



**Agenda Item #:** 2

**Project Title:** 3841 E. Washington Avenue - Renovation of a Former Hotel Building to Residential Located in Urban Design District (UDD) No. 5. 3rd Ald. Dist.

**Legistar File ID #:** 71120

**Members Present:** Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Tom DeChant, Shane Bernau, Jessica Klehr and Christian Harper

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Summary

At its meeting of September 7, 2022, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of renovation of a former hotel to residential located at 3841 E. Washington Avenue in UDD 5. Registered and speaking in support were Shaun Elwood and Ryman Kinney. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Patrick Altendorf, Morgan Van Riper-Rose, Colin Hooper and Dan O'Callaghan.

The exterior and interior hotel renovation will result in 190 multi-family units consisting of studios, one-bedrooms and amenity spaces with the primary focus on Lot 3. Site improvements include sidewalk and ADA pavement leveling, extending out the end rows for additional island spacing, adding new dog sanitation stations, and courtyard work consisting of extending the patio and improving the outdoor seating. The front porte cochere will be removed and new canopies added.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The landscape plan, the street connection to E. Washington Avenue, bike parking and site lighting are all issues pointed out in the staff memo.
- It does not appear that the landscape plan is complete, it lacks detailed information.
- We addressed the lack of landscaping in the courtyard at the Informational Presentation. The bulk of their supporting text makes references to doing stuff in these areas, but there's absolutely no details presented.
- Is it worth our time to discuss a landscape plan that was not submitted?
- I would echo that. I saw mostly trees in the perimeter landscaping, but there wasn't really a lot of detail, otherwise as far as foundation plantings, what's happening in the courtyard, etc.
- I would echo the staff report and maybe more importantly, the red line striping for pedestrian connectivity; having that through the parking lot is not great. It should be a permanent sidewalk connection, protected from traffic, a true pedestrian connection and not just a striping intervention. The bike parking also needs rethinking.
- Overall I like the idea behind the project, but there are a handful of things we would need to see for final approval.
  - Our current approach to the landscape plan was since we are not exceeding the 10% site disturbance, a landscape plan would not be required for final approval. We have had discussions on our commitment to the courtyard, the design is still ongoing and we would have something to distribute at some point.
  - The final point at the corner of the building was selected to minimize bicycle traffic through the lobby, with access to indoor bicycle parking in that area. With the reduction of the overall canopy, the overall site plan maintains the minimum driveway spacing from where the pedestrian access is proposed, and we do have striping from the corner of the building to the public right-of-way along E. Washington

Avenue. The two separate parcels (Lots 1 and 2) will be developed at some point, we are evaluating that and will ensure that they all work together for pedestrian and vehicular traffic, but for this particular application, access was strictly just for Lot 3.

- (Secretary) The UDD 5 landscape requirements are in effect for this development. The Zoning Code requirements are not in effect due to the level of site change. The UDD guidelines are supposed to be met as closely as possible. If the Commission can find the requirements are met based on what we see this evening, then things can move forward with the plans we have. If not, then we'll need additional information to be able to say that those requirements have been met.
- They are completely changing the use, people are going to live here.
- We should comment on the general placement of light fixtures and the fixtures themselves.
- (Secretary) Lighting will have to meet the current code, regardless of use of the building.
- No lighting is shown in the courtyard, it would benefit from nighttime lighting.
- My interpretation is yes, we can see some landscape improvements happening, but for all we know these areas could be a bunch of Stella D'Oro daylilies in stone mulch. Without knowing what any of that plant material is, it's hard to judge whether it's adequately contributing to urban design.
- Specifically on the crosswalk, could you take that route and shift it up along the edge of the parking and have a multi-use trail for pedestrians and bikes that connects you to E. Washington and gets you out of the traffic lane altogether?
  - It would appear we are falling short of your expectations on landscaping and aesthetics here. We thought we were in conformance, I hope you would agree we are providing a much needed improvement to this property. We will take this input to heart. We need to emphasize that we have some conditions that require us to commence this project in short order. If we're not in a position to receive final approval it would be harmful to us.
- The exterior design treatment to the EIFS and brick that's there is pretty successful. Taking off the hotel porte cochere makes it look less like a hotel.
- (Secretary) The UDC is approving for the request on the UDD 5 items, and advisory to the Plan Commission on the conditional use request, specifically related to pedestrian connectivity and any improvements to the parking lot related to conditional use standards 5 & 9.
- I agree that rethinking the color palette and banding is a success. I would suggest the color of the gutters should match the wall. Curious about the windows with the small panes, are those sliding, and if so, I would ask the Commission if they think that matches the larger windows above the new entry. Possibilities are limited because it's an existing building, but the small scale of the sliding windows with larger above seems unbalanced, and could just go back to sliding windows there.
- I appreciate the flat canopy over the entry and over the windows, they have a modern look, but you have gables with 1980s curvature in the stucco. The flat canopies seem updated and modern to me, wonder if you might consider downplaying those arcs on the gable ends of the dormers.
- The wall packs being so dark, particularly in the courtyard, will be quite a visible feature, repeated over and over, I suggest you paint those lighter colors.
- Either the color ought to match the window framing or be lighter, how wall packs are handled is important and I'm not clear given these drawings.
- I saw a note about stone mulch, which we try to avoid. When you fine tune your landscape plan our preference would be a bark mulch that supports plant life.

## Action

On a motion by Bernau, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (5-0).

The motion provided for the following:

- The applicant shall provide a landscape plan as part of the Final Approval application, including plantings in the courtyard space and the use of bark mulch.
- The applicant shall update the photometric plan that responds to the concerns in the staff report, including lighting in the courtyard and along pedestrian pathways.
- The applicant shall update the elevations to address architectural comments, including:
  - Updating the color of the downspouts and gutters to match the exterior wall color,
  - Consideration should be given to downplaying the arches in the building gable ends,
  - Updating the color of the wall packs to be a lighter color to match the window frame,
  - Consideration should be given to utilizing the same window type throughout, i.e. update sliding windows to match the new windows above the front entry.
- The advisory motion reflects that conditional use standard #9 has been fulfilled; standard #5 requires additional enhancement or rework, including consideration being given to the location and treatment of the pedestrian crosswalk connection and consider a true connection that is raised and protected.