



Agenda Item #: 6

Project Title: 2150 Marty Road & 7751 Mid Town Road - Residential Building Complex for Midpoint Meadows Multi-Family Development. (District 1)

Legistar File ID #: 84857

Members Present: Shane Bernau, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Rafeeq Asad, Harry Graham, Marsha Rummel, David McLean, and Anina Mbilinyi

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of February 5, 2025, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Residential Building Complex located at 2150 Marty Road & 7751 Mid Town Road. Registered and speaking in support was Brian Munson. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Greg Held, Karen Scott, and Daniel Brinkman.

Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission appreciated the changes to the project and inquired about private versus public entrances and how those will be identified. The applicant noted that canopies will be located over each of the public entry doors, which will also have taller and larger doors.

The Commission inquired about Condition No. 59, looking for clarification on the pedestrian connections to Raymond Road. The applicant noted that the enhanced walkway is provided between Buildings 4 and 5, but that there are three total connections to Raymond Road. The Commission noted appreciation for the crosswalk markings in the internal parking area.

The Commission acknowledged and appreciated the revisions, the additional trees within the parking lot interior to the site, the improved landscape plan, and the addition of ornamental trees to help anchor building corners. There are still some beds that have random wavy edges, which don't necessarily relate to anything architecturally, and could be simplified and cleaned up.

The Commission noted that Conditions 57, 58, 59, and 60 seem to be met. They appreciate that the height of the wall has been brought down. Condition No. 56 is difficult; making each building different than the other is likely not their brand. Is alternating colors enough for the Commission, or do we need different styles?

The Commission noted that it is Condition No. 56 that is the one to wrestle with, and whether the buildings are responding to the site topography, which is clearly one of the biggest challenges to the site. Thinking about the intent of that comment and showing variation in the buildings and responding to topography.

The Commission noted that the biggest question on this project was "what is urban design," and what do we want to see here. I am not sure that should be hashed out with this project, but I hope we can continue to have that conversation: what is urban and what is suburban. It is a struggle because something that is suburban now, may not be later down the road.

The Commission further noted that they are struggling with grade change, topography, and that the buildings do not necessarily work with the topography as much as they may have liked. The provision of parking and in particular perpendicular parking is driving a lot of the layout and form. It is important at an Initial Approval level to really hit the brakes or be more specific about what is desired.

Action

On a motion by Graham, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion found that conditions 56-60 have been adequately addressed.

The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1-1) with Graham, Klehr, Mbilinyi, Rummel, and McLean voting yes; Asad abstaining; and Bernau non-voting.