



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 160 Westgate Mall
Application Type: Planned Development Pre-Application Conference / Informational Review
Legistar File ID # [60411](#)
Prepared By: Janine Glaeser, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Jacob Klein with JT Klein and Melissa Huggins with Urban Assets

Project Description: The applicant is requesting Informational Review feedback for a PD- General Development Plan (GDP) that includes multiple four to five story buildings that contain a total of 234 residential units and a future office & clinic building. The new internal streets will be maintained as private streets.

Project Schedule:

- The development team is submitting UDC and Land Use applications this May.

Approval Standards:

The UDC is an **advisory body** on the PD request. As with any Planned Development, the Urban Design Commission is required to provide a recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in Zoning Code sections 28.098(1), Statement of Purpose, and (2), Standards for Approval. (**PD Standards for Approval.**)

Summary of Design Considerations and Recommendations

Staff recommends that the UDC provide feedback as to how the current proposal meets the PD Standards. In reviewing these standards, staff requests feedback be provided on how the proposal relates to adjacent sites as well as the existing surrounding context.

The site is currently developed with a one-story shopping center. The [Comprehensive Plan](#), adopted in 2018, recommends “Regional Mixed-Use” Development for the subject site, which is the Plan’s most intensive mixed-use district outside of Downtown. Such areas are recommended to have an intensive mix of regional-serving retail, office, service, entertainment, civic, institutional and high-density residential uses and be between two and 12 stories. The site is also within the planning area for the [Midvale Heights/Westmorland Joint Neighborhood Plan](#), adopted in 2009. That plan depicts three 4-6 mixed-use redevelopment concepts for this site.

Planning staff would like to emphasize the importance of the proposed building relationships to the public street facing areas on Whitney Way and Tokay Blvd and encourage activation of the streetscape for both public and private streets. Staff further requests that the UDC provide feedback on the development’s relationship to the adjacent Odana School Park and the architectural directional and differentiation of the proposed buildings.

UDC Informational Review Comments

<p>Site Plan</p>	<p>It's unclear how the public/private boundaries are defined for the private entrances off of the public lawn.</p> <p>Have questions about general access to the site. Are residents/visitors approaching from the east (say on Tokay or Segoe) relegated, because of the median on Tokay, to entering the complex through Hyvee's parking lots unless they want to go all the way around to Whitney Way?</p> <p>2 - Too homogeneous in height, use scale and look. Tokay is more residential, why not face senior apts. There and make clinic mid-block? Market-rate apts. orientation does not address various site conditions (steep hill @ Epic, side wall of grocery store, private drive) – just placed there because they fit. Private drives have no character.</p> <p>Dense development with limited green space tucked at far south end. Also see landscape comments about lawn connectivity.</p>
<p>Architecture</p>	<p>First floor units need clearly defined boundary to their patios - some seem close to the sidewalk/drive to garage entry. Sloped roofs seem slightly small in scale.</p> <p>At first glance, the three styles of buildings make a nice compromise between individuality but working well together as a development.</p> <p>4 - Very average and typical of the type of stuff we've been seeing in far-west developments for years.</p> <p>The building rendered in grey and rust – believe its Sr. Housing Phases II & III – is cleanly contemporary and simple in design and materials. The other buildings feel derivative and busy – not fresh designs.</p>
<p>Landscape Plan</p>	<p>Hopefully there is pervious paving. Connection to the adjacent Odana School Park seems misplaced - it seems almost semi-private. Maybe this connection should be a bigger design feature? Can it come off the public patio at the end of the public lawn?</p> <p>Street plantings are going to be important for the long views down the private drives.</p> <p>The 'lawn' is nice feature but doesn't connect to the park in any way. Topography issue? Also, the right- angle intersection of the two private drives is an opportunity for a clarified pedestrian crossing (table top, unique paving, etc.) Could also slow & guide traffic through the site.</p>
<p>Site Amenities/Lighting</p>	<p>3 - Open spaces are just there to accommodate vehicular traffic. No real connection to Odana Park.</p>
<p>Signs– if shown, do they complement the architecture? <i>(sign approvals will be a separate application.)</i></p>	
<p>Pedestrian/Vehicle Circulation</p>	<p>Make a better, more public pedestrian connection to Odana School Park, especially for families to keep an eye on kids going to the park</p> <p>See site plan comments above.</p> <p>3</p>

	<p>Seniors attempting to access bus transfer center/BRT will have to cross 6-lane Whitney Way – no small challenge. Car access off Tokay is unclear – will median remain or be opened? Will car access be permitted off Odana through HyVee lot? Will HyVee lot be accessible through the ‘private drives’? Could end up being a lot of traffic through the site depending on circulation rules.</p>
<p>Urban Context</p>	<p>The mixed types of residences is nice. This seems like a great neighborhood/site for senior housing.</p> <p>Nice transition from more commercial area to the traditional residential neighborhoods to the east. Avoids the conflicts when these types of apartments go up immediately adjacent to single family homes.</p> <p>3 – Does not achieve goals set forth in Comprehensive Plan and Neighborhood Plan.</p> <p>This project, like the residential one we just saw on Odana, drops a dense urban residential solution into a suburban commercial context. Understand the intent and long-term direction, but it’s an awkward fit at present. These ‘pioneer’ developments may need some city infrastructure assistance to make them work (e.g., pedestrian crossings, wider sidewalks and streetscaping, connection to bike paths, etc.).</p>
<p>Overall Rating (1-10)</p>	<p>6.5, 7, 3 & 5</p>

*Individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10. The scale is: 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding.