

Attachment 10

ADP notes



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
P.O. Box 1609, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
(760) 934-8989
fax (760) 934-8608

October 22, 2009

Notes from ADP meeting re: Old Mammoth Place

Attendees:

Staff: Pam Kobylarz, Mark Wardlaw, Sandra Moberly

Applicant: Dana Severy, Mark Carney, John Ashworth, John Thompson, Jim Demetriades, Jerry Keyser

ADP: Elizabeth Tenney, Jay Deinken, Larry Walker, Elliott Brainard, Larry Young (on phone)

PK gave a brief presentation of the staff report.

DS introduced BSA and the project.

JA gave a PowerPoint presentation highlighting various elements of the proposed project.

The ADP asked questions and had a discussion about various project elements with the applicant:

- EB expressed concerns about accessibility and visibility to market since it is one level up from the street front retail. He said it appears similar to the Village in that respect.
- LW expressed concern about sense of arrival at the northeast corner of the site. He said the southeast corner has a stronger sense of arrival. There is an opportunity to change the northeast corner to be more open and inviting; maybe it could also open up visibility to the market area.

The ADP discussed specific areas of focus and provided feedback:

Roof and building massing:

- The flat roofs are acceptable because the design of the buildings is such that the view from the pedestrian level perimeter screens the roof planes. Along the street edge, the design provides good undulation of the roof.
- The applicant should consider further breakdown of the building edges, especially along the eastern and western sides of the site.
- Concern expressed about the hotel building, including form and sense of place in the mountain environment. How much of the roof will be seen and from what vantage points?
- Materials will make the difference; concern expressed about the "trendiness" of some materials and architectural elements.

Materials and colors:

- The proposed materials may be too urban. Materials are critical to create the mountain aesthetic. The use of core-ten is appreciated. For the proposed

wood, the application is more important than the material itself. Additionally, there was a concern about wood deteriorating over time.

- Concern expressed about the “ice” concept. ADP stated that since Mammoth is cold 8 months out of the year, the building should feel “warm” and “rich.” ADP suggested use of the glass as an accent rather than a main building material.
- The colors need to be right; they are close as currently proposed.

Building base:

- Concern expressed that the sidewalk width may push retail too far from street.
- Glass all the way to ground in storefronts is very urban. Try to create a more rustic feel for storefronts.
- When retail is recessed under buildings, care must be taken to ensure that it “pops.”
- Important to get signage for retail right. Needs to be in appropriate location and visible from street. (Note: location of signs will be determined through the Master Sign Plan process.)

Public spaces and water feature:

- The plazas are the best feature of this project – good job utilizing sun and exposure.
- The water feature is very tasteful.
- Landscaping could benefit by having a more “natural,” less refined feel to it (i.e. wildflowers, soften edges of water feature).
- Ensure that plaza spaces are sufficient in size for anticipated uses.

Façade:

- Concern expressed about the OMR frontage; looks top heavy with the glass on the bottom and overhanging buildings. Suggest trying to ground it better to OMR.
- Need to work on the details, especially for the hotel. Keep in mind that fine details are subject to destruction in the winter. Imperfection should be built into the design. Needs to be built to withstand the elements and to look like it can withstand the elements. Generally, it looks like it will.
- It is important to have the right materials and textures at the right heights on the buildings.
- Character is much more contemporary than typically seen in Mammoth; blending that with rugged architecture and the natural environment will be critical.

Summary:

- Overall the applicant is on the right track.
- Edges of the façades still need more work.
- Work on the entrance statement at NE corner.
- East and west roofs and façades should be less severe; soften staccato window effect.
- Soften severe character.
- Refine design to better reflect snow country.
- Consider function of public spaces.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
P.O. Box 1609, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
(760) 934-8989
fax (760) 934-8608

ADP Notes from 1-14-10 meeting

Attendees:

Staff: MW, SM, PK

ADP: Larry Walker, Elizabeth Tenney, Jay Deinken, Elliot Brainard, Larry Young (on phone)

Applicant: Dana Severy, Jim Demetriades, Mark Carney, John Ashworth (BSA)

Associate Planner Pam Kobylarz introduced the project and summarized the staff memo.

John Ashworth, of BSA Architects, presented a PowerPoint presentation that summarized the changes that have been made to the project since the last time it was presented to ADP.

- Discussed options that were considered for the NE corner.
- Trying to utilize heavy timbers in the market and retail areas.
- Will be important to incorporate signage into the entrance of the paseo.
- The covered area over the OMR retail is ~8-10 feet above the sidewalk.

The ADP asked questions to clarify some elements of the project:

- Function and location of ice rink on the site.
- Explain grading at the NE corner.
- Explain how height is measured from podium vs. existing grade.

The ADP discussed the revisions to the project and came to consensus on the following points:

Roof and Building Massing

- The overall site plan is well placed and has good use of sun exposure.
- The changes to the NE corner are moving in the right direction. Suggest stepping back (moving to the south) the portion of the building closest to OMR for more openness.
- Still need to work on the massing around the edges of the buildings.

Façade

- The overall architectural approach misses the mark. It appears very urban and is lacking the warmth and sense of inviting mountain character that defines Mammoth.

- The photomontages make the building look like a professional or government office rather than a hotel/mixed-use project.

Materials and Colors

- At the revised NE corner and along Laurel Mountain Road, ADP appreciates the warmth of heavy timbers and would like to see them used more throughout the rest of the project.
- There is too much channel glass used on the hotel building; warmer materials should be incorporated.

Building Base

- The sense and sequence of arrival at the lobby entrance on the north side of the site should be strengthened. Graphic design could be used as a means to achieve this.

ADP Consensus:

- The overall site plan works well.
- The NE corner is heading in the right direction (heavy timbers, use of glass, mountain feel), however it has not gone far enough. Consider shifting the portion of the building closest to OMR to the south.
- The warmth of the heavy timbers could be a positive element to incorporate into the rest of the project.
- The overall façade, especially along OMR, feels somewhat institutional.
- Each façade shares the issue of being too severe; applicant should continue to work to soften the façades.
- The Laurel Mountain Road elevation is headed in the right direction. ADP suggests the applicant provide more variation in the bays.
- The hotel needs a stronger sense of arrival.
- The hotel elevation with channel glass is still too “cold” feeling. The applicant should incorporate more warm elements.
- Signage – although it is not part of this application, the applicant should show preliminary locations for signage, especially along OMR.

Next Steps:

- Applicant to respond to ADP comments.
 - Informal submittals, discussions with staff. Staff to get ADP involved as necessary.
- Special Planning Commission on Feb. 3 to discuss design and height.
 - Drawings will not be included in the 2-3 PC packet due to timing issues. Drawings will be provided to the PC on 2-2.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
P.O. Box 1609, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
(760) 934-8989
fax (760) 934-8608

ADP Notes from 2-2-10 meeting

Attendees:

Staff: Mark Wardlaw, Sandra Moberly

ADP: Larry Walker, Elizabeth Tenney, Jay Deinken, Larry Young (on phone)

Applicant (via phone): Dana Severy, John Ashworth (BSA), John Thompson (BSA), Rachel (BSA)

ET raised issues regarding:

- Functionality of trash enclosure location and grease traps...citing the issues with grease removal in the Village.
- Tour bus drop off and pick up. The applicant clarified that tour bus drop off and pick up will be on the connector road.
- Location of bicycle racks. The applicant clarified that there is a bicycle parking area in the parking garage.

The ADP reviewed the revised changes and made comments as follows:

- Design/approach sequence on OMR and mid-block connector needs more work.
- Signage pointing towards the north is needed.
- Need signage perpendicular to the travelers view on OMR (current signage not directed how people see it.)
- Issues with the partial pillars/columns throughout the project. Proportion in vertical dimension of columns and beams to height/width.
- Materials used for pillars/columns may not be appropriate (i.e. steel on top of board-formed concrete)
- Opportunities to use native stone in this project? It may convey a sense of place if introduced in a graceful way.
- Horizontal use of granite slab doesn't feel right. Consider changing board-formed concrete to a different pattern.
- The direction of the materials (granite) is good but the application of the materials may not be appropriate.
- Some of the design is disturbing and the reason for the design is not apparent (slot window concepts, columns look like they should be holding something up but pieces are missing).

The ADP came to consensus that the project should return to ADP with final design drawings prior to the issuance of a building permit. (Condition of approval).