

University of Wisconsin – Madison
2005 Campus Master Plan

Formal Comments from Neighborhood Associations

CAPITAL NEIGHBORHOODS, INC.

From: Ledell Zellers [lzellers@mailbag.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2005 7:41 am
To: Drury, Gwendolyn; sglen@prodigy.net
Subject: RE: Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. input on campus master plan

Hello Gwen,

We didn't have a presentation of the master plan to CNI and have not prepared a formal response. There are a number of things about the plan with which individuals in CNI are quite happy – others with which they disagree. They are pleased that Al Fish is talking about promoting owner occupancy in neighborhoods around the UW (although he leaves out Mansion Hill when he mentions the neighborhoods that might have good owner occupant possibilities – which is unfortunate).

Best,
Ledell

DUDGEON-MONROE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

February 28 (May 12), 2005

PRELIMINARY DUDGEON-MONROE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
UW MASTER PLAN COMMENTS

These are mid-point comments on the University's updating of its Long Range Plan. As more concrete proposals emerge, we expect to react to them as well in a constructive fashion.

As a foundation for all discussion, we submit that there are mutual interests between our neighborhood and the UW. We, along with other nearby neighborhoods, are the University's front yard or gateway, prominent to potential employees and students, and the home of many staff members and students as well. It is in everyone's interest to keep these neighborhoods healthy and livable.

We also want to compliment University staff and consultants for pulling together concepts for green space and views that will enhance the experience of this special

campus setting. We like the idea of trying to use building clusters to create a better sense of community.

NEW POINTS ADDED AFTER THE 4/05 JWCAC MEETING (discussed at the 5-4-05 Transportation Committee meeting and during (and by e-mail after) the 5/11/05 DMNA Council Meeting.)

1. We are extremely pleased the University is formally recognizing its impact on the surrounding neighborhoods in identifying a “transitional zone” at its borders. However, the transition zone at the University-neighborhood border is much narrower than the University’s actual impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. We would like to have a conversation about the rationale behind the University’s designation of that narrow band, as opposed to the blocks outside the edge of the transition zone, and as opposed to the commuter routes that cross our neighborhoods (SEE point #1 below) and are a major influence on our quality of life. We would also ask how the University’s “particular interest” in the transition zone mentioned in reports translates in action? We are unsure whether DMNA’s Clarendon Apts., just off Breese Terrace, are included in this zone. We are hearing reports that renters increasingly include students, and there are several houses on adjacent Stockton Court that are also student rentals.

2. We would like to see the University use its new data on the location of staff residences with its plans for new buildings and parking ramp distribution to estimate traffic volume changes at the three or four main campus vehicle entrance points. Then we would like to have a meaningful discussion of the results.

Dudgeon-Monroe is of course concerned about any increase in traffic at West and Athletic/Engineering/South campus entrance points, as it will pass through our already burdened neighborhood. We note that historically the west campus was the parking lot for the entire University campus, and that it appears that it will still provide a disproportionate amount of campus parking – and commuter traffic through our neighborhoods.

FORMAL POSITIONS TAKEN IN THE PAST AND REAFFIRMED HERE:

1. CAMPUS PARKING

DMNA opposes any significant increase in campus parking because it brings more traffic through our neighborhood as well as the rest of the city. Monroe is our busiest street at about 20,000 vehicles a day, showing steady increases over the last 20 years. Glenway shows the most obvious negative impact at 8,300 cars a day, many of them moving to and from campus at Farwell or Franklin/Speedway.

Glenway shows the ill effects of such heavy traffic on a residential street in the amount of absentee-landlord-owned rental housing, unlike the rest of our neighborhood. The few longtime owners still on the street tell us that they knew exactly when the UW Hospital opened because of the big increase in traffic. Glenway’s problems stem largely

from the major commuter route from the West Campus to Farley/Franklin/Highland and Speedway to southwest Madison to rapidly growing Fitchburg and Verona.

2. ROUTES TO WORK/CLASS MUST ENCOURAGE WALKERS & BIKERS

We are eager to cooperate with the city and UW on a systematic assessment of the most popular “routes to work/class” to make them more pleasant, direct/convenient, and safe, to encourage nearby residents to use their muscles or take the bus (the inclement weather refuge) on their work commute. With such a short travel distance the large number of UW employees in our neighborhood should nearly all be traveling to work in something besides a single-occupant vehicle. There are significant barriers that need to be improved en route, both in the city and on campus. Buses, the bad weather backup for walkers and bikers, and the preferred mode of transport for the less able, are an important component too. We are happy to work toward good bus service.

3. CAMPUS EDGES

Campus should present a welcome face to outsiders, while making campus boundaries clear. We suggest that clear graphics be developed to aid visitors to campus, both at the edges and internally. Al Fish’s recent comments about way-finding problems at University Hospitals are an example of the need, and we are glad to see this focus emerge.

3. UW SPECIAL EVENTS IMPACT

The great volume of University fans continues to periodically overwhelm the neighborhoods around the stadium. We want to thank the University for its efforts to clean up after them and to improve fan behavior. We believe these efforts need to continue through the coordinating process now in place.

3. TDM APPLAUSE

We want to compliment the UW on its Traffic Demand Management, which has been quite bold and we believe, effective, in the last several years. We encourage them to continue their efforts, and we want to go on record as happy to do whatever we can to work with the University in this effort (see #2 for instance).

4. TRUNCATED ZONING PROCESS

Al Fish has stated that he wants this Master Plan update to serve as effective city approval of UW building & development plans until the next plan update, rather than going through the present full city zoning process, building by building. We look forward to committee discussion to clarify this position.

We ask whether there could possibly be sufficient detail in this plan to make pre-approval prudent in all cases. We ask whether city commissions could possibly look closely enough now at a massive plan now to be sure a particular project won’t later create traffic or other problems to close-in neighborhoods and the city in general? Changes in building plans are also inevitable as time goes on and may drastically change their impact on the surrounding neighborhoods and the city.

Our neighborhood is willing to see some corners cut from the zoning process for buildings in the middle of campus within some obvious bounds in size and height and with little or no impact on the surrounding city, but we feel the city and its neighborhoods need to be consulted for projects near campus boundaries (for any project that would generate major building shadows, noise or fumes off-campus, and certainly for any project like parking ramps, that may increase and/or reroute commuter and service traffic. We would think that the city would want to retain the right to ask for the full zoning process should preliminary plans for any particular project throw up any red flags.

For instance, we have heard very preliminary concept plans for the Institute for Discovery, but they may change dramatically depending on the amount of funding and changes in perceived scientific and environmental needs. In addition, our neighborhood, and presumably others, will be very concerned about any increase in parking at that location, as it will inevitably funnel through our neighborhoods from that location.

6. STUDENT HOUSING

Every past ring of student rental housing encircling campus has been torn down for UW expansion in the past. Now the UW plans to stay within existing boundaries, and proposes a “transition zone” at the edge of campus, e.g. Breese Terrace and Regent, in which they would take particular interest. How would the University’s “particular interest” translate in action?

The proposal to house many students in privately owned high rise student apartments (similar to the popular 10 to 12 story ones at Gorham and University), with some return of students rentals to occupant-owned housing as a result sounds like an interesting solution.

It also raises important questions.

- Is this the best housing for undergrads?
- How easy is it for troubled students to get lost in such large buildings without community or counselors?
- What impact would it have on maturing student behavior, e/g/ drinking problems? Wouldn't it increase the divide between the affluent and the poor students?
- Where would these buildings be located – at the edge of campus in our neighborhoods? How do we integrate students in such large numbers in one building into our neighborhoods?
- If these large buildings were to be built at the UW/neighborhood edge (uncertain), what kind of neighbors would they be, with building shadows, a large population of drinking undergrads, and parking and traffic problems created by the density?
- Is there any way to use the vacated housing to house UW employees at the low end of the pay scale? They probably most need the cheap to free transportation provided by closeness to campus and walk-able neighborhoods.

We look forward to a further fleshing out of this concept, although we see that we pose a number of difficult questions above.

EAGLE HEIGHTS AND UNIVERSITY HOUSES ASSEMBLY

TO: Gary Brown and Campus Master Plan Committee
FROM: Laura Smith, Eagle Heights and University Houses Assembly Chair
DATE: March 7, 2005
RE: Assembly reactions to Campus Master Plan meeting

As an assembly we want to thank you for taking the time to explain the Campus Master Plan to us. As you probably know, we represent the over 4,000 residents that live within the Eagle Heights and University Houses area. We recognize that your presentation within our housing area was an acknowledgement of the significance of our group within the campus community.

In our February Assembly meeting we held a discussion soliciting feedback from our residents regarding the content of the Master Plan meeting. We wanted to send this memo to let you know about several concerns and suggestions we would like you to consider as the plan is formulated and changes are made.

Our main concern with the plan as presented lay in transportation issues. Travel from Eagle Heights and University Houses to campus is a huge issue for our residents. Our residents generally cycle or bus to campus for work, school, and (occasionally) recreation. We are close to campus but too far to walk in a timely manner. The distance from Eagle Heights to Memorial Union is close to 3 miles: A very fast walker might be able to make it to the Memorial Union in 30-40 minutes, but slower walkers may take considerably longer.

On cold or wet days the bus is our only option. Taking the bus, however, often involves a long and standing-room only journey (try riding bus 80 during peak hours of 8-10 a.m. and 4:30-6:30 p.m. from Eagle Heights to the campus or vice versa). Some residents ride their bicycles through snow and ice simply because they find it is faster than the bus. Others take their cars and are dropped off or park in the a rare parking spot. We strongly feel that campus bussing—especially for Eagle Heights and University Houses—needs improvement.

As we understand it, planners would like to see people be able to travel from one point on campus to their destination within 10 minutes. This is not at all possible for our residents. Before you think that we are not technically part of campus and this travel guideline should not apply to us, please remember that we are “On-Campus” housing. We are a huge population of faculty, staff, and students; a significant fraction of our population must travel to the University on a daily basis. We feel that to really facilitate campus travel we need to be included in the master plan.

The following list gives some of the suggestions resulting from our discussion regarding campus bussing:

1. Leave Bus 80 as is, with bus frequency increased during peak hours of 8-10 a.m. and 4:30-6:30 p.m. to at least every 4 minutes.
2. Increase weekend bus frequency to every 20 minutes (currently, the bus comes about every 45 minutes to an hour on weekends).
3. Eliminate reduced service during recess hours. Our community is made up of faculty, staff and graduate students. It does not make sense to schedule around the undergraduate calendar when our need for access to campus is the same every day.
4. We would like to see buses run on Christmas and New Year's Day. Most of our residents stay year round and need transportation every day of the year.
5. Consider creating a route to University Avenue to allow access to grocery, doctors, shopping, etc. (could be solved by creating the express line as explained below)
6. Consider creating a new express bus line that would travel on main roads to speed east-west travel with Eagle Heights, lot 60, the University Hospital, Union South, Johnson Street, the Memorial Union, and University Avenue as the main service areas. (see explanation below)
7. The idea of an East-West line that did not include Eagle Heights is unacceptable to our residents as transfers for riders into that line would be nightmarish especially for those with disabilities or small children.

The above list refers to an Express Bus Line. We envision such a bus line as follows:

The Express Bus Line travels in a loop. For purposes of discussion, assume that the loop begins at the Eagle Heights brown bus shelter. Starting at the brown bus shelter, continue around the current Eagle Heights loop of Lake Mendota Drive, turn left onto University Bay Drive, past lot 60, University Hospital, continuing past the Waisman Center onto University Bay Drive, left onto University Avenue, traveling down Campus Drive to Johnson and Union South, continuing on Johnson, left on Park to the Memorial Union building and back to University via Charter or bypassing north Park completely and turning directly onto University Ave. The bus would then return via University avenue to University Bay Drive, pass the hospital, Waisman Center, lot 60, and then return to Eagle Heights (see attached image –map.jpg—for a map).

We feel the creation of this new bus line would provide great service to the faculty, staff, students, and other residents of our housing area. It would also provide great service for those that park in the outer lots 60 and 129-132. It would provide better access to the hospitals, med school, and pharmacy school. It would speed traveling time drastically for those bus riders that need to travel from one end of the campus to the other. It would provide transfer access to all other bus routes that travel along University Avenue thus providing much needed access to grocery stores, shopping, doctors, etc. for our residents.

Again, we appreciate your discussion of the Master Plan with our community. Please feel free to contact us for clarification of any of the issues discussed above or for discussion.

Thank you,
Laura Smith

EAGLE HEIGHTS ADMINISTRATION

The University Apartments community (Eagle Heights, University Houses) is nestled between the Lakeshore Nature Preserve and the Village of Shorewood Hills (VOSH). In working with staff and the Eagle Heights/Harvey Street Assembly, please consider the following when establishing boundary issues between Eagle Heights, University Houses, Village of Shorewood Hills and the Lakeshore Nature Preserve.

1. The Eagle Heights and University Houses community gardens are consistently rated one of the most valued services to University Apartments residents.
2. Establish clear signage at entrance points to the University. Of particular interest, is the entrance on Lake Mendota Drive at the corner of the Eagle Heights Woods and the 500s units of Eagle Heights. The boundary definitions for VOSH, the Preserve and EH are very confusing at and around this area. In the past signage has been similar between VOSH and Eagle Heights, possibly because they are both residential neighborhoods. It might be helpful to make a distinction between the Preserve, entrance to the University and both residential areas.
3. A clear, inclusive planning framework and communication network is needed to address the needs of the three stakeholders. This has been difficult, at times, for a variety of reasons. (e.g. boundaries overlap, jurisdictions are unclear, the inclusion of affected stakeholders has been inconsistent).
4. The Lakeshore Nature Preserve is a wonderful asset to the University and the community at large; it is also the backyard to Eagle Heights and University Houses residents. They are one of the largest users of the Preserve. Decisions regarding its use impact the day to day lives of the University Apartments community. Concerns about safety, access, and increased traffic are University Apartments concerns, similar to the concerns VOSH has about its neighborhood.
5. With collaboration, there are a lot of opportunities for VOSH, the Preserve, and University Housing to do joint planning/funding for projects and/or academic or research projects between areas which would enhance the overall mission of the University (e.g. Pathways through the Preserve areas may include a path through Eagle Heights).

Respectfully,

Laura Shere

Assistant Director-University Apartments
University Housing
6/20/05

Greenbush Neighborhood Association

Comments from Greenbush Neighborhood on the UW master plan

Overall comments:

We appreciate and support the UW's Transportation Demand Management program, which should be an example to other Madison employers. We're glad to hear that the UW is continuing to support and develop this program.

Central Campus:

Union South: We are optimistic about renovating Union South, but we are very concerned that changing traffic patterns from the garage there will add traffic to the already-troubled Regent Street corridor. As plans develop, we want to hear about how the University plans to mitigate this. The traffic on Regent Street is already at failing grades during rush hour, and traffic counts on S. Mills Street [sic]

Institute for Discovery: The Institute will be a great addition to campus, but in the wake of the Chemistry addition and the Charter Street Plant, we are very sensitive to any additions to the noise pollution problems that already exist for our neighborhood. We hope that any ventilation systems for these buildings use state of the art noise control.

New academic facilities in Central and South Campus areas:

We are optimistic about replacing some of the truly run-down buildings in this area. We are concerned, however, that we maintain Regent Street's feel as a commercial district and that more opportunities for diverse businesses are added to this street.

The campus area between Randall and Park, Dayton and Regent, lacks a sense of place. It is our hope that as new construction occurs, there will be landscaping, small patches of greenspace, centers of activity, or others things that will help develop a sense of place and continuity between commercial district on Regent, Housing in the South Campus area, any new academic facilities, and the large service area to be built on Lot 51. We also feel that non-UW development needs to be carefully planned in conjunction with the UW's plans for development in this area. It is especially noteworthy that there is no greenspace serving the large population of 18-24 year olds in this area, and we hope that greenspace can be incorporated into any new development here.

In the case that the UW develops facilities of any sort directly on immediately next to Regent Street, we hope that they will remain mixed-use, with storefronts at street level. The Greenbush Neighborhood plan calls for no higher than 4 stories in any development on Regent Street.

Regent Street needs to have some careful planning by the city, as a business district, as an entertainment district on Football Saturdays, and as a transportation thoroughfare, and we hope that the UW will be present and part of that process when it happens.

Housing in the central and south campus area:

Our neighborhood is largely in favor of building more housing, both dormitory and apartment, for students in the downtown area. Most of us believe that this will relieve some of the economic pressure on homes in our neighborhood and bring more diversity to our neighborhood population by allowing owner-occupancy or even family rental. On the other hand, large-scale student developments in the College Park Area have proven to be one of the areas with the highest number of alcohol-related arrests in the city, and there is an unsafe-feeling enough that employees of Davis Duehr Dean ask for a security escort to get to their parked cars on College Ct. We worry that adding more students in large, anonymous apartment buildings would make this area worse. We would like to hear from anyone developing housing in this area how they would prevent this from happening, for example, structuring housing in a dormitory-like way with resident counselors and spaces for community-building activities that do not involve alcohol. The UW might have an interest in developing a “best practices” guide for developers of housing for students that could describe how to build housing that best supports a diversity of students who are making healthy alcohol and other lifestyle choices.

Utilities Planning:

GNA is very concerned about the Charter Street Steam Plant and its impact, with noise and pollution, on our neighborhood and the natural areas around it. We are pleased about plans to house the coal for the plant inside a building, and we want to encourage the UW to implement other measures that will either eliminate the plant’s use of coal altogether or to use state-of-the-art technologies to make the plant operate more cleanly. We hope that the building that will contain the coal will be as attractive as a building that contains coals can be. We look forward to meeting with the UW when they are developing more specific plans about the Charter Street Plant.

Sunset Village Community Association

May 20, 2005

Gary A. Brown, FASLA, Director
Planning & Landscape Architecture Facilities Planning & Management
University of Wisconsin
Madison
EMAIL: gbrown@fpm.wisc.edu

Re: Written Comments for the Joint West Campus Area Committee

Dear Mr. Brown,

Additional comments on the UW Master Plan were requested from residents at the May 12, 2005 meeting of the Sunset Village Community Association (SVCA). Below is the association's position on the proposed Master Plan.

1. While SVCA does not directly border the University, we are directly affected by traffic on University Avenue, congested parking on residential streets, exiting and future transit, student and staff housing concerns, accessibility and appearance of recreational and natural areas and a desire for a sense of community with the University.
2. SVCA commends UW for limiting parking on campus and encouraging transportation alternatives, however we would like to see a real effort to discourage UW commuter parking on residential streets. This is a major concern as our quiet neighborhood begins to feel more and more like a parking lot. We would hope in your master plan you might work more with the city or local churches to increase Park-and-Ride capacity for students and staff. Increase communication with students and staff to discourage parking in neighborhoods would also help.
3. UW working pro-actively with the city and Shorewood Hills for pedestrian crossings across University would be very beneficial.
4. Sign Pole banners instead of large signs would define the campus and better designate different sections of the campus and assist with traffic flow to academic, recreational and natural areas.
5. SVCA is grateful for your decision to increase density versus expanding into existing neighborhoods. We would like more information on how the UW plans to accomplish this.
6. SVCA would welcome the opportunity to work together on the planning of future public structures designated for traffic concerns.

Thank you for this opportunity to participate in the process. Without good neighborhoods and without the University neither could exist.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Ringle
SVCA Co-President

Liz Vowles
SVCA Joint West Campus
Area Committee Chair

Jean MacCubbin
SVCA Member

Additional comments on parking from Liz Vowles

We acknowledge that the UW is not going to increase its staff or student body, and that overall parking capacity on campus will remain the same, so that the traffic and parking burdens on surrounding neighborhoods should not be increased as a result of the Master

Plan. However, the Master Plan gives us all an opportunity and forum to address these problems.

We would like to see a real effort to discourage UW commuter parking on residential streets. This could include substantially increasing Park-and-Ride capacity, for both students and staff, as well as regular communications to the effect that parking in neighborhoods is not good behavior. It is great that parking is limited on campus and that people are given other transportation alternatives, but their actual and persisting behavior needs to be acknowledged and addressed rather than simply pushed past the boundaries of the university.

REGENT NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Draft Comments on 2005 Campus Master Plan
Regent Neighborhood Association, Inc.
May 25, 1005

These preliminary comments respond to UW's request that stakeholders provide responses to the 2005 Campus Master Plan by the end of May. Comments from the Regent Neighborhood Assoc. (RNA), Inc., board members and committees are still arriving, and will be submitted by the association later in June following recommendation/approval by the RNA board of directors.

The comments track the headings from the "Summary of Draft Master Plan Concepts."

Planning principles

Add – New development and redevelopment of existing structures on campus edges and boundaries respects the scale and character of neighborhoods that surround the campus boundary.

Assumptions

Add – Making the campus boundary permanent will allow for the potential development of mixed use and other types of partnerships between the private sector and UW as well as infrastructure and transportation improvements between UW and the city of Madison/village of Shorewood.

Major elements of the plan

9. The use of neighborhood in this context is confusing, as parts of campus already abut existing city neighborhoods. In the context used, it is understandable that campus buildings have the same guidelines, but also it is important to consider that campus guidelines for buildings adjacent to existing city neighborhoods should have guidelines that result in compatibility with surrounding neighborhood character and scale.

10. Consider adding "water" as stormwater management in relation to the existing campus natural areas is a concern. And where is the new "green line" –

or has one been re-established?

11. Add – minimize noise, emissions, light pollution...

12. Add – emphasize physical connections to campus, and particularly integrate surrounding neighborhoods into the pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular management scheme. [currently enforcement, services, etc. stop at the campus edge, and the division between jurisdictions is all to apparent]

13. Add – work with neighborhoods to develop an array of retail and commercial services that are within easy walking distance that benefit faculty/staff/students as well as varying types of neighborhood residents.

West Campus

Recognize the issues presented by University Station (lack of connectivity/access) and potentially other leases spaces, and require the same access standards (for pedestrians, busses, etc.) that are envisioned to apply to new construction on campus.

Central Campus

It is unclear how redevelopment (of Linden Drive) and proposed new development will affect traffic movements through central campus – will this have the effect of shifting additional vehicular traffic to existing arterials?

No mention of whether an attempt will be made to reintroduce appropriate private retail/commercial services to University Ave.

Long range transportation plan elements

Consider including neighborhood residents in bus pass and other initiatives (for either no or reduced fees), particularly since campus busses either are, or will likely use, residential streets. (consistent with #5 and #6)

Add - Study the conversion of Campus Drive to a boulevard concept instead of reconstruction as a limited-access highway. (combine with/or eliminate costs attributed to #12, #17, #20, #21)

Utilities master plan elements

2. Develop planning principles that...Minimize transmission of noise and vibration

Comments on draft (housing) letter to Mayor Cieslewicz

The devil is in the details, not all neighborhoods, or even parts of neighborhoods, have the same housing situs and structure relationships, or face the same challenges.

The Regent Neighborhood has a number of concerns, not the least of which is the effect alcohol consumption and related inappropriate behavior by students has on the livability

of parts of the neighborhood. The RNA, with the UW and Madison Police Dept., has developed several activities throughout the year whose purpose is to acquaint new residents with the neighborhood. Give the existing historic district adjacent to the stadium (and relative lack of sub-standard housing), the issues are a little different than in other areas near to campus. As research continues on background data for the current city-funded Regent Neighborhood Plan, we welcome the opportunity to share this information and work with the UW to begin to identify potential strategies that would strengthen owner-occupied housing adjacent to campus, as well as opportunities for maintaining and/or developing a range of housing alternatives for faculty, staff and students in the Old University Ave., and Kendal/Stevens Street Corridors.

COMMENTS FROM KAREN CORNWELL

Comments on Campus Master Plan 2005
May 25, 2005
Karen Cornwell, Dane County Supervisor

Planning Principles and Assumptions – In general, these principles are good, but perhaps a principle relating to services for the university/research community and a principle related to the transportation goals.

Suggested Services/Restaurants Principle idea

A permanent boundary means that investors and business people will be able to make investments along the well defined edge of campus to provide services to the 60,000 people that travel to the university every day. By providing services close to campus, people are able to easily walk to such services, supporting the assumption that there will be reduced vehicular traffic in and around campus. Going even further would be a principle related to the idea suggested before about allowing mixed-use retail/food establishments in some university buildings.

Suggested Transportation Principle Idea

“The campus will continue to rely on Transportation Demand Management techniques and continue physical improvement to the connections between campus and the community to achieve the goals of reducing traffic in and around campus.”

Major Elements of the Plan

9. The use of the word neighborhood here is confusing. Perhaps, “Areas of campus will have their own sets of design guidelines to improve and enhance the existing and proposed differences in architectural character.”
10. “*minimize our impact on the land and water.*” Addition of the words “and water” would put storm water management more directing in the document.

11. Provide a utilities master plan to assure new facilities can be adequately served with steam heat, chilled water, sanitary and storm sewer, **storm water treatment facilities**, IT services, etc. using state of the art technology and systems that minimize noise, light, pollution and emission problems for the surrounding community.

12. Add a new major element – **Analyze the edge of campus to improve and enhance the physical connections to campus. Produce pedestrian, bike and bus maps at the micro level that helps guide such improvements.**

13. Add a new major element – **With the help of the surrounding community, analyze and map the existing and future services, both public and private, available to the campus community within easy walking distance of different areas of campus.**

Also, where is the new green line?

West Campus (University Bay Drive to Elm Drive)

The omission of the University Station, a University Hospital facility at 2880 University Avenue from the master plan is disappointing. This facility is a rented property, but the lack of sidewalks to the facility from either University Avenue or Marshall Park is not a good situation. People using any transportation other than a car must use the street. This problem should be addressed in the Master Plan. The university should require that rented property that will be serving the public, like a clinic, will conform to certain basic standards that require the building to have sidewalks and connections to the surrounding community.

Central Campus (Elm Drive to Charter Street)

2. If Linden were to be developed with more pedestrian character, would the traffic be shifted to Observatory Drive? This would be in keeping with the assumption to reduce traffic in and around campus.

In general, this area of campus is very deficient in services for students and employees. The earlier proposal to provide services in a mixed-use building at 1300 University Avenue was a step in the right direction. Not acquiring every property with(in) the campus boundary in this area and allowing private retail and services to be re-established would help strengthen the campus and the community.

East Campus (Charter Street to Francis Street)

5. Potential capacity expansion to Charter Street heating plant including improved environmental controls on the entire plant. This would include storm water, noise, lighting and emissions.

13. Would the added traffic of a ramp expansion at Lake and Francis cause major congestion difficulties for Johnson Street, a major through fare?

Long Range Transportation Plan Elements

7. **Map**, improve and add to existing bicycle routes and facilities...**Include connections to the surround community.**

8. Map and improve pedestrian connections across campus **and to the surrounding community.**

Utilities Master Plan Element

2. New principle – “Develop and follow noise control standards.”

VILAS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Date: June 19, 2005
To: Gary Brown, Director of Planning and Landscape Architecture, Facilities Planning and Management, University of Wisconsin - Madison
From: Julia Kerr, President, Vilas Neighborhood Association (VNA)
Brad Ricker, VNA representative, JWCAC
Subject: UW-Madison Campus Master Plan
Cc: Alder Isadore Knox
Lamarr Billups
Amy Roundtree, Greenbush NA
Darryl Sherman, DMNA
Joy Drummond, Regent NA
VNA Council Members

The continued development of campus facilities is a critical element in the continued success of the University of Wisconsin – Madison, and is therefore an important investment in the future prosperity of the City of Madison and State of Wisconsin. As an organization representing some of the University’s closest residential neighbors, the Vilas Neighborhood Association (VNA) is pleased to take part in the development of a new Master Plan to guide this development.

The initial documents developed and shared by Facilities Planning and Management, as well as the public presentation and listening sessions held this past February, give us good reason to be excited and optimistic about the future of the University. In general we like the types of buildings and the locations being considered for replacement and expanded research, educational and service facilities. However, we are concerned about

how activities in existing campus buildings, as well as future ones, impact our neighborhood through a variety of indirect ways. Among these are housing of students, faculty, and staff; movement of these constituencies between their homes and campus locations; and the social and economic behavior of students and visitors in the proximity of the campus and our neighborhood. The movement and behavior of occasional campus visitors, most specifically attendees at sports and entertainment events and the potential to redevelop Regent Street, are further areas of concern that we have addressed in this memorandum.

While the Master Plan is intended to address the future need for campus buildings and other physical facilities, we request that the following areas of concern and opportunities for improved interaction with our neighborhood be considered and reflected in the final document.

Housing

Historically, one of the greatest indirect effects that the University has had on many Near-West neighborhoods has been the conversion of owner-occupied homes to student rentals. We applaud the fact that the University has begun discussions with neighborhood associations and the City of Madison about how some of these buildings can be re-converted to family housing with the hope that faculty and staff will choose to live near the university and walk or bike to work. While it is not directly a master plan issue in the sense of guiding the future development of the University's campus, we can not emphasize enough how important the University's hands-on and substantial effort in restoring family housing to near-campus areas will be to the long-term viability of the neighborhoods near the university.

In addition to actively working with the city and neighborhoods to re-convert rental housing, the University must also build additional dorm rooms to house its students. Much has been written about the academic and social benefits that first-year students realize from being housed in university-managed dormitories. In addition to accommodating all freshmen in university-sponsored dorms, we would strongly urge the university to seriously consider the benefits to its students and the life of the University of housing sophomores and build additional dorm space to accommodate second-year students as well.

Transportation and Parking

Our neighborhood is impacted by UW-associated traffic and we request that the Master Plan include the analysis and modeling of pedestrian, bike, moped, bus and car traffic to and from present and future campus facilities, to anticipate problems and either modify the location, size or use of buildings, or plan and implement offsetting initiatives. Example problem – increased number of participants in health science cluster on the west end of campus (versus former central campus locations) may redirect and increase traffic through the Vilas, Dudgeon-Monroe and Regent neighborhoods. Example problem and solution – to reduce dependence on car and bus transportation, the UW will take advantage of the SW Bike Path and be providing secure bicycle parking during football games.

We also would like the Master Plan to include provisions for improved North-South pedestrian and bike routes to campus from the Vilas neighborhood to encourage further residential settlement by faculty and staff. Among initiatives we recommend are safer crossings for Regent Street and improved streetscapes on Randall, Orchard, Charter and/or Mills. Other transportation-related items to address in the Master Plan or subsequent documents include the proactive management of special events to distribute traffic flow over time (a la Rhythm and Booms), modeling parking demand and economics to anticipate unintended effects such as an off-campus, commercial parking lot, and identifying and encouraging extended use of University parking resources for compatible off-peak activities, for example Lot 20 parking by patrons of the Luther's Blues nightclub before it closed.

Social Impact of the University

University facilities and activities can have powerful socio-economic effects on nearby neighborhoods. One of the most significant negative impacts that University students and campus visitors have on the Vilas neighborhood is the effect of excessive alcohol consumption. Large crowds and the social acceptance of alcohol consumption at sporting events have led to the prevalence of bars and temporary beer gardens in the Regent-Monroe area. Like anything else, a sense of balance must be maintained and the University should, and does, play a key role in this area. We believe that it is appropriate for the University to do more to evaluate and creatively respond to this threat to the quality of life in the Vilas neighborhood. Among ideas to explore are:

- Devote substantially more resources to assisting the City of Madison Police Department in adequately patrolling neighborhoods adjacent to Camp Randall before, during, and after football games;
- Hold annual town and gown alcohol brainstorming and discussion meetings in advance of fall football games;
- Join with the VNA in actively opposing additional alcohol licenses along Regent Street and supporting the neighborhood association's efforts to revoke licenses or request sanctions in the event licensed establishments are determined to be operated irresponsibly or in substantial conflict with the surrounding residential neighborhoods; and
- Consider expanding University-controlled post-game services, perhaps even an extended "6th Quarter" celebration.

Regent Street Redevelopment

Among the suggestions the UW has received in the past has been the concept of providing space for retail businesses in new University facilities. This concept is particularly appealing to the VNA for the Regent Street corridor, where there are many outmoded buildings and a generally unattractive streetscape. One of the guiding principals of the master plan is the University's goal of re-building within its already existing boundaries. This approach generally makes sense from a fiscal and urban design sense with the stark exception of the Regent Street corridor.

The University already has existing buildings or plans for new facilities in the South Campus area, without actually locating buildings fronting Regent Street. While this technically preserves the University's boundaries it has resulted and will continue to create a veneer of outmoded and unattractive buildings along the street, which is essentially the front door of the Vilas neighborhood as well as a major gateway to the University and city's West Side. As an alternative, the University should carefully consider working in close consultation with the city and neighborhood associations to build research and/or administrative office space on the north side of Regent Street in buildings that contain first-floor commercial spaces with businesses that would be attractive to the university's employees and neighborhood residents, such as dry cleaning establishments, copying and postal facilities.

We appreciate having had the opportunity to comment on the University's Master Plan and look forward to assisting you in whatever way possible to address the issues outlined here.

VILLAGE OF SHOREWOOD HILLS

June 20, 2005

Mr. Gary Brown
Director, Planning and Landscape Architecture
Facilities Planning and Management
University of Wisconsin, Madison
Suite 856 WARF Building
610 Walnut Street
Madison, WI 53726-2397

Dear Mr. Brown,

The Village of Shorewood Hills has the following comments regarding the draft UW Master Plan.

In early 2005, the university held a public information session predominantly for purposes of gathering village input at the UW Credit Union. At the time, university officials commented that this session had among the highest amounts of public participation and comments of meetings that had been held to date. We urge the university to take these comments into consideration as it finalizes the plan.

Over the course of the last several years, the university has obtained conditional use permits for construction of the Interdisciplinary Research Complex, Children's Hospital and heard comment on construction of the new parking ramp. The contents of those permits and discussions reflect our major concerns regarding development on the campus, especially on the west side. The predominant issues continue to involve increased traffic through and around the village, noise emanating from all sources, but specifically HVAC systems, lighting, odor, architectural design and material selection to include green design, storm water quantity and quality, and preservation of green space.

The village believes that sufficient information is included in those permits for the university to utilize in its planning efforts.

The village has also approved, or is in the process of approving ordinances involving noise, odor, and dark sky requirements. The university will need to incorporate the requirements of those ordinances into its planning efforts and future construction. In addition, the village through conditional use permits grants, developed an agreed to traffic monitoring program, and a no increase in traffic agreement with the university.

Late in the planning process, at a May 2005 Joint West Campus meeting, the university displayed potential additions to the University Hospitals that appear to possibly encroach closer to village residential areas, and also showed the Doctors Park properties as a fringe area that the university has a planning interest. This information was not presented to the village until very late in the process and the village expects that a more extensive dialogue will need to take place.

The Village of Shorewood Hills appreciates efforts the university has taken to involve us in the planning process, and looks forward to a continued collaborative and cooperative relationship.

Sincerely,

Karl P. Frantz
Village Administrator

**COMMENTS (from Nan Fey, submitted as a private individual) ON SUMMARY
UW DRAFT MASTER PLAN CONCEPTS
APRIL 22, 2005 (received August 2005)**

Planning Principles

- Much more responsible, aesthetic, forward looking than 1995
- Principles will have to be accepted by campus decision makers, and defended by campus planners if plan is to succeed over time

Assumptions

- Where is the “boundary”, clarify the distinction from “edges”
- Is UW doing anything to limit enrollment?
- Support decision to hold # parking spaces on campus constant
- Support TDM program and its expansion

Major Elements

- What form will review of this Master Plan take, when
- Design guidelines should acknowledge commitment to consider the joint planning areas at the edges of the campus, and involve landowners and neighborhoods in developing guidelines for these “fuzzy” areas

- Consider adding a “greenspace” element to the plan, setting out guidelines for development to respect established open spaces, set goals for creating new ones

West Campus

- Building heights should be specified if hope to enforce step-down to lake
- Addition to hospital (swing space) should be consistent with original architecture
- Disperse locations of new parking ramps at reasonable distances from Lot 76
- Involve RNA in design of new buildings on Old University Avenue (ROTC, EIS)
- Support exchange of Lot 60 for McClimon track to keep buildings back from the lakeshore, create a greenway buffer between Lakeshore Path and West Campus development
- Consider drawing a “green line” and making a commitment not to cross it – this would be consistent with 4 planning principles: preserving the setting, enhancing the experience of place, protecting the environment, and defining edges

Central Campus

- Correct #3 to read Engineering Research Building
- Doesn't Union South “replacement parking” contemplates additional parking for the conference center associated with the Wisconsin Institute for Discovery?
- Specify that redevelopment on the Credit Union/Police Dept block of Monroe Street is expected to continue the same land uses
- Is the Engineering library moving to the Engineering campus, east of Randall?
- Include redevelopment of Henry Mall consistent with 1908 plan

East Campus

- Charter Street expansion should improve its environmental impact
- Clarify characteristics of new coal storage facility (covered? screened?)
- New Educational Research building should not be a “tower”
- Underground parking between lake & University Avenue is a great idea, but what about the water table?
- Addition to Union should attempt to improve its overall architecture
- Any other new boathouses need to be much more sensitive to lakeshore issues (views from both the shore and the lake) than the Porter that was just completed.
- Support vertical addition of parking to Lake/Francis ramps as long as it is public

Long Range Transportation

- When developing elevated connections, consider that pedestrians and bicycles do not necessarily need the same thing – bikes always have the option of joining into traffic to get where they're going, pedestrians don't (e.g. when an idea of incorporating a walkway over Campus Drive into a potential building on the Goodwill site that might include an elevator, bike advocates were quick to say that cyclists wouldn't use it – but that doesn't mean that pedestrians wouldn't)
- Consider making the crossing of Campus Drive at Chamberlain Avenue for use by pedestrians only if this would simplify the land acquisition equation – bikes have the Ashman Bridge nearby to the east.

- Support incorporating the “on ramp” (item #16) into development to support transit stop in that location, not just WID and Union South
- Walnut Street eastbound “ramp” would continue the “freeway” feel of Campus Drive. Given the possibility that this road, beginning at Midvale Boulevard, may become a very different kind of place (more of a boulevard) – this proposal should be considered very cautiously in the broader discussion of what’s happening to this gateway to the city and campus.
- UBay intersection should also be considered in the larger context of changing the character of University Avenue
- Widening the “switchback” on Observatory Drive may provide more room for buses, but would also reduce its traffic calming effect, and alter the aesthetics of what is now kind of a “parkway” feel to that section of the road.
- Consider tunneling under Bascom Hill someday for campus transit use.

Utilities

- If UW needs additional substations, locate interior to campus
- Planning principles should specify commitment to cutting edge technology to minimize impact on the environment
- Planning principles should actively support the design of “green buildings” which use alternative energy sources and/or are designed for energy efficiency
- Planning principles should specify the need for sustainable design (and define what that means from an infrastructure perspective)
- Planning principles should include commitment to Wisconsin Energy Initiatives
- Support #12 initiatives on stormwater – UW can be a leader, set example