



**Agenda Item #:** 3

**Project Title:** 6201 Mineral Point Road - Major Alteration to a Previously Approved Planned Development (PD) for Oakwood Village Independent Living-University Woods. (District 19)

**Legistar File ID #:** 92813

**Members Present:** Shane Bernau, Chair; Anina Mbilinyi, David McLean, Nicholas Hellrood, Rafeeq Asad

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

## Summary

At its meeting of July 29, 2026, the Urban Design Commission made an advisory motion to the Plan Commission **APPROVE** a major alteration to a previously approved Planned Development (PD) located at 6201-6209 Mineral Point Road. Registered and speaking in support were Samantha Farrell Folger, Jennifer Sodo, and Keith VanLanduyt. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Chris Leinss, and Anne Anderson.

### Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission inquired about the west and east sidewalks. The west has handrails and more significant topography, the east is a more accessible route, to the new walking loop to connect to more natural conditions on the east side.

The Commission asked about how the building materials make for a more modern application and look. The older campus has out-of-date architecture. We are not using new materials in a way that is "noisy," used one color per building, using a lighter color in the middle, and on select inset balconies to break down the volume further. Trying to do something cost effective but impactful and contemporary, bringing in the warmth of natural stone on the first floor references adjacent buildings, providing a more human scale, with detailing around the windows to marry that darker banding to language used on the upper floors.

The Commission inquired about symmetrical window openings.

The Commission asked about the garage entry where at-grade mechanicals are located. There will be transformers, still working through shielding those as much as possible with plantings. The Commission commented on the void spaces in the landscape plan in front of that. There is a really strong hedge to the east of those transformers, but it is still quite visible as you come up the driveway. Maybe consider wrapping some of that landscape treatment in front of them and beefing it up some more.

The Commission talked about certain volumes that have more material above the upper windows than other spaces; is that a taller parapet for screening? Yes, have been selective about parapet heights and screening and careful about what you can see from the ground.

The Commission inquired about why the top of the building doesn't have something else to articulate the lower part of the building, a different color, to meet the sky. The team replied they studied a lot of options, it came down to campus context with neighboring buildings having heavier parapets, the clear verticality of the corrugated metal offset that expression.

The Commission commented that the vertical ribbing kind of seems like it wants to keep going and not have a top on it. The “u” itself is a termination of the glass rise, could be seen either way. Kind of like the heavy tops.

The Commission noted that there is a need to finish the top and create lightness where there is currently heavy at the top. Integrating a thinner, lighter color band could work. It would be good to think about that.

The Commission asked about where the precast material is landing in the composition. The balconies are screened in, metal clad, a simplistic expression of the balconies, with precast at the base for substructure and trim.

The Commission commented that the new sidewalk on the east side of driveway looks maybe to be conflicting with some plant material and may need small shifts.

As a replacement for what’s there, this isn’t out of character. The finish at the top doesn’t have to be just coping, something to articulate the top. Consideration could also be given to the amount of glass at the corners. These horizontal bands are very strong.

The Commission commented on the colors of the materials, the gauge of the metal panel, and the striation pattern, none of which is coming through very clearly in the renderings. It’s not clear what the articulation or color is.

The Commission talked about expressing the corners with larger fenestration or volumes. There is space for change or variation at the corners that will probably help that mass feel not so tall or heavy at the top. Right now, it’s all the same material, all the way down. How do you get that vertical piece at the top for a lid, something that projects, something to break up that volume, maybe just corner pieces?

The Commission noted that the old principle of base, middle, and top is a good guideline to design to. Look for a way to bring the solid piece that is taller so that it is more in line with the rest of the massing. Is it something that projects or recessed, but it needs to break up the corner volume. Doesn’t have to be a coping, just a change in material.

## Action

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Mbilinyi, the Urban Design Commission made an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission to **APPROVE**, with the following conditions:

- The proposal return to UDC for final approval.
- The building corner elements shall be refined to reduce the amount of materials and mass, especially at the top of the building including but not limited to integrating material changes, recesses, lids, protrusions, for example.
- The applicant shall provide more details and definition related to the metal panel materials and joint lines.
- The applicant shall provide the design progressions in the resubmittal materials.
- The landscape plan shall be updated to incorporate additional screening around above ground utilities.

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