



Main Gate District – Design Review Committee

Wednesday, July 15, 2015 – 5:30 p.m.

Public Works Building – 3rd Floor Large Conference Room

201 North Stone Avenue – Tucson, AZ 85701

Legal Action Report

1. Roll Call

Those present and absent were:

Present:

Jim Chaffee
Rick Gonzalez, Design Professional, Design Review Committee (DRC) Chair
Jane McCollum (recused for Item #3)
Tom Warne (recused for Item #3)
Noah Sensibar (at-large member in place of Matt Williams)
Bob Smith
Jan Cervelli

Absent:

Matt Williams
Richard Fe Tom (Design Professional / at-large MGD DRC member)
Scott Neeley (Design Professional / at-large MGD DRC member)

Staff Members Present:

Frank Dillon, Planning & Development Services

2. Approval of Legal Action Report – April 1, 2015

Mr. Smith moved to approve Legal Action Report of April 1, 2015. Mr. Chaffee seconded. Motion carried 6-0 (Mr. Sensibar did not vote).

3. Courtesy Review - Main Gate Hotel – Tyndall Avenue and Second Street – Parcels 124-04-102A, 124-04-102B, 124-04-100A, 124-04-101B

Discussion took place about how to proceed in reviewing the project with the at-large DRC members missing. Mr. Dillon suggested that the review should proceed as a courtesy review since projects of that size and scope require more than one round of review by the DRC. A *Courtesy Review* allows present DRC members to comment on the project without taking action and allows the applicant to consider the recommendations before any subsequent review.

Mr. Gonzalez recommended that the applicants carry on with the presentation.

George Melara, of Nelsen Partners Architects and Planners presented the project. He explained that the scope of work included the construction of a 286,00 square foot hotel with pool, exterior plaza and

amenities, integrated parking garage, bar and club area and on street retail. Mr. Melara and Mr. Warne proceeded to explain the functionality and design of the proposed building and exterior amenities.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Melara to explain the project regarding design philosophy and relationship to the surrounding context. Mr. Melara responded by describing the focus on relationship to scale and materiality of the surrounding buildings.

Dean Cervelli expressed concern regarding the blank appearance of the retail spaces in the interior plaza and asked Mr. Melara to explain how the retail facades would be articulated and provide visual interest. Mr. Melara explained the retail spaces appeared blank because the retailers occupying the spaces had not yet been identified. Mr. Melara described projects that he had worked on that took on new visual identities because of the branding strategies of the occupants. Mr. Melara added that he kept the renderings blank to avoid any misleading architectural details. Further discussion about the pedestrian experience in and through the plaza was discussed to which Mr. Warne and Mr. Melara explained that there would be ample shade, seating, plant materials and visual interest.

Mr. Gonzales inquired about the mid-level roof terrace. Mr. Melara explained that it there would be seating and plants. Mr. Gonzalez suggested that the solar exposure to the terrace may be an issue and offered an example of a successfully shaded area on the Arizona State University campus. Mr. Melara took note of the suggestion and mentioned that he would provide a solar study that his office had done for the site.

Mr. Sensibar expressed concern that the building appeared institutional and mentioned the long repetitive elevations. Mr. Melara explained that the west elevation was the longest elevation with the least amount of relief, however, that this elevation was also directly adjacent to the existing Marriot hotel and that elevation would only be visible for approximately 11 feet from Second Street. Mr. Melara showed that most of the other elevations had relief at the street level.

Mr. Gonzalez mentioned that applicants often show illustrative night renderings of the project to give reviewers an idea about how the space may be activated and appear in the evening. Mr. Smith added that it was helpful to see more of the surrounding context in the illustrative renderings. Mr. Smith suggested that in lieu of the surrounding buildings shown in white, to provide representations of the surrounding buildings depicting color and materials in addition to scale and massing. There was also a request that some close up views of the streetscape be shown to depict a greater level of detail of the building at the street level. Mr. Melara made note of the requests and agreed that he could provide them at the next meeting.

Mr. Sensibar inquired about the noise abatement and referenced the project's proposed rooftop bar and pool area. Mr. Warne explained that for the noise to be issue it would have to carry past the adjacent hotel and a number of other structures across the street and past the church to become a nuisance to the neighborhood.

Mr. Dillon suggested that the applicants take the recommendations of the DRC into consideration and return at a later date for a review of the project with the at-large DRC members, Fe Tom and Scott Neeley present. The next meeting will be a full review of the project and will require action. Mr. Smith added that there were applicant guide that the DRC had put together to help in mapping out the presentation. Mr. Dillon and Mr. Gonzalez agreed to provide the applicant with a summary of requested items and the DRC applicant guide referred to by Mr. Smith.

No action taken.

4. Future Agenda Items

The discussion was to get the Main Gate Hotel scheduled for a meeting on August 12th or dates following.

5. Call to the Audience

No audience spoke

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.