

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** March 27, 2019

TITLE: 1312 S. Park Street – SSM Dean Medical **REFERRED:**
Clinic Redevelopment Located in UDD

No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (55051) **REREFERRED:**

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: March 27, 2019 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Cliff Goodhart, Jessica Klehr, Tom DeChant, Rafeeq Asad and Shane Bernau.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 27, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on the SSM Dean Medical Clinic redevelopment located at 1312 S. Park Street in UDD No. 7. Registered in support of the project were Melissa Huggins, Jenny Nelson, Sareena Daniel, Tony Sullivan, David Vogel, Tim Scanley, Sara Maas, Brandon Kinl, Paul Widlarz and Cynthia McCallum, all representing SSM Health.

Scanley reviewed the existing clinic and site context. It's an interesting parcel of land in terms of design and how to incorporate it back into the City street grid. There is an existing Pick N Save grocery store on Park Street; placing the new clinic along Park Street seemed the best location. He reviewed the context of the street edge, the housing stock and other commercial buildings. This is phase one of a multi-phase master plan, thinking about how the building will grow and accommodate those phases. Development along Fish Hatchery Road is a long-term vision, but at this point they are experimenting with scale and size rather than specific healthcare functions on that piece of property. An analysis of current parking conditions show a total of 866 parking stalls on SSM property including Pick N Save, the current patient parking lot, a couple of ancillary parking lots, and the St. Mary's parking lot. (remote from the hospital). SSM does not presently own Pick N Save but do have a contract to acquire it within the next few months. There is a large parking requirement for this type of facility. The building is 175,000 square feet at 5-stories, which would require 700 parking stalls (50% patient/50% staff). They are working on a traffic analysis to fine tune what that parking ratio needs to be. They are working with the City to plan for extending through the site on Cedar Street to make the Wingra Triangle easier to develop and network through the area. The current entrance to the building is shown on Cedar Street. On the east side of the building they are planning a pedestrian entry off of Park Street. Service vehicles (trash and deliveries) would occur at the back of the building on Cedar Street and South Street, which assumes new street construction. They reviewed the parking lot scenarios with a few options, which also require the demolition or relocation of several vacant houses that SSM owns. They are in the very early stage of design showing the scale of a 5-story building with a penthouse and its relationship to both Park Street (setbacks of 0-10 feet) and the relationship of the building to a "new" Cedar Street. A lot of the massing will be dictated by the

clinical program; they are tasked with creating a building that allows for those clinical programs to ebb and grow as they need to over time. One of the requirements is to create a setback while maintaining a straight extrusion of the building as it responds to the interior programming.

The Secretary shared Planning staff's concerns regarding the large amount of surface parking and the phasing of the project. UDD No. 7 requires a setback at the third floor which is not shown on these plans. The Chair noted that the Commission received a memo from the neighborhood association urging structured parking, stormwater detention and concern about vehicular traffic on Midland possibly being increased.

Public Comment

Cindy McCallum: this gives a great opportunity to use contemporary measures to deal with stormwater more effectively. The long-range plan includes structured parking but perhaps it could be done first. The amount of sun that will be reflected on the other side of Park Street is of concern. The neighborhood has worked hard with the City to maintain at least an 8-foot setback along Park Street; this design will hang over the 8-feet and the sun angle will still be over those homes.

The Commission discussed the following:

- This is my neighborhood but there is no conflict. I share the serious issue of surface parking and the stormwater impact. This is a wet neighborhood already, adding impervious surface is a concern. I'm puzzled as to why this isn't a Planned Development we can hold to a master plan; we can't ensure it will be built. There are too many unknowns that leave it up in the air for the community and the urban fabric of the area. We have consistently tried to push back buildings at the ground floor to give even more than what UDD requires; this is a bus rapid transit route that could take some of the road where it's already tight. I would like to have you come back with full building measurements and a shadow study, those will be important issues for the neighborhood. The big issue is also your schedule and its impact on the neighborhood. There is grave neighborhood concern about losing the only full service grocery store and leaving a food desert for thousands of households over a several years period.
 - The team takes the stormwater concerns seriously. We were surprised to learn the amount of impervious area after phase one is less than what currently exists. All the new parking we're putting in includes the required City greenspace. Regarding timing, it has to do with a multitude of factors, but principally we have to finish the acquisition of Pick N Save, SSM needs to proceed with its replacement because they cannot continue to function as required in that location. We believe the answer to the community and City includes other partners to replace the grocery store, we can't control that. SSM is prepared to make decisions on what it can control.
- I would say SSM does control the schedule.
 - Of our building, but not over the grocery store.
- What's the area of hard surface parking?
 - I did not calculate the actual square footage at the 30 year plan. What we're showing in that parking garage is approximately 100 cars per floor potentially multi-floors. Right now we don't know what it's going to be.
- Do you have data from your clinic or other clinics for their ratios? Rather than industry standards that could be more concrete? You cited industry standards in your examples, but we need more localized data that look at more urban sites.
 - We could pull together some local examples.
- These clinics seem to have a lot of expansion. We need to have some understanding about how this is all going to work out with the type of uses.

- Things are moving from inpatient to outpatient and functions are moving out of St. Mary's and into the clinic nearby. SSM has other facilities in Madison that are at or near the end of their useful life that we are preparing to put on this site. And we have office space that we lease and may be located elsewhere.
- But we do need some understanding moving forward as to how it's going to fit. There's just a very hint of that but not much understanding. Your presentation focuses on the internal dynamic for the institution, not how it fits into the City and neighborhood. I urge you to respond to those needs and how it's going to fit. Dismissing setbacks and other ordinances is not a good way to present that; the City has reasons for those so try and think about how you can be a good partner as well.
- This is informational but difficult to analyze because there's not a lot of information provided. You say this is less surface parking than what is there, just because it's less doesn't mean it's better. I don't know how it fits into the concept of the neighborhood. The perspective looking towards the Peloton, that doesn't fit, nothing about that recognizes or fits the integrity of this block. I don't know if you have to go high rather than wide, but definitely show more concern to the context around you. It's just a massive building surrounded by a lot of unnecessary pavement. Look at minimizing the amount of asphalt on this site. Look at the context of Park Street because it has a culture of its own and this doesn't work.
- On a positive note a development of this size and complexity has real opportunities to improve the neighborhood. There's opportunities to do it right. As far as the streetscape there are definitely sections that are pretty brutal but this is an opportunity to make it more pedestrian-friendly. Is South Street important to your plan and circulation?
 - The existing clinic needs to remain in operation until the new one is completed. If SSM owns everything around this, does South Street need to exist? The City wanted to continue connections, and we felt access in and out of our parking lot would be easiest with a public street through it. We just don't know what the future holds for the buildings that might come in future phases.
- It should feel like a quality streetscape, whether that's trees, pedestrian amenities, crosswalks. Why does Cedar Street jog if it's going to come out perpendicular to Park Street?
 - Currently Cedar Street to the east of Park Street is shifted in order to align with that, as well as eating too much into SSM property, it's really straddling the property line. There's an existing two-story multi-family and that's why Cedar Street jogs around that. Currently Appleton Street is the main entrance to the clinic, that would go away and there would be a land swap between the City and SSM.
- For the next presentation it would be good to see what you're proposing for the demolition of the homes you referred to.
- There has long been envisioned a bike path on South Street. There was a potential intersection with the Wingra Creek.
 - Existing South Street has some wonderful old trees that we would want to keep. City Engineering has plans to fix some things on South Street.
- I don't understand what's happening with High Street.
 - It's currently a dead end. At this point we're really not touching High Street, we're having service vehicles service the back of the building without having to go down High Street.
 - There's been some discussion about whether or not the City would require a turn-around on High Street if we were to use that. But a turn-around is very space consuming. We would lose a dramatic amount of parking that would end up on Fish Hatchery Road, so we're trying to be sensitive and balance those issues.
- I understand all of these future buildings are hypothetical and you don't have a clear idea of phase one through whatever. For everything we see I would like to see exactly what will be left on the entire site after phase one, whether they're existing homes, you're going to re-seed, etc. We need to see what we

are leaving as an acceptable site in the neighborhood. I still would like to see some form of forethought with the next phase.

- We haven't shown the thought process behind the phasing, but we have looked at the circulation of phase one and if a phase two building were to come online, how it grows logically so we don't design ourselves into a corner. There is an idea of this public concourse that really ties all the different future buildings together. Having a very clear, simple form of circulation that links all the phases together.
- I would encourage you to really push the envelope to maximize water infiltration to the greatest extent possible. You do have an impact on your neighbors and those small houses, not to mention the creek and the bay.
 - The building will have two green roofs.
- As you know Park Street gets more narrow and dense as you go north. In previous projects we and the applicants have really struggled with an appropriate setback that's commensurate with the height and density of the building because the sites are small without much room in the back. We're going to hold the next applicant, your neighbors' feet to the fire. We have a real opportunity between Cedar and Midland to do a really significant development with an appropriate setback, especially if you're looking at a building likely to be 70-feet tall and how it relates to the south of you.
- Options 1 and 2 are pretty much the same, but Option 3, it looks like you're going to reuse this lot and for the short-term leave everything along Fish Hatchery Road vacant.
 - It presents SSM with being in the position where patients and staff have to cross two streets to get to the clinic rather than just one. That's the one concern about that option.
- For the other options what is the short-term plan for that lot, if you can get all your parking north of Cedar?
 - We would work to move those cars to a true off site location. I would say also that we only want to build the minimum amount of surface parking that's required for the business we have. We need to discover that. For the land that's leftover, we've talked about greenspace, activated greenspace, could be used by the community, what does the City want to see, these are all things that we want feedback on to be able to make those decisions.
- I understand your reluctance to put out there what you don't have resolved, but that leaves a lot of uncertainty about the locations of these things and how much structured parking there should be, and how that might expand. In the long-term that's not a good land use for this area. It's very hard for us to make a comfortable decision. Try to find a way to bridge that or solve that for what you're presenting.
- You could have a significant triangle greenspace there without giving up hardly any parking north of that parking lot. Concerns about run-off and impervious surface might be relatively easy for you to achieve.
- Please show the mature trees in your next presentation.

ACTION:

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