

**AGENDA # 3**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** June 9, 2021

**TITLE:** 6145-6301 Mineral Point Road & 502 Genomic Drive - Amended Planned Development (General Development Plan and Specific Implementation Plan) (PD(GDP-SIP), Oakwood Village University Woods Skilled Nursing Facility. 19th Ald. Dist. (63430)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Janine Glaeser, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** June 9, 2021

**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair\*; Craig Weisensel\*, Lois Braun-Oddo, Tom DeChant, Rafeeq Asad, Shane Bernau, Christian Harper and Russell Knudson.

\*Goodhart recused himself; Weisensel acted as Chair.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 9, 2021, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) located at 6145-6301 Mineral Point Road and 502 Genomic Drive. Registered and speaking in support were Jeffrey Bogart, representing Eppstein Uhen Architects; Christopher Sina, representing Saiki Design; Anne Anderson, representing Mead & Hunt; and Reginald Hislop, representing Oakwood Village University Woods. Registered in support but not wishing to speak was Rich Stoffels, representing Vogel Bros. Building Co. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Mike Oates, Jay Thomsen and Dave Bertsch. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak was Richard Bruce Allison, representing Allison Tree, LLC.

The project will replace the existing Hebron skilled nursing facility with a smaller scale facility comprised of five patient wings, four of which are specific to skilled nursing and post-recovery oriented rehabilitation clientele; and one wing to hospice care. The site was chosen for access and connectivity to the existing University Woods Campus. The specific location was desirable to connect to existing infrastructure and support that existing infrastructure as they demolish and redevelop portions of the site. The site of the existing building will be replaced with greenspace. Updates to the proposed development include reconfiguration of the site to save trees, the bioretention pond is now included in the center of the drop-off area, a pond in the back of the building is no longer needed, removal of the connection road through the woods to now go between buildings, tightening up of the parking area for better connectivity throughout the site while maximizing the greenspace, moving the building and realigning it to more of a 90 degree orientation, and the building connection will be entirely underground. They are decreasing vehicle stalls and increasing bicycle stalls. Richard Allison discussed the tree survey, identifying any historically significant trees within the demolition area. There were no Bicentennial Oaks in this area; the nature of the larger trees remaining lends to recycling. He would be on-site during the construction process. Design changes are relative to the building location and geometry to pull it out of the wooded area and make in an L-shape to further retreat the building from the slope and natural wooded

area. They also reduced the overall building footprint; there was an ambulance bay as a lower one-story projection and mechanical space, the tunnel connection now minimizes and reduces the overall footprint. The first floor contains the main reception, bistro room with covered terrace and central hub service core. The second floor has a hospice dedicated wing with small den and family-scaled living/kitchen/dining area, and small medication/chapel area. Seating areas and green roofs are developed unique to this household wing. The other wing is comprised of a spa and salon, and the physical therapy area. The central core and material palette have been simplified, with the addition of larger windows in the residential areas. The lower level is utilitarian with blank walls at the back-of-house, putting light and windows where it benefits the residents. Building materials include two scales of brick in a light buff color, Nichiha panel in a vertical expression in a color and pattern that mimics the bark of the trees to complement the forested areas, precast band elements to separate the base from the upper floors, metal roof screens the elevator overruns, two window systems with residential type in the rooms and storefront window systems in the service areas. A water feature is designed to mitigate the appearance of the surface parking. Enhanced landscaping will help the building settle into the natural surroundings.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Big kudos and thanks for some of the major changes in response to the tree protection and reconfiguring the site, it's a great improvement. Species list in the planting palette, proportionally there were too few Oaks relative to other ornamental trees, but I see the intent in how they are being placed to be used primarily in the back hillside area. The number of non-native Evergreens compared to native Oaks could favor White Oaks or Burr Oaks more. The trade-off with changes is the funkiness in the driveway, not a gentle slope necessarily, maybe there's a little fine-tuning in that space so the pedestrian crossings at the top works a little better. Site layout: it appears there's a large swell area and paving roundabout related to truck turning movements. Can you confirm that? In the northeast corner there's a lot of pavement, is that part of a truck turning movement or is there any way of tightening that up?
  - The large swell area on the north side of the roundabout is for truck maneuvering. The 75-foot wide area is tricky, it's currently a drop-off for Covenant Oaks and Tabor that will be maintained. Covenant has an overhang with foundation footings so trucks cannot go underneath there. That was a trade-off of losing the other connector road.
- Appreciate the care taken to change the configuration and protect more trees. Do we have the perspective of the last version? It is as dramatic a change as I was thinking. There are aspects to this more dramatic original proposal that I like architecturally. Is there some compromise to bring some of that element, particularly the all glass central element?
  - Considering being good stewards of the site, stewardship of the design relative to constructability and budget, concern we were getting too much glass and investing too much in areas that were not directly related to resident care. We also had to consider dealing with bird-friendly glass. This also relates more to the geometry of the entire campus.
- It feels like the corner has diminished to the point where it almost doesn't speak as the nexus of the building.
- PD discussion, having goals about density. Do we know that the density here is comparable to those goals? Is there any plan for vertical expansion of this building?
  - (Firchow) The Comprehensive Plan recommendation is high density residential, the development as proposed could be considered consistent with that underlying density.
- I do remember that informational façade, I really liked it as well. There was a heavy honoring of the existing campus and a nod to the Hebron building. What about this current design, does it align with those design goals? This building reads now like a lot of multi-family residential buildings we see. The initial design was set apart by expressing those central functions in the hub. I don't believe we're seeing that expression any longer.

- It's about how the building settles into the site and creates spaces in between buildings. Oakwood is known for lots of buildings within a natural and wooded setting with some being the quieter background. The form and geometry references some of the angles of other buildings that will remain on the campus. The character of this as a collection of buildings will start to change over time. It's not meant to be a design star but serves a purpose in a very handsome way in an understated way. Focusing the resources on the quality of the resident experiences.
- There is always push and pull. As all the components are being discussed, I appreciate that the natural setting of this was the priority. I liked the more reserved detailing of the building and appreciate the restraint in the design elements.
- I like this design a lot better.
- Really appreciate where this came from originally and what you've done to get this here.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Knudson, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).

The motion requested the development team attempt to increase the balance of new trees more towards the native Oaks.