



Agenda Item #: 6

Project Title: 4205 Portage Road - Residential Building Complex. 17th Ald. Dist.

Legistar File ID #: 72121

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Shane Bernau, Russell Knudson, Jessica Klehr, Rafeeq Asad*, Christian Harper and Juliana Bennett

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

*Asad recused himself on this item

Summary

At its meeting of January 11, 2023, the Urban Design Commission made an **ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION to the Plan Commission to approve** a Residential Building Complex located at 4205 Portage Road. Registered and speaking in support were Joseph Lee, Nick Patterson, and Sixto Villegas, representing T. Wall Enterprises. Registered neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions was Patrick Terry.

Updates to the proposal include reducing the number of units in Buildings A and B, which helped to lower the buildings and lengthened the parking ramp, thus reducing the amount of exposure. Those units were retained on Buildings C and E. They have maintained building orientation to continue to frame the streets, and added walk-out patios on Buildings B and C. Landscaping changes include the addition of more varieties, and the existing Spruce trees on the north and east lot lines, will be kept and relocated to the interior of the development on the other side of the bike path, which helps create a buffer from the Interstate. The Building D planting beds have been simplified for a more linear theme. Architectural updates include a reduction in the number of color and material palettes, condensed into a cohesive composition so that the scale and massing of the buildings work within the entire development, using a combination of wood, fiber cement siding, corrugated metal, stone and wood timber frame elements. The façades are now less cluttered with strategic elimination of some of the shed roofs within the development, while maintaining them around the perimeter to further articulate these longer building lengths. The timber and roof studies found that as you start to narrow the wood members and eliminate them, it seems too light; they have gone back to the larger timber frame (10" x 10") and added the horizontals and slanted piece to have the strength to hold that corner. Different roof angles caused the building to lose its context, so it is angled to see the definition. The wallpack units are integrated into the overall patio door, creating an element rather than two different units not related to each other. The P-tack units are located under the windows with trim to appear as transoms.

The Commission discussed the following:

- We need to comment on building design and orientation, proportions, the wallpacks, landscaping and maybe also bring some comments to locations designated for future signage, although we are not reviewing signage specifically tonight.
- The timber and slope of the roof – I am absolutely in agreement that it needs to be big enough to make it worth doing. Agree on the angle you've got and the size of the timber elements.
- Why do some corners have the timber frame corners with the hats and some don't? Building D doesn't have them at all.
 - The rationale for that was when we look at the east lot line of the property, we were framing in Building D with those elements. Building D is more grandiose of the detail we are using elsewhere with balconies.

Building A is the main entrance into the development and anchors that corner, with signage proposed on the landscaping beds. As you drive up W Creekwood Lane we wanted to introduce that element again to tie it all together.

- Appreciate the fact you are able to reuse existing Spruce trees to make that barrier for the Interstate. Tree spacing and transplanting trees of that size can be tricky. Appreciate that you expanded the plant palette a little bit, you're still missing opportunities for more flowering perennials in there. Happy to see dedicated areas for annual plantings that will give more seasonal color.
- Almost every planting bed and island is showing stone mulch. We really frown on that, bark mulch is better for plants. From an aesthetic standpoint it's an old tired landscaping style. Otherwise I like the buildings, it's going to be a really nice looking complex. It's nice to see buildings that don't look necessarily like everything else.
- Are you still planning a security fence around the entire development? Is it a dark anodized material?
 - I want to say it will be black powder coated aluminum.
- There is a nine-foot difference on Building A with landscaping, I would defer to Shane and Christian on that one.
- I like the design of this building.

Action

On a motion by Bennett, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission made an **ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION to the Plan Commission to approve**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1-0) with Asad recused and Goodhart non-voting.

The motion included a friendly amendment by Knudson to include a condition to use bark mulch instead of washed stone.