

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: September 16, 2015

TITLE: 518-542 (formerly 550) Junction Road – PD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Community Consisting of Three Buildings with Commercial and Residential Uses. 9th Ald. Dist. (39396)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: September 16, 2015

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, Dawn O’Kroley, Michael Rosenblum, Richard Slayton and Sheri Carter.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 16, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a mixed-use community located at 518-542 Junction Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce, Ken Saiki and John Leja, representing LZ Ventures. Bruce noted changes and improvements to the plan, including activating Junction Road with entrances, a commercial entry and signage on the south end of the project, the entrance into the apartment portion of the building is now located off the central court, signage and an awning similar to south end will be installed on the north end, and individual unit entries have been simplified. Building materials include a monotone material palette in metal panels, precast stone panels and EIFS. Traffic Engineering is requiring a parking connection in the southeastern corner. Heather Stouder of the Planning Division touched on any issues contained in the Planning staff report in relation to receiving initial approval. Planning is happy to see changes in the first floor layout to address Junction Road, but still feel there is too much surface parking. A possible solution would be a dedicated parking area, possibly on the southwestern corner of the site with landscaping. A greater level of detail is needed for the amenities along the interior streetscape on the western side of the property. Bruce noted they feel strongly that the current parking counts are just adequate.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- A lighter metal may allow for the entry to appear more prominent and larger.
- What else could you do besides the EIFS?
 - We looked at a metal panel, composite metal, and cast stone panels in different locations, but when we started to look at what those details really meant, and how we would have to put those together, cost, etc. it far outweighed what we could accomplish. We think this will be successful and well-maintained.
- Was is the stone that was driving the cost or the metal?
 - Both.
- What kind of trim element that makes the U around the punched opening?

- We did not actually talk about that. My thinking is that this piece ought to be in the same EIFS material as it's going to be part of this, it's going to be touching in relation to this piece here.
- The fin maybe seems to want to go higher, take it all the way up.
- Maybe a simple stone cap on top of brick piers, and maybe that inside piece, instead of thinking of stone trim, maybe it's a sleek aluminum inset frame.
- You could even do an aluminum fin.
- Is there no way to get just the part that's engaging with the brick to be the precast and then just the inset is a different material?
 - That's easier for us to do but you look at this as a unit, it has to read together. And we have to have a color and texture match.
- If you have some precast and then all of the sudden it's EIFS, sometimes it ages differently and it would become a different tone anyway. So if you could at least do what's touching the brick, I think that's what's kind of bothersome.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Carter abstaining. The motion provided that the applicant return with more details on the use of EIFS, or non-EIFS solutions to convince the Commission that the use of EIFS is appropriate to the building's design. The motion also provided that the applicant consider banking the parking area at the site's southwesterly corner.