

Attachment “C”

Request for Waivers and Response to Comments

August 12, 2016

Mr. Lawrence Calderon, City Planner
City of Gainesville
306 NE 6th Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32601

Re: Aloft Hotel Requested Development Review Board (DRB) Modifications

Dear Lawrence:

The referenced development proposes a new 5-story hotel and parking lot, within a parcel on the south side of SW 16th Avenue (Hull Road) and the west side of SW 37th Street. The project is located within the UMU-2 zoning district and Urban Village overlay. The proposed site layout and building design require board approval of modifications to some UMU-2 Land Development Code standards. The applicant is requesting modifications to the build-to lines, sidewalks, frontage, block length, interconnectivity, and bicycle parking.

The UMU-2 zoning district, Section 30-65.2(b)(2)a allows the appropriate reviewing Board authority to grant modifications limited to all requested standards. Evidence must be presented that either: 1) the proposed development offers compliance that meets the intent of the UMU-2 zoning district; or 2) an undue hardship, owing to conditions peculiar to the land or structure, would result from strict adherence to the standards of the UMU-2 zoning district. Both conditions apply and are discussed for each specific request.

The requested modifications are shown below, with accompanying justifications for review by City Planning staff and the Board. A site layout is also attached, which illustrates the requested specific modifications.

1. Allow larger build-to lines on both SW 16th Avenue (Hull Road) / SW 37th Street.

Justification: *Along SW 16th Avenue*, the UMU-2 zoning district prescribes a build-to line of 18 feet for non-residential uses on local streets. The build-to line for the proposed building ranges from 63.5 feet on the west side of the building to 57.4 feet on the east side of the building. This building location is being requested in order to provide a drive aisle and porte-cochère drop off area while meeting the required landscape zone, sidewalk zone, and surface parking requirements. As you can see from the attached illustration, the required build-to line of 18 feet falls outside of the property boundary.

Along SW 37th Street, the UMU-2 zoning district prescribes a build-to line of 18 feet on local streets. The eastern build-to line for the proposed building is 44.8 feet. This building

location is proposed to accommodate vehicle drive aisle exiting the porte-cochère drop off area, as shown on the attached site layout.

2. Allow modification of sidewalk placement and landscape zone along SW 37th Street.

Justification: Along SW 37th Street, the UMU-2 zoning district prescribes a minimum landscape zone of 8 feet and minimum sidewalk zone of 10 feet along local streets. As illustrated in the public realm requirements for local streets, Figure 4.3, it is intended that the landscape zone be placed at the back of curb to separate the sidewalk from the street.

This modification request allows placement of the 10-foot sidewalk at the back of curb and then the 8-foot landscape zone. This allows adequate spacing for the landscape zone and utilities, while maintaining the site layout, associated parking, and drive aisles. This placement also creates a buffer between the pedestrians and project site while keeping the sidewalk within the public right-of-way.

3. Allow reduced building frontage along SW 16th Avenue (Hull Road) / SW 37th Street.

Justification: The UMU-2 zoning district prescribes a 70% building frontage for non-residential uses along all street frontages. The proposed building provides 52% of frontage along SW 16th Avenue and 51% of frontage along SW 37th Street. The reduction in building frontage is requested due to the rectangular shape of the site and existing easement constraints. The site's southerly 70' consists of numerous existing easements, which prohibit structures. This leaves a possible building area that is wide and shallow and does not accommodate parking. Given the need for parking for the proposed hotel use, existing easement constraints, and the site configuration, the building frontage is very limited.

4. Allow larger Block Length

Justification: The proposed hotel sits within an established block with sidewalks surrounding the north and east sides. The southern frontage is along the Archer Braid Trail, a long-standing community multi-modal priority. The site, while slightly larger than the Historic 208'x208' traditional one-acre city block, creates an integral connection to the urban pedestrian realm, adjacent to the UF campus. Since the site can be accessed from a variety of transportation modes, the concept of minimizing block length to promote interconnectivity is achieved and strict adherence to linear foot criteria on this single use property is not necessary.

5. The Urban Village Overlay – Allow for full access pedestrian connections in lieu of vehicular connection to adjacent lot

Justification: The southern urban walkway (Archer Braid Trail) and northern sidewalks will allow full access between the two adjacent urban uses. Additional connections between the two lots are neither practicable nor standard practices between two non-residential parking lots.

6. Allow a reduced number of Bicycle Parking

Justification: The applicant is requesting a 50% reduction in bicycle parking for the requested hotel use. The reason for this request is due to several factors. Historically and by trend, very little patron traffic occurs at hotels by bicycle. Shuttles, taxis, uber, and personal vehicles are the predominant method of arrival and departure. The required 40 spaces represent $\frac{1}{4}$ of the entire hotel. Reduction to 20 spaces will provide adequate parking for the likely rider, which would be staff, administration, or students accessing the hotel to meet parents or friends. Further, the proximity to the Archer Braid Trail introduces numerous other bicycle parking locations within very close proximity.

We trust the requested modification and justification listed above, along with the development plans are acceptable for presentation to the board. Please see the attached exhibit illustrating the requested modifications. If you have any questions, please contact CHW at 352-331-1976.

Sincerely,
CHW

Holly Simon

L:\2016\16-0191\Engineering\City County\Working Files\LTR 160811 Aloft Hotel Modifications.docx

August 16, 2016

City of Gainesville
Planning Department
306 NE 6th Avenue, Thomas Center B
Gainesville, FL 32601

Re: Aloft Hotel

Dear Staff:

Please find the following items included with this cover letter:

- Four (4) Sets of Development Review Plans;
- Two (2) Modification Letters;
- Two (2) Revised Stormwater Reports;
- Two (2) CDs containing PDFs of the attached materials; and
- GRU submittal package containing five sets of plans and required attachments.

We submit this letter as a means to address your comments dated July 25, 2016, with our responses listed in bold below.

Planning Comments (Approvable with conditions) Lawrence Calderon, Planner, 334-5023

1. All signage and poles are reviewed separately and may need special permits. Where sign foundations are provided it is only to ensure that they are adequately separated from utilities and other sensitive site improvements. Wall mounted signs are not review or approved during the development review process. Please ensure that all proposed sign comply with the ordinance; the proposed location of the sign does not meet code.
 - **Noted. Sign locations will be shown on this plan and permitted separately as needed.**
2. No indication of the intended use is listed; please note the allowable uses are those listed in the list of permitted uses in Sec. 30-65.2. - Urban mixed-use district 2 (UMU-2).
 - **Use is listed in the description of Item 1, Development Data on Sheet C0.00.**
3. This parcel is not a legal lot and requires subdivision review in order to be reviewed as an independent parcel for development plan approval. Our records show that there is no approved subdivision on the parcel.
 - **This is a legal parcel per Boundary Line Adjustment map approved on May 20, 2016, Petition No. AD-16-49LSP.**
4. The UMU-2 requires a minimum building frontage of 70%; the plans do not meet that requirement, it is approximately 52%.
 - **Reduction in building frontage from 70% to 52% has been requested in the attached Modification Request Letter.**
5. Sidewalks are required from the north entrance to the adjacent street sidewalk to the north and east.
 - **Sidewalk connections have been added. Please see Sheet C1.00.**

6. There is inadequate landscaping buffer between the vehicular use area and the urban walkway along the south property line.
 - **Per Urban Walkway Dimensions Table in Section 30-65.2(d)(7) , the required landscape zone is 8 feet. A 9-ft buffer is provided between the urban walkway and the back of curb for the adjacent drive aisle.**
7. It looks like the UMU-2 states the following: “ neither driveways nor surface parking lots are permitted between the sidewalk and a building or between an urban walkway and a building..” The current plan does not appear to comply with this requirement.
 - **Section 30-65.2(d)(2)f states “Except for a driveway to reach the side yard or rear yard or on-site parking, neither driveways nor surface parking lots are permitted between the sidewalk and a building or between an urban walkway and a building. Driveways shall be perpendicular to any adjacent street. In the Urban Village, porte cocheres or covered drop-off areas in front of a building may be allowed for hotels, medical facilities, nursing homes, or assisted living facilities. Porte cocheres or covered drop-off areas shall be designed to meet queuing requirements such that vehicular traffic does not overflow out on public streets or sidewalks and does not impede safe and convenient pedestrian circulation at the site.”**
8. Each parcel must maintain a maximum perimeter length of 2000 feet; while the existing parcel is less than 2000, development of the entire block will exceed that requirement. This should be addressed in the subdivision.
 - **The perimeter length of this project is approximately 1,500 ft. The perimeter length of the overall block is approximately 2,200 ft. A modification has been requested in the attached letter.**
9. The urban walkway must have certain dimensional requirements as listed in Section (e) (3) (d); please show how you meet that requirement; particularly with reference to the landscaped areas. See the Urban Walkway Dimensional Table.
 - **Please see Sheet C0.13 for the Urban Village Compliance Plan including a cross section for the urban walkway and the master plan.**
10. A cross-section of the urban walkway is required with development plan review.
 - **Please see Sheet C0.13 for the Urban Village Compliance Plan including a cross section for the urban walkway and the master plan.**
11. Where is the Circulation Plan for the development or the previously provided Circulation Plan? The site is more than 2 acres.
 - **Please see Sheet C0.13 for the Urban Village Compliance Plan including a cross section for the urban walkway and the master plan.**
12. The circulation plan should include pedestrian circulation especially from the Urban Walkway and SW 37th Street.
 - **Please see Sheet C0.13 for the Urban Village Compliance Plan including a cross section for the urban walkway and the master plan. Also See Sheet C1.00 for connections proposed with this project.**
13. What plans are included for connectivity to the future development to the west?
 - **The Urban Walkway and Hull Road sidewalks are utilized for connectivity. Given the shallow depth of the site and close proximity to sidewalks and walkways, this connectivity is sufficient.**
14. The light fixtures near the urban walkway cannot be at 30 feet due to overhead lines.
 - **Light poles have been removed within the Duke and FGT easements. Photometric has been updated to include spotlights and additional building lighting in attempt to make up for this.**

15. Did not see vertical illuminance.
 - **Please refer to fixture schedule note #7 for vertical illuminance above fixtures.**
16. Did not see automatic shut-off.
 - **Automatic shutoff not required, 24 hour use.**

Concurrency Comments (Approvable subject to below) Jason Simmons, Concurrency Planning, 334-5022

1. Please amend note #19 on sheet C0.00 to say that, "This site is located in Zone M of the Transportation Mobility Program Area (TMPA) and will comply with the applicable provisions of Transportation Mobility Element Policies 10.1.4. and 10.1.13. Developer agrees to satisfy the criteria of Policy 10.1.13 by making a payment to the City." Delete the references to Policy 10.1.14 and transit payments since it is not applicable to this development which is a hotel, not a multiple-family residential use.
 - **Note 19 has been corrected.**
2. This development is located in Zone M of the Transportation Mobility Program Area (TMPA) and must meet all relevant Transportation Mobility Element Policy 10.1.4 and 10.1.13 criteria. Based on the estimated average daily trip generation based on the number of bedrooms, this development will need to fund a certain number of Transportation Mobility Element Policy 10.1.13 criteria, which includes items that address transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular needs in the zone.
 - **Per coordination with City staff, it is our understanding that this project will utilize concurrency credits from the Village Point project and payment will not be due. Please confirm.**
3. Transportation Mobility Element Policy 10.5.5 requires 65-gallon trees to be planted along all public and private streets. The landscape plans should indicate that the required trees meet the minimum 65-gallon size requirement.
 - **Noted; 65 gallon trees are proposed.**
4. At the eastern entrance, it appears that the "Right turn only" sign should say, "Left turn only."
 - **Sign direction has been corrected. See Sheet C1.00.**
5. Please provide a sidewalk connection on the east side of the building to the proposed sidewalk.
 - **A sidewalk connection to the east has been provided. See Sheet C1.00.**
6. Some type of cross-access connection should be provided with this development. There is no pedestrian connection to the urban walkway or vehicular stub outs to the adjacent property to the west. Please explain.
 - **The Urban Walkway and Hull Road sidewalks are utilized for connectivity. Given the shallow depth of the site and close proximity to sidewalks and walkways, this connectivity is sufficient.**
7. Please explain the rationale for the use of ITE 311, indicating this as an, "All Suites" hotel.
 - **The rationale for ITE 311 is used as a worst-case trip generation because it does not meet all of the standards of the "Hotel" use.**

Roadway & Site Design: COMMENTS – Rick Melzer (352) 393-8407:

1. Please provide a typical section for the proposed left turn lane on SW 16th Ave.
 - **Please see Sheet C5.00.**
2. Why are the utility connections not using the utility stub-outs that were to be constructed with the infrastructure for the Village Point Subdivision?
 - **Utility connections are proposed per GRU coordination. SW 37th will be milled and resurfaced and concrete pavement replaced as required.**
3. The "right turn only" sign for vehicles entering the site from SW 37th St. should be a "left turn only" sign.
 - **Sign direction has been corrected. See Sheet C1.00.**

Stormwater Management: COMMENTS – Andy Roberts (352) 393-8408:

1. Details for the proposed underground stormwater facility shall be provided. This should include the requirement from the geotechnical report concerning the undercutting required below the proposed underground system.
 - **Underground stormwater details have been added. See C2.30 series sheets.**
2. A note needs to be included on the detail sheet for the stormwater facility that a change from the permitted type of underground facility must be submitted and approved by Public Works. The submittal shall include signed and sealed calculations and plans.
 - **See Note 11 on Sheet C2.00.**
3. The ICPR input information for Basin "WS1 PST" has incorrect area and curve number information. Also the peaking factor for the post-developed watersheds should not be 256. A more reasonable peaking factor for the proposed development would be 484.
 - **Curve number has been corrected and peaking factor has been adjusted.**
4. Ensure the pipe lengths and inverts for the outfall structures match between ICRP and the plans.
 - **Pipe lengths and inverts have been adjusted.**
5. The perimeter values for the Percolation Link appear to be too large. The portion of the perimeter that overlaps between the two facilities should not be utilized as the facilities are close enough that they will affect the other facility with respect to percolation.
 - **Perimeter values have been adjusted to exclude overlap.**
6. The Operation and Maintenance sections needs to match the proposed design for underground facilities.
 - **Operation and Maintenance Plan has been updated.**
7. How will the connection to the existing structures be made? Core drill?
 - **Direction for core drilling has been labeled on Sheet C2.00.**

Inspections: COMMENTS - Reviewed by: Matt Williams (352) 393-8416:

1. Plans show utility connections on SW 37th street, but open cutting of new roadways is not permitted.
 - **Utility connections are proposed per GRU coordination. SW 37th will be milled and resurfaced and concrete pavement replaced as required.**

2. Consider removing curb ramp in the SW corner of SW 16th and SW 37th St to provide a standard FDOT type ramp and provide a more consistent path.
 - **The ramp connection to Hull Road has been adjusted. The sidewalk at the south is adjusted to maintain the location of an existing communications pole. An extended transition can be provided if needed.**
3. See comment above for SW 17th and SW 37th St curb ramps.
 - **The ramp connection to Hull Road has been adjusted. The sidewalk at the south is adjusted to maintain the location of an existing communications pole. An extended transition can be provided if needed.**
4. Change all references to Alachua County Design standards to City of Gainesville Engineering and Design Manual.
 - **All references to the Alachua County Design Standards found have been updated.**

Fire and Life Safety Services (Approvable with comment) Tom Burgett, Fire Inspector, 334-5065

1. The FDC is located south of an access road that is impassable to a fire truck. Can the FDC be relocated north of the access road and be accessible to a truck on SW 16th Av?
 - **The FDC has been relocated north of the porte cochere entrance. See Sheet C3.01.**

Urban Forestry Comments (Approvable with conditions) Earline Luhrman, Urban Forestry Inspector, 393-8188, 7/22/16

1. There are so many landscape islands shown without any plant materials. Please coordinate with the electric company (Duke) in order to propose Crape myrtles, Redbud, Little Gem magnolia or Walter's viburnum and shrubs.
 - **Due to the location of the two existing easements (FGT and Duke Energy), the planting of trees is prohibited in the landscape islands shown without trees. However, the Urban Forestry Inspector has coordinated with Julie Franklin with Florida Gas Transmission Company to allow shrubs and groundcovers under the following conditions:**
 - a. **The shrubs and groundcovers located within the FGT easement shall be maintained at a 10' minimum distance from the FGT pipeline.**
 - b. **The shrubs and groundcovers located within the FGT easement shall be maintained at a maximum 4' height.**
2. In the vehicular use areas please add low growing shrubs and small trees in order to provide shade in these areas.
 - **Please see response to previous comment.**
3. Please make sure light fixtures are 10' feet from any side of the trees.
 - **Noted.**
4. Please indicate a continuous tree barricade to protect the existing trees along the roadway frontages and other areas.
 - **A continuous tree barricade has been added. Please see Sheet C0.21.**
5. All roadway frontages require 65-gallon container shade trees.
 - **65 gallon trees are now provided along all roadway frontages.**

GPD Crime Prevention Unit Comments (Approvable) Dr. Richard Schneider, rschnei@ufl.edu

1. Potential light trespass (>.1) on property line on South and North sides, but approvable since it doesn't extend beyond their property.
 - **Photometric plan has been revised due to Duke and FGT utilities.**

If you have any questions, please contact me directly at (352) 331-1976 or hollys@chw-inc.com.

Sincerely,
CHW

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Holly Simon". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Holly" and last name "Simon" clearly distinguishable.

Holly Simon, E.I.
Project Manager

L:\2016\16-0191\Engineering\City County\160816 Submittal 2\LTR 160816 Aloft Hotel CoG Comment Response Letter.docx