



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**Project Address:** 702-750 University Row & 5119 Silvertree Run

**Application Type:** Major Amendment to an Approved Planned Development (PD) for Expansion of UW Digestive Health Clinic in UDD 6  
**UDC is an Approving Body**

**Legistar File ID #:** [83466](#)

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

## Background Information

**Applicant | Contact:** Jenni Eschner, Eppstein Uhen Architects | Paul Lenhart, University Row Clinic, LLC/GI Clinic, LLC

**Project Description:** The applicant is proposing an expansion of the existing UW Digestive Health Clinic. The project includes the construction of a four-story addition to the existing building, which includes the relocation of the main building entrance to University Row. In addition, the applicant is proposing the construction of a separate three-story, four-level parking structure with a covered walk-way connecting it to the building.

### Project History:

- In June 2023, the UDC reviewed and subsequently approved a similar development proposal for the expansion of the UW Health Digestive Health Clinic (Legistar File ID [76633](#)). Like the current proposal, the previous approval included an addition to the existing clinic building, but that included a more integrated parking structure, as well as the relocation of the building's main entry to University Row. As part of the previous approval, several exceptions to the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Overlay Zone were granted by the Common Council. These included those related to maximum building setbacks and site standards for automobile infrastructure as it pertained to the location of the drop-off area being between the building and street. For reference, the specific TOD Overlay Zone exceptions that were approved as part of this application are noted below.
- UDC received an Informational Presentation on May 29, 2024.
- UDC granted Initial Approval on September 11, 2024, with conditions. The Commission's approval included conditions of approval as noted below.
- The Plan Commission recommended conditional approval of this request at their September 23, 2024, meeting.
- The Common Council conditionally approved this request at their October 8, 2024, meeting.

**Approval Standards:** The UDC is both an **approving and advisory body** on this development. As an **approving body**, the UDC is reviewing this as new development in Urban Design District 6 ("UDD 6"). This requires that the Urban Design Commission review the proposed project for consistency with the requirements and guidelines for that district in [MGO Section 33.24](#)(13).

The UDC was also an **advisory body** on Planned Development request. For Planned Developments the Urban Design Commission was also required to provide a recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in Zoning Code sections 28.098(2). As noted above, the Planned Development Zoning has been conditionally approved.

As noted above, at the September 11, 2024, meeting, the Commission granted Initial Approval of this item with conditions that generally spoke to the design of the parking garage, including as it related to the integration of the metal panel into the overall building design, utilizing a similar level of design and detailing at all building corners, as well as the landscape and screening of the structure at the ground level. The Commission's subsequent review and continued evaluation of this item should focus on whether those conditions have been addressed.

**Zoning Related Information:** While the project site is zoned Planned Development, it is also located within the Transit Oriented (TOD) Overlay Zone. As noted in the application materials, the applicant requested and was subsequently approved relief from several of the TOD Overlay Zone requirements, including those related to maximum building setbacks and the site standards for automobile infrastructure, including, more specifically:

- At least 30 percent of the primary street-facing building facades shall be setback no more than 20 feet from the primary street (*exception previously approved*),
- Automobile parking, loading, drive aisles, and driveways, shall not be allowed between the primary street-facing facades and the primary public or private street (*exception previously approved*), and
- The same shall be setback from the primary street equal to or greater than the principal building setback (*exception previously approved*), and
- Parking structures shall integrate active uses along at least 50 percent of the primary street facing façade at the first floor. Because the parking structure changed from being an element that was part of the building addition to a free-standing structure, this exception is part of the current Planned Development Major Amendment request (**exception approved as part of Common Council's action**).

## Summary of Design Considerations

Staff requests the UDC's continued review and evaluation of the proposed parking structure and associated landscaping for consistency with the conditions of approval as outlined below. The UDC's role is to ensure that these previously established conditions are met. The UDC cannot waive or change these requirements.

- The applicant shall provide additional architectural detailing, renderings and perspectives of the parking structure, including long views, at grade views, and perspectives of the covered walkway.

*Staff believes this condition has been met. Please refer to sheets 22, 23, 24, and 25 of the plan set.*

- The applicant shall consider how the materiality is integrated with the language of the proposed new clinic and existing clinic, including the application of the materials, rhythm and proportions. The applicant shall refine the corner tower elements to be consistent in design and material.

*Staff believes this condition has been met. As noted on Sheet 25 of the plan set, the use of the brick material has been expanded to all consistently to the building corners, the metal panel has become more integrated into the overall design versus appearing as a superficial application and the rhythm has been adjusted to strike a better balance between the horizontal and vertical lines.*

- The landscape plan and grading plans shall be revised to incorporate berming along the public street facing side of the parking structure to support the proposed landscape.

*Staff believes this condition has been met. As noted on the plans and in the Letter of Intent, the applicant has adjusted the grade to create more of a berm-like shape and "...nuanced notions of an undulating berm." The applicant also indicates that the landscape plant list and placements have also been updated to follow suit and respond to the minor changes in elevation.*

## Summary of UDC Initial Approval Discussion and Comments

As a reference, the Commission's discussion and comments from the September 11, 2024, Initial Approval are provided below.

### Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission inquired about how metal screening panels on the parking garage meet the ground and what the building base looks like, and what the details of the covered walkway are. The applicant responded that the

first-floor precast panel goes up to 40" above grade. The screen panels start at the second-floor datum line and go up to the top of the structure. This allows the elevation to achieve 20% openness for the naturally ventilated structure. The applicant clarified that the covered walkway is a temporary structure that is removable because it crosses a public easement.

The Commission inquired about the different masonry style and materials across the project, including the thin brick and the brick pattern cast into the concrete panels. The applicant clarified that the clinic is traditional masonry to match the existing building, with a thin brick for the parking structure, and a vertical strip on corner of parking structure. The acid etched precast has a vertical pattern, and the left is perforated screening with two patterns.

The Commission inquired about the architectural lighting on the parking structure, especially the upper levels of garage. The applicant responded all lights will be downcast, and levels will be lowered to minimum safety standards after clinic closing. All lights are focused downward and mounted under the solar canopy.

The Commission inquired about the parking structure materials as viewed from the intersection of University Row and University Avenue with the idea of minimizing blank walls, noting that limited information was provided related to this street view.

The Commission noted acceptance of the TOD overlay exceptions being considered.

The Commission discussed the corner element of the parking structure, minimizing blank walls, long views, compatibility with the surrounding context, and sufficiency of the proposed landscape and screening, especially at the street level.

In consideration of a motion and findings, one could say that the ramp could be or is designed such that the material, proportions, and scale of openings in the parking structure are consistent with those of the building, and that the landscaping mitigates the effect of having cars on the street, and consideration of cost and de-watering of the subterranean ramp. With regard to setbacks and driveways, this is a unique situation where people come regionally, it's not just a neighborhood clinic. They need to be dropped off so being able to see that as you approach the building is paramount to a clinic like this.

Commissioner von Below found the materiality and proportions of the garage design problematic given the two corten steel panels which seem foreign to the project and the context. There does not appear to be an architectural conversation between the building addition and the parking structure, which has a more vertical appearance and application of materials. The base has not been developed well and limited information has been provided regarding the base treatment. It almost feels as though the garage entry is more suited in its architectural language to the clinic building with a higher level of detail and not the parking structure itself.

Additional detailing is needed on the parking structure, especially as it turns the corner and the covered walkway, which appears thin.

Commissioner Asad did not agree or disagree, noting that it is not the materials, but maybe it is the application of the materials instead. Applying the corten panels in a way that is more complementary way that better corresponds with the horizontality of the building. Commissioner Asad noted that he needed to better understand the ground level, where it appears open but not activated, and being heavily screened with vegetation; that could use some work and seems like an afterthought. The project could use some touchups with some of the datums and how those materials are applied.

Further discussion of the parking structure clarified that the Commission is not averse to the corten material, it is more the application and lack of integration of the material – the panels appear to be just attached to the building wall. The parking structure corner tower elements do not seem to relate as well – they are all different. Looking at the building beyond there is some articulation in the footprint and walls, which should serve as a point of reference for design considerations and refinements.

The Commission note that the corten screens are a nice material that will add interest to the parking structure. The application of the material is repetitious that does not relate to the other building in any way - it has a nice play of verticality; the language isn't matching when they so easily could. A horizontal element or datum could be introduced to parking structure to better relate to the building. The Commission was not convinced this is the best pattern for the screening material.

Commissioner Bernau noted that there is good and robust landscaping proposed. Commissioner Bernau noted that he had been under the impression that there was some topography and berming of the earth to reinforce the planting at the ground level, but that berming is no longer proposed. It would be a stronger landscape edge, base and foreground to the building if there was more topography undulation. A little bit of earth work for that landscape edge would be beneficial. The large blank wall needs plants to anchor that wall better.

## Action

On a motion by von Below, seconded by Asad, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**, with the following:

- Overall, the Commission finds that the proposed TOD overlay exceptions are consistent with the Planned Development (PD) standards.
- Overall, the Commission finds that the proposed building addition is consistent with the UDD 6 guidelines and requirements, as well as the PD standards.
- Related to the parking structure, design-related modifications are necessary for the Commission to make findings, including:
  - The applicant shall provide additional architectural detailing, renderings and perspectives of the parking structure, including long views, at grade views, and perspectives of the covered walkway.
  - The applicant shall consider how the materiality is integrated with the language of the proposed new clinic and existing clinic, including the application of the materials, rhythm and proportions. The applicant shall refine the corner tower elements to be consistent in design and material.
  - The landscape plan and grading plans shall be revised to incorporate berming along the public street facing side of the parking structure to support the proposed landscape.
  - The UDC recommends the project return to UDC for Final Approval.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).

**ATTACHMENT**  
**PD Zoning Statement of Purpose and Standards**

**28.098 (1) Statement of Purpose.**

The Planned Development (PD) District is established to provide a voluntary regulatory framework as a means to facilitate the unique development of land in an integrated and innovative fashion, to allow for flexibility in site design, and to encourage development that is sensitive to environmental, cultural, and economic considerations, and that features high-quality architecture and building materials. In addition, the Planned Development District is intended to achieve one or more of the following objectives:

- (a) Promotion of green building technologies, low-impact development techniques for stormwater management, and other innovative measures that encourage sustainable development.
- (b) Promotion of integrated land uses allowing for a mixture of residential, commercial, and public facilities along corridors and in transitional areas, with enhanced pedestrian, bicycle and transit connections and amenities.
- (c) Preservation and enhancement of important environmental features through careful and sensitive placement of buildings and facilities.
- (d) Preservation of historic buildings, structures, or landscape features through adaptive reuse of public or private preservation of land.
- (e) Provision of more adequate, usable, and suitably located open space, recreational amenities, and other public facilities than would otherwise be provided under conventional land development techniques.
- (f) Facilitation of high-quality development that is consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.

**28.098(2) Approval Standards for Project**

The standards for approval of a zoning map amendment to the PD District, or any major alteration to an approved General Development Plan, are as follows:

- (a) The applicant shall demonstrate that no other base zoning district can be used to achieve a substantially similar pattern of development. Planned developments shall not be allowed simply for the purpose of increasing overall density or allowing development that otherwise could not be approved unless the development also meets one or more of the objectives of (1) above. Conditions under which planned development may be appropriate include:
  - 1. Site conditions such as steep topography or other unusual physical features; or
  - 2. Redevelopment of an existing area or use of an infill site that could not be reasonably developed under base zoning district requirements.
- (b) The PD District plan shall facilitate the development or redevelopment goals of the Comprehensive Plan and of adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.
- (c) The PD District plan shall not adversely affect the economic health of the City or the area of the City where the development is proposed. The City shall be able to provide municipal services to the property where the planned development is proposed without a significant increase of the cost of providing those services or economic impact on municipal utilities serving that area.

- (d) The PD District plan shall not create traffic or parking demands disproportionate to the facilities and improvements designed to meet those demands. A traffic demand management plan may be required as a way to resolve traffic and parking concerns. The Plan shall include measurable goals, strategies, and actions to encourage travelers to use alternatives to driving alone, especially at congested times of day. Strategies and actions may include, but are not limited to, carpools and vanpools; public and private transit; promotion of bicycling, walking and other non-motorized travel; flexible work schedules and parking management programs to substantially reduce automobile trips.
- (e) The PD District plan shall coordinate architectural styles and building forms to achieve greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of the PD District.
- (f) The PD District plan shall include open space suitable to the type and character of development proposed, including for projects with residential components, a mix of structured and natural spaces for use by residents and visitors. Areas for stormwater management, parking, or in the public right of way shall not be used to satisfy this requirement.
- (g) The PD district shall include suitable assurances that each phase could be completed in a manner that would not result in an adverse effect upon the community as a result of termination at that point.
- (h) When applying the above standards to an application for height in excess of that allowed in Section 28.071(2)(a) Downtown Height Map, except as provided for in Section 28.071(2)(a)1. and Section 28.071(2)(b), the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans and no application for excess height shall be granted by the Plan Commission unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
  - 1. The excess height is compatible with the existing or planned (if the recommendations in the Downtown Plan call for changes) character of the surrounding area, including but not limited to the scale, mass, rhythm, and setbacks of buildings and relationships to street frontages and public spaces.
  - 2. The excess height allows for a demonstrated higher quality building than could be achieved without the additional stories.
  - 3. The scale, massing and design of new buildings complement and positively contribute to the setting of any landmark buildings within or adjacent to the project and create a pleasing visual relationship with them.
  - 4. For projects proposed in priority viewsheds and other views and vistas identified on the Views and Vistas Map in the City of Madison Downtown Plan, there are no negative impacts on the viewshed as demonstrated by viewshed studies prepared by the applicant.
- (i) When applying the above standards to an application to reduce or eliminate setbacks required by Section 28.071(2)(c) Downtown Stepback Map, the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans, including the downtown plan. No application to reduce or eliminate setbacks may be granted unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
  - 1. The lot is a corner parcel.
  - 2. The lot is not part of a larger assemblage of properties.
  - 3. The entire lot is vacant or improved with only a surface parking lot.
  - 4. No principal buildings on the lot have been demolished or removed since the effective date of this ordinance