



Project Address: 804 Felland Road
Application Type: Residential Building Complex – Final Approval is Requested
Legistar File ID # [67494](#)
Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Lindsay Hagens, Simply Homes Property Management | Robert Sieger, Sieger Architects

Project Description: The applicant is seeking Final Approval on a Residential Building Complex containing 134 units in three apartment buildings and 103 rowhouse units in 19 buildings with above and underground parking, a pool, and a clubhouse.

Project Schedule:

- The UDC gave an Initial Recommendation on October 27, 2021 (Legistar ID [67494](#)).
- The Plan Commission approved this proposal on November 8, 2021 (Legistar ID [67284](#)).

Approval Standards: The UDC is an **advisory body** on this request. Section 28.151 of the Zoning Code requires that Residential Building Complexes are reviewed by the Urban Design Commission pursuant to the provisions in Section 33.24(4)(c) which states: *“The Urban Design Commission shall review the exterior design and appearance of all principal buildings or structures and the landscape plans of all proposed residential building complexes. It shall report its findings and recommendations to the City Plan Commission.”*

The UDC is an advisory body on residential building complexes. As the Plan Commission has already acted on the conditional use based on UDC’s initial recommendation, the current purview of the UDC review is limited to the resolution of those conditions. The UDC should make findings based on the applicable review criteria as noted above for each of the design considerations outlined below. While the UDC may include conditions related to the below items, UDC does not have the ability to add additional conditions beyond what was raised in the Initial Approval.

Summary of Design Considerations

Staff requests that the UDC review the proposed development and make findings based on the aforementioned standards, including the previously recommended conditions that were part of the Commission’s Initial Approval motion as noted below:

- Replace Callery Pears, Acer Ginnala Amur Maple and Acer Tarari Maple with other small ornamental trees; replace Stella D’Oro Daylilies.
- Simplification of the prairie style building to somewhat match the modernity of the other buildings.
- Color simplification where the colors split.
- Create more greenspace in the townhome lots (3 and 4).

Summary of UDC Initial Approval Comments

As a reference, the Commission's comments from the October 27, 2021, Initial Approval Recommendation are provided below:

- In response to a comment in the staff report, there was question on the overall entrance orientation, with the proposed orientation being "side-loaded" not directly facing the street.
 - The steps going in are parallel to the building.
- Lot 4 siting and orientation, understand concerns but we don't know what will happen with the property to the far west for the units that are labeled 'D.'
 - The 'D' buildings are built into the hill and have quite a gracious front entrance off that drive court. These units have decks that overlook the open space to the west. Units A, B and C have front entrances off the garages.
- Taken with the fact that Lots 3 and 4 describe all the townhomes as 3 bedrooms. Are you anticipating a lot of families and children? Comment that plans did not see the play/greenspace to support that.
- There is a public park located in close proximity to be developed.
 - Applicant stated that they have dedicated 6 acres of land across the street for development of a public park. The density went up on these lots because of that dedication.
- The two units running north/south, the front of one Unit C is facing the garage of the other Unit C, that's worth looking at. Building A seems very different than the rest of the buildings in terms of style, is that on purpose?
 - All the townhouses have a pitched roof whether it's gable or hip with the same shingles.
- Comment on the organization of doors, window fenestration, noting that the other units appear to have more of a coherent theme. Building A appears to be pretty unique on its own.
 - A is definitely different and meant to be a little bit of a change up. It was an effort to get some uniqueness from building to building.
- Appreciate the attempt to add some variety and color to these buildings. Encourage you not to use vinyl siding, use the hardi-board everywhere. Commissioner comment to encourage some consistency with where the colors are changing and have a purpose to them, have them align with other components of the building.
 - We are using all hardi-plank. We don't intent to use vinyl siding.
- Didn't see a lot of greenspace, it's not always handy to go across to a park. It would be nice to have someplace closer.
- These landscape beds would really benefit from some simplicity. Creating some bed lines that are straight and having them swell out where there is a tree anchoring a corner or some sort of landscape massing where it's logical. Clean linear lines.
- Regarding some species, a couple should be substituted. The Gold Flame Spireas could be replaced with a Grow Low Sumac or Tor Leaf Spirea; also the Stella D'Oro Daylily which is overused far too much. There are thousands of others that could replace that. Two other selections that are more serious are the Callery Pear (on the edge of invasive) and Acer Ginnala Amur Maple is definitely an invasive species. I would request you replace those two with other smaller ornamental trees.
 - Unfortunately our landscape architect is not here. He doesn't do computer work. I'm sure he would be more than happy to meet and revise and discuss his concept and your concept. Our intent was to heavily landscape the project.
- Ambitious project. My focus is on Lot 3, trying to figure out the roof forms of the C type units. What is the function and purpose of the varying heights?
 - We have 9-foot ceilings in the second floor to avoid a long straight roofline. We could go back to an 8-foot height. The dormers as part of the master bedroom help break up the roofline

substantially and allow us to keep the massing so it's not all roof. That's the intent of the rear elevation.

- I appreciate trying to break up that longer building, along with the comments about simplification of materials I think there's opportunity to simplify here as well. Jostling the footprint of the buildings might create that interest.
- Look to provide usable space for kids to play. Lots 3 and 4, Buildings C could be moved closer to Wisdom Road, we're creating a little bit more space in the pool courtyard. Similarly by Eternity Drive, more space between A and C could make a pocket for kids to run around. Would the zoning prohibit those buildings from being closer to the street?
- Staff: Will verify if there is flexibility that the underlying setback can be waived or amended as part of the conditional use.
- Like the eclectic mix of everything, the prairie style motif seems out of place.
- Need to see some of these site plan changes vs. approval at a staff level.