



City of Arts & Innovation

City Council Memorandum

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL **DATE: AUGUST 17, 2021**
FROM: COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT **WARD: 1**
DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: P19-0563 CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - AN APPEAL BY GREENS EHRENBERG, LLC OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD'S FAILURE TO APPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION AND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A HOTEL AND ADAPTIVE REUSE OF THE FORMER CENTRAL FIRE STATION INTO OFFICE LOCATED AT 3420-3482 MISSION INN AVENUE, SITUATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF MISSION INN AVENUE BETWEEN LEMON AND LIME STREETS; AND P19-0560 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, P19-0561 VARIANCE, P19-0562 VARIANCE - AN APPEAL BY LOUZEAU DRURY, ON BEHALF OF SUPPORTERS ALLIANCE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY (SAFER), OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S APPROVAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, AND VARIANCES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A HOTEL AND ADAPTIVE REUSE OF THE FORMER CENTRAL FIRE STATION INTO OFFICE LOCATED AT 3420-3482 MISSION INN AVENUE, SITUATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF MISSION INN AVENUE BETWEEN LEMON AND LIME STREETS

ISSUES:

An Appeal by Greens Ehrenberg, LLC, of the Cultural Heritage Board's failure to approve the environmental determination and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a hotel and the adaptive reuse of the former Central Fire Station into office, located at 3420 – 3482 Mission Inn Avenue, situated on the south side of Mission Inn Avenue between Lemon and Lime Streets, in the DSP – RC – Downtown Specific Plan Raincross District.; and an Appeal by Louzeau Drury, on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER), of the Planning Commission's approval of the environmental determination, Conditional Use Permit, and Variances for the construction of a hotel and the adaptive reuse of the former Central Fire Station into office, located at 3420 – 3482 Mission Inn Avenue, situated on the south side of Mission Inn Avenue between Lemon and Lime Streets, in the DSP – RC – Downtown Specific Plan Raincross District.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the City Council:

1. Determine the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project is exempt from the

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15331 (Historic Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation) and 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects), as it constitutes an in-fill and rehabilitation project, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties;

2. Uphold the appeal by Greens Ehrenberg, LLC and approve Planning Case P19-0563 Certificate of Appropriateness, based on the findings outlined in the Cultural Heritage Board Staff report and subject to the recommended conditions of approval;
3. Determine and uphold the Planning Commission's determination that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15332 (Infill Development Projects) of the CEQA Guidelines, as the project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
4. Deny the appeal by Louzeau Drury, on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER), and uphold the City Planning Commission's approval of Planning Cases P19-0560 (Conditional Use Permit), P19-0561 (Variance), and P19-0562 (Variance), based on the findings outlined in the staff report and subject to the conditions of approval.

BOARD, COMMITTEE AND COMMISSION

The following summarizes the outcomes of the Cultural Heritage Board; Land Use, Sustainability and Resiliency Committee; and Planning Commission for the Certificate of Occupancy and entitlements for the project.

CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD DETERMINATION

On April 21, 2021, the Cultural Heritage Board (CHB) failed to approve Planning Case P19-0563 Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed project, as recommended by staff, by a vote of 4 ayes, 4 noes, and 1 abstention.

LAND USE, SUSTAINABILITY, AND RESILIENCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

On July 12, 2021, the Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee unanimously recommended that the City Council uphold the appeal by Greens Ehrenberg, LLC of the CHB's failure to approve by Planning Case P19-0563 Certificate of Appropriateness (Attachment 1 and 2).

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

On April 15, 2021, the City Planning Commission recommended approval of Planning Cases P19-0560 Conditional Use Permit, P19-0561 Variance, and P19-0562 Variance by a vote of 8 ayes, 1 noes and 0 abstentions, with staff recommended conditions of approval (Attachment 3 and 4).

BACKGROUND

The project site totals 0.95 acres and consists of three contiguous parcels located within the Mission Inn Historic District. The most westerly parcel is currently developed with a surface parking lot (Public Parking Lot 27); the two remaining parcels are developed with the former

Central Fire Station and associated parking lot.

- In 1957, the former Central Fire Station was constructed.
- In 2008, the former Central Fire Station was listed in the California Register of Historic Resources and is eligible for designation on the National Register based on the Modernism survey.
- In 2013, the Downtown Fire Station was dedicated, one block south of the Central Fire Station, located on the northwest corner of University Avenue and Lime Street.
- In 2017, the City solicited proposals for the disposition and development of the project site with a hotel and adaptive reuse of the former Central Fire Station. The proposal by Greens Ehrenberg, LLC (Greens) was awarded the project.
- In 2018, City Council approved a Purchase and Sale Agreement with Greens for the disposition of the City-owned former Central Fire Station and Parking Authority-owned Public Parking Lot 27 for the development of a hotel and the adaptive reuse of the fire station building.

DISCUSSION:

Project Description

The applicant is requesting approval of the following entitlements for the construction of a dual-branded AC and Residence Inn Hotel by Marriott Hotel and adaptive reuse of the former Central Fire Station to offices:

- From Cultural Heritage Board
 - o Certificate of Appropriateness for plot plan and building elevations.
- From Planning Commission
 - o Conditional Use Permit to permit a hotel development, a total floor-area-ratio greater than 3.0, and a building height greater than 60 feet;
 - o Variance to allow a reduced front yard setback along Mission Inn Avenue; and
 - o Variance to allow fewer parking spaces than required by Code.

The hotel consists of 226 rooms, a lounge, a rooftop view deck, a pool deck and, other on-site amenities associated with hotels. The building will be eight stories with an overall building height of 93 feet-4 inches. The upper floors of the hotel have been designed in a modern contemporary architectural style, and the ground floor takes architectural cues from the former Central Fire Station.

The adaptive reuse of the former Central Fire Station includes conversion of 12,000 square feet to offices. The remaining 6,172 square feet in the second story will be used for storage.

A three-level subterranean parking structure is proposed to serve the project. The parking structure will be constructed under the proposed hotel and will consist of 173 parking spaces, with 144 spaces for the hotel, 21 spaces for office use, and 8 spaces allocated for City Fire Department personnel.

Cultural Heritage Board - Appeal

On April 28, 2021, the applicant filed a timely appeal of the Cultural Heritage Board's (CHB) failure

to approve the proposed project. The appeal is based on the following: CHB did not make findings supporting the denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA), Planning staff recommended approval of the COA as the project design is consistent with the principles of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOIS), the project is consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan, and the project is categorically exempt from CEQA.

According to Title 20, appeals of CHB actions must first be heard by the Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee, which will then make a recommendation to the City Council for final action.

Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee - Recommendation

On July 12, 2021, the appeal was considered by the Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee.

Land Use, Sustainability and Resilience Committee - Public Comments

After publication of the Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee staff report, Staff received twenty-seven public comment letters regarding the proposed project, twenty-six letters in opposition and one letter in support (Attachment 5). One of the comment letters included a compatibility assessment prepared by Galvin Preservation Associates. A written response was prepared by the applicant's consultant to address the compatibility assessment (Attachment 6).

During the Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee meeting, six public comments were provided regarding the project, four in opposition and two in support. Comments provided at the meeting did not include any additional information that has not already been addressed in the staff reports.

Comments received did not include any additional information that has not already been addressed in the Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee and CHB staff reports, with the exception of concerns related to: 1) the shadow casted by the proposed building; 2) the project's consistency with historic preservation policies and objectives of General Plan 2025; 3) the cumulative impacts on the Mission Inn Historic District; 4) the existing views of the First Congressional Church bell tower; and 5) the bulk massing of the proposed hotel.

The following is a summary of these comments and Staff provided verbal responses to these comments at the committee meeting, which are now memorialized in this report.

1. **Comment:** If the proposed project is approved, the church will never see the morning sun again.

Response: The east elevation of the First Congregational Church contains four small windows, none of which are visible from the sanctuary interior. Light through these windows are not considered character-defining features of the building. Therefore, any potential shadow from the proposed project will have no significant impact on the historic structure.

2. **Comment:** The project is inconsistent with the Mission Revival design of the Mission Inn Historic District. Therefore, the project is inconsistent with the following policies and objectives of General Plan 2025:

- *Policy HP-1.5: The City shall promote neighborhood/city identity and the role of historic preservation in community enhancement.*
- *Policy HP-5.1: The City shall use its design and plot plan review processes to encourage new construction to be compatible in scale and character with cultural resources and historic districts.*
- *Objective LU-48: Strengthen the identity and character of Downtown using the*

existing historic and architectural urban character of the community, while allowing for new structures that are architecturally compatible with and complementary to the existing architectural and historic fabric.

- *Policy HP-1-4: Through design review, encourage new development to be compatible with adjacent historical structures in scale, massing, building materials, and general architectural treatment.*

Response: Comment letters assert that the predominant building design in the Mission Inn Historic District is the Mission Revival architectural style. The Mission Inn Historic District is not characterized by one style of architecture but rather contains a wide variety of styles common in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

The Downtown Specific Plan states: “The historic fabric in Downtown Riverside is interspersed with ‘contextual’ buildings - buildings that are not historic but contribute to the district character as one traverses the district.”

The former Central Fire Station is listed as a non-contributor to the historic district because it was constructed outside the period of significance of the district, but the Downtown Specific Plan recognizes that the building contributes to the overall district character. The former Central Fire Station is historic in its own right and incorporated as part of the project. Therefore, it is necessary for the proposed project to reference the International Style of the Fire Station.

The proposed project is consistent with historic preservation policies and objectives of General Plan 2025. The project design is influenced by the former Central Fire Station, which is listed in the California Register and recognized by the Downtown Specific Plan as contributing to the overall character of the historic district despite being listed as a non-contributor due to its age. Therefore, the proposed project is compatible with the character and historic fabric found in the Mission Inn Historic District.

3. Comment: The project contributes to cumulative impacts on the Mission Inn Historic District considering recent new construction, such as the Stalder and Imperial Hardware projects, and prior construction such as Cal Tower and its adjacent parking structure.

Response: The Cultural Heritage Board approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Stalder and Imperial Hardware projects because they were found to be consistent with the SOIS. Projects that are found to be consistent with the SOIS are considered to have a less than significant potential to impact historical resources. Cal Tower and the adjacent parking structure were constructed in the late 1970s prior to the designation of the Mission Inn and Seventh Street Historic Districts in 1986 and 1980, respectively. The presence of these buildings is not considered to have an impact on the historical resources as they were constructed prior to the historic designation.

The City Historic Preservation Officer found the project to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for rehabilitation, based on the recommendations in the Cultural Resources Report prepared for this project by George Taylor Loudon, a qualified consultant under the Secretary of the Interior professional qualifications. The project was determined to have less than significant impacts on the Historic Districts. The proposed project will not destroy or alter any contributors to the Historic District. Therefore, no cumulative impact on this historic district will occur by the proposed project.

4. Comment: The bell tower of the First Congregational Church is a character-defining feature of the church; therefore, restricting views of the tower will have an impact on the historic significance of the church.

Response: The First Congregational Church was listed in the National Register of Historic

Places under Criterion C – “embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.” The historic significance of the church is related to its design, and the bell tower is considered a character-defining feature. The proposed project will not alter the church bell tower. Existing views of a character-defining feature is not a factor in the historic significance. As the project will not alter the historic structure, the project will not impact the historic significance of the structure.

5. Comment: The bulk massing of the proposed hotel is inconsistent with the Historic Districts as there is no precedence of this type of massing among contributors to the districts.

Response: Buildings with a bulk massing can be found within the Historic Districts, including the Walling Building at the southeast corner of University Avenue and Main Street, the Loring Building at the northwest corner of Main Street and Mission Inn Avenue, and the Crescent Building, located on the southside of University Avenue between Lemon and Lime Streets. The proposed project is consistent with the type of massing exhibited in these structures. The u-shaped plan of the proposed project reduces the overall massing adjacent to Mission Inn Avenue.

Committee Comments

Following public comment, staff provided clarification on the following:

1. Rehabilitation Standard #9 of the SOIS, which suggests new construction should be compatible with a historic resource yet differentiated;
2. The differences between properties defined as adjacent and those defined as nearby; and
3. The applicability of the recommended California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) categorical exemptions.

The Committee expressed some concern with the overall massing at the corner and visibility of the church bell tower and recommended that the applicant consider modifying the design of the hotel to expand the proposed roof deck at the northwest corner of the building.

The applicant agreed to consider eliminating some rooms to expand the roof deck. Following discussion, the Committee made the recommendation to the City Council to uphold the appeal and approve the certificate of appropriateness.

Applicant Response to Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee Comments

In response to comments provided by the Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee, the applicant has prepared revised renderings showing an expanded roof deck and a new shadow study (Attachment 7). The applicant also provided a response to comments related to formaldehyde outgassing of interior materials (Attachment 8), a supplemental Historic Resource Assessment, by Loudon (Attachment 9). The supplemental assessment by Loudon provides additional analysis of the project’s compatibility with the historic district, relating to the project’s scale, massing, and architectural features. The supplemental assessment also provides a comparative analysis with other recent projects that have been issued a Certificate of Appropriateness and analyzes the projects references to signature buildings within the Mission Inn Historic district, as suggested by the Downtown Specific Plan Guidelines. Loudon’s supplemental report concludes that the project is compatible with the historic districts and nearby historic structures. Staff concurs with the findings of the supplemental assessment.

Planning Commission - Appeal

Planning Commission - Public Comments

After the publication of the Planning Commission staff report and prior to the Planning Commission hearing on April 15, 2021, Staff received 15 comments, 5 in support of the project and 10 in opposition to the project. Letters in opposition discussed lack of parking, too many existing hotels in Downtown, increase in traffic, environmental impacts, construction noise, height not in character with the neighborhood, and lack of a building setback. Staff provided verbal responses to these comments at the Planning Commission meeting, which are now memorialized in this report

1. Comment: The addition of the hotel will remove existing public parking.

Response: The proposed hotel development would remove 37 parking stalls located in an existing surface parking lot. Parking in the immediate area would remain, such as on-street parking along Mission Inn Avenue, the surface parking lot located on the northwest corner of University Avenue and Lemon Street and multiple parking garages located throughout Downtown. Additionally, downtown Riverside includes a wide range of uses, which operate at different times of the day throughout the week, leaving a high turnover ratio for on-street and garage parking spaces at different times of the day and week.

2. Comment: The project will not provide enough parking for the intended use.

Response: The proposed hotel development proposes 144 parking spaces, where 226 are required for the hotel. A Parking Study prepared by Trames Solutions, Inc. concluded that based on the location of the project, accessibility to public transit, the advent of ride hailing services and real world data from Urban Land Institute (ULI), the hotel would need a minimum of 117 parking spaces at the busiest time of the week. Based upon the information provided within the parking study, the project would be sufficiently parked with 144 parking spaces dedicated to the hotel.

3. Comment: Too many existing hotels in the Downtown area.

Response: There are currently 5 hotels in Downtown Riverside, with the exception of the Hampton Inn and Hyatt Place, the existing hotels cater to a different set of visitors. The AC Marriott will be geared towards business travelers and those wishing to attend events in the Downtown area and the Convention Center. The Residence Inn will be for those travelers looking for an extended stay option. Based upon the above, the proposal for the hotel development would add to the diversity of hotels in Downtown Riverside.

4. Comment: Increase in traffic.

Response: A Traffic Impact Analysis was prepared for this project to assess traffic. The Analysis concluded there will be no significant impacts on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) based on its location within a Transit Priority Area and compliance with City thresholds and guidelines for VMT Analysis.

5. Comment: Environmental Impacts.

Response: The project was assessed under a Class 32 In-fill exemption, consistent with the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Technical studies, such as Traffic Analysis, Air Quality/GHG Analysis, Noise/Vibration Analysis and a Historic Resources Report were prepared for the project. No impacts were identified.

6. Comment: Construction Noise will be disruptive to weddings and church services.

Response: The project is required to adhere to specific hours of construction within the Riverside Municipal Code, which includes no construction on Sundays and Federal Holidays.

7. Comment: The height of the building is not in character with the neighborhood.

Response: The project is located within the Raincross District of the Downtown Neighborhood. The Raincross District comprises a wide variety of architecturally designed features, including those that are similar in height or taller than the proposed project, including California Tower, Metro Center, Stalder, Imperial Hardware Lofts, and The Marriott Hotel.

8. Comment: Lack of a building setback, inconsistent with surrounding development.

Response: The site has been designed in an urban context by situating the hotel building along the front property line. Placement of the building at the property line engages the streetscape with the development. The design and setback are consistent with the adjacent former Central Fire Station.

Planning Commission – Appellant Comments

On April 22, 2021, staff received an appeal from Lozeau Drury, on behalf of SAFER, of the Planning Commission's decision on April 15, 2021 (Attachment 10).

Following are the comments provided by the appellant for the basis of the appeal and staff's responses which were provided verbally at the Planning Commission meeting and are now memorialized in this report:

1. Comment: The project fails to comply with applicable General Plan and Zoning requirements. Therefore, the CEQA Exemption is Improper.

Response: The proposed project complies with applicable General Plan and Zoning requirements, as it furthers the intent of the General Plan land use designation of DSP – Downtown Specific Plan and the following Policies:

- *Policy LU-5: Provide incentives for in-fill development throughout Downtown, and with an emphasis on the key opportunity sites identified in this plan.*
- *Policy LU-6: Place a strong emphasis on supporting, preserving, and expanding the Raincross District as a major center for culture, learning, and the arts.*
- *Policy LU-10: Encourage the establishment of a vibrant mix of uses that will serve the needs of both residents and visitors and will help create a vibrant daytime, evening, and weekend environment.*
- *Policy LU-11: Promote the expansion of the convention center and related hotel uses to support increased convention and tourist activity.*
- *Policy LU-12: Maintain a continuity of pedestrian activity through active retail and restaurant ground level uses along Mission Inn Avenue, Main Street and University Avenue.*
- *Policy UD-1-5: Encourage appropriate public art to further establish a sense of history and pride in the community.*

The proposed project is consistent with the development standards of the Raincross District of the Downtown Specific Plan. Deviations from the maximum floor area ratio and building height are permitted subject to the granting of a Conditional Use Permit. As the project proposes a floor area ratio of 3.73 and a building height of 93 feet-4 inches, the applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit.

Variances may be granted to deviate from the setback and parking standards. The applicant is requesting two Variances to allow encroachment into the front yard setback and reduction of the number of parking spaces.

Based on the above, the project complies with applicable General Plan and Zoning

requirements, allowing for a Class 32 In-fill exemption to be applied.

2. Comment: The project will have significant indoor and outdoor air quality impacts, therefore the City may not exempt the project from CEQA review.

Response: The letter asserts indoor air quality would have significant impacts and infers the project would exceed PM_{2.5}.

Indoor air quality is not required to be reviewed by CEQA. Indoor air quality is assessed for compliance with the standards of Title 24 - Building Code upon submittal of construction documents prior to building permit issuance. The Air Quality Report, prepared for this project, analyzed the project's construction and operations against thresholds administered by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). No thresholds, including those for PM_{2.5}, were exceeded by the project. The project will not have significant air quality impacts.

3. Comment: The project will have significant impacts due to inconsistencies with the General Plan and Zoning.

Response: The project will not have significant impacts as it is consistent with the intent of the General Plan policies and is generally consistent with the development standards of the Raincross District of the Downtown Specific Plan. The Downtown Specific Plan allows for Conditional Use Permits and Variances to be considered to deviate from specific standards.

The applicant is requesting the approval of a Conditional Use Permit for the floor area ratio and building height, and Variances to allow reduced front yard setback and number of parking spaces. Refer to response 1 above.

4. Comment: The project may not be exempted from CEQA because it may adversely affect historic resources.

Response: The City Historic Preservation Officer recommendation that the project is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for rehabilitation was based on a Cultural Resources Report prepared for this project by George Taylor Loudon, a qualified consultant that meets the Secretary of the Interior professional qualifications. The consistency determination was based on the following:

- The height of the proposed project is compatible with the average height of structures in the Mission Inn and Seventh Street Historic Districts, ranging from two to seven stories.
- The proposed one-foot setback is consistent with the setbacks throughout the historic districts, including several prominent buildings with zero setback.
- The u-shape configuration of the upper floors reduces the overall massing along the Mission Inn Avenue frontage and is similar to existing historic structures found in the historic district, such as the Mission Inn. Additionally, the design of the hotel incorporates design elements of the former Central Fire Station to achieve articulation along its facades and reduce overall massing.
- The proposed project design includes materials such as stucco cladding, brick veneer, and metal louvers and canopies similar in design to the former Central Fire Station. Stucco cladding and brick materials and architectural canopies are found throughout the historic districts.

In addition to the Cultural Resources Report, a Noise and Vibration Analysis was prepared to assess the construction methodology of the subterranean parking structure. The Noise and Vibration Analysis concluded that vibrations from the proposed caisson drilling would

not impact surrounding historic or unreinforced masonry buildings, thereby, having no physical impact to nearby historical resources.

Based upon the above, the proposed project will neither alter existing historical resources and will have no direct or indirect impact on them.

5. Comment: The Planning Commission improperly granted Variances for the project.

Response: The Downtown Specific Plan establishes the minimum setbacks and parking standards for the Raincross District. The applicant is requesting Variances for reduced front yard setback and number of parking spaces. Staff is able to make the necessary findings in support of the Variances as the site has been designed with the hotel building close to the front property line to activate the project's frontage and engage the streetscape, consistent with the former Central Fire Station and nearby buildings in the Raincross District. The proposed reduction in the number of parking spaces can be supported as the project site has access to 13 mass transit lines, multiple ride-share services and is located within walking and biking distance to community services, jobs, entertainment, civic institutions, cultural uses, and recreation. Therefore, the Planning Commission did not improperly grant Variances for the proposed project.

The applicant submitted supplemental variance justifications (Attachment 11) in response to the appellant's comments regarding the requested variances.

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

This item contributes to the Envision Riverside 2025 City Council Strategic Priority 3 – Economic Opportunity (Goal 3.3 – Cultivate a business climate that welcomes innovation, entrepreneurship and investment and Goal 3.4 - Collaborate with key partners to implement policies and programs that promote local business growth and ensure equitable opportunities for all).

This item aligns with the following Cross-Cutting Threads:

1. **Community Trust** – The proposed project aligns with the Community Trust Cross-Cutting Thread as the project was reviewed at public meetings held by the City Planning Commission, Cultural Heritage Board, and Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee.
2. **Equity** – N/A
3. **Fiscal Responsibility** – The proposed project aligns with the Fiscal Responsibility Cross-Cutting Thread as all project costs are borne by the applicant and will increase Transient Occupancy Tax revenue when the hotel is open for business.
4. **Innovation** - The proposed project aligns with the Innovation Cross-Cutting Thread as it responds to the need for additional lodging in the Downtown area due new tourist development.
5. **Sustainability and Resiliency** – The proposed project aligns with the Sustainability and Resiliency Cross-Cutting Thread as it will result in the adaptive reuse of the Central Fire Station and all new construction will meet the most up-to-date building Codes.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact to the City as all project costs are borne by the applicant.

Prepared by: David Welch, Community & Economic Development Director
Certified as to availability of funds: Edward Enriquez, Chief Financial Officer/City Treasurer
Approved by: Rafael Guzman, Assistant City Manager
Approved as to form: Phaedra A. Norton, City Attorney

Concurs with



Gaby Plascencia, Chair
Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee

Attachments:

1. Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee Report and Attachments – July 12, 2021
2. Land Use, Sustainability, and Resilience Committee Minutes – July 12, 2021
3. City Planning Commission Minutes – April 15, 2021
4. City Planning Commission Report and Exhibits – April 15, 2021
5. Public Comment Letters
6. Applicant response to Galvin Preservation Compatibility Assessment
7. Revised Elevations and Shadow Study
8. Applicant response to comments related to formaldehyde outgassing
9. Supplemental Historic Resources Assessment
10. City Planning Commission Appeal Letter
11. Supplemental Applicant Variance Justification
12. Presentation