



Main Gate District – Design Review Committee

Wednesday, August 13, 2015 – 5:30 p.m.

Public Works Building – 3rd Floor Large Conference Room

201 North Stone Avenue – Tucson, AZ 85701

***REVISED* Legal Action Report**

1. Roll Call

Those present and absent were:

Present:

Rick Gonzalez, Design Professional, Design Review Committee (DRC) Chair
Johnny Birkinbine (appointment pending)
Tom Warne (recused for Item #3)
Fe Tom (at-large member)
Scott Neeley (at-large member)
Jan Cervelli
Matt Williams

Absent:

Bob Smith
Jane McCollum

Staff Members Present:

Frank Dillon, Planning & Development Services

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

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 proceeded to explain the functionality and design of the proposed building and exterior amenities.

Mr. Melara explained the revisions that had occurred with the design since the last meeting. Mr. Melara opened the discussion to questions about the project.

Mr. Williams inquired about the 'nano' wall portion on the upper two floors. Mr. Williams asked for clarification as to whether or not the upper level would remain an open air patio or if in the final design there would be a glass partition wall. Mr. Melara explained that a portion would remain open and a section would be closed off by a rail.

Mr. Williams asked for clarification regarding the heights of the roof level at the pool area. Mr. Melara explained that the reduced height presented would be incorporated in the final design.

Mr. Birkinbine noted that the existing service areas into the proposed plaza spaces were unsightly and at times problematic. Mr. Birkinbine asked if there would be additional screening at the access area by

Gentle Ben's. Mr. Birkinbine suggested that the applicant should consider ways to make the plaza access from University Boulevard more prominent where there were no existing service areas.

Mr. Melara and Mr. Warne explained that the ground floor of the plaza area would be lined with display cases for use by the University of Arizona and any of future tenants. Mr. Birkinbine confirmed that the display cases would span a portion of the ground floor while the retail stores would occupy the other portion. Mr. Melara explained that the display cases and retail on the ground would screen the vehicles from view. Mr. Williams asked if the cars in the upper level of the garage would be visible. Mr. Melara explained that the areas were open for ventilation. Mr. Tom pointed out that the cars parked in the upper level of the garage may have headlights exposed to plaza.

Mr. Williams confirmed that the reason why the ground level retail spaces were lacking articulation was due to the absence of retail tenants. Mr. Melara explained that the goal was to allow the future tenants to activate the storefronts and create variety.

Mr. Melara described some of the elevation alterations per the DRC comments at the previous meeting. Mr. Melara explained that they had created 'bump outs' on the elevation to create more articulation and reduce the monolithic appearance of the previously presented design. Mr. Tom inquired about the material variation on elevations. Dean Cervelli suggested that the red banding on the north elevations could be carried through to create more contrast to the entry sequence. Mr. Williams suggested that we may not be getting a completely accurate depiction due to the lack of articulation in the graphics. Mr. Melara agreed that if the banding extended to the corner it would create more contrast.

Mr. Birkinbine suggested looking into shading opportunities on the upper two floors. Mr. Birkinbine added that it might be advantageous to incorporate shading ideas that would be more integral to the current design.

DRC members also requested that the applicant provide renderings to illustrate the lighting design on the building.

Mr. Gonzalez asked Mr. Gans if he would like to provide any comment. Mr. Gans asked about how the pedestrian experience would be regarding access to the plaza area. Mr. Melara explained that there would be an aspect of conceal and reveal and there would be stimulus in the plaza that would draw people in. Mr. Warne explained that the performance stage at the Geronimo Plaza would be located there.

Mr. Gonzalez summarized conditions of approval based on the earlier discussion. The items that the DRC members agreed that they would like included as conditions of approval included an the revised roof line at the pool level, alternative to provide screening of vehicle headlights into the plaza space, evening renderings to illustrate the lighting of the building, framing the entry sequence banding on the north elevation to provide more contrast and continuity, and to provide the most current solar / shading study and where possible, placing emphasis on existing entry ways to the plaza, to detract from using the unsightly service areas.

Mr. Birkinbine asked to see the site plan once more. Mr. Birkinbine suggested that emphasis be placed on the existing corridor as the main access to the plaza. Mr. Warne explained that the area is not part of the land lease with the Marshall Foundation.

Mr. Tom asked about the location of the transformers. Mr. Melara explained that they would be blocked by a wall and gate.

Dean Cervelli moved to approve the project as presented with the conditions that. Mr. Gonzalez seconded. Motion carried 6-0 (Mr. Birkinbine did not vote).

3. Call to the Audience

Chris Gans from WUNA spoke in favor of the revisions since the previous 7-18-15 meeting. Mr. Gans also stressed the importance of drawing people into the plaza space.

4. Approval of Legal Action Report – July 15, 2015

Dean Cervelli moved to approve Legal Action Report of July 15, 2015. Mr. Warne seconded. Motion carried 4-0 (Mr. Tom, Mr. Neeley and Mr. Birkinbine did not vote).

5. Future Agenda Items

None at this time.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:52 p.m.