I. INTRODUCTION

A. Project Description

Public hearing to consider recommendations concerning PLN 18-0198, consisting of an Architectural Review Permit and PUD Concept Plan (Rezoning), submitted by Stratus Development Partners for a new 155 room, three and four story, Cambria Hotel. In addition, PLN 18-0198 consists of a General Plan Amendment and Development Plan which will be considered and a recommendation made separately by the Planning Commission.

The Architectural Review Permit is for design review of approximately 95,957 square feet of building area, including 155 guest rooms, lobby area, office, meeting rooms, fitness facility, laundry and other hotel supportive areas. The hotel also include an outdoor pool area that will be surrounded by a six foot tall wall. The Architectural Review Permit also includes design review of the parking lot and proposed landscaping for the site.

Note: PHMC Section 18.30.060 states that PUD’s shall be forwarded to the Architectural Review Commission for review and recommendations prior to consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council. In addition, in accordance with Section 18.30.060.D (PUD/PPD) of the Zoning Ordinance: A development plan, architectural review permit, use permit, and/or any associated permits may be submitted for review concurrently with a PUD plan. In a concurrent submittal, the City Council shall be the final decision-maker on all applications after considering recommendations from the Planning Commission (PC) and/or Architectural Review Commission (ARC). The applicant has elected to submit all
related entitlement applications concurrently; consequently, the ARC will be considering recommendations regarding the project and any related findings and conditions. The City Council will consider the ARC’s recommendations prior to taking final actions on all concurrently submitted entitlements.

The proposed PUD “Concept Plan” addresses the following:
1. Land use schedule defining land use categories.
2. Development regulations.
3. Design guidelines/criteria, including landscaping.
4. General Plan consistency.

The proposed PUD is based on the Retail Business Zoning District with modifications proposed to various development standards.

B. Background

A public hearing was held on the proposal on July 18, 2019. At that meeting, the applicant presented the project, public comments were received and the comments were provided to the applicant. To allow time for the applicant to respond to the ARC comments, the item was continued to the August 1, 2019 meeting date.

I. ANALYSIS

Architectural Review Commission Comments from July 18, 2019

The Architectural Review Commission provided the following comments/direction at the last study session. Following each of the Architectural Review Commission’s comments is a summary of the applicant’s responses provided in italics:

- Study the circulation on-site to improve vehicular movements within the property.  
  *An Alternate Site Plan, which includes re-working the parking area to the south of our building, has been provided in response to this comment.*

- Consider increasing landscape buffers, and including additional trees, on the western edge of the property. This could be completed by adding smaller motorcycle parking in-lieu of the full size parking spaces.  
  *Motorcycle parking at the beginning of the drive aisle, and moving an interior landscape island to the edge, both result in added landscape buffers on the project edge.*

- Consider relocating, and consolidating, the electric vehicle (EV) parking spaces.  
  *EV parking has been relocated towards Oak Park Boulevard.*

- Consider substituting the Italian Cypress trees with a similar tree specie.  
  *Italian Cypress replaced with Juniper Taylor Redcedar.*
- Explore extending the pedestrian path from the rear/sides to the front in a continuous connected pattern.
  
  *Walkways were unable to be extended due to the close constraints of North Main Street. The applicant did, however, add stamped concrete at each of the vehicular entrance entrances on North Main St. and Oak Park Blvd*

- Extend the wall at the southern boundary as close to North Main Street as possible, without affecting line of sight, access issues.
  
  *The wall was extended to the east.*

- Enhance the southern elevation of the building, consider adding board and batten materials or other architectural features to increase interest on this elevation.
  
  *The elevations were updated with board and batten material on the southern elevation instead of stucco, along with additional windows*

- Consider providing a variety of window types on the western elevation.
  
  *A new line of smaller windows on the 4th floor were added, above a color change and batten divider. The new windows are 5’ different from the balance of windows on the building that are 6’. This will add interest and break up the elevation.*

- Modify the roof material to at least “50 year” composition that would have increased architectural interest and/or using different roof material, such as standing seam metal roof. If using composition roof materials, consider those with a cream or tan colored fleck within its material.
  
  *Modifications made in revised elevations.*

- Consider the use of pervious paving/pavers for walkways within the parking lot.
  
  *Not done, however, stamped concrete ribbons are provided at vehicular entrances.*

- The Commission also noted support for leaving the power pole on the northeast corner of the site, incorporating artwork into the site, decorative entrance features (paving, etc.).
  
  *No response necessary.*

### II. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission receive public testimony, review the revisions proposed by the applicant, provide any further direction regarding design issues, and adopt the attached resolution recommending approval of the proposed Planned Unit Development District (rezoning) and associated Concept Plan, Architectural Review Permit for the overall development subject to the staff-recommended findings and conditions, for consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council.
VI. ATTACHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Draft Resolution for recommendation to City Council on PUD, Concept Plan, Architectural Review Permit, including proposed Conditions of Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Revised Project Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>Applicant Response to Architectural Review Commission Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1</td>
<td>Architectural Review Commission Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1</td>
<td>July 18, 2019 Architectural Review Commission Staff Report and Attachments (including Draft Ordinance and Concept Plan, Draft EIR and Final EIR documents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>Public Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>