum.
9. **Site Plan Configuration.** **With numerous revisions, there are many discrepancies between various site plan drawings and those included with the building plans. These should all be resolved to a common acceptable plan.**

Additional building construction and fire protection requirements will be addressed in a formal application for building permit. Per my review, several problem areas have been addressed, but there still remaining concerns about the design of this project. Therefore, based on the applicant's continued failure to address City concerns, it is my recommendation that this submittal NOT BE APPROVED by the Commission until such time as the designer complies with all City requirements.

**(c) Police Chief:**

The revised site plan submittal has been reviewed by the Police Department and the following

**Oberlin Planning Commission – Staff Report**  
**Revised Site Plan - Proposed Gateway Hotel Complex - 7 N. Main St.**  
**June 13, 2013**  
**7 | Page**

comments are noted:

1. The applicant's revised plans do not address the Police Department's earlier stated concerns related to traffic circulation, particularly with respect to the proposed loading zone area. It is anticipated that trucks will have a difficult time maneuvering into and out of the loading zone area. Also, there is no provision for stacking of waiting delivery and service vehicles accessing that feature. This can lead to traffic interruptions and flow problems on Willard Court;
2. The proposal to have truck traffic access the site from East College Street also continues to be of concern. Large truck traffic exiting Willard Court to East College Street will cross the centerline of that street which is not desirable. As previously advised, the use of the State highway (E. Lorain St.) for such access is preferable;
3. Proposed traffic circulation pattern could be improved without the stand alone bank site. Although the "revised" plans continue to illustrate a bank site, the developer should confirm whether the bank is still being considered as part of this project;
4. The revised plans do not illustrate pedestrian crosswalks on Willard Court to clearly demarcate pedestrian access to the hotel from the parking areas on the east side of Willard Court;
5. The applicant's plans indicate that some of the off-street parking spaces currently used by the College and located to the east of Willard Court are included in the total number of off-street parking spaces for this redevelopment project. Including those parking spaces seems to overstate the number of parking spaces being provided for this project as those parking spaces are already in use by the College;
6. The proposed parking areas would comply with the Code's minimum parking space and aisle width regulations;
7. The proposed plans includes four (4) handicap accessible parking spaces near the rear entrance to the proposed hotel, two (2) handicap accessible parking spaces to the east of Willard Court in that parking lot, and one as part of the bank site. The applicant should provide sufficient handicap accessible parking spaces to comply with the intent of the ADA. Generally speaking, handicap accessible parking spaces should be conveniently located to provide direct access to the building without crossing traffic circulation lanes whenever possible;
8. The revised parking plan includes seventeen (17) "compact car" spaces in the west lot and twenty-one (21) in the east lot. The revised design provides for a 9.0 ft. width for those spaces which is an improvement over the last, preliminary design reviewed showing 7.5 ft. space widths;
9. The "drop-off area" for the hotel in the court yard area should be posted with time limits to ensure that access to the rear of the building remains available;
10. In the past, this Department has not been supportive of the proposed "drop off" area on East College Street near the building's main entrance due to concerns related to possible traffic movement conflicts, the potential for illegal J-turns, etc.

The Department is, however, willing to consider the proposed “drop off” area on a temporary basis, and through the completion of construction of “Phase Two” of the project (i.e. the courtyard area, administrative offices, etc.);

11. Any “drop off” area on the street should be 45 ft. in length with tapered ends. No unattended vehicles can remain there for more than 15 minutes; and
12. The “striped” pavement area long the north side of East College Street is seen as being problematic from both an enforcement of illegal parking and traffic circulation perspective.

**(d) City Engineer:**

The applicant’s plans have been reviewed. In this regard, the following is noted:

SITE LAYOUT/GRADING PLAN

1. The diagonal lines on the pavement are intended to indicate no parking along the curb. There should a conversation on how to best manage this space. Is existing parking to remain? Should the sidewalk be extended to the travel lane and street furniture, landscape features, or other amenities added? Should this be used for on-street bike parking?
2. The crosswalk at Eric Nord Way should be treated as a mid-block crossing and a High Visible – Continental style crosswalk should be used. The proposed design details need to be shown on the final site plan.
3. ADA parking – Parking facilities with 201-300 parking spaces requires seven (7) accessible parking. These accessible parking spaces must be located on the shortest accessible route of travel to an accessible facility entrance. The parking loading and spaces required are generated based on the use of this facility, therefore the accessible spaces need to be located near the entrance of this facility and not spread out around the various parking areas. Parking demand reports submitted suggested a required loading of 226 spaces. Using the ADA Table, seven (7) accessible parking spaces are required spaces as the plan shows 229 spaces.
4. The use of heavy duty asphalt the entire width of Willard Court to accommodate for truck turning movements backing into the loading dock is recommended. Will the current pavement section hold up or does the street need to be reconstructed at this location? This will quickly be a maintenance issue if not addressed now. A full depth reconstruction is recommended or at least taking a core sample to determine if what is there now is acceptable. At the very minimum, resurfacing is necessary.
6. The site improvements for the east parking are unclear i.e. what are the limits of new curb, resurfacing, patching, or reconstruction? Is it the entire parking areas shown on the plan? Developer to confirm.
7. The concrete walk has been shown extending through the drive entrance on North Pleasant Street. But why is it shown as striped?



8. Concrete walk across bank entrance on East College Street is required but not shown.
9. Ramp for handicap space on bank parcel is not shown. Site plan and grading plan needs to reflect this.
10. The site grading plan illustrates curbing in the vicinity of the loading zone to accommodate a sidewalk around the loading area. Does the “thick” line on the drawing indicate a screen wall?

#### SITE UTILITY PLAN

1. For the proposed “WAT (FIRE)” connection at mid block on East College Street, move tee and valve to sidewalk near other valves at the right of way.
2. Move Hydrant valves 2’6” from the hydrants.
3. Sanitary flow on Main Street is to the south. The plans propose connections to existing sanitary sewer. This detail needs to be confirmed.
4. Will the bank utility connections currently shown on the drawings be part of this project? If such utilities are not part of this project, note them as “by others” or “future”.

#### SITE LANDSCAPE

1. Sidewalk pattern on East College Street should be the downtown CBD pattern similar to the pattern used on the south side of East College Street.
2. Sidewalk pattern on North Main Street should match existing.

#### LIGHTING

At the circular entrance, are the in-ground luminaire 7090LED by BEGA lights going to be mounted on the surface or recessed in the vehicular traffic areas? They have a profile of 2.25” and will pose a challenge for snow removal. If recessed, they could be a problem to maintain clean and free of ice, etc. Is this the appropriate fixture to use here?

#### **(e) Line Distribution Superintendent, OMLPS:**

The electrical information provided to date is lacking in sufficient detail such that a meaningful review is not possible at this time. Electrical service elements should include the following items:

1. A complete power riser diagram from the utility pole to the main secondary switchgear located in the building electrical room. The elements of the diagram **would include specifications** for primary cables and conduits, 15 KV switches with fusing, main building transformer, utility metering, and system grounding for the conference center service, combined retail and bank service details, and existing service to Hall Auditorium.

2. A plan view showing the complete geographic path of all major electrical service elements such as utility pole location, roadway conduit crossing, electrical vaults reused or eliminated, existing duct bank path reused or replaced, new duct bank section views, pull boxes, 15 kV switch locations, and transformer locations.

A site lighting plan was submitted with no summary report. There are fixture symbols for perimeter lighting with no legend to reference. No street lighting plan along the north side of E. College is provided to confirm pole/fixture details, etc.

**(f) Public Works Director:**

1. **General.**

Many of the Public Works Department review comments from our 7-15-2013, 9-11-2013 and 10-21-2013 plan reviews remain applicable. Significant updates associated with the review of the submittal dated 5/26/2014 are in **bold font**.

**Coded notes shown on the building demolition drawings submitted to the City's Chief Building Official on sheets C4.0 and C4.1 are not shown on the review submittal distributed to the Planning Department. In addition to the various other requirements below and from other City Departments, the Developer should re-issue sheets C4.0 and C4.1 at a scale that will allow the inclusion of the coded notes for review.**

2. **Water.**

The Developer's civil engineer has addressed many of the Department's previous comments. There remain minor inconsistencies and uncertainties which will need to be worked out. The most important are:

- a. Construction sequencing – to ensure that all work in SR 58 is completed prior to ODOT's planned resurfacing. **ODOT has scheduled the pre-construction meeting for this work on 6/12/2014. This work is imminent. The Developer's failure to construct necessary improvements prior to re-paving will necessitate Councilmatic action to authorize such improvements after the paving work is completed per C.O. 903.11.**
- b. Construction sequencing and the means by which domestic and fire protection
- c. services are provided during phased demolition.

Additional comments based on the submittal dated 5/26/2014 include:

3. **For the proposed "WAT (FIRE)" connection at mid block on E. College, move tee and valve to sidewalk near other valves at the right of way.**

**4. Move Hydrant valves 2’6” from the hydrants.**

Details related to the water service have not yet been developed to the point that they can be approved by the Department for the issuance of an “Excavation/Utility Tap-In Permit.”

**5. Sanitary Sewer.**

The Developer’s civil engineer has addressed many of the Department’s comments from previous reviews. The most important remaining items are:

- a. Construction sequencing – to ensure that all work in SR58 is completed prior to ODOT’s planned resurfacing. **ODOT has scheduled the pre-construction meeting for this work on 6/12/2014. This work is imminent. The Developer’s failure to construct necessary improvements prior to re-paving will necessitate Councilmatic action to authorize such improvements after the paving work is completed per C.O. 903.11.**
- b. The Developer should provide flow calculations and a condition assessment of the receiving sanitary sewers to ensure adequate condition and capacity to serve the development. In the event that condition and/or capacity are insufficient, off-site improvements may be required. The plan note that “the location, size and condition...must be verified” does not meet this requirement (i.e. if the condition is “verified” as deficient, off-site improvements may be required). **This work is substantially but not fully complete. The Department provided specific direction relative to additional required field work required for evaluation as well as necessary improvements to be included in the plan set to the Developer’s Civil Engineer on 5/23/2014. These directives are not reflected in the submittal dated 5/26/2014.**

Per the Department’s previous comments:

The site utility plan locates a “6” SAN” near the northeast corner of the proposed bio-retention cell and extended across Willard Court and the parking lot to the east and to North Pleasant Street.

This line is now shown as “abandoned” on the 9-6-2013 plan set. No information about how this determination has been made has been provided by the Developer. This line is now more fully shown on the plan set. Whether it has any active services or not, appears not to have been determined at this time. If this line has, in fact, been abandoned, its connection to the manhole in North Pleasant St. should be sealed. **The Public Works Department’s requirement to evaluate**

**this sanitary sewer has not yet been met.**

Details related to sanitary sewer service have not yet been developed to the point that they can be approved by the Department for the issuance of an Excavation/Utility Tap-In permit.

**6. Storm Water.**

The Developer's civil engineer has addressed many of the Department's previous comments. There remain minor inconsistencies and uncertainties which will need to be worked out. The most important are:

- a. No information related to the condition of the receiving storm sewer has been provided. Pending review and approval of storm water calculations and condition assessment of the existing receiving storm sewer, off-site improvements may be required to serve the proposed development. The plan note that "the location, size and condition...must be verified" does not meet this requirement (i.e. if the condition is "verified" as deficient, off-site improvements may be required). **This work is substantially but not fully complete. The Department provided specific direction relative to additional required field work required to complete our evaluation to the Developer's Civil Engineer on 5/23/2014. These directives are not reflected in the submittal dated 5/26/2014.**
- b. **On Drawing Sheet C2.2, the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, the submittal dated 5/26/2014 now shows a gap in the silt fence near the northwest corner of the site. No information relative to this change has been provided by the Developer.**

**7. Traffic Circulation.**

**The Public Works Department's most significant concern remains traffic circulation to, from and through this site. For service vehicles, particularly, site circulation does not work. Given the (assumed) 50 year life expectancy of the project, circulation issues must be resolved prior to Site Plan Approval.**

**The significant change in the previous iteration of the plan set was the relocation of the proposed bank and its drive through to the east side of Willard Court. In the submittal dated 5/26/2014, some drawing sheets show "Bank Project (By Others)"; other drawing sheets appear to show the elimination of the bank from the plan set entirely. It is staff understanding that the bank proposes to re-locate off-site. However, no apparent consideration to improve site circulation has been undertaken as a result of the changed land use(s).**

Although this change minimizes traffic conflicts from the east, conflicts associated with the loading dock remain significant. On Willard Court, within 350' of East College Street, there are (8) points of access from the west side:

- 2 lanes in and out of the loading dock
- 2 lanes in and out of the south entry drop-off
- 2 lanes in and out of the north entry drop-off
- 2 lanes in and out of Hall Auditorium loading dock.

Previously, the Developer had proposed that service and delivery vehicles pull into the parking lot to the east and then back across Willard Court. **In this iteration, such vehicles stage entirely from Willard Court. Upon arrival, the driver will presumably park in the (private) street, leave the truck, walk across traffic to open the gates to the loading dock. Return to the vehicle, then back the vehicle across both lanes of traffic into the loading dock area. The driver will, presumably, perform a similar function to close the gates upon leaving – in which case the truck will be staged southbound, essentially at the East College Street intersection. As there is no truck staging area, except Willard Court, other drivers will be required to maneuver around the service vehicle(s) to continue north or south, while watching out for other turning movements from the multiple points of connection.**

**The design concept ensures problems with north/south traffic along Willard Court. Given the proximity of the proposed loading dock to East College Street (+/-120'), there will be times when these traffic conflicts work their way south to impede the smooth flow of traffic along East College Street as well.**

**The Developer's proposal to mitigate traffic impacts by prohibiting through-truck traffic north to SR 511 is wholly inadequate in that:**

- a. **As a private street, it is unenforceable by the Oberlin Police Department**
- b. **Truck drivers are reasonably expected (and usually required) to take the most direct route to the state highway system (i.e. north on Willard Court)**
- c. **All of the delivery truck traffic is forced back out onto East College Street where, by the Developer's own calculation, those trucks will have to cross the centerline not just of Willard Court but also on East College (into eastbound traffic, right in front of Eric Nord Way) in order to turn west to SR 58.**
- d. **Truck drivers who do continue north will, when turning east on SR 511, cross the center-line of SR 511 to make the turn.**

**Rather than mitigating traffic impacts, this proposed measure to prohibit through truck traffic to the north will almost certainly make traffic circulation worse on Willard Court at East College and at the intersection of East College and Main St.**

**Finally, the plan set shows heavy duty asphalt along approximately 235' of the western side of Willard Court only (and including the loading dock). The entire width of Willard Court will be subject to truck turning movements backing into the loading dock. It is unlikely (barring core sampling and analysis) that the pavement section proposed not to be replaced will hold up over time. This is expected to quickly become a maintenance issue if not addressed now. Staff recommends more detailed engineering analysis and/or full depth reconstruction.**

**Staff has discussed issues related to the loading dock at length internally and with the Developer. It is our opinion that the various proposed uses can be accommodated in lands available to the Developer, either at or immediately adjacent to the proposed site. Notwithstanding their assertion that the loading dock cannot be accommodated on the north edge of the site (perhaps shared with Hall Auditorium access as it is now), the Developer has failed to provide any concrete information about why this is the case. Lacking that information, the Public Works Department continues to disagree with the Developer's conclusion. The Department is obligated to report the known and anticipated defects.**

**The most recent iteration of the plan set does provide for improved pedestrian circulation along the east side of the proposed hotel complex, with continuous sidewalk from East College Street to behind Hall Auditorium. Connections continuing to the north are not shown. One connection only across Willard Court is shown, the continuation of the public sidewalk on the north side of East College Street. No points of connection from the east parking lots across Willard Court to the hotel (or other College facilities) are provided.**

**Although the Developer has provided for bicycle parking on all three (3) public corners of the building and at the main entrance to the northeast, it is unclear how bicyclists safely arrive at their destination. No provision (other than streets and sidewalks) is provided for bicycle transit along Willard Court, East College Street or North Main Street fronting the site. On Willard Court, with the known traffic circulation challenges, the savvy bicyclist will take to the sidewalk to protect his/her safety. Since College Street is a popular and logical bike route connecting downtown to east side neighborhoods and the "Bike Path," consideration should be given to**

developing a suitable bike lane on East College Street in the area immediately south of the proposed building (see below).

This plan set eliminates diagonal parking along the south side of complex on East College Street by means of (apparently) extensive diagonal striping. The Developer is missing a huge opportunity to open up nearly 30' of quasi-public space from the newly proposed retail building(s) to the edge of the pavement. The curb line of East College Street should be re-established consistent with the southerly terminus of the bump-outs shown for the crosswalks at Main Street and at Eric Nord Way. Suitable amenities, including landscaping and street furnishings, should be provided for patrons and visitors. Whether or not a loading/unloading zone for hotel guests can be safely accommodated is dependent on final design and concurrence of the Police and Fire Chiefs.

**8. Parking.**

The Public Works Department has not evaluated parking in this most recent iteration of the plan set except to reiterate previous guidance to the Developer:

**ADA parking – Parking facilities with 201-300 parking spaces requires seven (7) accessible parking. These accessible parking spaces must be located on the shortest accessible route of travel to an accessible facility entrance. The parking loading and spaces required are generated based on the use of this facility, therefore the accessible spaces need to be located near the entrance of this facility and not spread out around the various parking areas. Parking demand reports submitted suggested a required loading of 226 spaces. Using the ADA Table, seven (7) accessible parking spaces are required. The plan shows 229 spaces provided. Using the ADA Table, seven (7) accessible parking spaces are required.**

**9. Summary/Conclusion.**

Water, sanitary and storm sewer service is available to serve the proposed project. Additional work is required to properly locate and evaluate existing systems and to plan for the new service installations including finalizing service locations, construction details, construction sequencing and any upgrades that may be necessary.

Notwithstanding the City Administration's repeated attempts to address traffic circulation, the Developer has failed to adequately address traffic circulation concerns, particularly related to the loading dock at the proposed development. Staff believes that multiple potential solutions exist that the Developer appears to be unwilling to seriously consider. Until these issues are adequately resolved, this

proposed development, based on the 5/26/2014 submittal, should not receive site plan approval from the Planning Commission.

**V. CONCLUSION:**

The applicant proposes the redevelopment of the Oberlin Inn complex at 7 North Main Street and 22 to 40 East College Street as well as site and parking area improvements on property to the east of Willard Court. This proposed redevelopment project will feature sixty-eight (68) guest rooms, a conference center, restaurant /bar, retail space and College office space as well as improvements to off-street parking facilities and improvements to Willard Court (a private street).

The Planning Commission granted partial site plan approval for this proposed hotel complex at its meeting on October 23, 2013. The Commission's approval at that time was subject to compliance with a number of conditions including the need to address all City department requirements.

The Design Review Subcommittee and the Planning Commission have reviewed and approved the proposed building's architectural design, building materials, colors and textures at meetings held on December 4, 2013.

The applicant has also submitted an application for site plan approval for a proposed stand alone bank building on property at 52 East College Street (east of Willard Court). That proposed building design was recommended for approval by the Design Review Subcommittee at its meeting on March 19, 2014, and the site plan and building design was subsequently approved by the Planning Commission on that date subject to compliance with conditions. The Commission also reviewed and granted approval of a "Conditional Use Permit" for drive through lanes associated with that proposed bank building on March 19, 2014.

The Planning Commission also considered a "preliminary" site plan illustrating a "revised" parking design for parking areas on either side of Willard Court at its meeting on April 2, 2014.

In response to the Planning Commission's previous consideration of this redevelopment project, and the expressed requirements of City departments, the applicant has submitted a "revised" site plan for the Commission's review and approval as well as a landscape plan and exterior or site lighting plan for consideration by the Design Review Subcommittee and the Commission.

Department review of this "revised" submittal received on June 13, 2014 is under way, and additional comments will likely be provided from City departments at your meeting on June 18, 2014.

This request is hereby respectfully submitted for your consideration.