

Steering Committee Notes 17 Feb 22

Developer Presentation – changes (see TLNA website for presentation)

- BCycle kiosk and electric car share planned
- Parking exhaust fan at rear of building, below grade
- Trash removal 3 2 yd dumpsters, non peak hour pick up
- 28' loading area in front of hotel replaces existing curb cut
- Hotel and café deliveries 2-3 times/week, UPS & FedEx etc 1/day
- Fits with T-L neighborhood plan
- Articulation in front façade
- Overhang on front porch with wood detail
- Front door more prominent
- Brick replaces poured concrete finish
- More vertical windows, more deeply recessed
- Light grey siding

Comments from SC members

Building Management Plan comments

- (BH) we need a commitment on noise abatement from mechanicals and café
- (RM) We need a short-term and a long-term agenda for the café. Will there be a liquor license? (probably, but there will be a public review at a later date)

Design comments

- (AH) I agree with will, I think the hotel looks nice
- (AH) I like the wood on the porch
- (BK) Neighbors are concerned about flooding. This part of T-L is the lowest area on the isthmus. (Developer will conform to the City's recently updated stormwater runoff standards)
- (CK) Window design is a huge improvement.
- (DW) Strange to have a hotel in a residential n'hood. Typically zoning allows only a B&B in a residential n'hood and B&Bs are limited to 8 rooms (the parcel zoning is TE, which is commercial, not residential)
- (GL) Can the developer commit to a higher energy conservation standard than what our current 2007 code requires?
- (GL) the design is better, but there it doesn't match the quality and detail of that of the existing warehouse.
- (GL) what is level of insulation in exterior walls and roof
- (JH) appearance of bldg. is a concern: flat roof and large walls don't match rest of n'hood. Bldg belongs elsewhere, not in T-L. More articulation is called for, like development on 700 block E Johnson St.
- (JH) property is not ugly just because we don't like it. Developer has right to propose what they want. We need to be more collaborative to effect change.
- (JL) (screen share showing Marquette Hotel on S Baldwin) This small hotel was built to fit into the neighborhood.

- (JL) The neighborhood has the right to request something much nicer than this. The developer is asking for a conditional use, a change of rules if you will. And they are greatly increasing the density of this relatively quiet block. Their design is bland at best, and incongruous.
- (JL) Unofficial count of people speaking on the design issue, 9-2 against.
- (JL) Updates in design are too minor. Neighboring Dayton Row development works because it's on a smaller scale. We should keep large developments out of the residential areas of T-L and on E Washington
- (KW) I think at least one more meeting. There is a great opportunity to present an exciting design. This is not it. It will be interesting to see Mr. Metzger wants to take on that challenge
- (KW) Mr. Metzger, Joe is correct. You have an opportunity to do something really cool. Your design is really boring
- (LP) Glad Joe mentioned the Marquette Hotel, a "neighborhood hotel" with valet parking.
- (SM) Will you be pumping water from the parking garage into the sewer system?
- (WO) I like the design
- (WO) proposal is a better use than the warehouse. I like having a café nearby.

Historic Preservation comments

- (AH) And I don't feel an empty warehouse brings much value to our neighborhood. Although I do appreciate that not many buildings look like that anymore.
- (AH) Restoring an old brick warehouse and turning it into a hotel would no doubt be very expensive. How would this effect the affordability of the hotel? Is it even feasible?
- (CK) Preservation of the existing historic building is important
- (CK) would love to see front of old building maintained
- (DW) Please keep the historic bldg., we don't want to lose any more historic assets
- (GL) The hotel rehabilitation of the Kleuter Bldg (Mautz warehouse) is a great example of adaptive reuse that should be considered here.
- (GL) (comment about preserving warehouse) well said - this IS our history
- (GM) (screen share showing pics of warehouse) Look at the fine detail of the existing building. None of the detail and period architecture will be reflected in current design
- (JL) The context of the bldg. should honor the existing warehouse, which is part of the n'hood's cultural history
- (LP) It's better than their first design but it's still like they're deliberately ignoring what's there -- i.e., the warehouse. The neighborhood already has plenty of recent evocations of a residential history that's just not this block.
- (LP) The thing about the old warehouse is that it doesn't apologize for what it is -- it declares "Here I am! Doing business!" It's confident, even optimistic. Unlike the hotel, which seems to be trying to hide. Quite apart from their business model.
- (MA) Keep the warehouse façade and let it guide the hotel design
- (MA) The empty warehouse is currently an obstacle for this project, so it serves some purpose in my frame of reference.
- (PK) front of the old warehouse is unique and should be retained
- (RM) Don't tear down the warehouse and replace with a super ugly building

Transportation Demand Management comments

- (?) loading zone takes up existing parking (not really, it replaces existing curb cut)
- (BH) Where will employees park?
- (CK) BCycle is great

- (D) I think underground parking (24 stalls?) is insufficient for 52-55 rooms plus staff. Concerned about reduction of street parking (see note above about curb cut)
- (MA) Agreed on BCycle, hopefully there's more than 4 considering we're on Mifflin
- (PK) concerned about increased traffic on the E Mifflin Bike Boulevard

Comments unrelated to Conditional Use Permit

- (AG) negatives aren't well presented
- (AG) ow about something for the Elderly and Children...
- (AG) Still the basic question is : are there better ways to re-use this building?
- (AG) This seems like a done deal based on the developer has the right to do it! if tha's th case why to have this meeting? No option to change the land use of this property? Developing a none-comercial idea that would benefit the residents?
- (AH) Affordable housing was proposed at the Salvation Army development next door and many people were very upset about that, I'll point out
- (CK) Aren't there already too many hotels on the isthmus?
- (CK) Can someone justify the density of the number of hotels that have sprung up in the last 5 years?
- (CK) How much say do we really have to influence this? If it is pretty much a done deal, then there is no point in meeting more
- (CK) Yes, something for the elderly who would love to stay in this neighborhood! This would be a great place to use for a retirement home instead of a long stay hotel. It is close to busses and grocery store. There is hardly anything geared towards retirement living in this neighborhood
- (GL) yeah affordable housing would be great
- (KW) Joe is also spot on
- (LP) On Langdon Street there are some apartment towers that started out as this kind of extended stay (as in several months), studio hotel in the mid 1960's, with the idea of serving University visitors (staff, scholars). It went bust in the 70's recession and eventually became just regular studio housing. It seems to me that that's where this project will wind up eventually.
- (MA) Agreed with Christine and Joe. How much influence can our thoughts actually have on the development?
- (MA) I'm so glad Joe is on this call, I'm still too polite to voice my frustrations this openly
- (WO) (elderly and children) (They get a hotel cafe and bikes!