



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Draft JOINT WEST CAMPUS AREA COMMITTEE

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

4:45 PM

Union South, 3rd Flr Landmark Room
1308 West Dayton Street
Madison WI 53715

****Note** Quorum of the Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee was in attendance at this meeting.**

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Co-chair Carlson called the meeting to order at 4:52 pm.

Present: 16 - Sara Eskrich; Bradley A. Cantrell; Susan M. De Vos; Mary Czyszczak-Lyne; Julia Billingham; Douglas K. Carlson; Leslie G. Orrantia; Gary A. Brown; Rob Kennedy; Kelly Ignatoski; Mark C. Wells; Lisa M. Reese; Karl Frantz; John R. Imes; Felice Borisy-Rudin and Liz E. Vowles

Absent: 3 - Arvina Martin; Sharon Devenish and Liz Douglas

Excused: 3 - Shiva Bidar-Sielaff; Stephanie G. Jones and Beth M. Richmond

PUBLIC COMMENT

One person registered in support of the UW's Campus Institutional (CI) Master Plan.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

1. Campus Master Plan Update – ACTION, recommendation to City of Madison Plan Commission (Campus-Institutional District Master Plan)

Note that the meeting was held with the Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee, and the discussion below contains points from members of both Committees.

Gary Brown presented on the UW's Campus Master Plan, which is proposed for adoption under the City's Campus Institutional (CI) zoning district:

- The approval schedule for CI zoning, contents of the CI Master Plan document, and the existing zoning of the UW campus were reviewed. Brown said that privately held properties within the UW campus boundary are not part of the approval process and would remain as they are zoned now. The UW is requesting that Lot 76, Union South and the Charter Street heating plant be rezoned from PD to CI.
- Czyszczak-Lyne asked if the Kohl Center will remain in PD zoning. Brown said yes.
- All development in CI would go through a new approval process - projects would not go to PC or UDC.
- Cantrell asked about the proposed UW use of property by the MMSD Doyle Administration Building. Brown said any project in that area is not finalized in terms of use, and would be at least 10 years away.

- Bergamini asked about the expected capacity of the Lot 62 ramp that is in the plan; Kennedy said at least 500 stalls, hopefully 600.
- The UW will not exceed 13,000 parking stalls; new stalls that are added will be for visitors. There is a requirement in the proposed CI Master Plan that a traffic impact analysis be performed for any parking related project.
- The building capacity analysis and building removal plan was reviewed.
- Borisy-Rudin asked why all the ROTC buildings were proposed for demolition. Brown said that the UW is planning to combine all ROTC programs in a new Monroe Street location next to UWPD, and that the old sites would be redeveloped into new structures.
- Bergamini asked how many units of housing would be lost if the CI Master Plan is implemented as shown. Brown said that a full calculation has not been performed, but that most residential structures in the building removal plan are two-flats and three-flats. Brown said that the UW already owns three or four of the residential buildings and is using them for offices.
- The new buildings that are proposed over the next 10 years were reviewed.
- Parking was reviewed - the UW anticipates adding 2,165 visitor parking stalls over the next 20-40 years. The need for additional parking will be closely watched, given rapidly advancing autonomous vehicle technology, which could have a significant impact on parking demand.
- Kennedy said that there are 75,000 people on campus during a typical school day, but the UW will not be adding staff parking as part of this plan. However, visitors have to drive, and many have said that they have a difficult time finding parking.
- There could potentially be 751 additional visitor parking spaces by 2025, but there will likely be fewer than that because some surface parking will likely be used for construction of new buildings.
- The Campus Design Guidelines document was reviewed:
 - There are campus design neighborhoods that provide design guidelines for projects;
 - The guidelines cover massing, scale, and building heights. Heights are mainly considered in feet, as the height of stories can vary from building to building;
 - The document contains build-to lines and build-to dimensions;
 - The document also addresses landscape principles and guidelines, building materials and styles, and has a building inventory.
- The proposed composition of the Campus Design Review Board (DRB), which would review projects under the CI zoning, was discussed. The DRB Chair (the University Architect) would be non-voting unless there is a tie. The UW is still working with the City on DRB voting procedures.
- Bergamini asked if the City is now removed from the review process. Brown said that the Joint West or Joint Southeast Committee (depending on the project location) will take the place of the Urban Design Commission, and that City staff will still review all projects for compliance with the approved CI Master Plan.
- Berryman Agard noted that only one alder is included on the DRB and asked what would happen if more than one alder wanted to speak on a project. Brown said that all meetings will be open to the public - anyone can show up to meetings.
- Borisy-Rudin asked if the DRB only applies to projects within the CI district. Brown said yes - projects that are proposed in other zoning districts would have to go to the Plan Commission.
- The proposed project review process under CI zoning and the Joint Campus Committee roles in the project review process were discussed.
- Ignatoski left at 6:11 pm.
- Frantz said that it seems like CI zoning cuts back on the amount of public input for future projects - the City will need to make sure that it is comfortable with the CI Master Plan before approving. Brown said that there will be the same number of public meetings as part of the approval process, and that the UW and City are discussing methods for notifying nearby residents as part of the new process to

make sure people know of projects early on in the design process. The new notification procedure would take the place of the notifications for projects that currently go to the Plan Commission for approval.

- Bergamini said that public participation in design review is significantly reduced under CI zoning because there are fewer members of the public on the DRB. Brown emphasized that the JW/JSE representative on the DRB will have to be from neighborhoods, and could not be from the UW. The UW hopes to run the DRB on a consensus basis.
- DeVos suggested that Ad Hoc DRB members could be alternates who could vote if the DRB does not have its full membership at a given meeting.
- Cantrell said that, as a Plan Commission member, he voted for the zoning ordinance that includes the CI zoning district and the procedure for adopting a CI master plan. The Plan Commission is familiar with the CI district and knows that a plan like the UW's is the result of previous work on the City's updated zoning ordinance. He said that there needs to be an appeals process to the Plan Commission integrated into the UW's CI Master Plan. The DRB may not be able to come to consensus on all projects.
- Crandall asked if there will be any changes to what the current Campus Planning Committee (CPC) does. Brown said that the CPC deals with budgeting, and that there will be no change to that process. The CPC representative on the DRB will provide an overall campus perspective to the DRB process.
- Borisy-Rudin said she is concerned with the proposed ratio on the DRB - the UW has a majority of members, which means there is no power to the City or the public.
- Eskrich said that a lot of power rests in approval of the CI Master Plan that is in front of the Joint West and Joint Southeast Committees tonight, and that the DRB can only consider projects that are included in the CI Master Plan.
- Brown said that projects that involve historic buildings, even if they are not landmarks, must be reviewed by the Historical Society, and there are a lot of buildings that fall under that purview, including the WARF building. Additionally, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required for all projects, and that process requires public input. Not many people have tended to show up to EIS hearings, but that is another opportunity for public comment.
- Bergamini said that many people weighed in on the heating plant project EIS, and that the Historical Society is short staffed and may not be able to give the proper amount of attention to project reviews. Four of the seven on the proposed DRB are UW representatives, and there is no one on the proposed DRB whose primary mission is transportation. We should not be changing the approval structure to say that anything in the CI Master Plan is OK for construction. Brown emphasized that the Joint Committees will have multiple opportunities to make recommendations to the DRB on any project that moves forward under CI zoning, and that hot-button issues, such as parking structures, the potential Energy Institute expansion, and any Camp Randall modifications will all still go through the older process involving the Plan Commission.
- Imes asked if the involvement of the Ad Hoc members could be triggered if consensus is not achieved at the DRB. Brown said that idea could be examined further as the rules of the DRB are written.
- Cantrell said that it may be appropriate to have the City send out the same type of notification to the neighborhood for CI projects as was done when projects went in front of the Plan Commission. That would help avoid questions later in the process that can result if people learn about the project late in the approval process.
- Frantz said that if new projects not illustrated in the Master Plan come forward the plan would need to be amended through a public process. Brown said that is true, and mentioned that projects in the Master Plan are not locked into the estimated construction timeframes in the plan - projects can be shifted forward if funding becomes available sooner than expected.
- Borisy-Rudin said that the DRB's majority are UW-affiliated members, and asked if the the DRB could choose not to follow a JW or JSE recommendation. Brown said

yes, that could happen, but that the UW is not looking to use the CI Master Plan to suddenly start overriding public input.

- Eskrich said that a master plan adopted under CI zoning carries a lot of weight - it will not just sit on a shelf - City staff and the JW/JSE Committees will look to make sure it is followed when reviewing projects.
- Kennedy said that in his many years on JW, he has seen that design changes based on input given through the process tend to be addressed by the UW.
- Brown emphasized that EIS comments by the public can greatly modify, or even stop, projects as well, in addition to the new City CI process that would take place under an adopted CI Master Plan.

Czynszak-Lyne moved to recommend approval of the UW's Campus Institutional Master Plan to the Plan Commission, with draft minutes to be forwarded to the Commission so they could consider the discussion that has taken place in the Joint West meeting. Cantrell seconded. Frantz asked if the neighborhoods around the UW were comfortable with the UW's CI Master Plan. Carlson said that the Vilas Neighborhood is comfortable with the CI zoning – questions from the Vilas neighborhood have been adequately addressed by the UW. Billingham said that the Dudgeon-Monroe neighborhood is comfortable with CI zoning. Czynszak-Lyne said that the main concern from the Regent neighborhood was that Camp Randall Stadium and parking remain as PD zoning, which is being done. Motion approved unanimously by voice vote.

ROLL CALL

Present: 15 - Sara Eskrich; Bradley A. Cantrell; Susan M. De Vos; Mary Czynszak-Lyne; Julia Billingham; Douglas K. Carlson; Leslie G. Orrantia; Gary A. Brown; Rob Kennedy; Mark C. Wells; Lisa M. Reese; Karl Frantz; John R. Imes; Felice Borisy-Rudin and Liz E. Vowles

Absent: 3 - Arvina Martin; Sharon Devenish and Liz Douglas

Excused: 4 - Shiva Bidar-Sielaff; Stephanie G. Jones; Kelly Ignatoski and Beth M. Richmond

2. **Campus Master Plan Update – ACTION, recommendation to City of Madison Plan Commission (rezoning from PD to CI).**

Cantrell moved to recommend approval of rezoning of 2501 University Bay Drive (Lot 76 Parking Ramp) from PD-Planned Development to CI-Campus Institutional to the Plan Commission. Billingham seconded. Motion approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. **WIMR West Wedge presentation – ACTION, recommendation to the Village of Shorewood Hills**

Marc Walker of Flad Architects, the project architect for the UW, presented:

- Existing conditions were summarized and a rendering of proposed conditions was shown. The project adds two floors of research space. Mechanicals will exhaust to top of WIMR roof, as they do currently.
- Czynszak-Lyne asked if there will be a noise study done for the new project. Walker said yes. Czynszak-Lyne asked if the wedge will ever get another vertical addition? Walker said no.
- The site plan and landscaping were reviewed.
- Imes asked why there is no green roof. Walker said that it is anticipated that a green roof will be added when Tower 3 is constructed - Tower 3 construction will

- include roof access.
- Borisy-Rudin asked about the green wall on the proposed plans. Walker said that it is a temporary exterior green feature to soften the west façade.
- Borisy-Rudin asked whether the project includes skylights. Walker said that those will not be included.
- Czyszczak-Lyne asked if new bike racks are included. Walker said that no additional bike racks will be installed as part of the project, and that all access will be card access through an existing WIMR entrance.
- Materials and colors will be the same as the building between WIMR tower 1 and tower 2. Glazing on Towers 1 and 2 will match as well.
- Czyszczak-Lyne asked if the building includes glass that is safe for birds. Brown said that the front of the building will have trees, and said that the project has not gotten as far as selecting glass yet, but the project team will look at what can be done for birds when the project reaches the point of selecting what type of glass will be used.
- Imes asked about the plants that will be used for the green wall. Walker said that a vertical creeping vine will be used - the exact species has not been selected yet.
- The green roof design was reviewed, though the green roof will not be installed until Tower 3 is constructed.
- The construction schedule was reviewed. Construction is expected to be complete in September 2019.
- Czyszczak-Lyne asked about the best way to make a motion, considering the project is in the Village of Shorewood Hills, and most JW members are from the City and UW. Cantrell said that any motion is simply a recommendation to the Village, and they are free to consider it, or not, at their discretion.

Cantrell moved to recommend of approval of the WIMR west wedge addition to the Village of Shorewood Hills. Seconded by Czyszczak-Lyne. A friendly amendment was offered and accepted by Cantrell to forward the draft JW minutes to the Village. Frantz said that he will vote on the project since all phases of the WIMR project were previously approved, in a slightly different form, by the Village Board.

The motion was approved 13-0, with Borisy-Rudin and Imes abstaining.

4. LOCAL AGENCY UPDATES

Co-chair Carlson said that, unless there were objections from the Committee, all updates would be postponed until the next scheduled JW meeting. There were no objections.

5. NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Co-chair Carlson said that, unless there were objections from the Committee, all updates would be postponed until the next scheduled JW meeting. There were no objections.

ADJOURNMENT

Eskrich moved to adjourn. Kennedy seconded. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 6:59pm.