



Project Address: 2150 Marty Road & 7751 Mid Town Road

Application Type: Residential Building Complex for Midpoint Meadows Multi-Family Development
UDC is an Advisory Body

Legistar File ID #: [84857](#)

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Brian Munson, Vandewalle & Associates | Dan Brinkman, Midpoint Apartments, LLC

Project Description: The applicant is proposing a 210-unit multi-family residential project to be comprised of six buildings, including a clubhouse and amenity features.

Project Schedule:

- UDC received an Informational Presentation on August 28, 2024.
- The Plan Commission is scheduled to review this proposal on December 2, 2024 (Legistar File ID [85652](#)).

Approval Standards: The UDC is an **advisory body** on this request. Pursuant to MGO 28.151, residential building complexes shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Commission pursuant to the provisions in Section 33.24(4)(c). Section 33.24(4)(c), Residential Building Complexes, 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."*

As a Residential Building Complex, a Conditional Use is required. The Plan Commission will evaluate the request for consistency with the approval standards, including the following Conditional Use Standard No. 8, which is the primary standard related to project aesthetics. For reference, Conditional Use Standard No. 8 is noted below.

*"When applying the above standards to any new construction of a building or an addition to an existing building the Plan Commission shall find that **the project creates an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose for the zoning district.** In order to find that this standard is met, the Plan Commission may require the applicant to submit plans to the Urban Design Commission for comment and recommendation." (Emphasis Added)*

Adopted Plans: The project site is located in the [High Point-Raymond Neighborhood Development Plan](#) (the "Plan") planning area. The Plan recommends the project site for primarily residential development, including Housing Mix 2, 3, and 4 where densities of up to 20-50 dwelling units per acre for individual developments are anticipated. Development in the housing mix categories ranges from small lot single-family to large scale multi-family buildings, and where building heights of up to 4 stories are anticipated. The Plan notes that higher densities should be concentrated in locations closer to mixed-use areas, parks or along transit corridors to provide easy access for more residents, as well as provide activity to support the mix of uses.

Zoning Related Information: The project site is zoned TR-P (Traditional Residential Planned District). The Zoning and Preliminary Subdivision Plat for the property were approved in February 2024 (Legislative Files [81295](#) and [81268](#)) with a Final Plat subsequently approved in May 2024 (Legislative File [82752](#)).

Summary of Design Considerations

Staff recommends that the UDC provide feedback and findings and make a recommendation to the Plan Commission regarding the aforementioned standards as it relates to the design considerations noted below.

- **Building Design and Composition.** The project site is located at the future intersection of Raymond Road and S High Point Road, which will be a prominent intersection, and also includes focal points at the intersection of S High Point and Stones Throw Drive and the terminus of Ridgemont Road. As such, consideration should be given to the building design in these locations, including considering distinctive architectural features or elements that define corners or frame views, as well as these locations being able to accommodate more mass and intensity.

In addition, consideration should be given to the materials and detailing, as well as roof configurations and mass, especially as it relates to breaking down the overall mass and scale of the buildings, especially where Building 6 transitions to single-family residential.

Generally, and in summary, the UDC's Informational Presentation comments focused on utilizing the site's topography as an organizing element for locating mass and scale, as well as development intensity across the site (i.e. locating more mass and intensity at major intersections and less adjacent to single-family residential), as well as giving consideration to utilizing an alternate roof configuration or different building design and rhythm (i.e. a series of townhomes) to break down the perceived mass of the buildings.

Staff requests the UDC's feedback and findings on the overall building design and composition.

- **Landscape and Screening.** As indicated on the site plan there is significant grade change across the site, as well as adjacent development that will be at a much lower density. As such, consideration should be given to providing year-round screening for blank walls and surface parking areas, as well as utilizing landscape to breakdown building mass and scale and provide adequate buffers and transitions between uses of differing levels of intensity.

Staff notes that there are several retaining walls shown on the Grading Plan, Architectural Site Plan, and Landscape Plan, however the extents of the walls appear to be different across the plans, especially the wall associated with Building 6. In addition, wall height, and details and materials for all the proposed walls was not included in the submittal materials.

Staff requests the Commission's feedback and findings on the proposed landscape plan and plant list.

- **Building Orientation, Pedestrian Connections, & Parking Lot Layout.** From a landscaping and site plan standpoint, staff appreciates efforts to orient buildings to the public streets, noting a few additional connections have been added since the UDC Informational Presentation. However, staff continues to suggest additional enhancements be considered within the portions of the site's interior to improve building orientation and pedestrian circulation across the site. Consideration should be given to exploring parking alternatives in places (i.e., parallel parking or angled parking) that could limit head light glare into residential units and reduce vehicle overhangs into the pedestrian environment, as well as the use of detached sidewalks with terraces or wider sidewalks to accommodate both pedestrian circulation and vehicle overhang, or other possible modifications to increase landscape or open space areas that could also provide for enhanced pedestrian-focused amenities (striped mid-block crossings or alternative paving, benches, wider sidewalks, etc.).

In summary and generally, the UDC's site planning related comments noted that consideration should be given to:

- The location of the club house; strategically locating the amenity could aid in providing a better transition between this development and the adjacent development, as well as it being more contiguous to the other amenity spaces,
- Reducing the parking surface parking, and
- Providing enhanced connectivity, not only internally through the site, but also externally.

As part of this advisory recommendation, staff recommends the UDC should focus comments on potential building and landscape plan modifications, especially as it relates to Conditional Use Standard No. 8, as noted above.

Summary of Informational Presentation Discussion and Comments

As a reference, the Commission's discussion and comments from the August 28, 2024, Informational Presentation are provided below.

Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission discussed the site topography is key to solving the problem. Buildings 1, 2, and 6 are across from single-family dwellings, it would be nice to see those break down their masses differently. Perhaps the mass of those buildings should break down on the ends – redistribute the heights relative to grade across the site. A suggestion was given to having the three buildings be 2-stories, with the others along Raymond Road at 4 stories.

The Commission noted that the building masses are roof dominated, especially where they are across from and adjacent to single-family lots. Perhaps the middle portion of the building has more of a flat truss to let the ends break down the mass. Take advantage of the clubhouse amenity space as a potential transition point between the development and the adjacent single-family development, which might not be a central location, but it would provide a better transition. More mass could be located along Raymond Road, then decrease mass and scale as you move across the site to respond to grades.

The Commission discussed looking at the project with a broader contextual scope and the potential opportunities for connectivity within and to surrounding amenities, including the commercial across Raymond Road and the greenway. There should be stronger gestures and thought in how to connect to that commercial space and safely cross the new road. To the southeast there are the makings of a strong greenway and a network of connected greenspaces, and Prairie Ridge Park or Elver Park could connect in the future. This development should be deliberate in how those future connections are made.

The Commission notes that the parking "donut" is not ideal, and it seems like there is more land devoted to parking than to the people living here. The goal should be to provide better connectivity to the green space – consideration should be given to a U shaped layout versus a circle. Maybe an enhanced pedestrian connection – a table top connection to better identify the pedestrian space. Overall the Commission noted that the site plan needed to be refined.

The applicant noted that the parking ratio is 1.75 to one, which is workable. They can look at reducing that a little further though to integrate more landscape and connectivity.

The Commission noted that we are trying to grow urban spaces not suburban ones; parking on streets is ok.

The mass of the building should be considered along High Point and Stone's Throw to reduce that mass and that roof dominated appearance – something that looks more like a series of townhouses would be an improvement.