



**Agenda Item #:** 7

**Project Title:** 5817 Halley Way - Major Alteration to a Previously Approved Planned Development (PD). (District 3)

**Legistar File ID #:** 91588

**Members Present:** Shane Bernau, Chair; David McLean, Davy Mayer, Anina Mbilinyi, Jessica Klehr, Rafeeq Asad

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

## Summary

At its meeting of February 4, 2026, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a major alteration to a previously approved Planned Development (PD). Registered and speaking in support was Julie Graham. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Hayden Frank.

### Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission inquired about the north elevation where there were previously three volumes, noting this version is accepting the grade and expressing that in the building. It might need more, such as bookending the two ends.

The Commission asked why the top cherry material is so scarcely applied. The applicant replied that costs are a factor, as well as not wanting so many materials shifting; this is more refined and quieter while adding some color, matching the sister building would be too much.

The Commission liked the application of materials, and how they overlap and intercept. However, they did want to see more of the wood on the northeast perspective. It is a very sophisticated use of materials and how they intersect, hopefully that stays throughout the project. It may be beneficial to revisit the cantilevers and balcony sizes and how they return, but this overall concept is a strong project.

The Commission noted that there is a lot of stone pretty high up; looking at how to better break up some of the stone mass may be good, including in the patio area.

The Commission commended this lovely outdoor space. The pattern of windows is fairly consistent except one area, where there are the narrow short windows. The applicant noted those windows are responding to the floor plan, bringing light into spaces like a bathroom or closet.

The Commission talked about the height of the stone wall, the ramp coming down, and the possibility of steps to break up some of that stone mass. The applicant replied that the residents are 55+ and it seemed right to keep it simple with just the ramp. The Commission suggested it could benefit from a second look.

The Commission inquired about the west elevation, the gray blank wall, that used to be glazing and is now closed off. The applicant noted this was previously a fully glazed stair, but they felt it was overkill. There is still a slice of windows down the entire stairwell and along the whole base of the building, as well as a lot of exposure on the main traffic areas, where they have added signs to strongly identify.

The Commission noted this is a real opportunity to reconfigure some of the landscape to tie in and work well with the patio. Using taller plant material to help break down the mass of the stone masonry, the layout of the path could be beautiful and dramatic, right now it looks uninspired. There are planting material opportunities for not just reorganizing the plants but taking a swing at grouping plants in larger massings to anchor the architecture into the site and open space.

The Commission inquired about locations for louvers. The applicant replied every unit has a louver, for the most part there aren't any on the primary façade. There are two units in the building with louvers in the recess, otherwise they are on the side in the patio, and they will color match on those two units.

The Commission asked if there was any way to line up the louvers with the window sills/lintels. The applicant responded that there is flexibility there.

The Commission talked briefly about how the top of the building is finished and whether the coping is working.

## Action

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