PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT

June 28, 2023

PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: **750 University Row**

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

Legistar File ID #: 76633

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 addition of a 3.5-story parking structure, and construction of a four-story outpatient clinic that includes the relocation of the main building entrance to University Row.

Approval Standards: The UDC is both an **approving and advisory body** on this request. As an **approving body**, the UDC will be reviewing this as new development in Urban Design District 6 ("UDD 6"). The UDC shall review the proposed project using the design standards and guidelines for that district in MGO Section 33.24(13).

The UDC will also be an **advisory body** on the Planned Development request. For Planned Developments the UDC 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 Attached).

Zoning Related Information: The project site is located within the recently adopted TOD Overlay zone. The TOD Overlay requires that 30 percent of the building shall be within 20 feet of the primarily and secondary streets, which in this case is University Avenue and University Row, respectively. As proposed, the building, including the addition and the existing building, appears to not meet this standard and such an exception to this requirement is being sought.

In addition, the TOD Overlay does not allow for auto infrastructure to be located between the building and the street. As such the proposed drop-off/vehicular loading is not permitted, and an exception to this requirement is noted on the plans.

Summary of Design Considerations

Planning Division staff requests that the UDC review the proposed development and make findings based on the standards for Planned Developments and UDD 6 requirements and guidelines, including the design considerations noted below.

- **TOD Overlay Exceptions.** As noted above, two exceptions to the TOD Overlay are being requested as part of the PD request, including those related to maximum setbacks along primary and secondary streets and the location of auto infrastructure between the building and the street. UDC's role is not to approve the proposed PD exceptions, but staff requests that the UDC review and include advisory comments related to the two proposed exceptions.

- **Building Design and Materials.** As noted by the Commission in their Informational Presentation comments, consideration should be given to blank wall expanses, particularly those on the south and west elevations, both at grade and on upper floors. UDD 6 Building Design guidelines and requirements generally speak to the use of high-quality, low maintenance materials that are complementary to and compatible with the existing and surrounding building(s), utilizing four sided architecture, and minimizing blank wall expanses.

  Staff requests the UDC provide comment and make findings related to the proposed building design and material palette as it relates to creating one cohesive architectural expression, architectural detailing/materials of the parking garage structure and the treatment of blank walls.

- **Pedestrian Environment – University Row.** As shown on the site plan there is a one-way patient drop-off area along the street-facing façade of the building that is separated from the pedestrian pathway by stone cobble bed, that varies in width, as it transitions to a planted bed. Staff requests the UDC provide comment and make findings related to the pedestrian environment along University Row. Consideration should be given to the separation of uses and incorporating enhanced design measures to promote safety, including alternative paving, raised crossings, landscape islands, etc., and minimizing pedestrian/vehicular conflicts.

- **Landscape.** Staff requests UDC review and make findings related to the proposed landscape plan and plant schedule as it pertains to creating an enhanced pedestrian environment, not only along the street side of the building but also as it relates to the multi-use path, the use of stone mulch/cobbles, and as it relates to the screening of blank walls. Consideration should be given to the UDD 6 Landscape guidelines and requirements, including those that speak to providing functional and decorative landscape that provides year-round color and texture, as well as proper edging and mulch.

- **Lighting.** The proposed lighting plan appears to be inconsistent with the maximum light levels in both parking area and pedestrian pathways (2.5 footcandles) and vehicle use area (1.5 footcandles), as well as the maximum uniformity ratio (5:1) requirements pursuant to MGO 29.36.

  The applicant is advised that refinements to the average light levels will be required in order for the proposed lighting to be consistent with maximum light levels and uniformity ratio pursuant to MGO 29.36.

- **Signage.** While signage is not part of this application request, potential sign locations are shown on the elevations, including multiple wall signs per elevation, and locations higher on the building. Staff requests the UDC provide feedback on the proposed sign locations.

  Staff notes that additional review and approval will be required for the proposed signage.

Summary of Informational Presentation Comments

As a reference, the Commission's comments from the March 15, 2023, Informational Presentation are provided below:

- We don't control the TOD boundary or control any conformance or any relief on the setback for this project, right?
- (Secretary) The TOD overlay would require an amendment to the zoning ordinance as a separate process, UDC is not a reviewing agency on those requests. This is a PD, any modification or exceptions to

the TOD overlay would be a similar request as a setback modification to a standard zoning district. Think about the PD review and approval standards in thinking about those exceptions.

- The PD cannot be exempt from the TOD overlay district?
- (Secretary) It can, the PD can be written to allow the exceptions.
- It's not in our control but the information is still useful to understand how the design is where it is. The staff report asked us to look at the overall building design and materials, how it works with the existing building, the entrance orientation and the pedestrian environment at University Row.
- Overall I like it, I'm familiar with the area and it fits well into the context. You've had conversations with the neighbors to the west who want the lower building height. I do have concerns about them potentially looking back at the wall of the parking garage. I am wondering if there is flexibility in the location of the green roof, if you could flip the green roof with the solar panels, those panels would be viewed more from University Avenue and the residents would have a view of the green roof instead. What influenced where the panels go versus the green roof?
    - The houses are lower, I don't imagine they will look upon the roof. From a site planning perspective, the green roof is more north/northwest facing, the investment in solar wouldn't pay back there because they would be shaded the majority of the day.
- It looks like a really nice melding of the new building and the existing building. Sometimes these kinds of projects look like two separate parts awkwardly put together. These come together in a way that looks like it was designed as one, which is a big plus.
- How exciting it is to see this much green roof and solar on one project. Nice to see a really expansive green roof and swath of solar panels. From an operational/functional standpoint of a green roof over an unheated parking garage as opposed to an occupied heated building, are there technical issues that would be challenging with that?
    - UW Health has recently pursued this method, they are doing that on the Eastpark project, and we'll continue to work through that aspect with our designers and landscape architects.
- Good luck on the various exceptions for the drop-off area. I've recently had to take my mom to UW facilities, I can attest to how important a covered drop-off area is. At the same time you do have a challenging issue with what is probably going to be busier and busier sidewalk and bike traffic out front that you have to meld with that. Look forward to seeing how this project progresses.
- I think it looks really nice, you did a good job of giving it its own identity and yet looking cohesive with the existing building. I like the parking structure, the panels are nice and warm, the texture, and I liked the tone. My only comment is on rendering A12 where at the end of the parking structure, the building above the parking structure shows a blank wall at the end of the building, is anything planned for that? You can see that it's going to be pretty visible. Is it a backdrop to something?
    - Functionally what is happening there is we were trying to avoid having, a lot of times in healthcare you have these air handlers that are popping all over your low roofs. So we are bringing a significant volume of air from the parking structure in the first floor up into the enclosed rooftop penthouse through a direct route at the end of the building. There's opportunity to break up that massing, and use other materials even if it can't be transparent there. There's other things we can study.
- I'm trying really hard to critique and coming up short, I really like this project. Has future expansion of the parking garage or the building coming out over the garage is been considered?
    - We are pretty much maximizing this site with this project and parking. We don't have major plans for vertical expansion or horizontal expansion over a vertical area.
- Kudos to the team, it's a huge benefit that this ramp was submerged and not creating a bigger mass. It's a wonderful design.
- Looks like a nice project, very excited to see that large green roof. There is green roof on the existing building, I would strongly advocate that this green roof be at least a semi-intensive profile for more stormwater retention, lower maintenance, and plugging it with native pollinators. I look forward to seeing that in future presentations and hope that is something that can be accommodated.

- The address 750 is probably not part of this approval, but the numbers are gigantic. We'll expect to see much smaller address numbers.
- The wall containing the relief from the garage, you might look into the inflation reduction act incentives or building integrated solar on that wall, might be advantageous.
- I would hope that the building design and siting isn't dictated on a minor discrepancy in the percentage of façade within a boundary. I'm seeing how the pedestrian would have to move around the drop-off and back to the sidewalk, I much prefer the "original" site plan where the sidewalk goes straight across and the drop-off really is for vehicles. This isn't a department or grocery store, people with healthcare don't really choose their provider based on who is closest to their neighborhood, we have to accept the fact that there will be cars driving in and out of there, but if we can minimize confusion with pedestrians who want to just walk past the building it would be a better scenario. If the PD can dictate that in its zoning designation, hopefully that's the way the developer can go.

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 stepbacks 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 stepbacks 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