

ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL OF THE TOWN OF MAMMOTH LAKES

MINUTES

Friday, September 20, 2019

437 Old Mammoth Road, Suite Z, 10:00 A.M.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m. with members Elliott Brainard, Jennifer Burrows, Paul Chang, Robert Creasy, Greg Enright, and Dawn Vereuck present. Larry Walker was absent.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

BUSINESS MATTERS

1. Approval of the minutes of the February 14, 2019 meeting was continued to the next ADP meeting.

DESIGN REVIEWS

2. Sierra Center Mall Design Review (DR 19-003). Staff contact: Chandler Van Schaack, Senior Planner, (760) 965-3637.

Chandler Van Schaack, Senior Planner, provided a presentation of the project and answered questions from the ADP members and described the development standards that are not being met (parking, OMR development standards).

Ralph Lockhart introduced the Sierra Center Mall Design Review project team consisting of Drew Hild, Jeffrey Kim (Gensler), and Fong Liu (Gensler).

Jeffrey Kim provided a presentation on the design of the project.

Materials (Design Guidelines Sections 4.2.3, 4.2.4 & 4.2.8):

- Do the proposed first floor materials help to create visual interest, character, and a pedestrian scale?
ADP Comments: need additional details, renderings, and a materials board. White fascia material on the fourth floor does not complement the building. A darker material such as weathered steel (to match first floor) would be more appropriate. Materials board will help to inform final direction on the materials.
- Are the exterior siding materials appropriate for the neighborhood and regional area and do they harmonize with the site and surrounding structures? Please discuss both the Old Mammoth Road and Meridian Blvd elevations separately.
ADP Comments: The Meridian Blvd elevation is monotonous and could be improved visually. Applicant should explore ways to create articulation, visual interest on that wall. Incorporate changes in color/texture. Overall palate is good. The materials/articulation on the rest of the building is successful. The verticality of the building is good.

Windows (Design Guidelines Section 4.2.5):

- Are the proposed windows proportional to the other building elements? Do the windows help to create façade articulation and provide shadow relief?
ADP Comments: On east elevation of south wing, first floor window design is good, but second and third floor windows are monotonous and not visually interesting – need some kind of visual termination at south end. Consider larger windows and provide information (details) on the texture between the windows. Overall, Panel appreciates the fact that the window frames pop out and provide articulation/ shadow relief. Top floor window set back is good.

Colors (Design Guidelines Section 4.2.9):

- Do the proposed colors harmonize with surrounding buildings and with the natural setting of Mammoth Lakes?

ADP Comments: Colors are appropriate with the exception of the fascia on the fourth floor. Tie fourth floor fascia to ground floor (replace white/ light grey with weathered steel or similar). North wall also needs a change in color to better tie it into the rest of the project. Would like to see elevation of west side of building.

- Would you consider the proposed trim and accent colors to be “strong natural seasonal colors?”

ADP Comments: Overall, yes (except for fascia as discussed previously), but will need to see materials board to be sure.

Site Design (Design Review Criteria):

- Are the proposed streetscape improvements consistent with the character of commercial districts and nearby neighborhoods? Do you feel that these improvements will adequately activate the street and support pedestrian activity?

ADP Comments:

- *Concerns with the bus stops and how it relates to other bus stops Transit stop will look different than other transit stops in town but that’s okay as long as it complements the project. Transit stop should be enclosed to block wind/ snow.*
 - *Location of bus stop and pocket park. Concerns that people won’t use the pocket park and bus stop. What is the real concept of the pocket park? Pretty remote to put the bike parking in that location – should be additional bike parking closer to building. Applicant: pocket park bike facility considered as a public benefit, not a hotel amenity. Several panel members were interested in the idea of adding boulders and having the pocket park be more of a natural landscape with a better transition from sidewalk to pocket park. Agreed that urban photo example was not really appropriate for Mammoth Lakes. Suggested adding boulders along the frontage or bookending the project with natural landscape features. Panel also mentioned exploring xeriscape/ artificial turf as requiring less maintenance and having better durability.*
 - *Consider the location of the trash enclosure at the adjacent (AT&T) property and how that relates to the hotel room windows.*
 - *Consider including a stepback on the fourth story along Old Mammoth Road and a better transition of the building mass to the AT&T building. Renderings should more clearly show how fourth floor on Old Mammoth Road interacts with adjacent AT&T building to the north.*
 - *Provide information as to the how the shading of buildings on adjacent property to the west (condos) will be affected by proposed fourth floor.*
 - *Provide additional information to show what is happening at the ground level on the south and east facing elevations and how the building meets the ground in those areas.*
 - *Consider articulation/more logical termination of the east elevation of the south wing of the building – currently it ends abruptly at the property line with no sense of completion. Applicant should take cues from east elevation of north wing (restaurant elevation), i.e., recessed balconies/ visual interest on 2nd and 3rd floors.*
 - *Fence/wall along the site is too homogenous – should explore ways to make fence more creative while keeping it durable.*
- Does the parking area buffer surrounding land uses; minimize visibility; prevent conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians and cyclists; and generally help to achieve a safe, efficient, and harmonious development?
- ADP Comments: Provide better images of pedestrian experience. Consider softening the covered pedestrian walkway so that it is curved rather than hard right angles. Concerns*

that it may not be obvious to the pedestrian to access the building through the outdoor dining. Final plans should discuss wayfinding strategies to make sure pedestrian access is clear and easy to find.

- Is the landscaping designed to promote a natural aesthetic and be compatible with and enhance the architectural character and features of the buildings on site, and help relate the building to the surrounding landscape?

ADP Comments: Do not include grass as the area is in the shade and grass won't likely survive in this location. Include native landscaping that does not require sprinklers or watering. Prefer xeriscape or natural landscaping. Fake turf would be more environmentally conscious. Board formed concrete on the property line wall is successful (assuming earlier comments regarding the fence/ screening are addressed)

There was consensus from the ADP that this project should return back for a second review prior to the project consideration by the Planning and Economic Development Commission.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND PANEL MEETINGS

Staff noted that no future meetings have been scheduled at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 pm