

Main Gate District Design Review Committee
Meeting Summary
April 7, 2014
2:00 PM
County-City Public Works Building
201 N. Stone Avenue, 3rd floor conference room

1. ROLL CALL

Attendees:

Committee Members: Jan Cervelli, Jim Chaffee, Rick Gonzalez, Jane McCollum, Bob Smith, Matt Williams (Tom Warne – absent)

Applicants: Keri Silvyn, Jeff Zelisko, Tom Harrington, Lisa Bowers, and two other members of the development team

Audience: Chris Gans, Bill Ford, and a representative of Mama’s Hawaiian Barbeque

City Staff: Jim Mazzocco (PDSO), Adam Smith (PDSO), Rebecca Ruopp (OIP), Molly Thrasher (Ward 6)

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY – MARCH 12, 2014

Approved (5-0; Jane McCollum abstained)

3. THE HUB AT TUCSON I (1023 N. Tyndall Avenue – Phase 1 Alterations and Replacement Plan)

Jeff Zelisko, architect for the project explained that the alterations to the originally designed plans were necessary because: 1) changes in the interior layout (namely, the relocation of plumbing and kitchen walls) required a reduction and relocation of windows on the west elevation; and, 2) consequently, the contractor informed them that they couldn’t get warranties for the windows as originally planned. In order to lease by Fall 2014, the alterations

Mr. Zelisko proposed simulating the windows that were not installed on the west elevation with a series of aluminum frames that would be mounted to the walls. The stucco within the frames would be painted a darker color. Mr. Zelisko presented two options for the number and placement of the frames: 1) single rows of frames arranged vertically; or, 2) double rows of frames arranged vertically.

The following is a summary of the committee members' response to the applicant's proposal:

- There is too much stucco as it is built today (Bob Smith)
- Painting the stucco is problematic as it will fade over time (Bob Smith)
- Is there another option that is more authentic? Metal frames with painted stucco are not enough. Using mesh instead of painted stucco would perhaps be better (Bob Smith)
- The proposal is an inadequate alternative to the plans originally approved (Matt Williams, Jan Cervelli)
- There are discrepancies between the renderings and what has been built, namely the photographs show doors that have been built on the west elevation that are not shown on the renderings. These discrepancies need to be resolved. (Matt Williams)
- Not convinced that glazing could not be added. The proposal is a poor attempt to address the issues (Jan Cervelli)
- How are the frames going to look at night? One of the pluses of the original plan was the effect the light from the windows at night was going to have. (Jan Cervelli)
- This is the most important project in the Main Gate area because of its location and adjacency to the neighborhood. (Jan Cervelli)
- The presentation did not address the changes to the north and south elevations (Matt Williams)
- Trees and landscaping should not be used to hide the building (Matt Williams)
- What does the building look like without the greenery? Landscaping on the west side of the building is going to be difficult to grow as it is shown on the renderings. Without the landscaping, the building is ugly (Jane McCollum)
- Put as many windows back as possible. The alignment is not as important as putting as many windows back in and where they cannot, creating a passable replacement (Bob Smith)

Motion: To direct the applicant to address the issues raised by the committee and to continue the discussion at the April 16th committee meeting (Approved 6-0; Tom Warne absent)

4. DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS AFTER DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION/APPROVAL

Jim Mazzocco presented a proposed process by which projects will be overseen following approval of the design plan to prevent issues that arose with the Hub I project.

Summary of Committee Member comments:

- The terms “substantial alteration” and “significantly affects” are too subjective and need to be clarified (Bob Smith).
- The DRC should be notified of insubstantial and substantial alterations (Matt Williams).

- Lisa Bowers suggested that alterations from the DRC approval should be in writing from the project's architect to the Design Professional.

Motion: To direct staff to revise the issues raised by the committee and to continue the discussion at the April 16th committee meeting (Approved 6-0; Tom Warne absent)

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The following items will be discussed at the April 16, 2014 Main Gate DRC meeting:

1. The Hub at Tucson I – Phase 1 alterations and replacement plan (Continued discussion and possible action)
2. The Hub at Tucson I – Signage (Continued discussion and possible action)
3. Design Review Process (Continued discussion and possible action)
4. The Hub at Tucson II (Continued discussion and possible action)

6. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

Chris Gans (West University resident) – The west façade, in particular the upper floors, are the most important since they are the ones visible from the neighborhood. There is too much of the same color stucco on the west and north elevations. Consider using McNichols perforated metal and make sure it is well done.

Bill Ford (Feldman's Neighborhood resident) – He said he agreed with Chris Gans comments. He added he was disappointed with how something as important as design was handled. He said he had concerns about the panel system.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 pm.