



**Agenda Item #:** 7

**Project Title:** 3205 Stevens Street - Residential Building Complex. (District 5)

**Legistar File ID #:** 90325

**Members Present:** Shane Bernau, Chair; Rafeeq Asad, Anina Mbilinyi, Nicholas Hellrood, Davy Mayer

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

## Summary

At its meeting of December 17, 2025, the Urban Design Commission made an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission to **APPROVE** a Residential Building Complex located at 3205 Stevens Street. Registered and speaking in support was Matthew Tills. Registered and speaking in opposition was Alex Saloutos. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Zach Dressler, Colin Smith, Joseph McCormick, Kevin Burow, and Randy Kolinske. Registered and speaking neither in support nor opposition was Mary Sheean.

### Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

Based on the public comment, the Commission inquired about the dumpster locations. The applicant noted that the revised site plan addresses those concerns with the removal of Building 3. That dumpster has been relocated with that being the furthest from those buildings and easiest for the trucks entering and exiting.

The Commission asked about the new pedestrian path alignment through the center of the site (versus along the eastern property line) and how the path will be made public. The applicant noted that wayfinding signage is being considered along with landscape and lighting. The Commission noted that the applicant should continue to explore the relationship of the space to the two parks.

The Commission inquired if anything was done regarding the ecology of the area and how non-humans are navigating this space; an ecological corridor or uninterrupted environmental space to connect those spaces for pollinators as well as animals should be considered.

The Commission noted that the path seems like an asset, if people want it there, why not keep it? It seems like a minimal investment. The applicant noted that the southern portion of the site where the path is will be regraded, a retention pond is going to be physically blocking that and redirecting stormwater, with enhanced screening and fill in along the east side for a natural buffer. The grade and stormwater, along with the overhead utility wires would be a challenge to make that safe and presents a liability concern for the developer. The applicant noted that while the path is shown on the original approved plans from 1967, there is no reference to any sort of public easement covering that pathway.

The Commission noted the value in connecting the two area parks.

The Commission asked about the possibility of structured parking. The applicant replied that the practicality of that, with the way circulation works, did not lend itself to any solution there, though there is some parking under Buildings 1 and 2.

The Commission asked about any mature tree removal on the site, and about what trees are planned to be removed, including species and sizes. The applicant noted some will be removed for new sidewalks and new grading necessary to bring the site up to be more accessible. The Commission noted that taking another look at the site design and parking lot, north of Building A gives an opportunity to save a tree by removing a few parking stalls. The applicant noted that they would take a look at that.

The Commission commented that overall the landscape plan is underwhelming. There is a series of plant symbols that are shown around the foundations that are spaced far apart with the bare minimum of plant material. This is not contributing to good urban design and the quality of life of the people living there. There are no perennials, grasses, etc. There could be more diversity in the types of plants in the list and providing seasonal interest. More densely spaced, intentional swaths – there will be a bigger impact than a sparsely planted edge foundation planting.

The parking lot islands need enhancement with plants, and along Bluff Street, the street trees may not meet the zoning requirements for plantings. The name 'Woodland Reserve' and site context next to these parks makes it feel like the plantings should be much more lush. There are odd gaps or spacings in between that did not go along with that aesthetic vision and should be considered, especially the use of alternative ground covers such as Pennsylvania sedge. This site should tie in visually between the parks.

The Commission generally liked the new circulation provided, noting more could be done with the greenspaces. Think about the programming of these spaces - picnic benches, small activity nodes.

The Commission noted that there are no perennials in the plant list, just big seas of mulch. There should be more diversity in types of plants to provide seasonal interest, and more of a design concept for the planting plan.

The Commission noted that the building design and composition, compatibility as they are placed throughout the site to integrate, with a bit of echo in the roof design, are all positives. Overall, these are good looking buildings.

## Action

On a motion by Hellrood, seconded by Mayer, the Urban Design Commission made an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission to **APPROVE**, with the following condition:

- Revise the landscape plan to reflect an increase in density and screening, particularly in and near the parking areas, along pedestrian pathways and main site entrances and along east and west property lines, and a wider variety of plantings including providing a wider variety of sizes and species to provide seasonal interest and texture.
- The continued review of landscaping can be administratively approved.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (4-0).