



Agenda Item #: 6

Project Title: 4846 Eastpark Boulevard - Residential Building Complex. 17th Ald. Dist.

Legistar File ID #: 75854

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Rafeeq Asad, and Amanda Arnold

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of February 15, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a Residential Building Complex located at 4846 Eastpark Boulevard. Registered and speaking in support was Kevin Burow. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Luke Stauffacher, Brad Fregien, Gregory Held, Sarah Church, and Matt Schreiner.

Burow introduced the development at the American Center, which is a rather large infill development in the northwest portion of the campus that will provide additional housing. The overall plat is about 22 acres, and the first phase is 11.4 acres. The UDC's purview is lots 49 and 50, which is considered a Residential Building Complex. We are also moving forward with mixed-use along Dreamer Drive, which will carry into the future Phase 2. In Phase 1, there are three, four-story buildings, each 67 units. The two buildings on lot 50 are connected with the two-story amenity space. Central to the area is greenspace, which will be park that is privately owned with a public access easement for the public to enjoy. In the aerial layout, we have done our best to minimize and conceal the amount of parking for this development, as the neighbors are large amounts of asphalt paving. Because this is on a bus route, we are providing underground parking at a ratio of 1:1.5 stalls per unit of surface parking, which is located on the back as much as possible. The park interconnects to the commons area in the southwest portion, which is part of the American Center development that they will be developing. We wanted a strong pedestrian interconnection to that area and amongst the buildings. Moving to the elevations and renderings, the exterior is predominantly masonry and composite siding as an accent. We are introducing a couple colors of siding to highlight the corners with a more neutral darker accent along the top. Each view is fairly consistent with similar detailing and character on each side of the building. There is quite a bit of topography across the development. Moving west to east, the site rises up approximately 20 feet in elevation. The first building on lot 49 is down a story compared to the buildings on lot 50 due to the topography change. Each unit along the first floor has direct entry access. We highlighted the main public access point in the center, which is the two-story portion that connects the buildings. This project is also under the purview of the American Center. We presented to their project review committee, and it was favorably received. They are looking at overall development, so we received comments on the mixed-use buildings; the palette and materials will be similar for all of the buildings. We would appreciate your feedback on the development.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Do we have an example or breakdown of materials? The two grays look like siding. The reveals or breaks in the blue disappear, so I don't know how big it is. I have no problem with the colors, I just want to know the materials. If it is all siding, that might be weird. If not, some panels might help. It's not a bad massing, it's safe and gives a little interest. It could be more dynamic, but it's not a bad project; it has interest, it is pushing and pulling, and it works. It is safe and almost symmetrical. The proportions of openings vs. walls is safe, and I don't

mind it. If the whites and blues are also siding, it might start to detract from what's going on. It has just enough interest so that it's not a square building.

- The two gray tones are traditional lap siding. The white and blue is a panel and reveal system of siding. There are reveals between the panels and composite panels. Both white and blues are broken into vertical and horizontal panels. The masonry will likely be a utility-sized brick.
- You say safe, and I agree, but we see hats on corner tower elements all over the place. I wonder if a regular parapet roof vs. the hat on top of the building would be more streamlined and appropriate on a building of this scale?
- The general layout and attention to the large park area is a really favorable thing to see. Some areas of concern are the driveway and parking lot to the extreme east; there is a long stretch of building and a long stretch of parking lot. While I'm glad the parking is more or less visually attached to the parking area of the commercial building across the way, I don't think people on that side of the long apartment building want to look out at that expanse of asphalt. I see landscaping on the strip between the apartment parking lot and the commercial building parking lot, but I'm not sure that a bunch of small deciduous trees, which take a minimum of 15-20 years to turn into something, are providing enough screening from the business parking lot. I would like to see that bulked up with more year-round screening. It could entail some breaks of upright evergreens between deciduous trees, but I'd like to see more effort on making a visual screen, otherwise it is a poor view for anyone on that side of the building.
- There is a lot of nice stuff. The buildings are attractive, I'm happy to see some color in there and I like the blue panels. There is a decent mix of materials. One part that stuck out on the 2nd and 3rd floors was listed as silver Hardie siding, which seemed rather bright, but it might play nice with the gray tones and blue. It beats looking at earth tones.
 - Correct, it is intended to be a silver tone.
- It looks like a considerable amount of thought went into drainage patterns. As this moves along, I would like to see more detail as to what the various basins entail. Are the smaller ones dips and otherwise grass surface, and the others more of a rain garden with plants selected to live in a wet environment? This is a good start, I like the connectivity between the buildings and the park, it looks like there is nice stuff going on. Are lots 47 and 48 potential developments?
 - Lots 47 and 48 are part of this phase of development, but they do not require UDC oversight so we wanted to focus on the buildings you have authority over.
- I like the site plan overall. I think having the greenspace in the middle framed by the buildings seems to work. One thing to consider is how someone in the least desirable unit, maybe facing the parking, would get to the central green. I would make sure there's connectivity for all of those folks on the outside perimeter to have easy access back in toward the middle greenspace. I imagine some of that is through the commons area.
- The sidewalk that lines the inside of the east buildings is a pretty squared corner sidewalk that follows the building, maybe those inside corners could have radius, otherwise people will probably cut it. I don't know if this is in the development team's purview, but anywhere the sidewalk along Luminous Lane has mid-block crossings, it would be good to add crosswalk markings for safety of crossing that street.
- The two-story commons connector piece doesn't read as an entry and doesn't stand apart from other façades. With its materials and massing, I didn't immediately recognize it as a public entry. It would be beneficial to use the material palette or massing of the building to announce that as a public entry and let it stand apart more.
- Yay on the blue. Regarding previous comments on the hats on top, I think the hats add interest and will cast shade and shadow that will also add interest. Maybe just keep them over the blue areas, not over the strip of dark siding at the top where it looks less like a hat and more like a cap. The hats over the blue have some depth to them.
- I think the blue is a little severe; it feels like it wants more warmth. I don't mind the slight overhangs on the middle parts, and if you are keeping the hats on the blue corner pieces, I think I would reduce them. They look flimsy to be so cantilevered. I don't know if I'd like them removed completely, but maybe they don't need to be quite so deep.

- In the lot 49 building rendering, on the left corner of the building where the white box is sticking out, it looks odd to me the way it's popped out on both sides. When you go around, it doesn't look like quite as proud of the rest of the building, so I don't know if it's not rendered completely yet? In the same rendering, we have the lighter color panel inset in the brick, and that almost wants to be the dark color like you're seeing the back building come through. It looks too off color from the brick, and it looks flat to me. I'm wondering if a larger contrast would give it some depth so you'd have more shadow-looking on that point, just fine tuning where materials change from one to another.
- I agree that the eastern-facing part of the building could use some larger canopy trees. I know they take time to mature, but it's the right thing to do to help buffer between parking lots. The saving grace is that if it's a business there, it will be abandoned on weekends when people want to enjoy their balconies facing east. I like the general rhythms of the buildings and how the top receives the fourth floor; I like how it recedes with the darker tone siding.

Action

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