

Main Gate District Design Review Committee

Meeting Summary

Thursday, May 15, 2014

5:30 PM

University Park Marriott Hotel

880 E 2nd St, Canyon Room

1. ROLE CALL

Attendees:

Committee Members: Jan Cervelli, Jim Chaffee, Richard Fe Tom, Jane McCollum, Bob Smith, Tom Warne, Matt Williams

Applicants: Keri Silvyn, Jeff Zelisko, Tom Harrington, Eric Grimm, and Rory Juneman

Audience: Bill Ford, Chris Gans, Mike Golec, Val Little, Steve Kozachik (Council Member Ward 6), Val Little, Molly Thrasher (Ward 6 Aide), and Bob Vint.

City Staff: Jim Mazzocco (PDSO), Adam Smith (PDSO), Belinda Flores-McCleese (PDSO), and Kristina Medina (PDSO)

2. APPROVAL OF LEGAL ACTION REPORT – APRIL 7, 2014

Approved (7-0)

3. THE HUB AT TUCSON I (1023 N. Tyndall Avenue)

A. West Elevation Alteration and Replacement Plan

The applicant made a presentation on a proposed west elevation replacement plan. She noted that the walls that originally had been approved with windows were changed and now there is plumbing and electrical lines behind them. She also noted that cutting into the walls would create a serious problem with their contractor on retaining a warranty on the building.

She proceeded noting that after receiving input from the Design Review Committee her team has three options to address the bare walls of the west elevation. All three options involved using spandrel glass to create window-like features to be more in keeping with the originally approved proposal. While there have been other minor changes to the building since its original approval, they have focused on creating the options within increased glazing patterns. She said the options differed in the number, configuration, and/or size of spandrel glass.

In presenting the options she noted that Option 2b puts in a slightly greater amount of glaze than the originally approved plan. She also noted that any associated grills will be painted to match the background color to fit in with any adjoining windows. Her team architect noted that it would be impossible to see the difference between a real and spandrel window.

Will the heat from the spandrel windows would transfer to the stucco? (Fe Tom) The architect said there is some separation from the window to the stucco so there will not be a direct transfer of heat to the stucco.

What if the seal of the spandrel window breaks? (Jim Chafee) The architect said it would come off its frame and could be replaced with a new panel or part.

What about night views? (Jan Cervelli) The architect showed a night time rendering of the building with the various spandrel window options.

There needs to be a way to address a systematic problem with the proposed spandrel solution so it will come back to the DRC. (Bob Smith)

The applicant made an honest attempt to respond to the issues. Prefers Option #2b (Bob Smith).

If the spandrels don't work, is the applicant going to come back to the DRC for approval of a revised plan? (Jan Cervelli). Response: Yes.

If the apartment is sold will the same conditions apply? (Bob Smith). Response: Yes, the conditions will run with the property. If a future property owner wants to make changes, he or she will have to return to the DRC for approval.

Can a mock up be made? (Fe Tom). Response: The applicant provided a sample of the spandrel and framing. The applicant explained that the spandrels have to be custom made and would likely take approximately 8 weeks and would most likely not arrive and be installed until after the students move in this fall.

This building is going to be here a long time and is worth inconveniencing the students to ensure that the building is designed well (Jan Cervelli).

Hesitant to take action at this time until there are assurances that the spandrel will function properly. (Matt Williams)

The committee opened the floor to questions and comments from the audience before rendering a decision. The following is a summary of those comments:

Will the proposed spandrels affect the fire rating building and the ability to achieve any LEED rating the developer may be pursuing (Steve Kozachik)? Response: No.

Will the one-half inch projection of the spandrel from the building create shadows (Chris Gans)? Response: The shadows will be so minimal that they will not be perceived by an onlooker.

Will the planters be insulated (Chris Gans)? Response: Yes.
One positive of the proposal is that less light will be emanated into the neighborhood (Chris Gans).

Motion: To approve Option #2b as the solution to the glaze distribution on the west façade with the following conditions:

- 1. All metal grills on the west façade are to be powder-coated (rather than painted);**
- 2. Any changes to the design elements or any repeated failures of any design element(s) that have been approved by the DRC must be presented to the DRC for approval; and,**
- 3. This approval and conditions are to pass along to future owners of the property and shall run with the Certificate of Occupancy.**

Approved (7-0; Tom Warne – first; Jan McCollum seconded).

B. Regarding the Joints of the Stucco at the Alleyway on the West Elevation

The applicant presented ways in which they have tried to address the issues with the joints of the stucco along the alleyway. The applicant explained that he attempted to tape and paint the joints and found that it did not look good.

Motion: To require the applicant to treat the joints of the stucco at the alleyway façade (2 stories) with material such as paint or caulk or a similar material. Final approval of the selected material will be made on-site by the Design Professional and DRC Member Jane McCollum (Jane McCollum – first, Bob Smith seconded)

Approved (6-0; Jim Chaffee left the time the motion was made)

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.

Summary of Committee Member comments:

- Allow two or three options of paint, for example, to be approved when builders need to avoid expensive proprietary bids (Tom Warne).

- Safeguards should be put in place that the City shares in the accountability should errors occur. The accountability should not be solely on the City's Design Professional's shoulders (Matt Williams).
- Clarify the role of the PDSD Director (Jan Cervelli). Staff Response: The Director typically relies on the Design Professional, review boards, and staff's recommendations when making a decision.
- What if there's a difference of opinion on a insubstantial versus substantial change (Jan Cervelli)? Staff Response: The DRC will be notified of any change and will have an opportunity to comment.

Motion: To approve the Design Review Process with the following revisions:

- 1. The City is not exempt in making sure everything is done in compliance with the DRC or Director's approval and the responsibility is not solely with the City's Design Professional; and,**
- 2. The Director will not make a decision until giving the DRC members five working days to see if they have a quorum and hold a meeting to give an advisory recommendation for proposals outside of Area 1.**

(Bob Smith – second Jan Cervelli)

(Approved 7-0)

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

None at this time.

6. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

Bob Vint presented a project for a hotel and retail project on Euclid south of the Geronimo Plaza that will be coming to the DRC for review in the near future.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.