



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 4846 Eastpark Boulevard
Application Type: Residential Building Complex
UDC is an Advisory Body
Legistar File ID #: [76596](#)
Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Greg Held, Knothe & Bruce Architects, LLC | Luke Stauffacher, Cascade Development | American Family Insurance

Project Description: The applicant is proposing the construction of two, four-story residential buildings, one of which is connected by a two-story “Commons” area amenity space that will serve the residential development. A total of 201 units are proposed. The development will be served by both underground and surface parking. In addition, as part of the Phase 1 development, a two-acre private park is also proposed.

Project Schedule:

- The UDC received an Informational Presentation on February 15, 2023.
- The Plan Commission is scheduled to review this proposal on April 24, 2023.

Approval Standards: The UDC will be an **advisory body** on this request. Section 28.151 of the Zoning Code requires that Residential Building Complexes be reviewed by the Urban Design Commission pursuant to the provisions in Section 33.24(4)(c). Section 33.24(4)(c), Residential Building Complexes, states: *“The Urban Design Commission shall review the exterior design and appearance of all principal buildings or structures and the landscape plans of all proposed residential building complexes. It shall report its findings and recommendations to the City Plan Commission.”*

Summary of Design Considerations

Staff requests that the UDC make findings and provide an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission on the development proposal regarding the aforementioned standards, including as it relates to the items noted below.

- **Building Design and Materials.** Staff requests the UDC’s feedback and findings on the overall building mass and scale, specifically as it relates to the surrounding context and character, rhythm and articulation (vertical and horizontal building elements), and architectural detailing, especially as it relates to the Commission’s Informational Presentation comments, including:
 - The design of the tower elements, specifically as it relates to the scale of the roof overhangs (“hats”),
 - Streamlining the building design by utilizing a parapet roof in between tower elements versus a roof overhang, and
 - Utilizing an enhanced design aesthetic, varied materials palette or different massing on the “commons” building so that it is identifiable as a public entry.



- **Building Materials and Composition.** As shown on the elevations the building materials palette is comprised of multiple types and colors of composite siding, as well as masonry, including cast stone and brick. Staff requests UDC provide feedback and make findings on the overall material palette related to the number of materials proposed, as well as their composition and transitions, particularly those within the same plane, ornamentation and detailing and change in color palette, which transitioned from a warmer palette to a cooler one. As noted in the UDC’s Informational Presentation comments, consideration should be given to fine tuning where materials change from one to another.

Informational Presentation – Elevations



Initial/Final Approval - Elevations

- **Landscape and Open Space.** Staff requests UDC provide feedback and findings on the overall landscape plan and plant palette as it relates to providing year-round color, texture, individual unit privacy, especially for those units facing public/common areas, and screening of blank walls and surface parking areas. Staff refers the Commission to the Informational Presentation comments, which focused on:
 - Providing additional screening and large canopy trees along the eastern edge of the development, including breaks of up-right evergreens,
 - Providing more detail regarding the planting within bioretention areas (see civil plans),
 - Providing enhanced connectivity to the park, especially for those units located on the outside perimeter of the development,
 - Designing pedestrian pathways to be more organic versus a rigid design that follows the building, and
 - Plans show a combination of wood and stone mulch and staff requests UDC provides feedback on the appropriateness of those applications.

Summary of UDC Informational Presentation Comments

As a reference, the Commission's comments from the February 15, 2023, Informational Presentation are provided below:

- 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.