

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 7, 2014

TITLE: 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive –
Amended PD(GDP-SIP) for Sixty-Units of
Assisted Living, Revised Plans. 9th Ald.
Dist. (31146)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 7, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant and Melissa Huggins.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 7, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) located at 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was David Baum, representing All Saint’s Neighborhood, Horizon Design Build and Catholic Charities. The Secretary noted that the development team does not have the right or permission to build a skyway bridge over public property, nor have they begun the process of asking for that ability; therefore the Commission can only grant initial approval of the project. Changes to the project include additional tree islands at every 12 parking stalls, introduction of stone on the side to pick up the tower element so the corner reads as an accent feature. They were able to recess the building about 18-inches to get a nice off-set to it. The staircase has been integrated into the landscaping and brought down across to the east side (not retail storefronts) and engage the sidewalk. Their landscape architect is comfortable with their selection of plant materials (arborvitaes) and would prefer to leave them as is. Adding trees to make a canopy area would not work either as it would eventually hide any of the retail signage; they are leaving the original 4-5 trees as shown.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The corner reads a lot better to me. That was my biggest concern and I feel much better about it.
- You’ve got the Chair of the Landscape Architecture Department of UW-Madison telling you those won’t work. I would suggest you go back to your landscape architect.
 - His comment was that it was too tight, but this is shown at full grown.
- (Secretary) My read on this, again John is a professor of landscape architecture, and if Richard was here he wasn’t disagreeing, he’s also a professional, I would think that all comments pertinent to landscaping have to be done as part of this motion. I would say you need to address the landscape comments as previously stated.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (4-0). The motion provided that the applicant address all of the previously stated landscape comments, and address formal approval to construct and utilize the skywalk over the public right-of-way.

No rakings were provided for this project.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** August 7, 2013

TITLE: 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive –
Amended PD(GDP-SIP) for Sixty-Units of
Assisted Living, Revised Plans. 9th Ald.
Dist. (31146)

REFERRED:
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: August 7, 2013 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Melissa Huggins, Henry Lufler, Tom DeChant and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 7, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) located at 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were David Baum and John W. Thode, representing All Saints Neighborhood. Baum presented the project to expand and create the continuing care campus. The initial facility was a 144-unit apartment building for independent living. The second building, memory care and assisted living, was added five years ago. More people are starting to need assistance and the second building cannot be expanded. They wish to add additional assisted, skilled care and independent living units. They would like to connect the two buildings across the road into the ground floor, which houses all the amenities that this community needs. The building that provides the food service needs to be connected to the building that needs the food service. One corner of the building is at 430-feet with the entrance drive being at 455-feet; with the courtyard finished grade at 445-feet, two levels of parking can be added below that. Preliminary massing models were shown. A bridge across the parking lot will connect the future condominiums and skilled nursing facility; the residents will want to use all the amenities available on this campus. Staff noted that the most significant issue currently is the bridging over the public right-of-way. There is a standing policy by the City not favoring the private use of public right-of-way, which will require resolution in this case.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- One of my first impressions is that this seems like “topsy” growth, it’s not very well planned, is this the best way to deal with the situational need? I just wonder how good these bridges are for actual function and connections to people. It seems so cobbled that I’m wondering if it’s very functional.
- It’s quite a sprawled campus, particularly for the people you are serving. Distances are not good in this kind of play out. I’m very curious, how do you have circulation (food) through a condo building to skilled nursing?
 - It’s all common entity. All of this is All Saint’s land.
- I appreciate trying to connect to Watts Road and trying to work with the topography.

- How does this fit on what happens with the rest of the Seminary land?
 - How that will develop in the future, I'm not 100% sure, that's up to the Diocese.
- When you're creating a site with this much volume and these many buildings, you're essentially creating a neighborhood within a neighborhood, so there should be some architectural variation between buildings. Things look very similar.
 - The current go around is actually more of a massing and functionality study. We'll come back with more of a juxtaposition that you're looking for.
- What kind of service requirements will you have with the skilled nursing facility? Food service and semi delivery, etc.
 - The main food is being prepared in the common area on the main floor and hot carted throughout the facility into serving kitchens and potentially up into the units.

And as people pass on, where does the ambulance come?
 Right turn lane here, ambulance comes and stops there. There's a door out the end of the building that is a little more discreet, they can come out with a little bit of dignity.
- Have you looked into the fire requirements around the facilities?
 - Obviously we have to meet all their codes.
 - We've got access around the perimeter as well as the courtyard.
- As you move forward, if there are opportunities for healing gardens.
 - That will all take place in this entry courtyard and the back areas here. We'll put them in place once we fully develop the site.
- Is there any way that the existing memory care kitchen could serve the three-story building?
 - These people would buy meals if they want meals. The thought is there's a number of different service levels available to people in a CCRC. This is an independent 144-unit now, some of them want no meals, but there are a few, maybe 30, people that take these meals. But these are 70 and 80 year old people. One of the goals is to get people to the town center and with this footprint being the town center on the first floor, it's our vision to get people over here in the most convenient manner.
- While you've got this really beautiful interior courtyard, Commerce Drive should really be the face of your commercial activity and that town center, and you should be creating walkable opportunities, and should show them, instead of just relying on the bridge. If I'm thinking about this as a campus, the most important façade, the most active area of that should be right along here. You should be spending a lot of time thinking about how those folks could be crossing here 7-8 months out of the year. Instead of turning inward create the connection here in terms of activity across the street.
- Could you get rid of some of the parking and build on that lot (westerly component), then try and focus the amenities around a greenspace? If you're going to do new construction anyway, that might link more easily than going across a public street.
- Given the sense of community, could you come in from the middle and use that whole area as a less auto-oriented space? More greenspace connecting the buildings (easterly component).
 - That reduced the parking substantially. We're adding a significant more amount of asphalt. This was the most efficient way to get the parking in and minimize the asphalt.
- Need building variation in design.
- Need pedestrian connections for both existing and proposed building development.
- The Commerce Drive façades need to be emphasized as they relate to the street.
- Think of village center buildings as stronger design elements.
- Look at more improvements to sites/buildings to the west.
- The main drive aisle on the east from Watts cuts the site in half.

ACTION:

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

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. 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. The overall rating for this project is 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	5	-	-	-	4	-	5
	4	5	5	-	-	4	4	-

General Comments:

- Convoluted site layout – very challenging logistics layout, especially for SNF component. Question the logic.

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 13, 2013
TITLE: 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive – Amended PD(GDP-SIP) for Sixty-Units of Assisted Living, Revised Plans. 9 th Ald. Dist. (31146)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 13, 2013	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Melissa Huggins, Lauren Cnare, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 13, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) located at 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were David Baum, representing Horizon Development/All Saints; and David Griffin. Baum presented plans for the assisted living component of the campus. The ground floor (Commerce Drive street level) will be highly active with commons space, dining facilities, small convenience stores, health facilities, wellness centers, etc. which will engage the street with the sidewalk, stairs and terrace area. Underground parking will be accessed off of Commerce Drive. Baum further explained the entries, drop-off points and access throughout the facility. The parking facilities are at the side of the building with entrances off the backside. A large plaza is still part of the program for residential activities. The two buildings will be connected via stairs and a raised skywalk.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Where are you in negotiations for the use of air rights?
 - Horizon Construction is talking to the City at this point. I’ve not been involved in those conversations.

The Secretary noted that if air rights are not obtained, the plans will need to be altered.

- I will go to bat for this because I’m tired of us building these lovely facilities that keep people in separate buildings in the last years of their lives. I’m really glad that you have this here.
 - That overhead link is very important.

ACTION:

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

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 19, 2014

TITLE: 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive -
Amended PD(GDP-SIP) for Sixty-
Units of Assisted Living, Revised
Plans. 9th Ald. Dist. (31146)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 19, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 19, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) for 60-units of assisted living located at 501, 509 and 517 Commerce Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was David Baum, representing All Saint’s. Baum presented updated plans for a four-story building with two levels of parking, and a 2-story CBRF. A drive-thru component for parking and access will mean less congestion on Commerce Drive and access to Watts Road. The previous bridge crossings have been eliminated. A bridge across Commerce Drive connecting their facility to the existing 144-unit apartment is still being proposed. Baum stated that at the DAT meeting they were instructed to make sure this bridge is completed. They have allowed for ingress and egress to some retail space on Commerce Drive and a wellness center that will be accessible to the public. There is also a potential for outdoor seating. Access is available at grade to the underground parking level, with no parking on Watts Road. In trying to create something more contemporary, Baum stated that All Saint’s Charities were not in favor of that, preferring instead that the new buildings match identically the existing ones across the street; this contradicts the direction the Urban Design Commission would want the project to go in (based on previous review). Main elevations show a balcony connecting the commons area of the building which will help to activate the street.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I appreciate the difficult circumstance you’re in, trying to appease this body as well as All Saint’s. It does look compromised. Trying to force a traditional residential form on a building like this, must be really difficult. I’m not convinced this is the direction to go.
- I agree with the rooftop issue (flat roofs).
- I’d like to see this retail component somehow better integrated.
- I’d find somewhere else for the handicapped parking stalls; you can’t go from here to the building without crossing the street.

- We can put them over here.

Yes, and make this something really special. Let's celebrate that.

- I think you've made some great progress. The roofline is really going to be an issue.
 - How do we come to terms with that? I've got a client who wants to go one way, and we're going to butt heads.

(Secretary): You're going to get a recommendation from staff, you're going to get a recommendation from this body, and the Plan Commission and Common Council have to make that decision. The buildings are a tall form and a large roofline like that makes it even taller, especially with the existing topography.

- Maybe it would help your clients if you showed some perspectives from grade.
 - We brought the 3-D model and we walked around the entire site with them. Looked at it from every angle. They want us to match all materials from across the street.

(Secretary): When they originally developed, what 20 years ago, they were the only thing out there. They're not the only ones out there anymore, so more of the same may not be appropriate now.

- Vinyl siding on such a tall building... Internally the building is not at all in the same character. I see a real progressive plan, a sophisticated building type, a really good solution to a difficult to program site, and wrapping this skin that makes it look like a house. Is the market driving it?
 - They believe their clientele is comfortable with this. When we presented a contemporary building to some of the residents, they had no interest in it.

To the residents?

- Yes.

You said the development team was in support.

- The development team was listening to the input that we're getting. They said go ahead with the contemporary image. But when we got in front of the board of directors, they said no.
- I want to assist in this. They just don't want the flat roof. Your Planning Department wants a flat roof, our client doesn't want the flat roof, that's basically what it comes down to. I disagree with you, this is a residential building, it should look residential. This is only a 40-unit apartment building, it is a residential building. It's not an institutional building, it's not a hospital, it's not a university, it's not an office building. It's a residential building on a residential campus. Our clients want it to look like a residential building on a residential campus. So we're responding to our clients. Our clients are Gary Gorman, Tom Klein, Jerry Ring, these are people who've done hundreds of millions of dollars of development in the City of Madison and the State of Wisconsin, who we're responding to who feel that they know what they want on their campus and what their clients want (Thode).

Well you are a PD and design is what it's all about.

- I'm expressing what our clients' needs are. This isn't exactly what's across the street. What's across the street is tan and brown. This is moving towards a more contemporary structure. Also our clients may be developing the land above here in the future, and the land above here is about 40-feet above this in grade, there isn't necessarily a concept plan for that at this point in time. But at some point in time they will be looking down at this building and they'd prefer not to look down at flat roofs. They'd prefer to look down onto pitched roofs. This is in response to exactly what our clients want.

You're entitled to it but you've got to go through the process.

- I'm not sure why every building has to have a flat roof now.

Because there's too many buildings like this already that have been developed in the last 25 years and building forms change over time. You don't create the same building and rubber stamp it throughout time and say this is fine. What's appropriate 25 years ago versus today are two different things.

- I think this is improved from what we've seen earlier.

- I think the landscaping could be stronger. Particularly given the site base you have. Some of this just needs to be programmed a bit better with the building. It seems like it doesn't quite work with the building. You could do some really nice stuff here. This could be a powerful space.
- I would reinforce your landscape beyond just your courtyard, to really start to draw that connection.
- If you want to have a further discussion about roof types, there needs to be much more information about the context of the whole area, the topography of the whole area and how those kinds of heights and site lines are going to impact the various areas. What is presented here does not persuade us that this kind of a profile for this site is what is required, so you need something better if you want to make this argument.
 - Aerial views looking down?
I don't know what it is, the way this is presented it's not convincing, and if you want to follow this you're going to need something different.
- On your massing too, the repetitive forms don't feel like a cohesive solution.
- I would say particularly where the bridge might want to engage the building, it doesn't seem any different than this element here.
- And how does it connect to the adjacent building?
 - In a gable end. Our second floor ties into their third floor.
So the building across the street that we're trying to relate to is how many stories, 3? So you essentially have what feels like a 3-story base of masonry, that's what's going to connect to your adjacent building and how you treat that setback to the upper units. The gabled roof is not what will create a strong connection to that form.
 - What came out of the DAT was bring that masonry up higher on the building.
- DAT has nothing to do with that. It's the design body. They really don't have anything to do with particular design features of the building.
- If you brought in the neighboring context and the height of those gabled roofs, then show this building and how high those are and really out of context with the pedestrian scale, I think it may help form a solution to a flat roof.

ACTION:

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

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. 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. The overall ratings for this project are 2, 4 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 501 Commerce Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	6	5	5	-	-	-	4	5
	5	4	4	-	-	-	6	4

General Comments:

- Site layout much improved. Adjust building footprint to enhance entry courtyard.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 23, 2014
TITLE: 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive – Amended PD(GDP-SIP) for Sixty-Units of Assisted Living, Revised Plans. 9 th Ald. Dist. (31146)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Jay Wendt, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: April 23, 2014	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Tom DeChant, Lauren Cnare and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 23, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) for sixty-units of assisted living, revised plans located at 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was David Baum, representing Catholic Charities, All Saint’s Neighborhood. Baum presented the new plans for Phase 3 of the overall campus design for a 50- unit independent building and a 60-unit CBRF with structured parking under the entire building. In order to integrate articulation and provide activity at the street level, the lower level is uncovered and provides a retail space, giving the building a 5-story appearance. The steep gable ends have been removed and turned into a hip roof, which dramatically lowered the appearance of the building, making it more in context with the rest of the site. They have provided opportunities for street level activity, softening the street level, providing a patio on the corner, terraced planting beds concealing the structured parking level, and provide access to the two levels of parking while providing an entrance to the building on the south side. Handicapped parking has been moved from the entry circle to the side to be directly accessible to the assisted living facility, allowing for a larger landscaped area and stone walls as a gateway to the entry. A strong, defined walkway aligns the axis of their steeple with the steeple up the hill. They are providing semi-private patio with water fountain for the public to use, and two semi-private areas for activity, one outside the assisted living and one outside the independent living, provide a walkway around to connect the two of them with some contemplative gardens within the space. The shape of the courtyard has been explored to be more squared off; the plan inside the building did not work because of shifting over and maintaining site lines. On the outside they have more than they originally intended, and therefore feel they have met the objective of creating that celebratory courtyard. Their client is happy with the hip roof and the general direction the campus is going. An outdoor dining area overlooks the outdoor seating area, and an outdoor patio just north of the bridge will engage the street.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- (Chair) The Secretary has pointed out several times that there is no agreement in place for the bridge. Therefore we cannot approve that as part of the design until you get that approval. And the signage on that is not going to be approved.
- On the new tall corner, the material seems to change at the second level.
 - That is our main dining facility and we wanted to call attention to that by adding more glass. The material is the same siding between the windows.
- Thanks for the importance of that central axis. That's handled well.
- There are some areas where the foundation planting is so tight to the building but then it opens up in other areas. I really like where it opens up away from the building. That brings some interest in here. The main thing is that when plants are so tight along the building, it doesn't necessarily enhance the landscape as it does soften the building, and maybe the building doesn't necessarily need to be softened, but I think it's fine overall.
- We typically have a standard of no more than 12 stalls without an island. You'll need to work out something there.
- I think you would do yourself a favor by doubling those amounts of Juneberries. I would make this so you have a canopy right there that stands out over the sidewalk so it will give you a little more structure.
- It's definitely going in the right direction, I just encourage you to refine that corner and perhaps, if there's an opportunity for a balcony.
 - The whole thing is a dining room.

Just this corner here, to continue to bring some continuity to that corner so it doesn't feel like a 3-story wood frame apartment building sitting on this metropolis. The canopy trees along here would really help to soften that edge too.
- That corner seems like such a tall rigid face. I think the architecture needs to address it and it will be enhanced by the landscaping. But architecturally it needs to be addressed as well. To me it very much looks like the 3-story building from across the street set on a 2-story building, maybe you further that and push the upper stories back 10-feet? Really articulate it that it is two buildings and then maybe you can bring some scale to the hip roofs.
- I thought about that too but it would be disastrous to the residential plans up above.
- I'm having trouble with the corner too.
- I think it's a good evolution though. It's not a drastic redo of anything.
 - You're just looking for further integration on those areas.
- Look at directing your emergency egress stairway another way so it flows more with the landscape here, or having a landing midway between the stairs. It sticks out, you really notice it.
- There's arborvitae through here, the narrow ones at a higher elevation, I'm concerned we're going to have a series of winters like we just had, and they're not going to be successful. Check with your landscape architect about that.
- Maybe look at that stair tying into your retail patio and then create the connection to Watts Road. It may help your lower level retail.

ACTION:

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

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. 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. The overall rating for this project is 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 501, 509 & 517 Commerce Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	5	6	-	-	5	6	-
	6	6	7	-	-	6	5	6