URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING REPORT August 28, 2024

Agenda Item #: **2**

Project Title: 1202 S Park Street - New Mixed-Use Building in Urban Design District (UDD) 7. (District 13)

Legistar File ID #: 81072

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Shane Bernau, Marsha Rummel, Christian Harper, Rafeeq Asad, Jessica Klehr, Russell Knudson, and Wendy von Below

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of August 28, 2024, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a new mixed-use building in UDD 7 located at 1202 S Park Street. Registered and speaking in support was Steve Shulfer. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Julian Walters, and Kevin Yeska. Registered in opposition and wishing to speak was Cheryl Ann Elkinton.

Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission generally thought that this iteration was an improvements from the Informational Presentation.

The Commission expressed concerns about the High Street façade appearing like back-of-the-house and not part of a four-sided building. The applicant agreed to explore more glass along the stairwell, a canopy, and enhanced landscaping with upright evergreen plantings and taller ornamentals.

The Commission discussed the building's lack of undulation and depth on the High Street elevation and that adding push and pull (6-8 inches of plane change) would give it more interest. It may also help enhance what happens below at the pedestrian level.

The Commission also inquired about the glazing requirements and how the bus stop will be accommodated in the design. The applicant noted that the bus stop is driven by Metro. The BRT and how this location ties in is unknown at this time. This location was requested by Metro. There is seating but it is not extremely wide.

The Commission inquired about the reduced parking spaces in the garage and noted that the two parking stalls adjacent to the overhead door have limited turning movement. In addition, the Commission inquired about the Juliet balconies and whether the doors were sliding doors, and whether there was separation between the upper amenity space and the private residence.

The applicant noted that the parking stalls adjacent to the overhead door could be limited to compact stalls or require backing into those stalls. The applicant also confirmed that they are sliding glass doors. The intent was to provide light and ventilation without providing an actual balcony. The applicant clarified that there will be a short wall that separates the unit patio from the club patio.

Mechanical systems and louvers were discussed. The applicant noted there will be penetrations on the exterior walls, as well as possible smaller penetrations for each unit. The Commission requested that additional information regarding vents/flue penetrations be included in the next submittal.

The Commission inquired about the retaining wall and its materials as well as privacy fence. The applicant described the retaining wall as being poured in place concrete varying in height from 3.5 to 4 feet tall with a guardrail; the privacy fence is no longer proposed.

The Commission noted the egress door that opens into the pathway from High Street to Park Street with a 3-foot clearance; a safety barrier, paint marking or bollard should be considered.

The Commission inquired about the green roof and whether irrigation would be used. The applicant responded it will likely be irrigated.

The Commission suggested alternatives to the sod area on the north side of the building; a non-invasive ground cover could be used for lower maintenance.

The Commission noted that the High Street elevation will be a front façade for some. Consideration should be given to the man doors architecturally, like canopies, etc.

The applicant agreed that those are valid comments, adding light and glazing as well as a canopy would be possible.

The Commission discussed flipping the multi-use path as suggested in the staff report. The applicant responded it would be problematic to flip it, as it traverses along the parking and exit on the south, putting the traffic in front of the units there. Commissioner Asad asked why is that a bad thing; as a pedestrian you would prefer to walk past windows, and living on the ground floor you expect people to pass by your windows. The Secretary noted that a street was originally intended in this location however has been since moved to Olin Avenue. In light of that transition, Traffic Engineering still wants a connection between High Street and S Park Street as a public multi-use path. Continued review and coordination with Traffic Engineering is required to determine the best location on this site however.

The Commission complimented the use of color in the building materials.

The Commission discussed the UDD's 40% glazing requirement. The Secretary noted that while there is a level of flexibility that is permissible, it is up to the Commission to agree with the justification for relief from the guidelines and requirements as it relates to creating a better design by not adhering to the requirement or there are limitations with the ability to do so. The Secretary noted the recent example of a similar situation with the recent Starbucks on S Park Street, though that was mainly because the building is being reused. This is a brand-new building. Commissioner Klehr noted it is subjective, but seems pretty packed with glazing. In terms of setting a precedent, she wouldn't object to saying they have to meet the 40% requirement.

The Commission noted that the project has progressed, but further information and refinements are needed for Final Approval. The building materials are great with the use of color and variation, but the tectonics can be more varied by incorporating 4-5 inches of relief. This Commission hasn't reviewed any projects with the NuCedar product, and will need to understand the details of how the boards are staggered, alignment of the seams and how it handles corner details. An alternative should be provided as part of the next submittal. In addition, additional information and design details need to be provided for the louvers. It was noted that the plantings shown on all four sides of the transformer won't be allowed by MG&E, so revisions are needed there, as well as the planting strip areas between the doors on High Street, which are areas of landscape that could be used to break up blank walls.

Action

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion included the following conditions:

- Revise the High Street elevation to incorporate articulation or changes in plane (i.e., 4-5” in relief), especially where materials transition, as well as adding windows in the stair well and/or adding canopies above entries.
- Revise the landscape plan to include additional plantings along the west elevation, including additional upright evergreens and columnar ornamentals to break down blank wall expanses, as well as additional ground plantings. These plantings should also wrap round the north side of the building to enhance the pedestrian experience.
- The landscape plan shall indicate bark mulch in all beds.
- Revise the landscape plan to show a dense ground cover on the north side of the building (i.e., low mow seeded product or a sedge) versus bluegrass type sod.
- Revise the S Park Street elevation to meet the [UDD 7] glazing requirements (40%).
- Revise the building elevations to show the louvers/penetrations and finish details indicating how they are integrated into the building design.
- Provide a final materials board.
- The inconsistencies in the plan identified in the staff report shall be corrected.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0).