

From: Fedner, Greg <GFedner@columbus.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 3, 2018 11:31 AM

To: Steve E. Fox <SFox@manniksmithgroup.com>

Subject: Hyatt Place Type III SWDM Variance Application - Request for Additional Information

Steve,

The Variance Review Committee has reviewed the subject SWDM variance request dated May 29, 2018, and requests additional information as detailed below.

1. **Minimal impact alternative.** The Variance Review Committee requests the applicant to analyze, as part of the Minimal Impact Alternative, a scenario that allows for the 204 parking spaces required by code, but removes parking spaces along the north side of the proposed drive north of the hotel building (similar to the No Impact Alternative) thereby reducing SCPZ impacts to the stream that runs west to east on the north side of the property.

The required parking has slightly increased to 208 due to an increase in guest rooms for the hotel. The Minimal Impact Alternative has been revised to allow for only the required 208 parking spaces by code by removing additional parking along the north side of the proposed drive north of the hotel (See Exhibit 3). A retaining wall is still required in the area in order to reduce the impact to the SCPZ, however the reduction in disturbance is minimal (approximately .02 acres.)

2. **Stream Mitigation.** The Variance Review Committee concluded that the stream mitigation proposal lacks necessary detail. While the HHEI score of the ephemeral stream proposed to be filled in has been determined, the proposed mitigation description provided no indication on how the ecological and hydrological value of the impacted stream would be accounted for with the proposed mitigation measures. The Committee requests that this additional information be provided. Controlling invasive species and planting native ones, as well as providing conservation easements will not be considered adequate for the proposed impact, which includes both the temporary and permanent SCPZ loss as well as a direct stream impact. The Committee requests additional information and a proposal with sufficient mitigation to account for these impacts.

See the attached letter from GCI. It is our stance that the impact to the existing stream is negligible because of the low HHEI score.

3. **Floodplain Volume Loss.** While there is no FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain associated with the site streams, the proposed Minimal Impact and Preferred Alternatives would result in significant floodplain volume loss. The impact of such loss must be evaluated, unless the proposed grading work would result in no net loss of the floodplain volume. Please provide this additional information.

MSG ran a stream analysis for the 100 year flood to determine the approximate depth in the event of large storm events. See the attached Hydraflow Express, HydroCAD analysis and Tributary Map The 100 year flood elevations has an depth of approximately 8.5 feet. Under post-developed conditions with the Preferred Alternative (Exhibit 4), the stream would have a between 1.5-3.5 feet of freeboard during the 100 year storm event.

4. **Hardship Demonstration.** While the No Impact Alternative has the hardship of not being able to meet the Code parking space requirement (for which a separate City BZS variance could be sought), there is no clear indication of an undue hardship associated with the Minimal Impact Alternative. Please provide this additional information. As the SWDM provides “...a modest increase in the cost of the project or on the estimated rate of return does not justify a variance.” Additional parking spaces may be desired for potential future benefits; however, they come with a price tag of an increased stream impact, which is not acceptable.
Per the revised Minimal Impact Alternative (comment 1) there is still minimal impact to the SCPZ because of grading. Although this layout (Exhibit 3) meets the parking requirements, the site is able to provide maximum parking as shown in the Preferred Alternative (Exhibit 4) with limited additional impact to the SCPZ. In addition, all mitigation is able to be done on site, based on the revised Preferred Alternative layout.
5. **Tree Mitigation.** A tree survey of the impacted areas must be conducted to develop an adequate tree replanting plan consistent with the City Tree Policy. Please provide a tree survey report and planting plan.
See attached tree survey (L100) and landscape plan (L102).
6. **Conservation Easement.** Proposed conservation easement on the adjacent land parcel cannot “hug” the existing detention basin. A triangular area immediately north of the existing hotel and west of the detention basin, adjacent to the existing SCPZ, may be used instead if still needed.
The Preferred Alternative (Exhibit 4) has been revised to reduce the disturbed limits of the SCPZ. All mitigation will be performed

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Thanks,

GREG FEDNER, PE
PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT SECTION MANAGER

THE CITY OF
COLUMBUS
ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC UTILITIES

910 Dublin Road
Columbus, OH 43215
Phone: 614-645-8072
Email: gfedner@columbus.gov
www.columbus.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information contained in this communication and its attachment(s) is intended only for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify postmaster@manniksmithgroup.com and delete the communication without retaining any copies. Thank you.