

NANCY McPeak

From: Edward Sing <singtam168@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2019 5:22 PM
To: ANDREW THOMAS
Cc: LARA WEISIGER; NANCY McPeak; Bob Leach; Brian Tremper; Patricia Lamborn; Donna Fletcher; Irving & Alicia Gonzales; Reyla Graber; Henry Dong; Sandy Sullivan; Susan Natt; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Mark Cachia-Riedl
Subject: Design Drawings fro Residence Inn for Approval at July 22nd Planning Board meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Nancy - Pls provide copies to members of the Planning Board.

July 16, 2019

RE: Project Plans dated 7/22/2019 for Proposed Residence Inn on Bay Farm Island

Andrew et al:

I have taken a quick look at the subject documents posted on the City website for review and approval at the July 22, 2019 Planning Board meeting, and only surmise that they were posted to meet the required 7 day review period prior to the subject meeting. The plans are incomplete.

Three examples –

(a) The elevation renderings **DO NOT** reflect the color schemes discussed at the July 8th Community design meeting. Only one small plate shows the agreed upon color scheme. Hence, the Planning Board and the Community does not know how the color scheme looks from all views provided in the design packet.

(b) The landscaping features shown in plates A10 and A11, and Plates LDE 1.a and 1.b **DO NOT** match that shown on the Landscaping plan on Plate L1.0. You may ask what's the big deal? Well, it IS IMPORTANT to ensure that reviewers have an accurate portrayal of the proposed plan throughout the entire set of plans.

(c) Plate L1.2 **DOES NOT** show the 4+ foot high metal mesh vegetative wall (to shield the nearby residences from headlight glare) proposed between the parking lot and the bioswale along Harbor Bay Parkway – as discussed at the previous two Community Design Group meetings.

At the May 22nd Planning Board meeting at which the building footprint and parking lot were approved, the then Planning Board President noted that the plans presented at that meeting were similarly incomplete or inconsistent, and expressed her displeasure at this, and **stated that this should not happen again**. Again, the Planning Board and the Community is presented with an incomplete set of plans for approval. At the July 8th Community Design Group meeting, I was informed that the project plans were under “plan check”. It is evident that that this plan check was not sufficient. The Community looks to the City and its staff to ensure that submitted designs and plans are complete, accurate and consistent. This is NOT the case with what is currently shown on the website.

Hence, the Planning Board **should not approve** these project plans until all information that the developer is requesting be approved be shown on the review drawings and that these drawings are consistent and accurate throughout. Changing these drawings now during the 7 day read ahead period **should not be accepted** practice and does not provide the Planning Board nor the Community sufficient time to fully review these drawings. They should be fully complete when posted to this website.

Respectfully,

Ed Sing, Bay Farm Resident

NANCY McPeak

From: Edward Sing <singtam168@att.net>
Sent: Saturday, July 20, 2019 10:25 AM
To: ANDREW THOMAS; Bob Leach; NANCY McPeak; LARA WEISIGER; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Cc: Brian Tremper; Patricia Lamborn; Donna Fletcher; Irving & Alicia Gonzales; Reyla Graber; Henry Dong; Susan Natt; Mark Cachia-Riedl
Subject: Additional Comments on Marriott Hotel Project Plans for July 22nd Planning Board meeting

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Nancy McPeak - Please provide a copy of these comments to all Planning Board members.

July 20, 2019

RE: Additional Comments on Marriott Hotel Plan for July 22, 2019 Planning Board meeting.

1. Reference: Comments submitted by email on July 16, 2019 by the undersigned.
2. My comments are provided as concerns, questions and highlight inconsistencies in information provided for the sought after approval.
3. At the July 8th Community Design Group meeting with the City and the Developer, I requested a written explanation as to how the additional 400+ sq ft “backhouse” space required by the Marriott Corp. was incorporated into the hotel design – as how this was done was not clearly stated at the May 28th Planning Board meeting (as is the subject of an appeal by Brian Tremper). City staff has provided the following with the July 22nd meeting notes as a reply to this question:

“Although the plans approved by the Planning Board on May 28th re-affirmed the hotel setback (the hotel is setback 40 feet from the park and approximately 75 feet from the top of the rip rap), the footprint of the hotel and restaurant differed slightly from the dimensions approved in December 2018. To accommodate some additional “back of house” support space on the ground floor of the hotel and allow for better architectural design (described later in this report), the current plans differ from the December plans as follows:

- *The first floor footprint increased from 23,310 feet to 24,627 square feet to accommodate the additional “back of house” space. As the result of the 1,317 square feet, the ground floor is slightly longer by approximately 25 feet. Internally, the back of house space increased and the conference room space was reduced to make room for a gym.*
- *The second floor increased in size by 867 feet.*

- *The third, fourth and fifth floors decreased in size by about 776 square feet each, for a total reduction in floor area of 2,298 square feet on the top three floors.*
- *The total floor area of the hotel (all floors) reduced by 114 square feet from 112,990 to 112,876.*
- *The restaurant floor area was reduced by 355 square feet from 7,000 to 6,645 square feet.”*

a. The agreed upon and approved setback at the May 28th Planning Board meeting is 35 feet. These meeting notes now say it is 40 feet – **which has NOT been approved** by the Planning Board nor has it been discussed with the Community.

b. The hotel approved in December 2018 included 1200 sq ft of conference room space. Its now been significantly reduced. Does this require City approval?

c. The length of the building has now been lengthened by 25 feet. **This was not brought to the attention** of the public nor the Planning Board when the footprint was approved in May 28th. **How was this accomplished without affecting other elements of the project?** The developer has stated several times during Community group meetings that the addition of the 400+ sq ft of back room space added only “inches” to the building dimensions.

4. Restaurant and Coffee House: Elevations are shown of these structures. The City stated at the July 1st Community Design Group meeting that the color and design of these structures would be agreed to at a later date. All attention was thus relegated to the main hotel structure during these meetings. Thus, the Community **has not had the opportunity** to discuss with the City and developer these structures, and hence, **should not be part of the design approval** sought at the July 22nd meeting.

5. Hotel Color Scheme - this comments is in addition to my earlier July 16th comments. The City requested that the developer provided full size color renderings of the hotel with the blue accent wall over the entrance ways for City and Community review on or about July 16th. This info was never provided. Instead, only one small view of this color scheme is provided in the meeting read ahead packet for review by the public and the Planning Board. All views should be provided by the developer to that an informed review can be made by the Board and by the public.

6. I want to express my appreciation to Andrew Thomas and Robert Leach for meeting since the May 28th Planning Board meeting with the Community to discuss design issues.

7. Approval of the design should be postponed until all inconsistencies are resolved, and all required information is provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Sing

Bay Farm Resident

NANCY McPeak

From: Susan <sue13dives@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 21, 2019 7:17 AM
To: ANDREW THOMAS; Henry Dong
Cc: singtam168@att.net; NANCY McPeak
Subject: URGENT: for Marriott Hotel Project Plans for July 22nd Planning Board meeting

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Andrew /Henry,

Due to business travel reasons I've been out of pocket and can not attend the meeting on July 22. I have asked other Bay Colony residents to do so but in the event they do not (& not because they don't care but because they asked me to speak on their behalf), please note this:

As a Bay Colony Homeowner and member of the Bay Colony Board we fully support the concerns Ed Sing has provided, in detail, in multiple emails to you and Henry.

While we appreciate the additional time provided to meet with us, the salient points we all agreed to have yet to come to fruition.

What was the point of meeting only to have our opinions or questions ignored?

Why over and over does the developer promise to provide answers to our questions, with photos, renderings, drawings yet does not follow through?

How can a decision be made on incomplete documents?

I hope by now you truly believe these are not stall tactics. We are not trying to fight the construction of this hotel.

We just want it done right.

The first time.

One and done, not "oh we can change this or that later" nonsense which we all know won't happen.

Thank you,
Susan

On Saturday, July 20, 2019, 10:24:58 AM PDT, Edward Sing <singtam168@att.net> wrote:

Nancy McPeak - Please provide a copy of these comments to all Planning Board members.

July 20, 2019

RE: Additional Comments on Marriott Hotel Plan for July 22, 2019 Planning Board meeting.

1. Reference: Comments submitted by email on July 16, 2019 by the undersigned.

2. My comments are provided as concerns, questions and highlight inconsistencies in information provided for the sought after approval.

3. At the July 8th Community Design Group meeting with the City and the Developer, I requested a written explanation as to how the additional 400+ sq ft “backhouse” space required by the Marriott Corp. was incorporated into the hotel design – as how this was done was not clearly stated at the May 28th Planning Board meeting (as is the subject of an appeal by Brian Tremper). City staff has provided the following with the July 22nd meeting notes as a reply to this question:

“Although the plans approved by the Planning Board on May 28th re-affirmed the hotel setback (the hotel is setback 40 feet from the park and approximately 75 feet from the top of the rip rap), the footprint of the hotel and restaurant differed slightly from the dimensions approved in December 2018. To accommodate some additional “back of house” support space on the ground floor of the hotel and allow for better architectural design (described later in this report), the current plans differ from the December plans as follows:

- *The first floor footprint increased from 23,310 feet to 24,627 square feet to accommodate the additional “back of house” space. As the result of the 1,317 square feet, the ground floor is slightly longer by approximately 25 feet. Internally, the back of house space increased and the conference room space was reduced to make room for a gym.*
- *The second floor increased in size by 867 feet.*
- *The third, fourth and fifth floors decreased in size by about 776 square feet each, for a total reduction in floor area of 2,298 square feet on the top three floors.*
- *The total floor area of the hotel (all floors) reduced by 114 square feet from 112,990 to 112,876.*
- *The restaurant floor area was reduced by 355 square feet from 7,000 to 6,645 square feet.”*

a. The agreed upon and approved setback at the May 28th Planning Board meeting is 35 feet. These meeting notes now say it is 40 feet – **which has NOT been approved** by the Planning Board nor has it been discussed with the Community.

b. The hotel approved in December 2018 included 1200 sq ft of conference room space. Its now been significantly reduced. Does this require City approval?

c. The length of the building has now been lengthened by 25 feet. **This was not brought to the attention** of the public nor the Planning Board when the footprint was approved in May 28th. **How was this accomplished without affecting other elements of the project?** The developer has stated several times during Community group meetings that the addition of the 400+ sq ft of back room space added only “inches” to the building dimensions.

4. Restaurant and Coffee House: Elevations are shown of these structures. The City stated at the July 1st Community Design Group meeting that the color and design of these structures would be agreed to at a later date. All attention was thus relegated to the main hotel structure during these meetings. Thus, the Community **has not had the opportunity** to discuss with the City and developer these structures, and hence, **should not be part of the design approval** sought at the July 22nd meeting.

5. Hotel Color Scheme - this comments is in addition to my earlier July 16th comments. The City requested that the developer provided full size color renderings of the hotel with the blue accent wall over the entrance ways for City and Community review on or about July 16th. This info was never provided. Instead, only one small view of this color scheme is provided in the meeting read ahead packet for review by the public and the Planning Board. All views should be provided by the developer to that an informed review can be made by the Board and by the public.

6. I want to express my appreciation to Andrew Thomas and Robert Leach for meeting since the May 28th Planning Board meeting with the Community to discuss design issues.

7. Approval of the design should be postponed until all inconsistencies are resolved, and all required information is provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Sing

Bay Farm Resident