



**Agenda Item #:** 7

**Project Title:** 2150 Marty Road & 7751 Mid Town Road - Residential Building Complex for Midpoint Meadows Multi-Family Development. (District 1)

**Legistar File ID #:** 84857

**Members Present:** Shane Bernau, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Russell Knudson, Harry Graham, David McLean, and Anina Mbiliyi

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

## Summary

At its meeting of November 20, 2024, the Urban Design Commission made an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission to **APPROVE** a Residential Building Complex for Midpoint Meadows located at 2150 Marty Road and 7751 Mid Town Road. Registered and speaking in support was Greg Held. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Daniel Brinkman, and Karen Scott.

### Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission asked about the grade change and retaining wall material. The applicant noted it would be either field stone boulders or block limestone, but that the detail has not been finalized.

The Commission inquired as to sidewalks on the outside perimeter. The applicant noted there will be sidewalks around the public streets, and a 10-foot bike path will be located on the Raymond Road frontage.

The Commission asked about the parking ratio; the applicant responded it is approximately a 1.65:1 parking ratio, which they see as an adequate amount.

The Commission inquired about the parking lot pavement, and whether pervious pavers were considered. The applicant replied there was pushback because of silting, and the regional stormwater; they would prefer mitigation of urban heat island effect through trees and plantings.

The Commission complimented the blue color of building material, and inquired about variety of materials and colors in the five buildings making them more individualistic. The applicant replied that the team wanted something more cohesive, but that they were willing to consider providing more variation. The Commission noted that given the number of buildings and mass, it warrants another look.

The Commission inquired about the parking lot layout, and if another design was considered. The applicant replied that they don't like parallel parking, and don't anticipate any glare from headlights given the grade.

The Commission inquired about the height of the retaining wall around Building 6 and the possibility of terracing for a better pedestrian experience. The applicant responded that the civil engineer thought it would be a tough fit, but that he would like to take another look at that.

The Commission asked about connectivity to future neighbors, and midblock crossings, getting people to S High Point and Raymond Road. The applicant noted it is connected outward in every direction. The Commission inquired about street crossings on Raymond Road, design as an opportunity to communicate what makes sense for this development – providing a bigger gesture for pedestrian connectivity here may make sense. The applicant did not have any information related to the other sites, but that there will be a multi-use path on Raymond Road.

The Commission inquired about whether there is an opportunity to locate a similar connection point like the one between Building 2 and 3 to be located between Building 3 and 4. The applicant noted that they are not opposed to looking at that, but that they have created places to gather and direct pedestrian connections.

The Commission remarked on the amount of parking, with on-street parking being an essential component of good urban design and questioned the limited allowance of on-street parking on S High Point Road. The applicant noted the grade changes make direct unit entries unfeasible without large costly staircases. The City is designing the profile of the streets. The Commission noted that they are trying to distinguish between good urban design and suburban design and having direct connectivity to the street is part of that.

The Commission noted several areas (Building 3) with vacant landscape corners where an ornamental scale tree would help anchor the building and architecture to the site. Center public commons island space plantings are lacking a lot of design, where it could be so much more. Drifts of ornamental grasses, and drifts of prairie should be used rather than an uninspired line, groupings or masses of plantings versus linear planting beds. Bark mulch should be used rather than stone mulch.

The Commission remarked that there needs to be more articulation with the street, better connectivity, more greenery in the center court, and less white building material. The applicant responded there will be more variation in the stone material than what is coming through in the renderings, as well as texture and contrast.

The Commission discussed the growth of the city, urban versus suburban design, and what is appropriate for this site. An island with a swimming pool is not urban. The amenity is a contemporary metaphor for a neighborhood park, surrounded by a parking lot. Perpendicular parking is suburban; this is a key differentiator, the parking ratio and vehicular parking everywhere. This development is an opportunity to create a pedestrian-oriented development, to gesture at how pedestrians can break out of this site to get to another site. This development has an opportunity to set a precedent for how the rest of the area develops in this area. Right now, this is auto oriented and has failed to set a precedent that is urban in nature. Ultimately, it's up to the Plan Commission to determine whether this is the precedent they want to set.

## Action

On a motion by Knudson, seconded by McLean, the Urban Design Commission made an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission to **APPROVE** with the following finding and conditions:

- The application return to the UDC for Final Approval and to resolve following details:
  - Overall, the Commission finds that the proposed massing and building composition is lacking a variety in its massing and roof structures that are appropriate for an urban design aesthetic. The building design and massing shall be refined to better respond to the site grading and provide a better transition across the site, as well as locating mass in more appropriate locations.
  - The landscape plan shall be revised to increase the shade tree coverage in the parking areas.
  - The retaining wall around Building 6 shall be redesigned to be terraced to minimize the blank walls along the street and provide a more pedestrian scale and incorporate landscape.

- The site plan shall be revised to provide an enhanced pedestrian connection along Raymond Road between Buildings 3 and 4, similar to the enhanced pedestrian connection between Buildings 2 and 3.
- The landscape plan shall be revised to incorporate ornamental scale trees to anchor the building corners; within the central amenity space the planting plan should be reorganized to create drifts, groupings or massing of plants versus singular linear planting beds; to reflect hardwood mulch versus stone mulch.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (5-0).