



Agenda Item #: 7

Project Title: 345 W Main Street - Major Amendment to an Approved Planned Development (PD) for the Construction of an Independent Living Facility for Capitol Lakes Retirement Community. (District 4)

Legistar File ID #: 86359

Members Present: Shane Bernau, Chair; Russell Knudson, Marsha Rummel, Rafeeq Asad, Harry Graham, and David McLean

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of December 18, 2024, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a major amendment to an approved Planned Development (PD) for Capitol Lakes Retirement Community located at 345 W Main Street. Registered and speaking in support were Tim Conroy, and Jason Erdahl. Registered in support and available to answer questions Sarah Stevens, Sarah Lynch, and Jeson Nguyen.

Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission confirmed that the development proposal is intended to serve independent living. The applicant confirmed, the development will be set-up much like a multi-family dwelling unit.

The Commission commented on the proposed four-story building height and questioned why it isn't taller. The applicant responded that this part of the block is in a four-story zone; as you move up Doty Street, it increases to a maximum of eight (8) stories. The Commission discussed bonus stories, with the Secretary explaining how additional height could be achieved through the major amendment to the Planned Development.

The Commission discussed the unit entries versus a main building entry, noting it is difficult to tell the front of the building without any signified entry. The hierarchy of the building and its entries should be addressed. The applicant noted that this project does not have a public entry, only residential entries. The main lobby is part of the main campus and is located along W Main Street.

The Commission discussed mechanical equipment and screening, as well as possible louvers. The applicant noted there will be parapets with screening for mechanicals on the roof, and that the elevator may not actually go that tall. The applicant noted that these details are still be worked out, but the intent is to centrally locate the mechanicals and screen with the parapet.

The Commission discussed the material palette, and how it fits in contextually. The applicant responded that the masonry base is contextual with the campus, without replicating one of the many styles on the campus. Other materials include fiber cement siding, horizontal lap/residential, smoother on the top in fiber cement panel or composite panel, with some transition bands to articulate those materials. The Commission commented that certain types of affordable housing shouldn't be pointed out by the materials they use. With a higher degree of design in how those materials are used, they can look just as good as market rate housing. Flat facades look cheap and dated. There needs to be push and pull so it's not just the banding that makes the base, middle and top.

The Commission inquired about the mature healthy trees in the terrace. The applicant noted they are working to preserve and protect the existing trees. There is possible sidewalk rework in the future that may affect some trees.

The Commission discussed the landscaping on the interior side of the building. The applicant noted that the existing outdoor area for assisted living will go away as part of this development. The Commission advocated for any potential to reintroduce living things back into that core.

The Commission asked about the parking going under another existing building; the applicant noted it is under the courtyard area. The Commission suggested opportunities to introduce natural light into the subgrade parking.

The Commission asked about the amount of glazing that could lead to cooler/hotter spaces, and to think about an appropriate amount of glazing that is comfortable for the occupants.

The Commission commented that this is a badly needed housing type in this city and that additional height is encouraged. The Commission noted that additional height could still result in a successful transition if designed right.

Encouragement was given to consider how the entrances could be more pronounced both along W Main and individual unit entries. Addressing the blank walls along the sidewalk/ways to break up the solid walls at the pedestrian level and how those are treated. The raised parking creates some voids in the architecture and design; consideration should be given to the locations and design of necessary louvers for ventilation. Overall, the base does not support the top, those are in conflict with each other.

The Commission noted that they will pay particular attention to those blank walls and pedestrian experience when this item returns for approvals. Consideration could be given to a planter wall (2-4 feet in height), a structured softscape to bring down the scale of the blank base – something to create an edge but also hold landscape. This is a vibrant downtown location, try to retain those moments where you can see into the inner campus.

In regard to the building materials and design language, the Commission inquired about how this development ties into the rest of the campus. The applicant noted that there are a variety of architectural styles present on the campus. Overall, the desire is to have it fit in really well with brick and masonry materials, a similar tone, but not match style-wise.

The Commission noted that the rooftop amenity space is supported and encouraged noting that the design challenge is that it is up high and it is flat; there is no other structure to serve as your “back”. The Commission noted that the design of this space should have elements/features that define the space and hold it, including landscape and some element of structure to anchor it.

The Commission stated support for more height in the project.

Action

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no formal action was taken by the Commission.