

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 18, 2009

TITLE: 202 South Park Street – Meriter Campus
Master Plan, PUD-GDP. 13th Ald. Dist.
(12023)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 18, 2009

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Mark Smith, Dawn Weber, Ron Luskin, Jay Ferm, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett and Bruce Woods.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 18, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the Meriter Campus Master Plan, PUD-GDP. Appearing on behalf of the project were Doug Hursh and Jody Shaw, representing Meriter Hospital; Joe Starck, representing Brittingham Area Resident's Association: Braxton Place; and Melissa Huggins. Since elements of the Meriter Campus Master Plan, PUD-GDP had been presented by the project team on a number of occasions, including the March 4, 2009 meeting (9/24/08, 10/15/08) the project team provided a summary of the Meriter Campus Master Plan PUD-GDP to the Commission. Following the presentation the question of sustainability, such as its specifics and objectives within the plan were raised. Huggins noted that the last project built by Meriter is almost comparable to a LEED level project without the certification. The issue is the cost of certification adding to the overall project.

Following discussion on sustainability issues, Huggins noted the approval also provides for an overall PUD-SIP for existing conditions within the overall Meriter Campus until redevelopment occurs consistent with the PUD-GDP as proposed. The rezoning request also includes two SIP level approvals for enclosing existing Park Street upper terrace with a glass enclosure, along with modifications to the Chandler Street façade to alter an existing loading and trash area and dock to be enclosed. Huggins further emphasized that the enclosure to the existing Park Street upper terrace was necessary to accommodate expansions with the pre-operation and post-operation facilities. She further noted the Chandler Street improvements provide for an increase in back-up power capacity as placed in existing loading dock. Following discussion emphasized the following:

- On the Chandler Street modifications, the masonry façade's joint between old and new, needs work, needs to improve the interface.
- Need to pull out consideration of the Chandler Street modifications; need to see streetscape for context.
- Familiar with the Chandler Street façade, think that the Chandler Street improvements are fine.
- What happens to cinder block building on Chandler Street not thoroughly detailed within the proposed plans. If the cinder block building's façade matches with the other proposed improvements, design is straightforward and appropriate.

Following the discussion on Chandler Street improvements Bill Stark spoke in opposition to the project noting issue with impacts of the proposed Braxton medical office building being too big and too tall in regards to relationship to existing residential buildings in the block. Stark felt that the project will drastically change the neighborhood and adjacent residential where four-stories would be more appropriate. In response to issues raised by Stark, the Commission noted the following:

- This building will not block light near to adjacent residential buildings with a precedent already established on the block with both existing commercial/office and medical buildings in combination with adjacent residential development.
- Issues were raised at the neighborhood planning process where the staff team reviewed the record of neighborhood meetings associated with the master plan development.
- Skeptical about traffic table because of its sheer size. Come back with more details at the SIP level.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Weber, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the Meriter Campus Master Plan, PUD-GDP, and overall PUD-SIP for the existing operations facilities on the Meriter Campus, along with a PUD-SIP for the enclosure of the existing Park Street upper terrace. The motion also provided for initial approval of the Chandler Street improvements for a façade alteration and emergency generator enclosure with the following to be addressed:

- Submit samples of both the terrace enclosure and Chandler Street façade materials including lighting.
- Provide details on the appearance of the existing cinder block building and dumpster enclosure, as well as context for the overall Chandler Street building façade and streetscape relation.

The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Luskin abstaining.

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 6.5, 7, 7, 8 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 202 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	8	6	-	-	-	8	8	8
	7	-	-	-	-	7	7	7
	6	6	6	-	-	6	7.5	6.5

General Comments:

- Excellent job.
- Surprisingly little neighborhood reaction to this major plan. One wonders if there was sufficient outreach to neighborhood associations.
- Excellent, thoughtful and thorough graphic and written presentation.

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 4, 2009

TITLE: 202 South Park Street – Meriter Campus
Master Plan, PUD-GDP. 13th Ald. Dist.
(12023)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 4, 2009

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods; Chair, Todd Barnett, Ron Luskin, Dawn Weber, Mark Smith, Jay Ferm, Ald. Marsha Rummel, Richard Wagner, and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 4, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD-GDP for the Meriter Campus Master Plan at 202 South Park Street, located in Urban Design District No. 7. Appearing on behalf of the applicant were: Melissa Huggins, Doug Hursh, and Jody Shaw. The applicants stated that while this is a long-range plan, it will guide development over the next 10 years. The plan includes the maximum amount of parking that would be provided, but could be reevaluated with each SIP to consider whether less parking would be workable. A transportation analyses was distributed. The applicants reviewed the various components of the plan, including but not limited to: Transportation Demand Management recommendations, preferred phasing, campus sub-districts, overall landscape plan, and demolition plan (although no demolitions are being requested as part of this request).

The Commission expressed appreciation for the thorough presentation and the hospital's desire to remain at this location. The Commission asked the applicants to look carefully at the design of the pedestrian bridges over Park Street, and to consider how to improve and enliven Park Street.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no 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 7, 7.5 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 202 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	7	-	-	-	-	-	7	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.5

General Comments:

- Good presentation, again. A lot of info. Appreciate recognition that revitalizing older housing stock will contribute to TDM plan. Good effort at utilizing existing space to allow Meriter to expand in place.
- Informational GDP! Open meeting on 3/18. Very thorough.
- Very comprehensive. Thorough presentation, excellent job.

**CITY OF MADISON
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL
CORRESPONDENCE**

To: Plan Commission

From: Rebecca S Cnare, Acting Preservation Planner

re: Landmarks Commission Meeting 4/20/09

Date: April 27, 2009

The Landmarks Commission, on a referral from the Common Council recommended the following at its meeting of April 20. Below is a summary of the Landmarks Commission action:

Legistar #13780 (Landmarks Legistar ID#14253):
202 South Park Street – Meriter Campus Master Plan PUD-GDP

By a unanimous vote the Landmarks Commission made the following recommendation:

On a motion by Mr. Levitan, seconded by Konkel, the Commission recommended that the Meriter Campus Plan PUD-GDP be approved with the condition that the height limit of the building next to Longfellow School should be no higher than sixty-five (65) feet, as a building higher than sixty-five (65) feet would have an adverse impact on the Landmark Longfellow School Building, and that Meriter should return to the Landmarks Commission with design details related to the height, location, scale and design of the building adjacent to Longfellow School for approval, when more finalized plans are available. The Commission added that that the housing on Mills Street should be consistent with the results of the Greenbush Workforce Housing Study now being discussed in the neighborhood.

The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

The Minutes from the 4/20/09 Landmarks Commission meeting were as follows:

Melissa Huggins, 202 S Park Street, presented general information about the project information to the Commission. Jody Shaw, 15 Ellis Potter Court, gave a presentation on specific issues regarding building heights, design and locations.

Mr. Levitan asked about the potential height of the proposed building next to Longfellow School. Mr. Shaw replied that it would be up to 6 stories and/or 88 feet tall. Mr. Levitan stated that he believes that that is too tall. Ms Slattery agreed and asked about the height of the School. Mr. Shaw replied that he believes that is it approximately 35 feet tall.

Ms Gehrig noted that Longfellow School already feels dwarfed by some of the surrounding buildings, and that this would only make it worse. She also noted that she would like Meriter to consider keeping the houses where potential townhomes, built up to 42 feet tall, are being proposed. Ms Huggins noted that she is managing a grant project for a Greenbush Workforce Housing Study and Revitalization Project that will be looking into housing issues in the neighborhood. Ms Huggins said that she will forward that information to Ms Gehrig, as that study will help to inform the type of housing that could be a buffer between Meriter and the neighborhood.

Mr. Stephans noted that the height of 6 stories, or 88 feet doesn't necessarily mean that the building will be that tall over the whole site, and suggested that with modulation of building form, setbacks, and stepbacks could help alleviate some of the bulk issue adjacent to Longfellow School, however agreeing that a shorter building height would be better.

Ms Taylor asked if it was absolutely necessary to demolish McConnell Hall to build a parking garage. Ms. Huggins stated that while Meriter is completely committed to the care of Longfellow School, McConnell Hall is not the best example of Colonial Revival, and has many structural and HVAC issues that prevent it from being converted into medical offices. The severe lack of parking and the central location of the site, along with the difficulty of renovating the building for other uses, necessitates the building of a parking garage.

Mr. Levitan stated that Meriter has made a good case for the demolition. Ms. Gehrig added that perhaps the most historic thing about the building was its use as a nurse's dormitory, and that perhaps the new building could use the same name, or otherwise acknowledge the previous use on the site.

Paul Schoeneman, 1108 E Gorham Street, registered in opposition and asked why the parking ramp couldn't be built on the Braxton site, as that is closer to Park Street, and also centrally located.

Ms. Huggins noted that parking would also be a part of the Braxton Place project.

Note to Commission: Meriter Campus Master Plan

Meriter has submitted a PUD-GDP (Planned Unit Development – General Development Plan) development proposal for the Meriter Campus Plan. The campus includes the designated landmark, Longfellow School at 210 S Brooks Street.

Staff has included the Landmark Nomination for the Longfellow School Building in the Landmarks Commission Packet. The Longfellow School was designated a local landmark in 1993.

Potential new addition to Longfellow School:

The campus plan envisions a future addition to the Longfellow School, when it will be remodeled to become medical offices. The campus plan shows that the new addition could be up to five stories in height. As is typical of GDPs, the campus plan only shows the location, massing, height and size of the adjacent/connected building.

Once approved by the Common Council, PUD-GDP zoning provides some assurance that the general, location, scale and massing of the building addition is appropriate.

At this level of design development, staff believes that the new addition is consistent with the standards in section 33.19(5)(b)4 regarding landmark properties. However, the final plans and architectural designs must return to the Landmark Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness when an SIP (Specific Implementation Plan) is proposed, as required by the Landmarks Ordinance. Staff recommends that the Commission recommends only conceptual approval of the addition to Longfellow School, in order to reserve judgment on the design details related to the location, scale and massing of the building when more finalized plans are available.

Potential Demolition of McConnell Hall

The PUD-GDP application also includes future plans to demolish McConnell Hall, a 1939 WPA built building, designed as a nurse's dormitory for the hospital. The building also has a 1969 addition. It is not a designated landmark. As is the case with the Longfellow School addition, the approval of this PUD-GDP, as written, provides some assurance that both the future demolition of the building, along with the scale, mass and future use of the site are appropriate.

Staff understands that the applicant will be providing additional information regarding the historic and architectural context of McConnell Hall to the Landmarks Commission.

Respectfully submitted,
Rebecca Cnare and Bill Fruhling
3/30/09