

CAMPUS-INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT MASTER PLAN

Madison, Wisconsin EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2019

EXTENDING OUR HISTORY-EMBRACING OUR FUTURE

Table of Contents

Forward.	5	4. Facilities Plan: Proposed Conditions (MGO Sec. 28.097(5)(c)(2)) 111
i	Document Composition	4.1 Campus Development Plan Boundary and Potential Land Acquisitions
ii	List of Figures, Tables, and Photo Credits	4.2 Proposed Land Use
iii	Introduction	4.3 Building Density Floor Area Ratios (F.A.R.)
iv	City of Madison Conditions of Approval - Planning Requirements	4.4 Proposed Building Use
1. Background & History (MGO Sec. 28.097(5)(a))		4.5 Open Space & Landscape Plan
1.1	Scope of the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update	4.6 Natural Campus Landscapes
1.2	History of Campus Planning at UW-Madison	4.7 Social Campus Landscapes
1.3	Historical Development of the UW-Madison Campus	4.8 Green Streets
1.4	2005 Campus Master Plan "Recreating Ourselves in Place"	4.9 Proposed Green Infrastructure & Stormwater Management
2. Mission &	& Guiding Principles (MGO Sec. 28.097(5)(b))49	4.10 Proposed Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation
2.1	University Mission, Vision, and Strategic Plan	4.11 Proposed Transit, Parking, and Vehicular Circulation
2.2	Coordination with Campus Strategic Framework Plan	5. Proposed Project Phasing (MGO Sec. 28.097(5)(c)(2)(b)) 173
2.3	Need for a Master Plan	6. Design Review Process (MGO Sec. 28.097(8)) 195
2.4	Physical Planning Principles, UW System Board of Regents	6.1 UW-Madison Design Review Board
2.5	Master Plan Goals and Guiding Principles	7. Campus Design Guidelines & Standards (MGO Sec. 28.097(7)) 205
3. Facilities	Plan: Existing Conditions (MGO Sec. 28.097(5)(c)(1))63	7.1 Building Principles and Guidelines Summary
3.1	Campus Profile	7.2 Campus Design Neighborhoods
3.2	Context within Region and City	8. Neighborhood Coordination
3.3	Campus Development Plan Boundary	9. Amendments to the Approved C-I District Master Plan
3.4	Existing Zoning Districts	10. Appendix
3.5	Projects Completed Since 2005 Plan	A. Acknowledgements
3.6	Campus Planning Districts	B. Long Range Transportation Plan
3.7	Campus Land Use Land Uses and Buildings	C. Campus and Community Engagement Summary
3.8	Building Form and Density	D. Master Plan Graphic
3.9	Landmarks and Historic Sites	E. C-I District Zoning Graphic
3.10	Historic Preservation Planning at UW-Madison	F. Build-to Lines
3.11	Open Space	G. Maximum Building Heights
3.12	Tree Canopy	
3.13	Existing Green Infrastructure & Stormwater Management	
3.14	Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle	
3.15	Existing Transit, Parking, and Vehicular Circulation	

{This page intentionally left blank}

Document Composition - REFERENCE







2015 Campus Master Plan Executive Summary

A full color 24-page report that summarizes the major goals and guiding principles for the Master Plan. The document includes the Chancellor's vision and the major goals and initiatives for each of the identified focus topics (appendices to the Technical Document). Welcomes and sets the tone for users and viewers of the Master Plan document. It is both a marketing piece for future development and a summary of the master planning process.

2015 Campus Master Plan Technical Document

The unabridged thought and support behind the goals and guiding principles for the Master Plan. This more than 250-page document presents a roadmap for campus development over the next 30-50 years by referencing what has come previously and embracing what the future holds. Together with the Campus Design Guidelines, the Technical Document strives to give physical form to the university's mission, vision, and programs through the effective use of human, environmental and fiscal resources.

Campus Institutional District Master Plan

Master Plan document specific to the Madison General Ordinance section 28.097. As an outcome of the City of Madison zoning code rewrite (2013), the city established a Campus Institutional (C-I) District to recognize the role major educational and medical institutions play in the city. This plan aims to serve the public interests as well as the interests of the university and be consistent with the goals of the city Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor, or special area plans adjacent to or within the Campus Plan Development Boundary.

UW-Madison Campus Design Guidelines

The site specific framework that has been established to create the ground rules for a fruitful dialogue between planners, architects, engineers, campus community, and city/state authorities. Divided into nine Campus Design Neighborhoods, the goal of the guidelines is to enhance the university's sense of place by creating well-defined, functional, sustainable, beautiful, and coherent campus environments that promote intellectual and social exchange.

Appendices:

Landscape Master Plan

Establishes a 'sense of place' where phased growth and future development can occur while maintaining a cohesive environment.

Utility Master Plan:

Confirms status of the 2005 recommendations, acknowledges completed projects, and makes recommendations to meet the 2015 plan revisions.

Long Range Transportation

Plan: Updated from the previous LRTP, the plan is the university's transportation vision and describes baseline conditions, travel behaviors, and trends all modes.

Green Infrastructure & Stormwater Management Master Plan: A campuswide plan that recommends solutions to meet stormwater management

List of Figures and Tables

Figure iii - University of Wisconsin Campus-Institutional Zoning Map9				
Figure 1-1 Master Planning Process				
Figure 1-2 Master Planning Process, Campus Planning Steering Committee16				
Figure 1-3 Master Planning Process, Campus Planning Steering Committee17				
Figure 1-4 Map of Four Lakes Mound Sites18				
Figure 1-5 Cultural Landscape Project-A0129I				
Figure 1-6 General Plan for the University of Wisconsin by John Raque,				
January 1850				
Figure 1-7 O.C. Simonds 1906 Plan for the Grounds of the UW21				
Figure 1-8 O.C. Simonds 1906 Plan for the Grounds of the University of				
Wisconsin, Bascom Hill (Detail)22				
Figure 1-9 Laird & Cret 1908 General Design of the UW				
Figure 1-10 Laird & Cret 1908 General Design of the UW, Detail24				
Figure 1-11 Laird & Cret 1908 General Design of the University of Wisconsin,				
Detail showing "liberal arts piazza" near the summit of College Hill25				
Figure 1-12 Laird & Cret 1908 General Design of the University of Wisconsin,				
General Design for Future Development				
Figure 1-13 Figure Ground Map, 1870				
Figure 1-14 Figure Ground Map, 1880				
Figure 1-15 Figure Ground Map, 1900				
Figure 1-16 1941 Design for the Campus (at) the UW–Madison32				
Figure 1-17 Figure Ground Map, 1940				
Figure 1-18 Figure Ground Map, 1954				
Figure 1-19 Figure Ground Map, 1967				
Figure 1-20 1959 Sketch Plan for the UW, UW Planning & Construction 37				
Figure 1-21 Figure Ground Map, 1980				
Figure 1-22 JJR 1996 Campus Opportunities Plan				
Figure 1-23 Figure Ground Map, 2000				
Figure 1-24 Ayers Saint Gross 2005 Campus Master Plan				
Figure 3-1 Student Housing				
Figure 3-2 CDPB and Potential Land Acquisitions				
Figure 3-3 Campus Institutional Zoning Map70-71				
Figure 3-4 Building Projects Completed Since 2005				
Figure 3-5 Transportation Improvements Completed Since 200573				

Figure 3-6 Campus Planning Districts74			
Figure 3-7 Existing Building Uses			
Figure 3-8 Existing Density In 201576			
Figure 3-9 Campus Pre-Settlement Landscape			
Figure 3-10 Campus Cultural Landscape			
Figure 3-11 Archaeological Sites on the Main Campus of the University of			
Wisconsin-Madison			
Figure 3-12 2005 Cultural Landscape Resource Project, Fifteen Potentially			
Significant Sites			
Figure 3-13 2005 Cultural Landscape Resource Project, Eight Sites Selected			
for In-Depth Analysis			
Figure 3-14 Open Space Ratios			
Figure 3-15 Existing Landscape Character			
Figure 3-16 Existing Tree Canopy90			
Figure 3-17 Campus Relationship to Rock River Watershed			
Figure 3-18 Campus Watersheds			
Figure 3-19 Campus Impervious Areas			
Figure 3-20 Campus Impervious Traffic Areas			
Table 3-1 Impervious and Pervious Areas 95			
Figure 3-21 Source Area Map96			
Figure 3-22 Stormwater Best Management Practice Types and Locations97			
Figure 3-23 Existing Walking and Biking Routes and Identified Challenges99			
Table 3-2 Summary of Gaps in Walking and Bike Connectivity100			
Table 3-3 Summary of Locations Where Challenges Exist 101			
Figure 3-24 Vehicle Congestion on Campus			
Figure 3-25 Campus Bus Routes105			
Figure 3-26 Peer Institutions Parking Spaces per Person106			
Figure 3-27 Existing Campus Parking Facilities107			
Figure 3-28 Mid-day Parking Occupancies for Faculty and Staff108			
Figure 3-29 Mid-day Parking Occupancies for Visitors109			
Figure 4-1 Potential Acquisitions113			
Figure 4-2 Zoning Overlay and Proposed Buildings114			
Figure 4-3 Enlargement Zoning Overlay and Proposed Buildings115			
Figure 4-4 Floor Area Ratio - Existing and Proposed116			

7

Figure 4-5 Capacity Density			
Figure 4-6 Proposed Building Uses			
Figure 4-7 Far West and West Campus Building Key121			
Figure 4-8 Far West and West Campus Illustration			
Figure 4-9 Near West Campus Building Key125			
Figure 4-10 West and Near West Campus Illustration			
Figure 4-11 Central Campus Building Key129			
Figure 4-12 Central Campus Illustration			
Figure 4-13 South Campus Building Key			
Figure 4-14 South Campus Illustration			
Table 4-1 Proposed Building Summary			
Figure 4-15 Proposed Landscape Project Location			
Table 4-2 Proposed Landscape Summary			
Figure 4-16 Observatory Hill Proposed Plan			
Figure 4-17 Willow Creek and Linden Drive Plan			
Figure 4-18 Revitalized Willow Creek Corridor			
Figure 4-19 Lake Access Boardwalk Proposed Section149			
Figure 4-20 Lake Access Boardwalk Proposed Plan149			
Figure 4-21 Existing Housing Units along N. Brooks Street			
Figure 4-22 Proposed South Campus Quad			
Figure 4-23 South Campus Quad and W. Dayton Green Street153			
Figure 4-24 Green Street, West Union, Iowa			
Figure 4-25 Green Street, Normal, Illinois154			
Figure 4-26 Example Green Street Cross Section			
Figure 4-27 Recommended Green Infrastructure Projects			
Figure 4-28 N. Charter Street at Linden Drive Pedestrian Bridge159			
Figure 4-29 Pedestrian Bridge over N. Charter Street and Linden Drive160			
Figure 4-30 Locations of Recommended Intersection Improvements162			
Figure 4-31 Recommended Walking and Biking Improvements163			
Figure 4-32 Proposed Road Additions, Vacations, and Conversions165			
Figure 4-33 Existing Bike Parking Spaces on Campus per Area168			
Table 4-3 Recommended Parking Reductions 169			
Table 4-4 Recommended Parking Additions			
Figure 4-34 Recommended Parking Reductions			

Figure 4-35 Recommended Parking Additions17	1
Table 5-1 Phase 1 - 2017-2023 Near Term Improvements174,17	6
Figure 5-1 Phase 1 (2017-2023) Proposed Facility Removal17	5
Figure 5-2 Phase 1 (2017-2023) Proposed Facility Construction17	7
Table 5-2 Phase 2 - 2023-2029 Mid-Term Improvements	0
Figure 5-3 Phase 3 (2023-2029) Proposed Facility Removal17	9
Figure 5-4 Phase 3 (2023-2029) Proposed Facility Construction18	1
Table 5-3 Phase 3 - 2029-2035 Long Term Improvements	4
Figure 5-5 Phase 3 (2029-2035) Proposed Facility Removal18	3
Figure 5-6 Phase 3 (2029-2035) Proposed Facility Construction18	5
Table 5-4 Phase 4 - 2035+ Future Capacity	8
Figure 5-7 Phase 4 (2035+) Proposed Facility Removal	7
Figure 5-8 Phase 4 (2035+) Proposed Facility Construction	9
Figure 5-9 All Phases Proposed Facility Removal19	0
Figure 5-10 All Phases Proposed Facility Construction19	1
Figure 5-11 2017-2027 Proposed Building Removals19	2
Figure 5-12 2017-2027 Proposed Building Additions19	3
Figure 6-1 Design Review Board Meeting	7
Figure 6-2a Observatory Hill Area of Campus19	9
Figure 6-2b Willow Creek Area of Campus20	0
Figure 7-1 Campus Master Plan	7
Figure 7-2 A Pleasing Composition Diagram20	
Figure 7-3 Build-to Limits210-21	
Figure 7-4 Proposed Building Height	5
Figure 8-1 Neighborhood Associations of Madison	2

Photo Credits

All photos courtesy of UW-Madison University Communications, except:

E. Arti Wulandari (rightmost)	60
SmithGroupJJR (leftmost)	
SmithGroupJJR (second from right)	61
SmithGroupJJR	111
Machado-Silvetti Architects	205

iii Introduction

It has been a transformational decade since the 2005 Campus Master Plan. The growth of and change on our 936-acre campus has been swift. Our campus and city skyline changed with the construction of new campus facilities and off-campus student housing towers. Key open space milestones were achieved including the connection and extension of the East Campus Mall and the opening of the cross-campus bicycle "missing link".

The pace of change slowed with the economic downturn in the late 2000s, which only abated a few years ago. State and university budgets were reduced, and public support for the flagship university declined. Reliance on the philanthropy of private donors, already extraordinarily high, increased. The university is turning increasingly toward the renovation of existing facilities and the reduction of facility operating costs. Yet the physical beauty and function of the campus remains important as it plays a significant role in the attraction and retention of researchers, faculty, staff, and students.

In this fiscal climate, measured and deliberate long-term master planning is more important than ever. The physical campus will continue to change and evolve, though the steps may be smaller and less frequent. Thus, the university needs a strong, guiding, long-term vision that can be achieved incrementally through multiple projects. When the vision is both clear and exciting, both public and private investors are more likely to financially support it.

The 2005 Campus Master Plan focused primarily on the building capacity of the main campus. With easy building sites long gone, how much more could UW-Madison grow within its existing footprint, while still maintaining a comfortable density and its special campus character? Through strategic redevelopment, the 2005 Campus Master Plan proved that UW-Madison can continue to grow and evolve for decades within its existing Campus Development Plan Boundary. No large boundary expansions needed, no satellite campuses required. The 2005 Campus Master Plan was supported by a Long-Range Transportation Plan and a Utility Master Plan.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update picks up where the 2005 Campus Master Plan left off. Given the beauty of the campus lakeshore and open spaces, incredulously the campus has never prepared a formal landscape master plan. As much as the 2005 Campus Master Plan was focused on building siting and density, this update is focused on the spaces between the buildings. It delineates the qualities of the most successful active, passive, and working open spaces, and designates new open spaces in the areas of campus that do not meet the character of the historic core. It restores many of Willow Creek's biological and ecological functions while offering new opportunities for engagement and interpretation. The Landscape Master Plan connects existing and planned open spaces for all campus users - faculty, staff, students, visitors, and the campus's flora and fauna.

The Lake Mendota shoreline is the most characteristic component of the UW-Madison campus landscape. From the Memorial Union Terrace to Picnic Point and beyond, campus users enjoy the shoreline throughout the seasons. Yet, with this inheritance comes great responsibility. How the campus and the City of Madison treat the water that flows into the chain of lakes greatly influences lake health. UW-Madison has always been a regional leader in implementing effective stormwater management practices and facilities. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update includes the university's most comprehensive campuswide stormwater and green infrastructure master planning. The state's stormwater requirements are stringent and getting more so, and with the campus's 4 miles of shoreline, their impacts are tremendous. The minimal objective of the Green Infrastructure & Stormwater Management Master Plan is to meet and exceed these requirements. However, our goal is to become a national leader in how the campus can reduce its negative impacts and contribute to making the water flowing into our lakes cleaner, while also educating campus users of the campus ecosystem.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update includes updates to the Transportation and Utility Master Plans. Since 2005, circulation congestion on campus has increased, and UW-Madison has met the challenge through truly exemplary efforts with transportation demand management. This update pushes the university further, improving transportation for all modes. The Utility Master Plan continues to address the campus's aging utility infrastructure and enables constant building changes, all the while seeking more economical and sustainable methods.

Planning & Development

William M. Elvey

Daniel T. Okoli

Associate Vice Chancellor Director of Capital for Facilities Planning & Management

Gary A. Brown

Director of Campus Planning & Landscape Architecture

9



Parcels indicated in blue and within the Campus Development Plan Boundary (black line) are subject to the master plan approval granted by City of Madison ordinance ID 47245.

Figure iii - University of Wisconsin Campus-Institutional Zoning Map

iv City of Madison Conditions of Approval Planning Requirements

Conditions of approval recommended by City agencies to be followed as future projects are realized within the Campus Development Plan Boundary.

- 1. Developing Green Streets will require that the University work with the City Engineering Division to develop a cross-section that meets the needs of pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle traffic while enhancing the "green" nature of the street. This may require that easements or additional right of way be dedicated to allow for the required width of cross-section.
- 2. Until technology is developed that removes chlorides from the winter management strategies of the University and City of Madison, "green" infrastructure improvements on W. Dayton and N. Charter streets shall not include infiltration practices that cannot be diverted for the winter seasons, as these compounds are incompatible with infiltration devices. Further, as these roads are arterial bus routes chlorides are currently necessary for winter operation of the system.
- 3. The proposed cross-section for University Avenue, including a protected two-way bike path, should be installed if found to be beneficial after further public involvement and study.
- 4. The proposed recommendations for N. Charter Street, N. Mills Street and N. Brooks Street will require more study/ public involvement to determine traffic and/or right of way impacts.
- 5. The City recognizes that some existing parking lots may be reduced or eliminated and parking may be added in other areas. New areas of concentrations of parking may affect City streets operation and right of way widths required. A Traffic Impact Analysis, right of way improvements and/or dedications may be required.
- 6. As part of the master plan, it is anticipated that there will likely be some University of Wisconsin improvements within City right of ways. The applicant shall be aware that coordination of these improvements within pubic right of ways may require, but are not limited to, maintenance agreements, encroachment agreements, air/ subterranean leases, street vacations, or intergovernmental agreements.

- 7. The applicant shall be aware that redevelopment of sites comprised of more than one platted lot will likely require a land division approved by the City of Madison to dissolve underlying lot lines.
- 8. All proposed right-of-way vacations shall be approved or denied at the time of the proposed project and after the approval of a TIA reviewed and approved by the City Traffic Engineer.
- 9. All relevant sections of the Zoning Code and Madison General Ordinances, which may be amended from time to time, shall apply to this Campus Master Plan, unless otherwise noted in the final approved Master Plan documents
- 10. Vacation of Walnut Street north of Observatory Drive, and construction of a new north-south street east of Highland Avenue (between Observatory Drive and Marsh Drive), will require alteration of current transit operations, including the construction of new bus stops locations.
- 11. Every effort has been taken to remove references to future university planning inititatives on lands within the Campus Development Plan Boundary, but not owned by the Board of Regents. For reference, these planning initiatives are identified in the UW-Madison Campus Master Plan Technical Document and support materials.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act ADAAG: Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines ADT: Average Daily Trips AE: Architect/Engineer AWT: Average Weekly Trips AHABS: The Animal Health and Biomedical Sciences Building APPA: Formerly the Association of Physical Plant Administrators, today known as "APPA: Leadership in Educational Facilities." The association supports the development and training of education facilities personnel. ANSI: American National Standards Institute ASM: Associated Students of Madison BOR: Board of Regents C-I: Campus Institutional District Zoning CDPB: Campus Development Plan Boundary CF: Cubic feet CLI: Cultural Landscape Inventory CLR: Cultural Landscape Report CN: Conservation Zoning Classification (City of Madison) CPC: Campus Planning Committee (UW-Madison) CPD: Capital Planning & Development CPLA: Capital Planning & Landscape Architecture CPTED: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, is defined as a multi-disciplinary approach to deterring criminal behavior through environmental design CSC: Clincial Science Center

- C/W: Corridor Width of Street where no street right-of-way exists
- DFD: Division of Facilities Development (Wisconsin)
- DOA: Department of Administration (Wisconsin)

DRB: Design Review Board (UW-Madison) EAB: Emerald Ash Borer EPA: Environmental Protection Agency FAR: Floor Area Ratio FP&M: Facilities Planning & Management at UW-Madison GI: Green Infrastructure **GIS:** Geographic Information System **GSF:** Gross Square Feet LEED: Leadership in Energyand Environmental Design LRTP: Long Range Transportation Plan MGO: Madison General Ordinance PD: Planned Development Zoning PUD: Planned Unit Development (now called PD: Planned Development) R/W: Right-of-Way of Street SBC: State Building Commission SF: Square feet **TDM: Transportation Demand Management TIA:** Transportation Impact Analysis WEPA: Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act WHS: Wisconsin Historical Society WinSLAMM: Source Loading and Management Model for Windows WSOR: Wisconsin & Southern Railroad

1. BACKGROUND & HISTORY

· GENERAL VIEW ·

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN GENERAL DESIGN FOR FUTURE CONSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION,

1.1 Scope of the 2015 Campus Master Plan

The 2015 Campus Master Plan provides a framework for open space, circulation, land use relationships, and building placement. To achieve UW– Madison's objectives, the Master Planning team created a flexible framework of land uses, open spaces, and infrastructure. Campus design guidelines ensure each major and minor campus decision is in support of the university's long-term mission, vision, and values. Implementation recommendations create an ambitious yet reasonable action plan.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan is not intended to be so constraining and prescriptive as to stifle creativity, analysis, and judgment. The plan and its graphics are not specific building or site designs and they should not predict design solutions. The design standards within this master plan allow flexibility and imagination while ensuring consistent, sustainable, and quality implementation. It is a baseline that guides project designers while allowing and encouraging creativity.

However, the 2015 Campus Master Plan should not be interpreted so loosely as to permit entirely different initiatives and conceptual directions. The goal is to achieve a balance between the 2015 Campus Master Plan and the mutual decisions that must be reached throughout each project's development process. The skillful use of this master plan by university planners, designers, and facility managers will result in a functional, memorable, and sustainable campus.

This capacity plan will direct campus development and reinvestment to meet the university's needs and trends for decades. Just as this plan is an update and expansion of the 2005 Campus Master Plan, this document should be a living document, periodically re-examined and updated as campus challenges evolve.



Figure 1-1 Master Planning Process

Master Planning Process

Through a forward-thinking, interactive, and inclusive master planning process, UW–Madison staff, faculty, and students defined the campus's physical future.

Assisted by the Master Planning team, UW–Madison staff, faculty, and students developed the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update through sequential steps. The Master Planning team understood the pressing campus issues, analyzed the campus site and infrastructure, interpreted the university's mission and sustainable future, and determined how best to meet the designated future needs.

In response to this input and analysis, the campus Master Planning team prepared viable and contrasting alternatives for campus change and growth. Inspired by the opportunities uncovered in these alternatives, staff, faculty, and students crafted a consensus campus concept. The Master Planning team then refined and illustrated this concept and created campus design guidelines and a potential project sequencing plan.

Master planning was inclusive and transparent in all stages. The master planning process was directed by the Campus Planning Steering Committee and advised by four Technical Coordinating Committees and the Executive Leadership team. The master plan commenced by interviewing dozens of campus and community leaders. Scores more faculty, staff, students, and community members participated in workshops, open houses, presentations, and online forms to confirm campus analysis and direct future decisions. The campus repeatedly reached into the community, meeting with adjacent neighborhood leaders and with City of Madison and Village of Shorewood elected officials and staff on and off campus. The university's website provided access to planning materials for review and an online town hall facilitated concurrent and interactive discussions throughout the master planning process.

As a result of this collaborative process, the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update has widespread understanding and support within all groups on campus and in the community.

Decision-Making Structure

The master planning process had several types of review and participation. Stakeholders included the Executive Leadership team, the Campus Planning Steering Committee, four Technical Coordinating Committees, and a number of campus and community constituency representatives. Each group met with the Master Plan Consultant team to provide input and oversight into: a) the master planning process, b) the development of the plan alternatives, and c) the final results of the plan. Members of those groups are listed in the Appendix.

The official approval process of the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update was via the UW-Madison shared governance Campus Planning Steering Committee, acting as the steering committee for the plan and making a final recommendation to the Chancellor for approval. Presentations were made to the Campus Planning Steering Committee for their input and guidance on the development of the plan. Upon Chancellor approval, Facilities Planning & Management then made informational presentations to the Board of Regents (BOR) and the State Building Commission (SBC). The Master Plan Consultant team also presented the draft recommendations to the Executive Leadership team and Campus Design Review Board for input throughout the process. Facilities Planning & Management staff also presented the plan to the various constituency groups across the campus and to the local community to assure their active participation and input in to the plan. The final draft plan was presented to the City of Madison Plan Commission for approval and formal adoption by the Madison Common Council with recommendations coming from the Joint West and Joint Southeast Campus Area Committees.

Executive Leadership Team

Chaired by the Chancellor, this group met four times with the Master Planning team to establish overall direction, check on the progress of the plan and validate the conclusions developed for the plan prior to its final release.

Campus Planning Steering Committee

Chaired by the Provost, the shared governance steering committee for the master planning process met on a semi-regular basis with the Master Plan Consultant team (approximately eight times over the entire 24-month process) to review draft proposals and provide guidance on the master planning process. This group also reviewed the final master plan and made a recommendation to the Chancellor for approval. For meetings related to the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update, the Campus Planning Steering Committee expanded to include invited guests, and individuals comprising a variety of university and city functions.

Campus Design Review Board

Chaired by the University Architect, this group met six times with the Master Planning team to provide input and guidance on specific content and scope of the plan. The Design Review Board also approved the Campus Design Guidelines and supporting documentation.

Technical Coordinating Committee

The Technical Coordinating Committees met on a regular basis with the Master Plan Consultant team (seven times over the 24 month period, with committee leads meeting an additional six times) to analyze planning data,

brainstorm solutions, and provide input into the master planning process. This was the main working group for the plan and is the sounding board for technical ideas and draft recommendations for the plan. This group invited other subject experts to join them for individual meeting(s) to provide further detailed information about a particular topic. Recommendations from this group were shared with the Campus Planning Steering Committee for inclusion in the overall master plan to be approved by the Chancellor. The Technical Coordinating Committee met both as a single committee and as specialized subcommittees:

- Administration Technical Coordinating Committee
- Green Infrastructure/Stormwater Technical Coordinating Committee
- Landscape Technical Coordinating Committee
- Transportation Technical Coordinating Committee
- Utility Infrastructure Technical Coordinating Committee

Outreach and Coordination

The Master Planning team met with various campus and community constituency groups throughout the master planning process. These groups were individuals with special concerns who provided detailed level input and feedback into the concepts and ideas proposed in the plan. The list of over 50 campus and community constituency organizations is listed in the Appendix.



Figure 1-2 Master Planning Process, Campus Planning Steering Committee

Coordination with On-Going Local Planning

The master planning process was integrated with municipal planning and leadership throughout. The mayor of the City of Madison and the president of the Village of Shorewood Hills, and their representatives, served on the Executive Leadership Committee. City department leaders were invited guests of the Campus Planning Steering Committee. City staff were also members of the Technical Coordinating Committees. The Joint West and Joint Southeast Committees reviewed and commented on the draft plan multiple times. The internal Master Planning team met frequently with City of Madison staff to best understand the political and physical interface between the university and city. In particular, special appreciation is due to the City of Madison, Mayor Paul Soglin, Director of Planning, Community & Economic Development Natalie Erdman, and City of Madison Planning, Zoning, Metro, Traffic Engineering, and Stormwater Engineering staff.

Plan Approval and Future Use

The Chancellor approved the 2015 Campus Master Plan on September 13, 2016 and the Board of Regents accepted the plan on February 2, 2017. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update will guide the planning and design of campus by university staff and all consultants it hires. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update will guide the development of the campus, indicating appropriate building and open space uses, parking and transportation improvements, and necessary green infrastructure and utilities upgrades. Design guidelines will shape the design of future buildings, open spaces, and streetscapes.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update was also reviewed and approved by the City of Madison as part of a rezoning process. *The C-I District master plan* only applies to properties owned by the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents, State of Wisconsin, and University affiliates within the Campus Development Plan Boundary.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update should serve as a guide and its specific recommendations should be modified as additional information and needs are discovered. Even as specific recommendations are modified, the revised plans and designs must directly follow and support the Master Plan Goals and Guiding Principles. Any major modifications may need further review and approval by the City of Madison.



Figure 1-3 Master Planning Process, Campus Planning Steering Committee

1.2 History of Campus Planning at UW-Madison

Before European settlement, indigenous people built earthen mounds on Bascom Hill, suggesting that it may have served religious or ceremonial purposes. Early residents of Madison used the area as a burial site and hunting ground over 12,000 years ago. It was purchased as the site of the state university in 1849. Since then, Bascom Hill's primary function has been to serve as the core landscape of a sprawling academic community, the symbolic "front door" of the university.

The University of Wisconsin at Madison was established by the Wisconsin legislature within months of the territory becoming a state of the union in May of 1848. By the end of that summer, a chancellor was selected and a governing board of regents were defined. The first campus building, North Hall was completed in September 1851 for a projected enrollment of 256 young men. That first year, the university was comprised of about 30 students, 3 faculty and a janitor. By 1855 North Hall's twin, South Hall had been finished and in 1859 Bascom Hall opened as the "main edifice" for the university and enrollment had increased to over 175 students. By 1892, the university had topped one thousand students and boasted nearly 20 buildings.

Since the first master plan for the University of Wisconsin was prepared in 1850, the concept of a strong relationship between "town and gown" has provided a framework for campus planning. The 1850 Campus Plan, attributed to Architect John Rague and the university's first chancellor, John H. Lathrop, proposed situating the campus on Madison's "second hill," facing the nearby state capitol building which was located on the "first hill." The hills overlook the city of Madison surrounded by beautiful lakes and natural areas, created by the retreating glaciers some 15,000 years ago. The effigy mound cultural, so prevalent on this campus and throughout the upper Midwest, occurred over 1,000 years ago. These relationships have served as a structure for the physical development of the campus landscape we have known for over the last 150 years (see Figure 2-4).

The appellation "College Hill" traces to Wisconsin's territorial period. During the 1838-39 session of the territorial legislature in Madison, the university's board of visitors appointed a committee to select "a suitable site for the location of the University." A few months before the legislature had convened,



Figure 1-4 Map of Four Lakes Mound Sites

Source: Birmingham, Robert A., Spirits of Earth

land speculators Josiah Noonan of Madison and Aaron Vanderpoel of New York had offered to donate land for a campus.

Noonan was familiar with local real estate, having worked with the crew that surveyed the shorelines of Lake Wingra and Lake Monona in 1837. Although Noonan himself owned no land in the immediate vicinity of Madison in 1838, he may have approached the board of visitors on behalf of Warren Bryant, another New York speculator who owned all the land in Section 22 (640 acres). Aaron Vanderpoel's tract, in Section 23, was adjacent to Bryant's and comprised nearly 160 acres. It covered the area now bounded by State Street on the north, Mills Street on the west, Regent Street on the south, and Frances Street on the east.

On the northwest, Vanderpoel's tract ended at the top of a glacial drumlin, a spot now near the southeastern corner of Bascom Hall. Vanderpoel's proposed donation thus included only the southeastern slope of the landmark that eventually became known as "College Hill." On December 15, 1838, the board of visitors' site selection committee reported finding "the site proposed by Mr. Noonan and others was the most eligible." Unfortunately, minutes of the visitors' meeting contain no further description of the properties under consideration (see Figure 1-5).

A decade passed before the university's governing board (reconstituted in 1848 as the Board of Regents) took any further action on acquiring a campus site. In the meantime, Madisonians held fast to the notion that the hill one day would become the site of Wisconsin's institution of higher learning, and began calling it (with tongue in cheek, perhaps) "College Hill." The hill remained an untamed "blackberry tangle," over which prairie fires swept unchecked.

In the spring of 1848, Wisconsin achieved statehood, after passage of a state constitution that included a provision for the creation of a state university. That October, the regents appointed a committee to negotiate the purchase of College Hill, portions of which had been acquired by a variety of owners during the territorial period. Vanderpoel's quarter section remained unsold, but the owner was no longer willing to give it away. Through local agents John Catlin and Ezekiel Williamson, Vanderpoel offered to sell his property to the regents for \$15 per acre, on the condition that they buy the entire tract. Unfortunately, the legislature had yet to authorize the sale of the university's land grant, so the regents had no funds with which to negotiate.



Figure 1-5 Cultural Landscape Project Source: University of Wisconsin-Madison Division of Archives

During their 1848-49 session, legislators passed a joint resolution approving the regents' request to purchase a site. Interestingly, they also approved "the plan of the buildings submitted by said regents." Although the legislature denied the board's request for a \$1,000 loan to cover the first payment on the site, the sale nonetheless went forward. On March 16, 1849, Vanderpoel and his wife, Ellen, deeded their tract to the regents for the sum of \$2,435.36. How the regents managed to fund the Vanderpoel purchase remains unknown. Regent Simeon Mills (1810-1895), then chairman of the legislature's finance committee and one of Madison's most successful real estate dealers, may have stepped forward to help.

A plan for a "main edifice, fronting towards the Capitol" was devised by the regents' building committee in 1850 (see Figure 1-6) and was included with the regents' annual report. The committee, consisting of Chancellor John Lathrop and Regents Mills and Nathanial Dean, also called for "an avenue, two hundred and forty feet wide... bordered by double rows of trees," extending from the main building to the eastern boundary of the campus (Park Street). The regents originally planned to build four dormitories on the hill, two on each side of the avenue. They also recommended the construction of two carriage ways flanking the dormitory buildings and paralleling the tree-lined avenue.

One of the first general development plans for the University of Wisconsin was by Milwaukee Architect John F. Rague in January 1850 which included his plans for "College Hill." The simple site plan showed a "main edifice" that later would be designed by William Tinsley of Indianapolis, Indiana opening in 1859 as University Hall. It was later named Bascom Hall in June 1920, after John A. Bascom, university president from 1874 to 1887.

The first campus building, North Hall built in 1851, was also attributed to John F. Rague after the Board of Regents approved the 1850 plan. It was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1966. Rague designed the Madison sandstone building to be similar to dormitories on University of Michigan campus, in Ann Arbor. The plan included three dormitories but only one other (South Hall) was built in 1855 (see Figure 1-6).

From 1860 to 1865, the new university struggled financially, aided to some degree by the Morrill Act which provided public lands to be sold to create an endowment for "land-grant universities."



Figure 1-6 General Plan for the University of Wisconsin by John Rague, January 1850



Figure 1-7 O.C. Simonds, Plan for the Grounds of the University of Wisconsin, 1906

Over time, the campus grew from these first three buildings (North, South and University Halls) on what would become Bascom Hill, to over the present-day 300 buildings spanning 936 acres in downtown Madison. Growth of campus facilities was clearly directed by several master planning efforts: some were followed rather closely, while others because of political pressures and the necessity of campus growth to meet basic demands, were basically disregarded. The "college on the hill" met with success early on and enrollment increased steadily as projected by the regents.

Expansion of the university was consistent until 1890 to 1900 when a number of new buildings were built and student enrollment doubled. After Charles R. Van Hise assumed the presidency in 1903, a series of planning initiatives began to influence development across campus. In early 1900, Ossian C. Simonds, a prominent Chicago landscape gardener, was hired to consider future development of the campus. He completed his plans in 1906. Simonds was the first to address the entire campus as Rague's earlier plan focused on the Bascom Hill area before the campus began to expand to the west (see Figure 1-7).

Simonds' plan picked up on some of the earlier formal planning concepts but took on a more pastoral and curvilinear layout reflecting his training as a landscape gardener. Simonds' plan was curiously devoid of projected major new buildings and more expertly concentrated on the grounds, which he was much more comfortable with pursuing (see Figure 1-8).

In the meantime, President Van Hise was out scouting for much broader based planning and found Arthur Peabody, a supervising architect at the Chicago World's Columbian Exposition. In 1906, the Board of Regents created an Architectural Commission consisting of then university architect Arthur Peabody, consultant Warren P. Laird, and Laird's colleague, Paul Philippe Cret, a University of Pennsylvania professor of design. This was to be the first significant and comprehensive campus master plan for the university, eventually being completed in 1908. Laird had originally come to campus in 1903 to provide consulting services for the new Chemistry Building which began a lengthy partnership with Peabody. Peabody explained the 1908 Campus Plan by saying . "The design attempts to forecast and visualize the physical development of the University during the next forty or fifty years, by laying out in a large ground plan the general form and location of departmental buildings in the logical groups. It is aimed to secure harmony of aspect among the groups through emphasizing their unity as parts of one great University. The plan determines the prevailing architectural style." The architectural style being proposed was the Beaux-Arts classical revival style popularized by Daniel Burnham's grand White City at the Chicago Columbian Exposition of 1893 and the subsequent City Beautiful Movement.

The 1908 Campus Plan called for a series of well-defined districts, each with its own character but based on the major academic units they comprised. For example, the "eastern section" would include public functions (library, theatre, and administration) and the liberal arts. The "northern section" would include residence halls and athletics. The University Avenue section, including the south facing slopes and westerly levels, were to include the pure sciences, pre-medical and applied sciences along with agriculture. The



Figure 1-8 O.C. Simonds 1906 Plan for the Grounds of the University of Wisconsin, Bascom Hill (Detail)

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN CENERAL DESIGN OR FUTURE CONSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Figure 1-9 Laird & Cret 1908 General Design of the University of Wisconsin

Dere Hol

21

CAMPUS INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT MASTER PLAN - Effective January 1, 2019

· GENERAL VILW-1. BACKGROUND & HISTORY "southern section" including Randall Field and contiguous properties to the east would be for general service building, engineering and military science. The "western section" would mainly be comprised of agricultural research fields and general farm fields. Those farm fields, even then, were considered as a potential for "indefinite expansion." Curiously, mention was made in the plan to note. "Future buildings should be held to a careful consonance with the general design by conforming to its plan scheme, producing, in each single group or unit composition, a unity of effect in treatment of mass and line." Each district would take on its general design character but with a basis of buff toned limestone and yellow/tan brick colors. The districts today still are visible if one looks closely. The buildings of the "old campus" are mainly comprised of the Madison sandstone. Buildings on the agricultural campus are brownish red brick with red tile roofs. Buildings on the engineering campus are of buff brick with flat roofs.

The 1908 Campus Plan also proposed development of the "Greater" and "Lesser" malls, large green spaces framed by classical buildings and forming collegiate quadrangles of space. The "Lesser Mall," later named Henry Mall after Agricultural Dean William Henry, was developed using the 1903 Agricultural Hall as its figure head and the new Agricultural Science Buildings marching down the west face of the mall creating the classic quadrangle of green space. Jennings had just completed the Engineering Building on Bascom Hill (now known as the Education Building), in 1899, also in the Beaux-Arts style. Home Economics (now part of Nancy Nicholas Hall), east of Agricultural Hall, was designed by Arthur Peabody along with Laird and Cret in 1912. Both Agricultural Hall and Home Economics, helped form the basis of the "Greater Mall" stepping back and away from Linden Drive up the green hillside.

Peabody replaced J.T.W Jennings as the university architect in 1905 and went on to design many of the most historic buildings on campus today. Along with the new university president, Charles Van Hise, Peabody instigated one of the largest building programs for the early campus. Van Hise had just begun expounding on the popular "Wisconsin Idea" as "the boundaries of the University are the boundaries of the State" which lives on today at the forefront of every strategic plan for the University of Wisconsin.



Figure 1-10 Laird & Cret 1908 General Design of the University of Wisconsin, Detail



Figure 1-11 Laird & Cret 1908 General Design of the University of Wisconsin, Detail showing "liberal arts piazza" near the summit of College Hill.

"The General Design of the University was completed in 1908, after two years of thorough investigation and careful study... the design attempts to forecast and visualize the physical development of the University during the next forty or fifty years... It is aimed to secure harmony of aspect among groups through emphasizing their unity as parts of one great University.... Through forecasting by a general plan the University can develop and maintain a visible unity and that individuality of character which may be epitomized by the word "Wisconsin"."

> – The Future of Wisconsin, Arthur Peabody, Supervising Architect, Badger Yearbook, 1913.

Peabody's work includes the buildings along the west side of Henry Mall, Agronomy (not integrated into Biochemical Sciences, 1906), Agricultural Engineering (1906) – his first two solo works – and Biochemistry (with Laird and Cret in 1912), the old Heating Plant on University Avenue (1907), Birge Hall (with Jarvis Hunt in 1910), the Service Building (1910), and Horticulture (1910). Laird and Cret designed their own classical style buildings for the campus including the Stock Pavilion (1909) and Lathrop Hall (1909). Peabody teamed with Laird and Cret to develop such classic buildings as Biochemistry on Henry Mall (1912), Barnard Hall (1913), Wisconsin High School (1913), Sterling Hall (1914), and the Soils Annex (1915).

With the departure of Laird and Cret in the late 1910s, Arthur Peabody went on to complete designs for the Wisconsin General Hospital (c. 1921, now the Medical Sciences Center), Nurses Dormitory (1924, removed in 2002), the Van Hise Dormitories (also known as Tripp and Adams Halls, 1925), Service Memorial Institute (1927), Memorial Union (1927), UW Fieldhouse (1929), Mechanical Engineering (1929), and the Carillon Tower (1936). No architect or team of architects would have such a profound impact on the design and future growth of the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus than Arthur Peabody, Phillipe Paul Cret and William Laird, all based on their classic revival plan of 1908. Peabody continued to serve as the university architect, updating the 1908 Campus Plan in 1927. The work of Laird and Cret, in the early 1900s, clearly guided development of the campus up through the 1930s.

Little of the 1908 Laird and Cret plan was ever fully implemented. Henry Mall, including the iconic Agricultural Hall at its apex, is one of the few features that came to fruition. Most notably, in the Laird and Cret plan, the majority of campus development was to occur north of University Avenue. Only the Service Building, Heating Plant, a recreation field and three academic buildings were shown south of University Avenue. The grand Beaux-Arts classical revival Agricultural Hall had been completed in 1903 under the design of then university architect J.T.W. Jennings, along with his work on King Hall (1896) and the Dairy Barn (1897) on the agriculture campus. Jennings also designed the classical Chemistry Building in 1903 (now known as Chamberlin Hall).

Since its completion, the 1908 Campus Plan has been looked to for inspiration and encouragement in the development of university buildings and grounds. In 1927, State Architect and former university architect Arthur Peabody, revised the 1908 plan based on changing needs of the university.

(tester to State 1

Percent,

Bauna,

÷

Figure 1-12 Laird & Cret 1908 General Design of the University of Wisconsin, General Design for Future Development

100

жĭ.

CENERAL PLAN

Менара

LANC

1.3

POLL THE

Werene Dowinster

Rate.

10 1 0

1111

1000

Term

Print 20

Friday

VISCONSIN SIGN L DEVELOPEMENT

MISSION

26 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

1.3 Historical Development of the UW-Madison Campus

The figure ground maps of the campus on the following pages show historical growth patterns and how the campus grew over time with the accompanying text describing major planning initiatives.

From 1875 through to the 1940s the campus saw a major shift from its humble beginnings as a small land grant college to what would become a large, modern university. Buildings were typically planned and designed to fit an immediate need and a departure from the historic academic village was seen. From 1910 to 1920, many new buildings were dedicated to agriculture and to the sciences. The 1920s saw the building of the Wisconsin General Hospital, the Service Memorial Institute for the College of Medicine (now part of the Medical Sciences Center) and the new Field House was completed. The first men's dormitories were also constructed during this period (Tripp and Adams Halls). In 1927, modifications to the Campus Plan were made which involved placing Intercollegiate Athletics at Camp Randall and the Medical School, as noted above, in the Service Memorial Institute. The 1908 Campus Plan called for the engineering campus to be located on the site of the current Medical Sciences Center located where the hospital and medical school was eventually built. Engineering eventually was placed south of University Avenue, north of Camp Randall. In the 1930s most new buildings were for residential, social and athletic purposes (e.g., the Lakeshore Dormitories, Elizabeth Waters Residence Hall, the Carillon Tower and completion of the Stadium).



Building footprints adapted from "A Campus Development Plan for the University of Wisconsin." Campus roadways adapted from "Experimental Farm and College Grounds Belonging to the University of Wisconsin – ca. 1870."

Figure 1-13 Figure Ground Map, 1870



Figure 1-14 Figure Ground Map, 1880

Building footprints adapted from a dated but unlabeled map archived at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Division of Facilities Planning and Management. Campus roadways adapted from "Experimental Farm and College Grounds Belonging to the University of Wisconsin – ca. 1870."



Building footprints adapted from a dated but unlabeled map archived at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Division of Facilities Planning and Management. Campus roadways adapted from "Experimental Farm and College Grounds Belonging to the University of Wisconsin – 1870."

Figure 1-15 Figure Ground Map, 1900

In November 1940, President Clarence A. Dykstra requested the development of a new plan to guide future development and growth for the campus. The objective of the plan was clearly defined to provide a pattern for new growth in such a way that "*construction will be guided along lines which will insure continuous direction toward a harmonious unity, embodying both physical and spiritual values.*" An extensive building program was being submitted to the legislature and the leaders of the day suggested that a new plan be developed to help guide the massive undertaking. In 1941, the Wisconsin State Planning Board finalized the development of "A Campus Development Plan for the University of Wisconsin."

The 1941 Plan's major recommendations included:

- The plan should facilitate the integration of related activities by college.
- The unique topographic features of the campus shall be preserved and enhanced.
- Ample open spaces should be maintained within the developed areas.
- The plan be achieved without significant land acquisition adjacent to the existing campus.
- New construction be primarily devoted to the College of Agriculture.

No attempt was made to provide for architectural details in the 1941 Plan. The commissioned architect and university authorities were tasked to make these decisions with respect to the architecture. The plan was to be flexible and allow for change over time but the broader objectives would be maintained. The planning team suggested the development of a group of individuals to carry out the program, something similar to a City Plan Commission. The "University Plan Commission" was to include regents, alumni, university staff, and state staff as ex-officio members. The charge to the commission would be to review all proposals for construction of new buildings or alterations of old ones. Since 2007 the university has had a Design Review Board, chaired by the university architect, which provides review and input into the development of large capital building projects.

In the 1940s, growth was seen late in the decade with Babcock Hall and several quonset huts and temporary buildings were constructed as enrollment grew after the end of World War II in 1945. The University Houses complex was built in 1948, as was Babcock Hall, and Engineering Hall in 1949. Taylor, Humphrey and Jorns Halls were also built in 1949. In May 1946, the regents requested that the University Plan Commission (also known as Campus Planning Commission and now the shared governance Campus Planning Committee) work with the City of Madison to develop plans for the area of expansion south of University Avenue and east of N. Park Street. Many months of discussion ensued with the eventual outcome of a master plan approved by the Board of Regents in August 1949. The design basically followed the 1908 Plan but, due to ever increasing enrollments, it indicated an expansion of the university to the south and east.

These historic prior plans served the campus well for over 40 years when, with the baby boom looming in the late 1950s, the next generation of campus planning began. In 1958, enrollment was just over 16,500 students and projected to grow up to 30,000 or greater by 1970. While the expected enrollment and subsequent growth in faculty and staff was predicted, it was not predicted at the rate at which it actually occurred in the 1960s and 70s. By 1970, enrollment stood at nearly 36,000 and a concurrent building boom was in full swing.

In the early 1950s, several new buildings were added to the campus including the Memorial Library, Stovall Hall, University Health Service, and the Dairy Cattle Center. Ingraham Hall (now known as the Commerce Building) was built in 1954, as was Camp Randall Memorial Practice Building (also known informally as the Shell). In 1955, the campus saw the Bardeen Labs being built, along with the Harvey Street Apartment complex for graduate students, approximately 1 mile west of the main campus. In the late 1950s, more residence halls were added (Holt Commons, Cole Hall, Sullivan Hall in 1957 and the Elm Drive Dorms – Bradley, Goodnight, Friedrick (now know as Val Phillips Residence Hall), and the associated dining hall facility were all built in 1958) and the beginning phases of the Eagle Heights married student housing complex was started. Poultry Research and the Agricultural Engineering Shop were also added on the Agriculture campus in that year.

In 1959, the Board of Regents adopted a "Sketch Plan for the University of Wisconsin–Madison." Goals of that plan where "to define succinctly the kind of physical environment deemed most desirable for the various activities of the University" and "to serve as a framework for more detailed site plans for the future development of the campus." The plan set about several planning principles that strove to use the natural beauty of the campus making sure new buildings enhance that setting and that the campus "does not spread unnecessarily." The distribution of activities was important such that related functions would be grouped together in the most efficient manner.



Figure 1-16 1941 Design for the Campus (at) the University of Wisconsin–Madison



Figure 1-17 Figure Ground Map, 1940

Building footprints adapted from a dated but unlabeled map archived at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Division of Facilities Planning and Management. Campus roadways estimated from "Plat Plan – West of Breeze (sic) Terrace, University of Wisconsin – Arthur Peabody, 1919" and "The University of Wisconsin Campus – Department of Buildings and Grounds, 1940." Expansion of existing facilities was planned and sites were reserved for future growth of established departments on campus. Density standards were established for various areas on campus and the concept "to minimize conflict between pedestrian and vehicular circulation, to eliminate excess vehicular traffic on campus, and to develop separate pedestrian systems" was first introduced. New boundaries for the campus were established by the Board of Regents in anticipation of growth of the campus south of University Avenue. Adequate space for parking was important as was the planning for non-university service facilities. In the 1959 Sketch Plan, they also wanted to *"separate University residential housing from academic and research functions"* on campus.

The early 1960s saw a boom in construction with larger square footage buildings being constructed for the first time on campus. The average size of facilities built since 1960 are over twice the gross square footage of earlier developed facilities. (It is interesting to note that over half of the existing campus buildings were constructed between 1950 and 1979.) The early 1960s saw the development of: Susan B. Davis House, Social Sciences Building, Van Vleck Hall, Genetics, and the Limnology Building on Lake Mendota, all in 1961; Henry Rust House, Hi Ray Hall, Veterinary Sciences, AW Peterson Building, McArdle Labs, Gym/Natatorium Unit I and II, and UW Extension Services in 1962; the Mifflin Street Warehouse, Russell Labs, Zoology Research Building in 1963; Brodgen Hall, Biotron, Primate Center in 1964; and Daniels Chemistry Building, Bock Labs, Computer Sciences Building, Van Hise Hall, and Middleton Medical Library in 1965.

In 1965, plans for enrollment growth were projected to upwards of 40,000 students, a level unprecedented in prior thinking. An intensive space needs study was implemented to look at what it would take to provide facilities for this burgeoning student population. Talk of the need for a second satellite campus, utilizing the Charmany and Reider Farms on the western edge of the city, were contemplated. Teaching workloads were analyzed and projected space deficits were looming on the horizon. A study of circulation patterns, both vehicular and pedestrian, was started with City of Madison officials. The great building boom of the late 1960s and early 1970s was finally beginning to meet the needs of the baby boomers coming to campus. In 1966, the Eagle Heights married student housing complex was finally completed.

In 1970, a new Campus Development Plan was developed by an internal university staff team that reached out to meet the goal of having a campus population of 40,000 students. Major proposals coming out of that plan included continuing efforts to preserve and upgrade the traditional feel and atmosphere of the original campus north of University Avenue and spreading outward from Bascom Hill. South of University Avenue, the plan called for a fresh approach to integrating campus and community development yet meet the needs of the ever expanding campus. Growth of on-campus housing was projected and thoughts of adding more residence halls were discussed. The late 1960s also included a major new development that was in full discussion. The development of a new Medical School teaching hospital on the far west end of campus, just east of University Bay Drive, was coming to fruition. The new Clinical Sciences Center would eventually open in March 1979 with the move of patients from the old hospital complex on University Avenue.

Parking capacity levels were contemplated to have up to 15,000 spaces on campus, again with most of them being in structured parking facilities. The university's long tradition of preserving its natural areas was also codified and included a suggestion to add the lands of "Second Point" (now known as Frautschi Point) to the 250 acres of already set aside natural areas. Their preservation and protection remain as a major planning goal for the campus. Service and utility areas, then spread across several sites, was to be consolidated in and around the Charter Street Heating Plant and on a site near Walnut Street, the latter being the future home of the Walnut Street Heating Plant constructed to serve the growing west campus. Removal of the railroad tracks that bisect the campus was also being discussed along with the development of a major vehicular bypass that would handle the large volumes of community wide traffic coming into downtown Madison. The bypass would connect at Highland Avenue on the west and the Gorham-Johnson Street pair on the east. The bypass would also act as a city-community redevelopment initiative that would spur integrated development along this large, 200-foot wide transportation corridor. Mass transit options were expanding in the planning circles of the day, with elevated trams, mono rails and duo-rail rapid transit. Funding for such a large scale endeavor would certainly be an issue.

In 1973, a campus planning workbook for UW–Madison was adopted by the Campus Planning Committee as a culmination of the planning efforts started in 1970 by university facilities staff. The 1973 "Madison Campus Development Plan" envisioned a projected enrollment of 35,350 students by 1982 and a maximum enrollment of 42,000 students (as predicted by the Wisconsin Coordinating Council on Higher Education and under enrollment management constraints established by the Board of Regents). Enrollment projections were starting to stabilize after the extreme growth in the late 1960's. Some boundary changes were suggested through joint city-university negotiations. The majority of campus development was again focused around the central campus with additional development starting around the newly opened UW Hospital's Clinical Sciences Center.



Figure 1-18 Figure Ground Map, 1954

Building footprints adapted from a dated but unlabeled map archived at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Division of Facilities Planning and Management. Roadways adapted from "Map and Aerial View of the Wisconsin Campus [1951 or 1952]", and "University of Wisconsin in Madison (from Lincoln-Mercury Times 1952."



Figure 1-19 Figure Ground Map, 1967

Both building footprints and roadways adapted from "University of Wisconsin and Madison Water Utility Existing Distribution System, 1967."
1. BACKGROUND & HISTORY



Figure 1-20 1959 Sketch Plan for the University of Wisconsin, UW Planning & Construction

The extensively detailed 1973 Campus Plan including the following planning efforts:

- Increase density of building in the central campus and on the west campus related to the Medical School and hospital.
- Design new buildings and replace obsolete old buildings so as to facilitate use by different departments and programs with a minimal amount of remodeling.
- Work toward reducing pedestrian-vehicular conflicts by locating facilities that need extensive vehicular access (medical center and athletic complexes) on the periphery of the campus.
- Maintain or increase pedestrian malls, natural areas, recreational land and green spaces across campus; protect from development the natural and park-like areas of John Muir Woods, Picnic Point and Camp Randall Memorial Park.
- Incorporate more public art, construct more pedestrian malls and other works of landscape architecture.
- Increase on-campus student housing from 7,550 beds to approximately 10,000 beds.
- Working with the city and local developers, increase near-campus private student housing.
- Increase available parking on campus from 6,800 to 13,500 spaces, creating more structured parking to reduce the number of acres devoted to surface parking from over 62 acres to around 40 acres; locate new parking on the fringe of the campus to reduce congestion and traffic including two large shuttle lots, one on the east and one on the west end of campus (each with 3,000 spaces).
- Close University Avenue from Lake Street on the east to Henry Mall on the west to provide a more pedestrian friendly campus; redirect vehicular traffic to Johnson Street and a proposed four-lane highway system via W. Dayton Street connecting back up to "old" University Avenue on the west and to

E. Johnson Street on the east.

- Improve vehicular circulation around campus and possibly remove/ relocate the existing railroad tracks that bisect the campus.
- Improve the campus transit system to serve remote parking areas and reduce on-campus vehicular traffic; work with the city to improve the regional and city-wide transit systems.
- On the south campus (south of W. Dayton Street) continue to work with the city to partner on redevelopment initiatives.

From 1979 to 1980, facilities staff updated the 1973 Campus Plan with a final plan being adopted by the Campus Planning Committee in September 1980. The primary focus of the 1980 Campus Plan centered on the South Campus area for which the City of Madison established a joint planning area with the university in 1979. Those efforts resulted in a land use plan being adopted by the Campus Planning Committee on January 17, 1980 and by the Madison Common Council in April 1980. Major conclusions of that plan and the 1980 Campus Development Plan include:

- Undergraduate enrollments will continue to decline somewhat over the next decade and then begin to increase again with little to no effect on campus facilities; research programs will continue to grow on campus.
- The building program for the next decade will focus on remodeling and upgrading existing facilities with selective new space to complement existing programs.
- The parking program has stabilized on campus at the existing level of approximately 10,000 spaces.
- Considerable emphasis will need to be placed on alternative modes of transportation to and from campus to accommodate user needs.
- The university continues its strong commitment to maintaining open space and preserving campus natural areas.
- The university will continue to work with the City of Madison and the private sector to resolve issues around the need for more and improved student housing close to campus; first step has been made in the jointly developed land use plan for the South Campus.
- The boundaries of the campus will not change dramatically from those approved in 1959; principal modifications will be in the South Campus area and in modest land acquisition to meet programmatic needs.

During the fall of 1980, the Campus Planning Committee, the Board of Regents and the State Building Commission adopted the 1980 Campus Development Plan. The major conclusions of that plan stated that enrollment would decline somewhat but would increase again in the mid-1990s. The plan focused on remodeling and upgrading existing facilities while adding selective space to complement existing programs. In order to accommodate the needs of the campus users, considerable emphasis was placed on alternative modes of transportation, including bus, car and van-pooling, bicycles and walking. The plan made a strong commitment to maintaining open space and did not make major recommendations in expanding the campus boundary over what was established in the 1959 Campus Plan. Principal boundary modifications



Building footprints and roadways adapted from University of Wisconsin– Madison Facilities Planning & Management 2007 Base Map, the 1980 University of Wisconsin–Madison Base Map, and "Buildings of the University of Wisconsin" by Jim Feldman.

Figure 1-21 Figure Ground Map, 1980

since that time were in the south campus area and along the rail corridor where a joint planning area was established with the City of Madison. Modest land acquisition was planned to meet programmatic needs.

In 1982, a Campus Transportation Plan was adopted by the UW–Madison Parking and Transportation Board, the Campus Planning Committee and the Board of Regents of the UW System. The plan, based on several transportation surveys of faculty, staff and students, helped pave the way for future transportation planning initiatives and the campus' leadership role in defining campus transportation solutions.

In 1984, a series of campus master development plans were completed as part of an overall UW System effort to bring all of the campus master plans up-to-date and define the pressing need of facility improvements to the state legislature. A 2-year, 6-year and 10-year plan were developed, the latter two of which included extensive amounts of information pertinent to the anticipated program directions and corresponding future needs of the campus. All of these documents are available for review in the current offices of Facilities Planning & Management.

These series of plans, outlined in 1984, included the following major themes:

- Undergraduate enrollments were expected to dip somewhat in the 1980s and begin to stabilize in the 1990s.
- Minor changes in the campus plan boundary in the south campus area, mainly for housing redevelopment; property acquisition within the boundary continued to occur based upon program needs.
- A number of improvements for bicycle and pedestrian enhancements were considered including the development of new bicycle routes and a series of overhead pedestrian bridges connecting much of the east campus to Bascom Hill.
- A comprehensive transportation planning effort was developed with Dane County.
- Parking supply was held at a steady state of 9,383 parking spaces for the campus realizing some parking will continue to be moved into parking structures to free up future space for development or new open space.
- Wherever possible, existing buildings would continue to be utilized for programmatic needs; in some instances buildings would need to be removed for better land use, or a replacement for a facility whose operational and on-going maintenance costs were unreasonable.
- Preservation of key historic buildings that possess a high degree of

architectural or historical integrity was identified as important to the campus community.

- A shortage of research and instructional program space was identified across campus as well as a shortage of service facilities.
- Affordable, private sector student housing in the campus area was seen as an issue forcing many students to reside further away from campus where rents were less expensive.
- Emphasis on upgrading and expanding utility systems (electrical, heating and cooling) were discussed.
- Energy conservation was a key component in all facilities planning efforts; stability and reliability of energy sources was seen as a concern.

Updates to the 1984 plans were completed in 1986 and 1988 with minor revisions along the way as part of the biennial capital budget process.

The next major campus planning effort occurred in 1996, when Johnson, Johnson & Roy (JJR) was hired to develop a comprehensive campus master plan for UW–Madison, a first for the campus in many years. A new strategic plan had been developed for the campus by then Chancellor David Ward entitled "A Vision for the Future." This plan identified priorities for the campus including a need to encourage unified interrelationships among the university's highly specialized activities all while encouraging a common goal of increasing "community" and improving "learning environments" through well planned facilities. Campus facilities must be flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances and be easily changeable programmatically. The new campus physical master plan would provide a solid framework for organizing and enhancing the campus' physical environment for the next 10-30 years as the university faced the challenges of the future.

The major planning issues discussed include:

- Enrollment will continue to be held stable under Board of Regent Enrollment Management Initiatives at approximately 42,000 students.
- The location of the Medical School and other health science related facilities in relation to the hospital on the west campus.
- Visitor reception is needed on the east campus.
- Improved pedestrian linkages of the campus north-south and east-west and improve transit service on campus.
- Promote alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel modes to and from campus.
- Create a new major sports arena on the southeast campus.
- Balance development with properly scaled open spaces.



- Protect and preserve the waterfront, sensitive environmental areas and open spaces.
- Eliminate vehicular conflicts and configure roads for efficient traffic flow; roadways were defined as "at capacity" with several upgrades to intersections and roadways planned with the City of Madison.
- Locate parking in close relationship to major campus destinations; add 2,500 spaces for parking on campus.
- Build relationships between the campus and surrounding community via improved visual gateways, edges and boundaries, etc..
- Respect adjacent neighborhoods.
- Utility capacities were analyzed with 1.5 million gross square feet of chilled water demand and 1.0 million gross square feet of steam demand found.

Development was projected to occur mainly on the south, west, and east edges of the campus where it ultimately did occur. The Medical School and School of Pharmacy consolidated into a Health Sciences Campus by moving from the center of campus and the old Medical Sciences Center out to the west campus near the UW Hospital. The 17,000-seat Kohl Center was built on the southeast campus to serve major athletic, university events and national tour concerts. The East Campus Mall (also known as Murray Mall as defined in the 1996 plan) came to fruition with the redevelopment in 2005 of two new residence halls and an office building on North Park Street. As new building development occurs along the former Murray Street corridor, each project is including the development of the north-south pedestrian mall to assure its completion from Regent Street on the south to Lake Mendota on the north. Parking has been increased from approximately 11,000 spaces on campus to 13,000 spaces bringing an increase in visitor parking along with a significant increase in Transportation Demand Management initiatives. The university has become the leader in providing options to single-occupancy vehicle trips to downtown Madison and the university.

The 1996 Campus Master Plan identified 50 potential building sites across campus with an estimated growth of approximately 4.7 million gross square feet. In 1996, the campus had approximately 15.8 million gross square feet in existing buildings. Campus growth since 1986 was at a rate of about one million gross square feet per decade. The Campus Plan therefore suggested a growth rate of approximately three million gross square feet would last 30 years. By comparison, in 2005 the campus was at about 18.5 million gross square feet. Little did they know then that the university would witness

another era of major new building across the campus. Over 80% of the recommendations made in the 1996 Campus Plan were implemented and are seen today in the development of the many new buildings on the main campus.

From 1996 to 2005, biennial capital building programs continued to be developed that started to implement the 1996 Plan. Each two years, a new Campus Physical Development Plan was updated and submitted as part of the capital budget process through the Campus Planning Committee, the Chancellor's office, UW System Administration, the Board of Regents and eventually on to the Department of Administration to help provide support and background information on the proposed projects in each subsequent capital budget. Enrollment management continued keeping student enrollments around 40,000 students. Faculty and staff remained stable as well at approximately 19,000 individuals.

In 1999, through a mandatory self-study as part of the campuswide 10-year reaccreditation process, "Targeting Tomorrow" was published identifying five strategic trends for the university: promote research, advance learning, accelerate internationalization, amplify the Wisconsin Idea, and nurture human resources. The university completed another national reaccreditation process that started in 2008.

In an effort to facilitate approvals for new campus research facilities, especially related to the sciences, several capital funding initiatives were started. In the early 1990s, a new effort began with the State of Wisconsin and the university to jointly commit to funding major facility improvement initiatives. These funding initiatives allowed projects to occur on a more streamlined approach and solidified funding over a longer period of time for a number of projects.

The projects included:

- WiStar (1991-93 biennium): This \$150 million program required a 50/50 match of private to state dollars and lasted for eight years focusing efforts on improving and upgrading biological and basic science facilities.
- HealthStar (1997-99 biennium): This \$210 million program required a one-third General Fund Supported Borrowing to two-thirds Gift/Grant/ Program Revenue Supported Borrowing split funding that lasted for six years focusing on the Medical School and Health Sciences facilities on the West Campus.
- BioStar (2001-03 biennium): This \$317 million program required a 50/50 match of private to state dollars and lasted for 10 years and focused on new biological and interdisciplinary science facilities.



Building footprints and roadways adapted from University of Wisconsin-Madison Facilities Planning & Management 2007 Base Map, and May 1999 Aerial Photograph.

Figure 1-23 Figure Ground Map, 2000

The 1996 Campus Master Plan served the campus well into early 2005. Several recommendations were deemed unlikely to be forwarded due to changing campus priorities and planning circumstances beyond the control of the university (namely changing street use patterns and closing city streets south of University Avenue). In all, the 1996 Plan was successful in guiding 10 years of facilities development on the campus.

As in any planning process, the horizon is never ending. It was clear in 2005 that the campus was going to continue to change and evolve, meeting new challenges and providing quality learning environments for future researchers, faculty, students and staff. It was time for a new facilities growth capacity plan for the 936-plus acres of the main UW–Madison campus.

1.4 2005 Campus Master Plan Recreating Ourselves in Place"

As a result of the regents' enrollment management efforts, the university's enrollment was projected to remain at approximately 41,500 students (headcount), well into the future. Continued moderate growth would be seen in faculty and staff related to the university's research engine, estimated to be approximately 2% per year. The 2005 Campus Master Plan addressed how to responsibly plan for growth without requiring significant land acquisition outside the current development plan boundary approved by the Board of Regents in 1996. It also provided recommendations for a responsible "carrying capacity" of the land, striving to balance the importance of open space to building space within the campus development plan boundary of the campus.

Six major goals were identified as part of the 2005 Campus Master Plan process:

Goal #1 - Sustainability

Protect, enhance and celebrate our lakeside setting. Develop sustainability guidelines using "green" building designs, materials and techniques. Reduce our impact on the land and better manage energy use. Investigate use of alternative fuels for heating plants and fleet vehicles.

Goal #2 - Community, Academic and Research Connections

Promote the Wisconsin Idea by enhancing community connections. Define our borders and enliven streetscapes with more trees and more public gathering places. Make boundaries inviting and transparent. Enhance academic connections by replacing aging buildings, adding research space and improving the quality and quantity of academic facilities. Promote interdisciplinary learning and research with flexible new facilities.

Goal #3 - Student Life

Renew a commitment to student life by renovating, rebuilding or restoring our unions and adding upgraded recreation facilities. Add on-campus housing space and continue to promote learning communities. Create new outdoor spaces for informal student gatherings.

Goal #4 - Buildings and Design Guidelines

Renew campus by removing obsolete buildings that cannot be renovated. Provide buildings with renewable designs and a planned life of at least 100 years. Preserve significant historic buildings. Define existing neighborhoods of design to ensure new buildings fit into their campus context. Develop comprehensive design guidelines to provide architectural coherence.

Goal #5 - Open Space

Protect and enhance existing open spaces and create new gathering areas. Maintain lands in the Lakeshore Nature Preserve as natural areas that support our mission of teaching, research and outreach. Protect and enhance known historic cultural landscapes, quadrangles and courtyards.

Goal #6 - Transportation and Utilities

Provide attractive options to driving alone. Maintain parking capacity. Provide more pedestrian areas, bicycle lanes, connected paths and bicycle commuter facilities. Plan for the future development of commuter rail and streetcars. Provide a reliable utility network to meet current and future demands.

Four major components were identified to be studied in the 2005 Campus Master Plan, including:

1. **Buildings** – Which buildings should remain and which are nearing the end of their useful life? How much new space will be needed to support growth in the research engine of the campus? How can we decompress current research and teaching facilities to provide the outstanding types of facilities our faculty, staff and students require? What is the responsible building capacity of the currently developed land within the campus boundary? If we do not have enough land to meet our programmatic needs, while protecting important open spaces, will we need to develop a satellite campus outside of downtown Madison?

- 2. **Open Space** What are the important green spaces on campus that need to be protected or enhanced? Can we add more usable open space if we remove buildings or surface parking lots and without purchasing additional land outside our existing approved boundary? Where can we create new courtyards and quadrangles in the more urbanized campus to provide outdoor gathering areas for passive use?
- **3. Transportation** How can we continue to maximize our progressive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) initiatives and continue to provide sustainable alternatives to driving alone to campus, all while maintaining our current 13,000 parking spaces? How can we have campus users make a positive choice to use an alternative form of transportation to, from and around campus? How can we improve our public transit system on campus and move people quickly and efficiently across campus without using their cars?
- **4. Utilities** What is the capacity of our utility systems to support current and future campus facilities? What utilities require improvements or expansion in order to meet our needs? What about alternative fuel sources and sustainability in our energy use and building design?

For all of these areas, existing components were analyzed; guidelines developed for the future, and sustainability issues were addressed.

At the conclusion of the 2005 Campus Master Plan process, it was confirmed that indeed the campus had plenty of capacity to build up to an additional net 7 million gross square feet without having to significantly change the campus planning boundary or think about a satellite campus, as many universities have across the country. Surface parking lots, some 10% (90+ acres) of the campus land area in 2005, were suggested as the potential space to grow the campus facilities by consolidating surface parking into structured parking garages in key locations were needed most in the fabric of the campus landscape.

Additionally, with a review of the then existing building stock, it was confirmed (and as projected) that many buildings built in the 1960's and 1970's were nearing the end of their useful life and a decision would have to be made on keeping them for renovation, remodeling and re-programming, or remove the buildings for future redevelopment. In the end, a combination of the two was recommended across the campus for buildings that critically needed upgrades.

Since the completion of the 2005 Campus Master Plan, and with the national economic challenges that started in 2008, overall campus construction and new capital projects, has slowed considerably compared to the redevelopment that occurred between 1996 and 2006. In 2015, the campus has only completed about 35% of the 2005 Campus Master Plan which suggests there is still adequate potential for future growth and redevelopment on the campus without significantly expanding our planning boundary.

In 2009, the City of Madison approved their new municipal zoning code, last updated (created) in 1966. Included in the new form-based code was the development of a new "Campus-Institutional" (C-I) zoning district. With the approval of the new code, UW–Madison has the ability to have a comprehensive campus master plan approved by the city and codified by ordinance. The new C-I district requires the development of an approved campus master plan every 10 years. With the 10-year update in 2015-16 of the 2005 Campus Master Plan, the university is poised to have its first ever Campus Master Plan approved by the City of Madison.

1. BACKGROUND & HISTORY



2. MISSION & GUIDING PRINCIPLES



2.1 University Mission, Vision, and Strategic Plan

The primary purpose of UW–Madison is to provide a learning environment in which faculty, staff and students can discover, examine critically, preserve and transmit the knowledge, wisdom and values that will help ensure the survival of this and future generations and improve the quality of life for all. The university seeks to help students to develop an understanding and appreciation for the complex cultural and physical worlds in which they live and to realize their highest potential of intellectual, physical and human development. It also seeks to attract and serve students from diverse social, economic and ethnic backgrounds and to be sensitive and responsive to those groups which have been underserved by higher education.

- 1. Offer broad and balanced academic programs that are mutually reinforcing and emphasize high quality and creative instruction at the undergraduate, graduate, professional and postgraduate levels.
- 2. Generate new knowledge through a broad array of scholarly, research and creative endeavors, which provide a foundation for dealing with the immediate and long-range needs of society.
- 3. Achieve leadership in each discipline; strengthen interdisciplinary studies, and pioneer new fields of learning.
- 4. Serve society through coordinated statewide outreach programs that meet continuing educational needs in accordance with the university's designated land-grant status.
- 5. Participate extensively in statewide, national and international programs and encourage others in the University of Wisconsin System, at other educational institutions and in state, national and international organizations to seek benefit from the university's unique educational resources, such as faculty and staff expertise, libraries, archives, museums and research facilities.
- 6. Strengthen cultural understanding through opportunities to study languages, cultures, the arts and the implications of social, political, economic and technological change and through encouragement of study, research and service off campus and abroad.
- 7. Maintain a level of excellence and standards in all programs that will give them statewide, national and international significance.
- 8. Embody, through its policies and programs, respect for, and commitment to, the ideals of a pluralistic, multiracial, open and democratic society.

Revised statement, adopted June 10, 1988, UW

2.2 Coordination with the Campus Strategic Framework Plan

The current UW–Madison strategic framework plan, developed by the university in 2015, identifies five strategic priorities and initiatives, including:

- 1. Educational Experience: The Wisconsin Experience describes what's unique about getting a degree from UW–Madison— together, we create and apply learning inside and outside the classroom to make the world a better place. UW–Madison produces graduates who are creative problem solvers, able to integrate empirical analysis and passion, seek out and create new knowledge and technologies, adapt to new situations, and engage as world citizens and leaders.
- 2. Research and Scholarship: Nurture excellence in research, scholarship, and creative activity across all divisions. Optimize the research and scholarship infrastructure of the university. Strengthen our influence in national decision-making around research policy and funding. Engage our interdisciplinary strength to generate creative solutions. Support the continued high level of integration of research and education.
- 3. The Wisconsin Idea: Partner with UW System schools, corporations, communities, and government to bring value to Wisconsin citizens. Promote economic development and job creation through our campus technology-transfer ecosystem, in partnership with the business and entrepreneurial communities. Extend our educational mission to Wisconsin and the world with new technology and partnerships. Leverage our distinctive interdisciplinary strength to address complex problems in the state and the world.
- 4. Our People: Ensure UW–Madison has a workforce that is highly talented, engaged, and diverse by implementing our new personnel/human resource system. Enhance the strength of our campus through diversity and inclusion by implementing the campus Diversity Framework. Ensure our ability to attract and retain talent by making progress toward competitive compensation relative to our peers and market medians. Nurture growth of our people through professional development and performance excellence. Create the best possible environment in which our people can carry out their responsibilities to the university.

5. Resource Stewardship: Promote resource stewardship, improve service delivery and efficiency, and ensure administrative capacity. Create a stable and sustainable financial structure through the implementation of a transformed budget model. Identify and pursue new revenue sources aligned with the institution's mission and goals. Promote environmental sustainability through our own campus operations, integrated with research and education. Transform library structures and technologies to best support research and learning, and to attain campus efficiencies. Sponsor a comprehensive campaign to invest in the future of the university and the students, faculty, and staff who will shape the future of Wisconsin and the world.

Among the world's leading universities, UW–Madison is distinctive in its scale and breadth, the premium we place on our relevance to society, and our commitment to inclusivity in the broadest sense. The combination of these attributes enables us to be fully equipped to address the complex problems facing the modern world.

The strategic framework is designed to chart a course for 2015–2019 that will not only protect our legacy of research, teaching, and public service, but also will encourage new ideas from all corners of the campus and transform our state, nation, and world.

This framework has evolved from a rigorous self-study conducted in 2009 during the university's reaccreditation process. We experienced significant achievements in key priorities that served as the core of our 2009–2014 framework, and that very success convinced us to continue along this path as we begin the next five years. The priorities have been updated to build on our momentum and to take bold steps toward our vision.

2.3 Need for a Campus Master Plan

Approximately every 10 years, the university takes a comprehensive look at its programmatic directions and how its facilities support those programmatic changes. The State of Wisconsin Building Commission, under Sections 13.48(4) and (6) of the Wisconsin Statutes, requires that capital building programs be prepared for each state agency on a regular basis. Specific recommendations and priorities must be established for the next three biennia in what is defined as an agency's "Six-Year Development Plan." Every two years, Facilities Planning & Management staff works directly with all colleges and departments across the university in defining their current and future physical facility issues and determining potential solutions to address those needs. The shared governance Campus Planning Committee oversees the entire process and makes a final recommendation to the Chancellor for inclusion in the on-going capital budget for the State of Wisconsin. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update for UW–Madison has been prepared to assist in that process for at least the next three, 6-year planning horizons and beyond. The general planning horizon for the document is approximately 25-40 years, with the understanding that the next planned update to the Campus Master Plan would be in 2025.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update is also being used to satisfy the City of Madison's Campus-Institutional (C-I) zoning district requirements that includes having an approved campus master plan. That approved plan is required to be updated every 10 years to maintain the C-I district on property it currently owns. As the university acquires privately held land within the Board of Regents approved Campus Development Plan Boundary, university campus planning staff will facilitate a zoning change to that land to bring it in alignment with the current approved campus master plan and within the C-I district. The overall comprehensive campus master plan, showing full development as a capacity plan, will serve as a reference document for development occurring within the university context.

The master planning process is used to accommodate and direct future growth of the campus in a responsible and efficient manner utilizing funding to assure that facilities development supports the institution's mission of teaching, research and outreach. The plan needs to assure that daily decisions are part of a long-term vision, are not short sighted but are optimistic about the future outlook of the campus and its facilities. The plan also needs to continue to raise aspirations as well as provide positive direction for potential donors interested in investing in the future of the campus.

The current master planning process at UW–Madison also follows Physical Planning Principles that have been adopted by the Board of Regents. Those principles are as follows:



Our Vision

The University of Wisconsin–Madison (UW–Madison) will be a model public university in the 21st century, serving as a resource to the public, and working to enhance the quality of life in the state, the nation, and the world.

The university will remain a preeminent center for discovery, learning, and engagement by opening new forms of access to citizens from every background; creating a welcoming, empowered, and inclusive community; and preparing current and future generations to live satisfying, useful, and ethical lives. In partnership with the state and with colleagues around the world, the university's faculty, staff, and students will identify and address many of the state's and the world's most urgent and complex problems.

Guiding Principles

As an institution and as individuals, we are guided by the following principles:

- We promote the highest standards of intellectual inquiry and rigor, in keeping with the university's proven commitment to the "continual sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found."
- We support learning for its own sake, throughout our lives, as a service to the greater good.
- We fiercely defend intellectual freedom and combine it with responsibility and civility so that all who work and live on our campus can question, criticize, teach, learn, create, and grow.
- We observe the highest ethical integrity in everything we do.
- We believe in the importance of working with and learning from those whose backgrounds and views differ from our own.
- We share the belief that neither origin nor economic background should be barriers to participation in the community.
- We are committed to being responsible stewards of our human, intellectual, cultural, financial, and environmental resources.
- We promote the application of research and teaching to issues of importance for the state, the nation, and the world, and we place learning and discovery in the service of political, economic, social, and cultural progress.

The current campus physical master planning process aligns closely with the campus mission and strategic plan by creating a framework for upgrading research facilities and the utility infrastructure that serves them. The plan advances learning by planning facilities with life-long learning in mind; utilizing technology to its best advantage through appropriate facility improvements; and substantially upgrading the buildings that serve the arts and humanities.

The plan reaches out not only to the Madison and Dane County communities, but to the entire Midwest and the world beyond. The plan seeks to improve wayfinding for our many visitors with better graphic wayfinding. It will amplify the Wisconsin Idea by promoting these community connections and making the campus boundaries more transparent and inviting. The plan will enhance academic connections by providing upgraded facilities that are flexible and promote interdisciplinary learning and research.

The master planning process included a broad base group of representatives from across campus. Students, faculty and staff from every department and college have been involved as well as many members of the Madison community. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update, as well as the Strategic Plan, is a result of shared values among the many campus users and provides a direction to guide future growth.

2.4 Physical Planning Principles, UW System Board of Regents

It is the policy of the Board of Regents that the following principles shall guide the physical planning and development of UW System institutions and stewardship of physical assets controlled by the Board of Regents.

A. Physical Planning and Development

- 1. Physical development that is planned using an integrated planning model that incorporates programmatic concerns, physical concerns, and financial realities.
- 2. Involvement of stakeholders that provides a meaningful role for students when student funding and fees are involved.
- 3. Physical development that is planned within the context of UW System, institutional, and State of Wisconsin planning guidelines, policies, and funding parameters.
- 4. Cooperative planning with the city and county in which the institution is located.
- 5. Campus physical environments that promote optimal accessibility for people with disabilities.
- 6. Comprehensive campus master plans that are periodically updated and address:
 - a. Space needs;
 - b. Image, identity, and aesthetics;
 - c. Multimodal transportation access and circulation;
 - d. Parking;
 - e. Open space;
 - f. Building sites;
 - g. Infrastructure and utilities;
 - h. Sustainability;
 - *i.* Implementation; and
 - j. Health and safety.

Physical development is planned in accordance with the campus master plan.

- 7. Planning that includes student enrollment, faculty, and staff projections; applicable space allocation and utilization benchmarks; evidence-based decision-making; and best planning practices.
- 8. Responsiveness to the needs of a diverse student body and the delivery of programs and services that meet those needs.
- 9. Sustainable design through:
 - a. Optimal use and reuse of existing facilities;
 - b. Minimal construction of new facilities;
 - c. Optimal adaptability for future changes;

- d. High-performance and energy-efficient design;
- e. Ease of long-term maintenance and operation; and
- f. Appropriate use of renewable energy.
- 10. Accurate and defensible project programs, budgets, and schedules developed prior to enumeration.

B. Stewardship of Physical Assets

Appropriate stewardship of physical assets should include:

- 1. An institutional commitment to assure sufficient resources, their optimal use, and adequate expertise to care for physical assets.
- 2. An accurate and current geographic information system (GIS) for all Board of Regentsowned land using a common UW System-wide format and minimum level of detail.
- 3. A comprehensive building space management function, an accurate and current space inventory, and a comprehensive space use plan specific to each institution.
- 4. An accurate and current record of the physical condition and maintenance needs of all facilities.
- 5. Proper maintenance of all existing facilities to protect and extend the life of existing investments and ensure that facilities are usable for their intended purposes.
- 6. A commitment to Wisconsin's heritage through preservation of historic buildings and other cultural resources.

A successful campus master plan needs to be consistent yet flexible and responsive to the needs of its time. It is an important baseline upon which to make day-to-day decisions over a longer period of time and to meet a consistent vision. The development of new facilities, and the preservation, renovation and maintenance of existing facilities, need to assure university and state decision-makers that funds allocated for facilities are in line with the campus mission. As the campus continues to rely on private dollars for more and more of its development, it is also clear that the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update will be used to keep aspirations high and help raise funds for new and exciting endeavors. The campus master plan must continue to always provide an optimistic vision for the future.



2.5 Master Plan Goals and Guiding Principles

The master planning process was guided and driven by the master plan goals and guiding principles. The master plan goals of the 2005 Campus Master Plan were updated to reflect the university's 2015 strategic direction and leadership. The goals were expanded to provide additional guidance regarding the campus landscape, open space, and green infrastructure. The Master Plan Consultant team and Campus Planning Steering Committee referred to the goals and principles when considering alternative futures and refining the Master Plan recommendations.

More important than this historical use is the future use of these goals and guiding principles. As all building, parking, landscape, and utility projects are developed and constructed, UW–Madison staff and its consultants should refer to and apply these principles to ensure a consistent and common vision.



1. Support Our Mission

- Support our mission of teaching, research, and outreach by enhancing our physical identity.
- Demonstrate and support the Wisconsin Idea in how we perceive and develop our physical campus.
- Maintain/renovate/replace campus buildings to support a high quality academic and research environment.
- Support and create interdisciplinary academic connections through improved campus facilities and landscapes.
- Support the integration of education, research, and outreach into campus operations with hands-on learning opportunities.
- Leverage the Lakeshore Nature Preserve as natural areas that support our mission of teaching, research, and outreach.



2. Manage Our Resources

- Manage our physical resources as effectively and efficiently as possible.
- Provide buildings with designed flexibilities to meet a planned life of at least 50-100 years or more.
- Demonstrate leadership in environmental sustainability both on- and off-campus.
- Develop and respect sustainable design guidelines to create sustainable facilities.
- Preserve and enhance our environmentally sensitive and culturally important areas by improving, expanding, and monitoring their long-term viability.
- Establish long-range goals to become a future zero-waste campus by 2025.
- Make data-informed decisions regarding infrastructure and building services as the campus evolves.
- Manage and improve our water resources by continuing our water conservation initiatives.
- Construct a reliable utility infrastructure network to meet current and future demands.
- Use Sustainable SITES Initiative[®] as a guideline for all future development.



3. Make Travel Easy

- Support convenient alternatives to driving by maximizing our Transportation Demand Management initiatives.
- Make it efficient to travel to and move around campus.
- Construct accessible and convenient bicycle/pedestrian facilities that connect users to destinations on campus and beyond.
- Provide an efficient and convenient commuter and circulator transit system, connecting campus destinations and linking campus with the city and surrounding areas.
- Improve our streetscapes, making them more comfortable, safe, and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Provide the minimal amount of parking needed to meet the needs of the campus and its visitors.



4. Celebrate Our Lakeside Setting

- Protect and celebrate our lakeside setting while reducing our impacts on land and water.
- Leverage our lake front setting and natural areas in the Lakeshore Nature Preserve.
- Enhance and sustain our campus natural resources for future generations.
- Work with our local partners to continue to improve the water quality of Willow Creek, Lake Mendota, and the entire Yahara Lakes system to meet current and future water quality regulations.



5. Revitalize Outdoor Spaces

- Develop our physical environment so that it communicates our institutional values and strategic priorities.
- Respect and celebrate the history and cultural diversity of the university.
- Promote a clear sense of place by protecting, enhancing, and maintaining our existing quadrangles, courtyards, and streetscapes.
- Explore the need for new outdoor spaces for informal gatherings.
- Protect and enhance our historic buildings, historic districts, and cultural landscape resources.
- Nurture wellness through a broad spectrum of outdoor open spaces and encourage physical activity throughout the seasons.
- Refine and unite our on-campus neighborhoods by revitalizing outdoor gathering spaces and utilizing the campus for experiential learning, health, and wellness.
- Ensure our available land is put to the highest and best use.
- Design buildings and landscapes so that they fit into their campus neighborhood context.
- Develop and respect comprehensive design guidelines to further design coherence.



6. Be Good Neighbors

- Be responsive to our neighbors to assure we are good community partners, maintaining a high quality of life for everyone.
- Create an environment that invites participation by the surrounding community in our educational and entertainment events.
- Welcome visitors to campus with a sense of arrival through defined gateways at major entry points.
- Delineate an identifiable and inviting campus boundary where appropriate.
- Establish efficient and attractive connections across campus and with the surrounding neighborhoods.

Extending Our History

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update vision is to capture the best characteristics of our historic campus core, and extend and strengthen them throughout our evolving campus.



The careful balance of Bascom Hill – mixed-use buildings of architectural prominence surrounding and defining a well-designed and active open space.

The comfort and safety of Library Mall and East Campus Mall – easy walking and biking with careful interaction with vehicles.

The activity of the Memorial Union Terrace – indoor and outdoor places for people to gather and exchange ideas with a focus on Lake Mendota.

The preservation of the Lakeshore Nature Preserve – a place of respite for humans and habitat for flora and fauna.

Embracing Our Future

We will continue to recreate ourselves in place, while reducing the impact of the campus and its activities on our environment. The UW–Madison physical campus supports the university as a preeminent center for discovery, learning, and engagement.



As the campus infiltrates and treats not only the water that falls upon it, but also a portion of water from the region, the water of Lakes Mendota and Monona will be cleaner.

As we strengthen our national leadership in those taking transit, carpooling, biking, and walking to campus, we will support the region's growth toward a more balanced and effective transportation system.

As we maximize opportunities for generating and using renewable energy, we will continue to reduce our carbon footprint.

As we meticulously plan and improve our facilities, we will reduce our operating costs and wisely manage the state's physical assets. We will promote our resource stewardship and improve our service delivery, efficiency, and sustainability.

3. FACILITIES PLAN: EXISTING CONDITIONS

3.1 Campus Profile

Founded in 1848 by a clause in the Wisconsin Constitution that provided for "a State University, at or near the seat of state government," the UW-Madison has grown to become one of the nation's largest and most productive institutions of higher learning. Beginning with a class of 17 on February 5, 1849, the university now enrolls more than 42,000 students. UW-Madison offers the only public schools of law, medicine and veterinary medicine in the state and is one of only two state-supported schools to offer doctoral degrees. As one of the country's first land grant universities, currently serving over 43,000 students and 21,600 faculty and staff (data as of Fall 2015). The main campus is comprised of over 936 acres of picturesque grounds along the shores of Lake Mendota, of which 300 acres are defined as the Lakeshore Nature Preserve and are protected from development. The university currently (as of early 2016) has over 22.9 million gross square feet of building space and offers a broad array of undergraduate, graduate, professional, research and advanced academic programs. UW-Madison is the flagship university in the 26-campus University of Wisconsin System (UW System) and is one of the nation's largest and most productive research institutions in higher education.

UW–Madison's strength as a research university garnered \$1,142.7 million of extramural awards in 2014-15 with the largest awards (\$901.5 million) coming to research programs. These awards translate into service to the people of Wisconsin, hands-on research opportunities for undergraduates, top tier graduate training programs, news-making discoveries by faculty, staff, and students and economic development for the State of Wisconsin. Additionally, in 2014, there were 417 invention disclosures, 166 US patents issued, and 147 new patent applications filed. Total licensing income for UW– Madison in 2014 was \$43.4 million.

In achievement and prestige, UW–Madison has long been recognized as one of America's great universities. A public, land-grant institution, UW–Madison offers a complete spectrum of liberal arts studies, professional programs and student activities

As a land-grant university, UW–Madison maintains a strong research emphasis. Award-winning research spanning the academic disciplines has earned the University a place among the world's elite institutions of higher education. The flagship school of the UW System, UW–Madison has always sought to return the fruits of teaching and research to Wisconsin residents. In 1904, UW– Madison President Charles Van Hise crystallized the university's commitment to public service in defining "the Wisconsin Idea," which mandates that "the beneficent influence of the university [be] available to every home in the state."

Across all programs, UW–Madison garnered \$1.09 billion of extramural awards in 2010-11 with the largest awards (\$849 million) coming to research programs. These awards translate into service to the people of Wisconsin, hands-on research opportunities for undergraduates, top tier graduate training programs, news-making discoveries by faculty, staff, and students and economic development for the State of Wisconsin. A 2011 economic impact report found that UW–Madison and affiliated organizations and startup companies support 128,146 Wisconsin jobs and generate \$614 million in revenue annually for Wisconsin.

UW–Madison graduates become extraordinary citizens, community members, and national and global leaders. Since the agency was created in 1961, UW–Madison has produced the greatest number of Peace Corps volunteers, second only to the University of California, Berkeley. More leaders of major corporations have graduated from UW–Madison than any other university in the country. We are among the top producers of faculty members who teach at research intensive institutions around the world. Many local, state, and national leaders are our graduates. Something about the UW– Madison experience prepares students to become outstanding leaders who are engaged locally, nationally, and globally. That "something" is the Wisconsin Experience.

Grounded in the hundred-year old Wisconsin Idea and our progressive history, our historical mission has evolved to create an expectation for all faculty, staff, and students to apply in- and out-of classroom learning in ways that have significant and positive impacts on the world. What we do matters, and together we can solve any problem. It is this distinctive Wisconsin Experience that produces graduates who think beyond the conventional wisdom, who are creative problem-solvers who know how to integrate passion with empirical analysis, who know how to seek out, evaluate and create new knowledge and technologies, who can adapt to new situations, and who are engaged citizens of the world.

3. FACILITIES PLAN: EXISTING CONDITIONS



3.2 Context within Region and City

Symbolic and Prominent Location

The university is located in Dane County, less than a mile from the state capitol building. Inland lakes create a narrow isthmus where concentrated development patterns exist within a scenic setting. The campus is well-known for its location along 4 miles of shoreline on Lake Mendota. The City of Madison, with a population of almost a quarter million, is routinely rated as one of the most livable cities in America.

The campus' spectacular lake front setting is its greatest physical asset. The natural areas, historic landscapes, and public spaces are the places that create astounding first impressions and lasting memories for those who visit, work, and learn at this institution. They are the essence of its physical quality and its greatest hope for the future of the campus' physical environment.

Ancient forces have shaped the campus and its host community. The City of Madison is surrounded by beautiful lakes and natural areas, created by the glaciers some 15,000 years ago. Over 1,000 years ago, the effigy mound culture was prevalent throughout the Midwest and it transformed the topography of many areas of campus. The 1850 Campus Plan, attributed to architect John Rague and the university's first chancellor, John H. Lathrop, proposed situating the campus on Madison's "second hill," facing the nearby state capitol building which was located on the "first hill."

Over time, the campus grew from its first three buildings (North, South, and University (aka Bascom) Halls) on what would become Bascom Hill, to the present day total of 405 buildings spanning 936 acres in downtown Madison.

Shared Resources

The university is intertwined with its host communities of the City of Madison and the Village of Shorewood Hills. Particularly on the south and east campus edges, the university and private uses are blurred.

Student Housing

The university relies on the private housing market to house our students, especially students beyond their first year. On-campus, the university provides:

- Southeast: 4,104 beds
- Lakeshore: 3,465 beds
- Eagle Heights: 1,848 beds

Off-campus, students live throughout the region, but are concentrated in neighborhoods within a short walk, a bicycle ride, or a brief transit ride. Since the 2005 Campus Master Plan, the private real estate market has constructed a significant number of student-focused housing facilities, many of them in higher density towers. These urban developments do not provide on-site open space, resulting in a higher use pressure on existing open spaces on campus and within the city. Considering only the student-focused housing projects constructed or planned between 2008 and 2015:

- East of campus: 4,966 beds
- South of campus: 1,132 beds
- West of campus: 501 beds

3. FACILITIES PLAN: EXISTING CONDITIONS



3.3 Campus Development Plan Boundary and Potential Land Acquisitions

UW–Madison's main campus currently includes approximately 936 acres within a Campus Development Plan Boundary defined by the Board of Regents.

The last change to the Campus Development Plan Boundary occurred in September 2005 with the inclusion of the University Square redevelopment block bounded by N. Lake Street, University Avenue, W. Johnson Street and N. Murray Street (now vacated as referred to as East Campus Mall).

As part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update, one minor change to the Campus Development Plan Boundary is recommended in the southeast corner of campus. See Chapter 4: Recommendations for more information.

Parcels indicated below and color coded in Figure 3-2 must first be rezoned in to the C-I zoning district and the use of those parcels added to the Master Plan through the amendment process in the City's Zoning Code. These parcels are referenced and acknowledged within this C-I District master plan for reference only and for the benefit of the University's long-range planning efforts.

Private Parcels within the Campus Development Plan Boundary

There are many privately-owned parcels within the Campus Development Plan Boundary (see Figure 3-2).

Not Considered for Acquisition

Within the Campus Development Plan Boundary, certain parcels continue to be held privately. Of those parcels, several are not currently being considered for future acquisition by UW–Madison. Those parcels not considered for future acquisition by the Board of Regents include:

- 816 State Street (Wisconsin Historical Society)
- 433 N. Murray Street (Pres House Apartments site)
- 701 University Avenue (University Square development-condo)
- 108 and 110 N. Murray Street (MGE South Campus Substation)
- 1001 W. Dayton Street (W. Dayton Street private apartments)
- Block bounded by University Avenue, N. Mills Street, W. Johnson Street and N. Brooks Street (including Luther Memorial Church/Lutheran Campus Center, Street Francis House Episcopal Student Center, X01, Grand Central, Porchlight)
- 1127 University Avenue (The Crossing)

- 1423 Monroe Street (private apartments)
- 1435 Monroe Street (UW Credit Union)
- 1437 Monroe Street (City of Madison Fire Department)
- 210 N. Charter Street (private apartments)
- 445 Easterday Lane (Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Lab)
- 112 N. Mills Street (private apartments)

Open for Acquisition

Several parcels are held by the federal government and not currently being considered for acquisition. If at such time the federal government decides to relocate and/or liquidate their property interests in these locations, the university would be interested in acquiring the land under prior agreements with the federal government.

- 2500 Overlook Terrace (William F. Middleton Memorial Veterans Administration Hospital)
- One Gifford Pinchot Drive, (USDA Forest Products Laboratory facilities)
- 502 Walnut Street (Cereal Crops Research Unit)
- 1925 Linden Drive (US Dairy Forage Research Center) (long-term lease)

Desired Acquisition

Within the approved Campus Development Plan Boundary, several private parcels are being considered for future purchase when available from willing sellers. It is the desire of the university to, over time, purchase these parcels for future development. These include parcels not currently owned by the Board of Regents.

- All parcels in the block bounded by N. Randall Avenue, W. Dayton Street, N. Orchard Street, and Spring Street
- All parcels in the 1200 block of Spring Street, both sides of the street
- Parcel at W. Johnson Street and the rail line (1221 W. Johnson Street)
- Parcel at N. Charter Street and the rail line (222 N. Charter Street)
- Parcel on N. Charter Street, north of Capitol Court (26 N. Charter Street)
- Parcels on south side of Spring Street (1101 Spring Street, 1111 Spring Street, 1115 Spring Street)
- Parcels near the corner of N. Brooks Street and W. Dayton Street (1014 W. Dayton Street, 202 N. Brooks Street)
- All parcels in the block bounded by N. Park Street, W. Johnson Street, N. Brooks Street, and W. Dayton Street

68 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON



3.4 Existing Zoning Districts

The city of Madison's 1966 zoning code was recently updated, becoming effective on January 2, 2013. The previous code did not reflect current best management zoning and planning practices which led to excessive use of planned unit developments (PUD) and excessive requirements for conditional uses which burdened city staff time and resources. One outcome of this rewrite came in section 28.096, the Campus Institutional (C-I) District, established to recognize the City's major educational and medical institutions as important activity centers & traffic generators, accommodate the growth & development needs of these institutions, and coordinate the master plans of these institutions with the City's plans, policies and zoning standards. The district is also intended to:

Under this new C-I district code, UW-Madison is required to have an approved master plan which is valid for a period of ten years. This aligns with the current State Building Commission and Board of Regents policy requiring a campus master plan process being performed every ten years. Ultimately, this document carries more importance and influence on our current and long-range planning projects.

Parcels indicated in blue and within the Campus Development Plan Boundary (black line) are subject to the master plan approval granted by City of Madison ordinance ID 47245.

Figure 3-3 Campus-Institutional Zoning Map





3.5 Projects Completed Since 2005 Campus Master Plan

The decade after the 2005 Campus Master Plan saw dramatic on-campus changes. New buildings provided over 3,750,000 gross square feet of new academic, research and support spaces. Transportation improvements dramatically connected the campus with the city's bicycle and pedestrian network. These building and transportation projects were sited and designed in support of the 2005 Campus Master Plan.

•	West Campus	Near West	Central	South
	1. UW Medical Foundation Centennial Building (#1435)	6. Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Lab-WI (#0126)	11. Microbial Sciences Building (#0060)	16. Mechanical Engineering (#0407)
1	2. Wisconsin Institutes for Medical Research Towers I	7. Veterinary Medicine Tomotherapy	12. Nancy Nicholas Hall (#0085) 13. Hector F. DeLuca	17. Student Achievement Performance Center
2 3	and II (#1485) 3. Goodman Softball Practice	8. Dejope Residence Hall (#0567)	Biochemical Sciences (#0204)	18. Wisconsin Institute for Discovery (#0212)
	Facility (#1075)	9. Aldo Leopold Residence Hall	14. Education Building (#0400)	19. Union South (#0088)
	4. Cooper Hall, Signe Skott	(#0576)	15. Chazen Building (#0524)	20. 30 N. Mills Street (#0124)
RAS-	Cooper Hall (#0044) 5. West Campus Cogeneration Facility (#1020)	10. Wisconsin Energy Institute (#0752)		 21. 21 North Park Street (#1078) 22. Newell J. Smith Residence Hall (#1079)
	Tail	dia la	A K E	23. Ogg Residence Hall, Frederic A (#1243)
	5	8 MEN	DOTA	24. Gordon Dining & Event Center (#1249)
			151	25. 333 East Campus Mall (#0467)
To serve and				26. LaBahn Arena (#0227) 27. Art Lofts (#0220)
This fam.		El El El El	12	
		10 10	1.2. 4 5.	4
and the second	' < D	13		
		17 16	(18)	A MARINE
			19	15
Legend	North	Bark A		25
Campus Develop Boundary		Les M	20	23 24
Building Projects 2005	Completed since			27
Figure 3-4 Building P	rojects Completed Since 2005	All market and a second		
Legend

Bicycle Improvements

- 1. Campus Drive Path
- 2. Extension of Southwest Path ("Missing Link")
- 3. Bicycle Lands on Walnut Street, south of Observatory Drive
- 4. Bicycle Lanes, Traffic Calming on Highland Avenue
- 5. Bicycle Lanes on Observatory Drive
- 6. Bicycle Lanes on University Bay Drive
- 7. Bicycle Lanes on Randall Avenue

AVE

Figure 3-5 Transportation Improvements Completed Since 2005

8. Bicycle Signal Added

- Pedestrian Improvements
- 1. East Campus Mall
- 2. Signal and Crosswalk on University Avenue at MSC/WID
- 3. Signal and Crosswalk on University Avenue at East Campus Mall
- 4. Signal and Crosswalk at Johnson Street at Orchard Street
- 5. Traffic Calming and Streetscape Improvements on University Avenue at Johnson Street
- 6. Pedestrian Priority Streetscape on Observatory Drive
- 7. Sidewalk on east side of Highland Avenue between Campus Drive and Observatory Drive



- 1. Vacation of Johnson Street (Randall Avenue to Campus Drive)
- 2. Reconfiguration of Intersection of University Avenue and Campus Drive
- 3. Extension of Observatory Drive

Μ

OBSERVATOR

LINDEN D

F

Parking Improvements

- 1. CSC Visitor Ramp (Lot 75) Expansion
- 2. Steenbock Ramp (Lot 36) Expansion
- 3. Union South Ramp (Lot 80)
- 4. New Surface Parking Lots (Lots 33 and 45)
- 5. Surface Parking Lot (Lot 61)
- 6. Parking Added Under School of Education Green Roof (Lot 10)
- 7. Parking Added Under School of Human Ecology (Lot 27)

Ε

Т

0

Α

Ν

UNIVERSITY AVE

DAYTON S

Κ

D



STATE ST.

Α

3.6 Campus Planning Districts

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update divides the campus into five easily recognizable districts, each a collection of several campus neighborhoods.

NOTE: These districts are for planning purposes of this document only and should not be confused with the Campus Design Neighborhoods as identified in the Campus Design Guidelines and Standards document.



The campus has a clear existing building use pattern. Academic and research uses are concentrated in Central and South Campus, clinical and health research in the West Campus, and agricultural teaching and research in the Near West Campus. There are two distinct student housing neighborhoods in the southeast and along the lakeshore. Athletic venues are in South Campus and in the West Campus.

3.7 Campus Land Use and Buildings



Figure 3-7 Existing Building Uses

3.8 Building Form and Density

The campus planning districts vary considerably in the existing density of buildings. The Central and South Campuses are relatively dense, although differing in open space character. The Far West campus is largely preserved open space and has a low density.



Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is a method measuring density. It is calculated as the sum of the gross floor area (GSF) of all buildings in a district, divided by the size of the district.

To better measure the activity concentration of each district, building GSF and FAR do not include parking structures, Camp Randall, or the Kohl Center.

3.9 Landmarks and Historic Sites





3.10 Historic Preservation Planning at UW-Madison

Registered and Listed Buildings

With this significant historical perspective of the campus and how it developed, comes the need to develop a historic preservation plan for the university. This rich history today is codified in the recognition of two historic districts and 18 buildings listed by themselves on the National Register of Historic Places. Four of these buildings have also reached National Landmark status with the National Park Service. In addition, 45 buildings are currently listed on the Wisconsin Architecture & History Inventory by the Wisconsin Historical Society as having potential historic value to the State of Wisconsin. Some of these are the already noted National Register buildings as listed below.

Per Wisconsin Statute 44.40 the university and State of Wisconsin are required to consider any proposed action that may affect a historic property listed on the inventory or on any locally designated list of historic properties. The university then works cooperatively with the Wisconsin Historical Society to review the project details, mitigate the affect and provide a final determination on if the project creates an adverse effect on the historic building or property.

Buildings on the National Register are listed below followed by the dates they were listed.

National Register Districts

Bascom Hill Historic District (1974)

- North Hall
- South Hall
- Bascom Hall
- Music Hall (aka Assembly Hall and Library Building)
- Science Hall
- State Historical Society Building
- Armory and Gymnasium
- Radio Hall (aka Mining and Metal Engineering and Heating Station)

- Carillon Tower
- Memorial Union
- University Club (needs to be reconsidered as contributing)
- Lake Lab (aka Hydrobiology Lab)
- Water Chemistry (aka Sanitary Engineering and Pumping Station)
- Birge Hall
- Education Building (aka Engineering Hall)
- Humanities Building
- Elvehjem Art Center (aka Chazen Museum of Art)
- Helen C. White Hall
- Limnology Laboratory Building
- Law Building

Henry Mall District (1992)

- Contributing
 - Biochemistry (Agricultural Chemistry)
 - Agronomy (aka Agricultural Journalism)
 - Agriculture Engineering
 - Agriculture Hall
 - Wisconsin High School (removed 1993)
 - Henry Mall
 - Hoard Statue
 - William A. Henry Memorial Boulder
- Non-contributing
 - Stovall State Lab of Hygiene
 - Genetics Building
 - 1956 Wing, Biochemistry
 - 1985 Wing, Biochemistry

Buildings on the National Register of Historic Places (date of listing)

- Agriculture Dean's Residence (1984)
- Agricultural Engineering (1985)
- Agricultural Hall (1985)
- Agricultural Heating Station (1985)
- Camp Randall Memorial Park (1971)
- Biochemistry (aka Agricultural Chemistry Building) (1985)
- Hiram Smith Hall and Annex (1985)
- Lathrop Hall (1985)
- Materials Sciences Building (aka Old US Forest Products Lab) (1985)
- North Hall (1974 and 1977) National Landmark Status (1966)
- Observatory Director's Residence (1985)
- King Hall/Soils (aka Horticulture, Agricultural Physics and Soil Science) (1985)
- Red Gym/Armory (1974) National Landmark Status (1993)
- Science Hall (1993) National Landmark Status (1993)
- Stock Pavilion (1985)
- UW Fieldhouse (1998)
- Washburn Observatory (1985)
- Wisconsin Dairy Barn (2002) National Landmark Status (2005)

Buildings on the Wisconsin Architecture and History Inventory (date surveyed)

All of the above buildings listed on the National Register or in a National Register of Historic Places District (including all contributing and non-contributing buildings)

- Barnard Hall (1974)
- Chadbourne Hall (1973)
- Chamberlin Hall (1974)
- Engineering Research Building (1973)
- Heating Station (aka Old Heating Plant) (1974)
- Home Economics Building (aka School of Human Ecology) (1974)
- Horticulture Hall (1973)
- Mechanical Engineering (1974)
- Primate Center (1985)
- Sea Grant Institute (1973)
- Sellery Hall (1973)
- Service Building (2003)
- Sterling Hall (unknown)
- University Life Saving Station (1997)
- Vilas Hall (1998)
- WARF Building (1974)
- Weeks Hall (aka Geology Building) (1973)
- Wisconsin General Hospital (aka Medical Sciences Center) (1974)

Buildings Eligible for National Register Designation

(As determined by the Wisconsin Historical Society)

- Adams Hall
- Animal Science Building
- Barnard Hall
- Biotron Laboratory
- Camp Randall Memorial Sports Center (aka The Shell)
- Carson Gulley Commons
- Cole Hall
- Elizabeth Waters Hall
- Enzyme Institute
- Goodnight Hall
- Horse Barn
- Humphrey Hall
- Ingraham Hall (formerly Commerce Building)
- Institute for Enzyme Research
- Keystone House and Garage (aka 901 University Bay Drive)
- Kronshage Dormitories (Chamberlin, Conover, Gilman, Jones, Kronshage, Mack, Showerman, and Swenson)
- McArdle Cancer Research Building
- McClain Athletic Facility
- Mechanical Engineering Building
- Meiklejohn House
- Middleton Building (former Middleton Medical Library)
- Nancy Nicholas Hall, School of Human Ecology (former Home Economics)
- Nutritional Sciences (former Children's Hospital/Orthopedic Hospital
- Phillips, Vel Hall
- Service Building Annex (former Old Heating Plant, Central Heating Station)
- Picnic Point Change House/Beach House
- Primate Laboratory and Addition
- Sewell Social Science Building
- Short Course Dormitories (Humphrey and Jorns)
- Slichter Hall
- Steenbock Library
- Sterling Hall
- Teacher Education
- Temin Lakeshore Path
- Tripp Hall
- Van Hise Hall
- Van Vleck Hall
- Vilas Communication Hall
- WARF Office Building

There are also several important archaeological sites on campus which are mapped and inventoried by the Wisconsin Historical Society (see Figure 2-25). Several are on the National Register of Historic Places and others are inventoried and catalogued. Some of those major sites include (with their State Archaeological Site Number and Year Cataloged, if known):

- Willow Drive Mounds (DA-119)
- Picnic Point Grove Mounds (DA-120)
- Picnic Point Mound Group (DA-0121) (2006)
- Stevens (DA-122)
- Unnamed Group (eastern end of Picnic Point) (DA-123)
- Unnamed Group (west lakeshore residence halls and the Natatorium) (DA-124)
- Picnic Point Bay Mounds Group (DA-125)
- University Ridge Mound Group (DA-126)
- Breitenbach (along University Bay Drive, west of the Recreation fields) (DA-128)
- Eagle Heights Group (DA-0130) (2006)
- Eagle Heights Field (DA-413)
- Picnic Point (DA-501)
- Observatory Hill Mound Group (DA-0571) (2006)
- Bascom Hill Mound Group (DA-573)
- North Hall Mounds (DA-819)
- Agricultural Hall Mounds (DA-820)
- South Slope (on Picnic Point) (DA-1168)
- Unnamed (on Picnic Point) (DA-1169)
- Observatory Hill Village (DA-1207)
- Muir Knoll (DA-1208)

Further detailed information is available on all of these sites, including a map with all of the historic sites, at the Campus Planning & Landscape Architecture office of Facilities Planning & Management and on their website.



Figure 3-11 Archaeological Sites on the Main Campus of the University of Wisconsin–Madison

Cultural Landscape Resources

In 2005, the university developed a Cultural Landscape Resources Plan as one part of a collaborative project entitled the Cultural Landscape Resource Project. The Cultural Landscape Resource Project developed a base of knowledge and resources to protect the significant cultural landscapes on campus. The Cultural Landscape Resource Project was funded through a grant from the J. Paul Getty Trust and supported by Facilities Planning & Management. The Cultural Landscape Resource Project was developed under the guidance of the Wisconsin Department of Administration, Quinn Evans Architects, faculty and students from the UW–Madison Department of Landscape Architecture and staff of Facilities Planning & Management. Portions have been excerpted from the planning documents developed by that process and included in this comprehensive campus master plan. A complete copy of the analysis and recommendations in the Cultural Landscape Resource Project can be found for reference in the UW–Madison Facilities Planning & Management office or in the UW–Madison Library system.

The cultural landscapes on the UW–Madison campus are places that provide touchstones to the past. Stories related to past activities bring the history of these places to life for people who use, visit, and explore these sites today. The campus today can be compared to a fabric woven of historic and contemporary landscapes that are intertwined. The historic landscapes retain the ability to conjure the past as three-dimensional entities that display a sense of place and contain physical reminders of the activities that occurred. As such, the preservation of historic landscapes takes on the same responsibility as the preservation of historic buildings.

The university is undergoing a period of change that requires updated and new facilities to address the needs of advancing education and research. Since the campus is surrounded by the City of Madison on three sides and Lake Mendota on the fourth, only limited opportunities for expansion of boundaries exist. A major goal of the current master planning effort is for the campus to "recreate itself in place" with the physical planning needs met within the current campus boundaries. Identification of the historic landscapes on campus has played an important role in the master planning process in two ways:

1. It has increased understanding of these landscapes through historical research and analysis and helped to identify the aspects that are most essential for preserving their character and integrity; and,

2. It has identified the characteristics and features that are components of the historic landscapes providing guidance for planning and design for future development on campus.

The protection of historic landscapes already has taken a step forward by integrating these newly identified resources into the current comprehensive master planning process.

The Cultural Landscape Resource Project, completed in fall 2005, includes a number of documents that are available to provide information about the historic landscapes on campus. A Cultural Landscape Report was developed addressing:

- The historical context for the development of cultural landscapes on campus.
- Archaeological resources on campus (details of the site investigations conducted as part of the project and management recommendations for archaeological resources).
- Individual Cultural Landscape Inventories (CLI) for eight sites: Bascom Mall, Library Mall, John Muir Park, Memorial Union Terrace, Observatory Hill, Henry Mall, the Agricultural Campus, and Camp Randall Memorial Park. The CLIs each include: a historic narrative and graphics documenting the physical development of the site; documentation of existing conditions; evaluation of the significance and integrity of the site; and, landscape preservation recommendations.
- A summary of the reconnaissance survey for additional sites including: Temin Lakeshore Path, Lakeshore Area Residence Halls, Class of 1918
 Marsh, Picnic Point, Keystone House, Eagle Heights Community Gardens, and University Houses.

In addition to the Cultural Landscape Report, efforts associated with preparing the Cultural Landscape Resource Project, have included

- Historical image and map gallery website: http://digital.library.wisc. edu/1711.dl/UW.UWCulturalLand
- UW-Madison cultural resources website: http://www2.fpm.wisc.edu/ planning/culturalresources
- Press package with information regarding cultural landscapes
- Walking tour brochure of significant campus landscapes
- Interpretive exhibit posters for the eight sites studied
- A PowerPoint presentation that provides an overview of the Cultural Landscape Resource Project, findings.



Figure 3-12 2005 Cultural Landscape Resource Project, Fifteen Potentially Significant Sites

(The archaeological materials referenced are housed at the office of UW– Madison Campus Planning & Landscape Architecture, Facilities Planning & Management and at www.fpm.wisc.edu. Address inquiries to the Campus Planning Director at 608-263-3023.)

The documents address two audiences interested in the cultural landscapes on campus. One is the general public. The other includes the facilities managers, planners, designers, and others involved in the implementation of treatment applications and facilities development on campus. These range from everyday maintenance including mowing, pruning, and building repairs; to restoration, rehabilitation and construction of new buildings and landscapes within the historic site boundaries. The Cultural Landscape Resource Project was a tremendous first attempt to identify, evaluate, and determine appropriate future management for the historic landscapes on campus. An emphasis has been placed on compiling as much information as possible for providing access for future researchers and the general public. The Cultural Landscape Report is a technical document supplying a large amount of information in a simple format. The cultural landscapes and archaeological sites at the UW-Madison campus are tremendously valuable historic resources. The Cultural Landscape Resource Project has also provided a basis for future research and management of these sites.



Figure 3-13 2005 Cultural Landscape Resource Project, Eight Sites Selected for In-Depth Analysis

3.11 Open Space

Each campus area was analyzed to determine a percentage of open space as a ratio of landscape (both soft and hardscapes) minus buildings, roads, and parking. Existing open space ratios were compared to open space ratios for the proposed building siting recommended in the 2005 Campus Master Plan.





The development of campus over time has resulted in a diversity of landscape spaces on campus, each reflective of the values of the students and administration that oversaw their development.



3.12 Tree Canopy

The tree canopy contributes directly to the landscape structure of a campus. At the UW–Madison campus, the tree canopy varies greatly throughout, resulting in a disconnection between campus areas. Central Campus is endowed with beautiful mature trees, many of them campus landmarks such as the Euthenics Oak at the School of Human Ecology. The Memorial Union Terrace is also graced with mature White Oaks shading the historic outdoor terrace. Yet on the West Campus, the historic expansion of the agricultural campus and its modern redevelopment have given this area a distinctly different landscape character. The re-establishment of a consistent tree canopy would better unify it with the campus lakeshore and the Central Campus.

Similarly, the lack of street trees makes a distinct separation between the "campus" spaces and the roads intertwined throughout. This is particularly apparent on the South Campus, where streetscapes dominate the campus experience. Street rights-of-way south of University Avenue are owned by the City of Madison requiring close collaboration and commitment to a robust street tree canopy. Here, the addition of street trees would not only help provide landscape structure, but also provide shade, habitat, manage stormwater and buffer pedestrians from traffic.

With over 5,200* campus trees and 74* documented tree species, the campus has significant species diversity. The canopy is dominated by maple (13%), honey locust (9%), ash (8%), pine (7%), oak (7%) and elm (5%). The grounds department is currently managing the ash tree canopy and their percentages continue to decline, due to the recent activity of the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) in Dane County.

*Does not include trees within the Lakeshore Nature Preserve





3.13 Stormwater Management & Green Infrastructure

The campus and its host communities drain into the Yahara River, Six Mile Creek, and Rock River watersheds. The Rock River watershed, which includes Lake Mendota, Lake Monona, the UW–Madison campus, and much of the City of Madison, is included on the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Department of Natural Resources (DNR) list of impaired waters.



Figure 3-17 Campus Relationship to Rock River Watershed

Approximately 802 acres of campus and public rights-of-way drain to Lake Mendota, and 238 acres to Lake Monona via campus and city-owned storm sewers. Of the area draining to Lake Mendota, approximately 134 acres drains via discharge to Willow Creek.





94 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON



Stormwater and pollutant runoff rates and volumes are dependent on the type and condition of the surface upon which precipitation falls and the type of stormwater conveyance system. Stormwater runoff rates are higher from paved surfaces than from unpaved surfaces due to the limited infiltration capacity of the pavement. Compacted turf lawns also only provide minimal infiltration if not properly managed and maintained.



Since completion of the 2008 Stormwater Management Study, dozens of stormwater best management practices have been installed throughout campus. The campus showcases a wide variety of practices such as green roofs, wet detention ponds, biofiltration basins, and pervious pavements. In addition, non-structural stormwater best practices such as street sweeping, education of facilities staff, and improved "housekeeping" efforts have improved and expanded. WinSLAMM modeling results indicate that these practices capture approximately 53,000 pounds of total suspended solids and 143 pounds of phosphorus annually that would otherwise discharge to adjacent waterways.

3. FACILITIES PLAN: EXISTING CONDITIONS



Figure 3-22 Stormwater Best Management Practice Types and Locations

3.14 Pedestrian and Bicycle

Walking and biking are the predominant modes of transportation on campus. A grid street system, dense land uses, attractive streetscapes, and comfortable walking and biking facilities carry students, faculty, and staff to classes, work, and appointments on a daily basis. UW–Madison consists of a dense building network interconnected with walking facilities, particularly on the east part of campus. With nearly 22,000 faculty and staff and over 43,000 students on a nearly 1.5 square mile campus, walking continues to be the most accessible and popular form of transportation. See the Long-Range Transportation Plan for a detailed analysis of existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities and services.

This section describes the current assets and challenges with the nonmotorized transportation network. The findings presented in this section form the basis of the recommendations offered.

Gaps in Connectivity For Pedestrians

Paved pedestrian-only pathways represent the primary routes carrying students, faculty, and staff across campus grounds and between buildings. These pathways provide micro-level connections. Paved shared-use facilities such as the Southwest Path and unpaved facilities like the Lakeshore Path serve longer distance and cross-campus connections. Campus destinations are well-connected, with a few exceptions.

Sidewalks exist on the majority of campus streets and carry high volumes of pedestrian traffic on a daily basis. Interior block connecting roads such as Lathrop Drive, Clymer Place, Conklin Place, and Fitch Court do not have sidewalks on either side of the road but have alternate pathways nearby. However, analysis identified Lathrop Drive as being particularly uncomfortable for pedestrians because there is an absence of infrastructure or design elements indicating whether pedestrians or automobiles have priority in this space.

There is a primary gap in pedestrian connectivity on the west side of campus. The eastbound Campus Drive shared-use path ends near the School of Veterinary Medicine. A connection to Babcock Drive and University Avenue to the east would better connect pedestrians and cyclists along this corridor.

Busy arterial roads and railroads act as barriers to pedestrian connectivity on campus because of uncomfortable intersections and the absence of adequate crossing locations. There is limited pedestrian connectivity across Campus Drive and the railroad corridor west of Babcock Drive. The shared-use bridge at the Stock Pavilion (city-owned Alicia Ashman Bridge) as well as Walnut Street and Highland Avenue are the only north-south crossings on campus. There is a ½ mile span near the Veterinary Medicine Building without a crossing of Campus Drive. This is an issue for students and others living in the concentration of residences along University Avenue west of Breese Terrace and south of Campus Drive.



Figure 3-23 Existing Walking and Biking Routes and Identified Challenges

For Cyclists

Corridors without designated bicycle markings or signage discourage cycling, especially where motor vehicle speeds and volumes are high. Adding biking infrastructure in the listed gaps will work to boost cycling, reduce instances of cyclists riding on sidewalks, and promote overall efficiency and safety for all modes of travel.

Critical locations where gaps in walking and bicycle infrastructure reduce campus connectivity are summarized in Table 3-2 (the Route IDs correspond to the map in Figure 3-23).

Table 3-2 Summary of Gaps in Walking and Biking Connectivity

Route ID	Location	Challenge/Need
A * * * 0	Campus Drive Path and Linden Drive	Need for connection between end of path at Veterinary Medicine to Babcock Drive and University Avenue to the east
B CO	West Campus Connection over Campus Drive	Additional north-south crossing of Campus Drive for pedestrians and cyclists between existing bridge and Walnut Street
<u>ب</u> ر بر	N. Charter Street between W. Dayton Street and University Avenue	Primary north-south route connecting north campus with campus and neighborhoods to the south Need for bicycle accommodations on N. Charter Street between W. Dayton Street and University Avenue
<mark>৴</mark> ৲৲ি	N. Mills Street between W. Dayton Street and University Avenue	Primary north-south route, similar to N. Charter Street Need for bicycle accommodations between W. Dayton Street and University Avenue to connect northern parts of campus to the neighborhood area to the south Will have to integrate with on-street parking

Challenging Crossings and Interactions with Other Modes

Pedestrians and cyclists travel in large volumes across streets, railroad crossings, and intersections. Many pedestrians cross streets at mid-block locations or at locations without designated pathways or crossings. Pedestrian and cyclist compliance of walk signals and other control devices is often low. They are often in a hurry to get to class or appointments because of limited time and long travel distances. High volumes of people walking and biking interact regularly with Metro Transit buses, personal automobiles, delivery trucks, service vehicles, and mopeds across campus.

Table 3-3 Summary of Locations Where Challenges Exist

Location ID Location Challenge AA N. Charter Street High non-motorized volumes; peak 15 minute and Linden Drive pedestrian volume from 10:45 - 11:00 a.m. on 次かっ a Tuesday in April 2015 of 2,199 pedestrians and 95 cvclists Conflicts between modes, major transit delays BB **N. Charter Street** High non-motorized volumes; peak 15 minute and Observatory pedestrian volume from 10:45 - 11:00 a.m. on 3 50 Drive a Tuesday in April 2015 of 1,299 pedestrians and 26 cyclists Conflicts between modes, major transit delays СС **Campus Drive and** Skewed intersection, long crossing **N. Randall Avenue** Various turning movements, high vehicle 次分 speeds and volumes Pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicle yielding confusion **Railroad crossing** DD Campus Drive, Skewed intersection, long crossing University Avenue, Various turning movements, high vehicle 次后 and Babcock Drive speeds and volumes Pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicle yielding confusion **Railroad crossing** EE N. Park Street and Various turning movements, high vehicle **University Avenue** speeds and volumes Pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicle yielding confusion Very high pedestrian and bicycle traffic

Analysis indicated low perceived safety for pedestrians and cyclists at uncontrolled crossings around campus. At these intersections signs or signals indicate that cars must stop and yield to pedestrians using the crossing, but environmental conditions such as low visibility (due to glare or precipitation) can inhibit a driver's ability to recognize a pedestrian in the crosswalk. Furthermore, angled and offset intersections and crossings exist on campus that reduce visibility of pedestrians and cyclists and create long crossing distances.

Table 3-3 Summary of Locations Where Challenges Exist summarizes intersections and crossings identified as critical locations where pedestrian and cyclist interactions with other modes diminishes overall efficiency and safety. The Location IDs correspond to those on the map in Figure 3-23.

Location ID	Location	Challenge
FF	N. Park Street and Observatory Drive	Highly skewed and offset intersection Transit layover area on west side of Memorial Union All mode turning movements Low pedestrian and bicycle compliance
GG	Southwest Path, Regent Street, Breese Terrace, Crazy Legs Lane, and Monroe Street	City has worked to address green pavement markings, bike specific signal going westbound, and other measures Highly skewed intersection results in a lot of confusion between all modes and intersection shared-use path
HH CO	University Avenue and N. Charter Street	Skewed intersection with difficult crossings for pedestrians and cyclists Modal conflicts, transit delay
" ং ্ত্ৰ্ত	University Bay Drive and Campus Drive Path	Cyclists crossing this intersection come into conflict with buses and emergency hospital vehicles
৾৾৻৾৾৽	University Avenue and N. Randall Avenue	No pedestrian crosswalk at the west leg of the intersection Long crossing with high motor vehicle traffic speeds and volumes

3.15 ExistingTransit, Parking, and Vehicular Circulation

Campus Road Network

Campus Drive and University Avenue run east-west through campus and act as the primary arterial "spine" on campus. N. Park Street is the primary north-south campus arterial. A variety of other smaller connectors run north-south including N. Randall Avenue, N. Mills Street, N. Orchard Street, and N. Charter Street. The smaller east-west connectors include Observatory Drive, Linden Drive, and W. Dayton Street. Campus Drive and Observatory Drive provide the only vehicle connections across Willow Creek and to the West Campus.

Traffic Volumes

Traffic volumes on the roads leading into and circulating around campus are varied. The highest vehicular volumes on campus occur at the intersection of Babcock Drive, Campus Drive, and University Avenue with an average daily traffic of 32,050 vehicles. Campus Drive west of this intersection had an average daily traffic of 41,600 vehicles (both 2011) (see Figure 3-24).

Public Transportation

UW–Madison currently contracts with the local transit provider, Metro Transit, to provide transit service to students, faculty, and staff on campus. There are four routes on campus that UW–Madison faculty, staff, and students can ride for free. Metro Transit bus passes for an unlimited number of rides are available for eligible UW faculty and staff for \$24 per year. Those without a pass can ride Metro Transit routes for \$2 per ride.

Existing Service Options

There are a variety of service options that connect to and around the UW–Madison campus.

- On-Campus Metro Transit Bus Routes: There are currently 11 routes on campus and 18 additional routes that travel close to campus. Figure 3-25 displays the peak transit service locations provided on campus, as well as transit stops. Currently, there is an average of 16,900 boardings on campus each weekday during the academic year. According to available Metro Transit data, the busiest transit stop on campus is at University Avenue and N. Park Street, with an average of 1,460 daily boardings.
- Carpool: The university offers carpool locations for those wishing to decrease their commuting costs by riding with others. Carpools may elect to register for a carpool permit with UW Transportation Services to give them priority in acquiring a parking permit in the parking lot of their choice from a select list of lots across campus.
- Vanpool: Vanpools consist of 8-15 employees that travel to work in a State of Wisconsin van. Operating costs are covered by fares. Vanpools are serviced by the Wisconsin State Vanpool Program.
- Car Sharing
- Intercity Buses: Megabus, Van Galder, and Badger Bus offer intercity bus service from a stop at the Chazen Museum of Art on University Avenue. Buses layover in the northern bus lane at this location. During bus layovers, Metro Transit buses are forced into the adjacent vehicle travel lane, crossing the westbound bicycle lane for access.



Figure 3-24 Vehicle Congestion on Campus

Park-and-Ride Service: Metro Transit owns and operates five designated park-and-ride lots with direct transit service to and from campus. Complimentary parking is provided to riders at these locations. The university also has its own park-and-rides, including Lot 202 (served by a UW–Madison shuttle), and Lot 203 (served by a UW–Madison shuttle). These park-and-rides are serviced by the UW independently of Metro Transit in order to improve commuters' access to campus.

Transit System Analysis

The current transit system works well and those wishing to access campus via a high-occupancy vehicle have several options. Transit is available for those traveling just around the corner as well as those traveling to the other side of campus. Transit service is also available during the peak period, the middle of the day, and the evening.

The transit system analysis presented here builds off of the 2013 Campus Transportation System Evaluation completed by Nelson Nygaard, currently serving as a reference for Transportation Services. There are several areas in need of improvement within the UW–Madison transit system. These include the street network, route structuring, travel time, capacity, and express service. Each of these items is discussed in further detail below.

Street Network Connectivity

The street network throughout campus is a significant limitation to the transit network. There is a lack of connecting roadways and a significant number of one-way streets so transit routes are required to operate in a circuitous and indirect manner. This prohibits bidirectional service, creates inefficiencies, and provides less optimal service. There is an identified wish to explore allowing transit vehicles to operate through the Observatory Drive switchback.

Route Structuring

The structure of the transit routes on campus also is in need of improvement. Currently, there are many routes that operate on the same stretch of roadway, partly due to the geography of campus. This creates route duplication, which in turn causes increased congestion and operational issues.

Furthermore, due to the road network and limited resources several routes operate in a circuitous fashion. This is not optimal for several reasons, but is especially an issue for circulator routes that only operate in one direction. This has significant travel time implications for those traveling a relatively short distance in the opposite direction of the route.

Finally, some routes on campus currently serve competing purposes. As discussed previously, this is particularly an issue for the current structure of Route 80. This route is currently structured to serve as a connector between the east and west ends of campus and as a circulator. As a result of these contradictory roles, the route is inhibited from performing well in either one. There is a strong desire for a Memorial Union to Union South circulator route that would operate back and forth between these popular destinations.

Travel Time and Delay

Several factors contribute to the issues associated with bus travel time. As discussed previously, the road network and route structures create several travel time limitations. Additionally, there are a large number of pedestrians on campus, which often conflict with bus operations, particularly at intersections such as N. Charter Street and Linden Drive, and N. Park Street and University Avenue. The current bus stop spacing on campus also is a detriment to travel time since buses stop frequently along with slow fare collection and manual rider counting methods contributing to delays. Finally, buses often face increased delay and poor performance during times of inclement weather due to degraded road conditions and high usage.

Capacity Limits

Capacity is a challenge, especially during class change times. This issue causes students to have to wait for the next bus or commute via another mode. As with other issues, capacity is exacerbated during times of inclement weather since buses are delayed and have more passengers per stop than usual. During other times of the year buses are well below capacity. A more demand-responsive set of routes on campus should be examined. Improving the efficiency and reducing the capacity limitations of Route 80 is a high priority on campus.

Limited to No Express Service

Currently there is limited or no express bus service to campus. This results in those taking transit from more remote areas to transfer or experience an indirect, time-consuming trip to campus. There is likely latent transit demand not being captured, since direct service to campus is not available. This is evident based on the substantial amount of "hide-and-ride" activity that occurs in the residential areas near campus. Direct, express transit service for area park-and-rides should be explored as a viable option to reducing oncampus vehicle use and parking demands.

See the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for additional analysis.



Figure 3-25 Campus Bus Routes

Existing Parking Inventory

In total, there are approximately 13,000 parking stalls on the UW–Madison campus. These stalls are located in surface lots or in underground and above-ground structures. The inventory includes approximately 9,400 faculty/ staff spaces, 1,600 visitor spaces, and 2,000 service/fleet spaces. There are also approximately 350 motorcycle/moped stalls which are not included in the parking inventory total.

A total of 12 structured parking areas are located on campus and are available for visitors. The Transportation Services website displays real-time stall availability per garage in order to assist visitors in planning their parking destination. About half of these garages are located in Central and South Campus, with the remainder in other various locations.

There also are numerous surface parking lots on campus. The hours of availability vary depending on general campus location and the specific lot. Many of the surface lots in the Central and South Campus area are available for use all day, while most lots in the Near West and West Campus area are only open Monday through Friday. Campus development consumes available surface parking which is causing the university to seek replacement parking often in more consolidated (but more expensive) parking structures.



Figure 3-26 Peer Institution Parking Spaces Per Person

National Leaders in Parking and Transportation Demand Management

UW–Madison has approximately 13,000 parking spaces that serve approximately 22,000 faculty and staff, 8,600 UW Hospital employees, and 43,000 students. This yields a parking ratio of 0.18 parking spaces provided per person. This is the second lowest parking ratio of peer universities in the United States. With limited physical and financial resources, the university focuses on providing a minimal but efficiently managed parking supply to meet the needs of its faculty, staff, employees, visitors, and select students.

UW–Madison is a national leader in providing effective travel demand management and alternative commuting strategies and messaging. The City of Madison provides services and infrastructure that support travel to and around UW–Madison. Alternative commuting options include connected and comfortable walking and biking facilities, Metro Transit bus service, park-and-ride options, and carpool and vanpool programs. These options have allowed UW–Madison to maintain low parking ratios along with an attractive, livable environment on a campus with limited space and constrained parking resources.

Without the current policies in place, traditional land use-based parking calculations would estimate a necessary supply of nearly 24,000 spaces to meet the faculty, staff, employee, and visitor parking demand. If students were permitted to park on campus this demand would increase by as many as 18,000 more parking spaces. In summary, the current supply is about 13,000 parking spaces. Unconstrained demand would be as high as 24,000 parking spaces of demand (or higher if students were allowed to park). Current parking supply is effectively full. The current constrained demand is approximately 13,750 spaces, which includes those that are on the waiting list and those that park at area park-and-ride lots.



Figure 3-27 Existing Campus Parking Facilities

Occupancy Analysis

An occupancy analysis was conducted to determine the current supply and demand pattern for each user type for all parking lots on campus. Knowledge of these existing parking behaviors helps to identify spatial and temporal opportunities to improve parking efficiency and highlight needs of the system as the university undergoes physical changes across the 20+ year period of the 2015

Campus Master Plan Update.

Overall, campus parking supply is operating between 85-90% full during the peak period—occupancies between 85% and 95% are considered to be effective capacity maximums. This indicates that current observed parking occupancies on campus are at or very near the overall effective capacity. Figures 3-28 and 3-29 display mid-day parking occupancies for faculty and staff, as well as visitors. Lots colored in orange and red are effectively full. Visitor parking is particularly challenging to find, especially in South and Central Campus. The university tightly controls and manages parking supply on a daily basis to allocate available spaces (including visitor parking spaces), depending on events and other situations which drive demand. Transportation Services is challenged with allocating the correct supply of visitor spaces in the correct locations to meet changing demand, while maintaining permit parking supply. This problem is further exacerbated by consumption of parking supply by ongoing campus building development.

Visitor parking allocations fill up daily and requests exceed available supply. Transportation Services indicates a need of approximately 2,000 additional parking spaces to accommodate increasing visitor parking demand, and to provide flexibility and "swing space" for parking phasing and campus construction.



Figure 3-28 Mid-day Parking Occupancies for Faculty and Staff
As a result of limited supply in the desired locations, visitors and other university parkers spend considerable time searching for available parking spaces and usually end up parking in locations far from their destinations. Visitors are less likely to use alternative modes of travel due to lack of knowledge or their inability to access alternatives from where they are traveling.

UW–Madison will never reach an equilibrium in placing an adequate supply of parking directly adjacent to building destinations. In some capacity, parking will always occur in adjacent districts. Parking supply must be continuously evaluated relative to the demand for academic and research building sites.

While current policies and practices nearly halve the amount of parking needed to accommodate a development the size of the campus, any further development will have to be paired with additional transportation demand management (TDM) strategies or an expansion of the current parking supply to meet increased demand.



Figure 3-29 Mid-day Parking Occupancies for Visitors

4. FACILITIES PLAN: PROPOSED CONDITIONS

4.1 Campus Development Plan Boundary and Proposed Land Acquisitions

The current master planning process recommends a change to the Campus Development Plan Boundary in the southeast corner of campus. The boundary is recommended to be shifted north to the south side of the Doyle Administration Building to include the entirety of Lot 91.

Parcels indicated below and color coded in Figure 4-1 must first be rezoned in to the C-I zoning district and the use of those parcels added to the Master Plan through the amendment process in the City's Zoning Code. These parcels are referenced and acknowledged within this C-I District master plan for reference only and for the benefit of the University's long-range planning efforts.

Private Parcels within the Campus Development Plan Boundary

There are many privately-owned parcels within the Campus Development Plan Boundary (see Figure 3-2).

Not Considered for Acquisition

Within the Campus Development Plan Boundary, certain parcels continue to be held privately. Of those parcels, several are not currently being considered for future acquisition by UW–Madison. Those parcels not considered for future acquisition by the Board of Regents include:

- 816 State Street (Wisconsin Historical Society)
- 433 N. Murray Street (Pres House Apartments site)
- 701 University Avenue (University Square development-condo)
- 108 and 110 N. Murray Street (MGE South Campus Substation)
- 1001 W. Dayton Street (W. Dayton Street private apartments)
- Block bounded by University Avenue, N. Mills Street, W. Johnson Street and N. Brooks Street (including Luther Memorial Church/Lutheran Campus Center, Street Francis House Episcopal Student Center, X01, Grand Central, Porchlight)
- 1127 University Avenue (The Crossing)
- 1423 Monroe Street (private apartments)
- 1435 Monroe Street (UW Credit Union)
- 1437 Monroe Street (City of Madison Fire Department)
- 210 N. Charter Street (private apartments)
- 445 Easterday Lane (Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Lab)
- 112 N. Mills Street (private apartments)

Open for Acquisition

Several parcels are held by the federal government and not currently being considered for acquisition. If at such time the federal government decides to relocate and/or liquidate their property interests in these locations, the university would be interested in acquiring the land under prior agreements with the federal government.

- 2500 Overlook Terrace (William F. Middleton Memorial Veterans Administration Hospital)
- One Gifford Pinchot Drive, (USDA Forest Products Laboratory facilities)
- 502 Walnut Street (Cereal Crops Research Unit)
- 1925 Linden Drive (US Dairy Forage Research Center) (long-term lease)

Desired Acquisition

Within the approved Campus Development Plan Boundary, several private parcels are being considered for future purchase when available from willing sellers. It is the desire of the university to, over time, purchase these parcels for future development. These include parcels not currently owned by the Board of Regents.

- All parcels in the block bounded by N. Randall Avenue, W. Dayton Street, N. Orchard Street, and Spring Street
- All parcels in the 1200 block of Spring Street, both sides of the street
- Parcel at W. Johnson Street and the rail line (1221 W. Johnson Street)
- Parcel at N. Charter Street and the rail line (222 N. Charter Street)
- Parcel on N. Charter Street, north of Capitol Court (26 N. Charter Street)
- Parcels on south side of Spring Street (1101 Spring Street, 1111 Spring Street, 1115 Spring Street)
- Parcels near the corner of N. Brooks Street and W. Dayton Street (1014 W. Dayton Street, 202 N. Brooks Street)
- All parcels in the block bounded by N. Park Street, W. Johnson Street, N. Brooks Street, and W. Dayton Street

112 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON



4.2 Proposed Land Use

Master Plan + Zoning Overlay

The graphic below and on the following page indicate an overlay of the City of Madison zoning designations and the Campus Master Plan graphic. The 'white' boxes indicate the proposed future buildings across campus and how they overlap with the existing zoning. Note where the Campus Development Plan Boundary is identified in the south campus (south of University Avenue) there are a number of parcels not owned by the university and as such not yet zoned Campus Institutional (C-I) District. All non C-I properties will have to undergo a zoning change before the university can develop these parcels in accordance with the Campus Master Plan. The graphics also identify a number of Planned Development (PD) parcels that the university is requesting to convert to Campus Institutional (C-I) districts. The conditions of these four areas have been met and the development reflects the purpose and intent of the larger zoning district. Exceptions to this would be the Camp Randall, Kohl Center, Wisconsin Energy Institute, and University Square. All of these sites are unique land uses which require specific design considerations which are atypical to the larger zoning districts which they border.



Enlargement Area (See Next Page)

Master Plan + Zoning Overlay Enlargement

The enlargement graphic below identifies the area of campus south of University Avenue where a number of non-university owned parcels exist within the Campus Development Plan Boundary. The 'white' boxes indicate the proposed future buildings across campus and how they overlap with the existing zoning. The C-I District that is subject to the master plan is indicated by the blue parcels. Other parcels are indicated for reference only. The C-I District master plan only applies to the blue parcels. Non-blue parcels must first be rezoned in to the C-I zoning district and the use of those parcels added to the Master Plan throught the amendment process in the City's Zoning Code.

Redevelopment of sites comprised of more than one platted lot will require a land division approved by the City of Madison to dissolve underlying lot lines.



4.3 Building Density Floor Area Ratios (FAR)

Density

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update indicates the appropriate location and massing for future buildings. These sites are new construction on existing surface parking lots or removal of existing structures and construction on the same site. These building site opportunities represent the long-term capacity of campus, with a campuswide increase of capacity of over 4,747,000 gross square feet over existing inventory. The university will be able to grow and change for decades within the Campus Development Plan Boundary. The density of the Central Campus and Far West Campus areas will remain largely unchanged, and the density of the West and Near West Campus areas will increase moderately. With over half of the increased capacity, the density of South Campus will increase substantially, overtaking Central Campus as the most building dense area of campus.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is a method measuring density. It is calculated as the sum of the floor area (gross square foot, GSF) of all buildings in a district, divided by the size of the district. To better measure the activity concentration of each campus district, the building gross square feet of the floor area ratios of parking structures, Camp Randall, and the Kohl Center are not included in Figures 4-4 and 4-5.



Figure 4-4 Floor Area Ratio – Existing and Proposed



4.4 **Proposed Building Use**

The campus has a clear existing building use pattern and the 2015 Master Plan Update strengthens and extends that pattern. Academic and research uses are concentrated in the Central and South Campus areas, clinical and health teaching and research in the West Campus area, and agricultural teaching and research in the Near West area. There are two distinct student housing neighborhoods, in the southeast and along the lakeshore, each with significant outdoor and indoor recreational facilities. Outdoor recreational fields are located in lower density Near West, West, and Far West Campuses. Athletic venues are in the South Campus and West Campus areas. The most significant building use pattern change proposed in the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update is a relocation and expansion of medical and health related teaching and research from the Central Campus to the West Campus

A detailed listing of all major planned buildings follows. In each section, where a new building is proposed, it is referenced to a map by a key location and building number. For example, "W-08" would be a new building on the West Campus or Near West Campus The numeric numbers are in a simple geographic sequence and does not signify a timeline or sequence as to how the buildings would be built over time.

Building Demolition

Per MGO 48025 Section 28.185, demolition of buildings identified in the approved C-I District master plan shall be exempt from Plan Commission approval and the need to seek demolition approvals for those identified buildings. However, projects that involve historic buildings and/or structures, even if they are not landmarks, must be reviewed by the Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS). Consideration shall also be given to proposed buildings or major renovations that occur adjacent to historic buildings and/or structures. Proposals shall not negatively impact the historic context they are being placed within.

City Coordination

As part of the master plan, it is anticipated that there will be some University of Wisconsin improvements within the City right-of-ways. The coordination of these improvements within the right-of-way may require, but are not limited to maintenance agreements, encroachment agreements, air/ subterranean leases, street vacations/dedications, or intergovernmental agreements.



Far West Campus

The general goals for the Far West Campus district (approximately all land north of UW Hospital, Nielsen Tennis Stadium, and Goodman Softball Complex) are to:

- Maintain existing recreation fields and open space connections, understanding much of the land is zoned Conservancy (CN).
- Maintain existing low-scale residential in Eagle Heights
- Continue strong preservation and management of the Lakeshore Nature Preserve, per the goals and recommendations of the Lakeshore Nature Preserve Master Plan

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends one new facility, a Preserve Outreach Center (W-29). This facility would welcome visitors, provide maps, educational displays, and interpretive information for the entire, 300-acre Lakeshore Nature Preserve. It could provide an overlook as part of the structure to enhance views across University Bay and toward the Class of 1918 Marsh, year-round restroom facilities, and better organized parking for cars and bicycles.

West Campus

The general goals for the West Campus district are to:

- Increase building density to provide for potential future growth in the health sciences
- Change the general character of the West Campus from suburban to more of a traditional campus with large buildings organized around quadrangles and green spaces
- Set heights to generally reflect existing buildings in the area
- Preserve and create new viewsheds to Lake Mendota, particularly for the UW Hospital and WARF Building

The primary focus of the West Campus is health sciences services, medical and affiliated education, and research. Other uses include athletic facilities, recreational fields, and supporting parking and service facilities.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update continues the migration of the medical school and UW Hospital from its original home in the Central Campus district on University Avenue. As outlined in earlier campus master plans, the university seeks to move medical research and teaching facilities near the teaching hospital to facilitate a closer bench-to-bed technology transfer. The consolidation of the hospital and medical school on the West Campus continues what was initially envisioned in the original hospital master development plan developed in 1970 by HOK.

Health sciences-related research will continue to grow and expand. Space expansion is likely for the UW Hospital, Medical School, Pharmacy, and Nursing, in addition to swing space necessary for efficient remodeling. Two expansion opportunities remain within the Highland Avenue ring road – the Wisconsin Institutes for Medical Research Phase 3 (W-01) and a reservation of space for an additional hospital module (W-04A).

The USDA Forest Products Lab and the William S. Middleton Veterans Memorial Hospital comprise over 45 acres of land within the Campus Development Plan Boundary and adjacent to the hospital. Expansion into the federal property is currently not possible. These two federal properties are shown to be continuing without significant changes. Both the USDA Forest Products Lab and the Veterans Hospital are consolidating their functions from around Wisconsin and the Midwest to their facilities here in Madison making them even more viable then in the past. Purchasing land from the federal government will be difficult, if not impossible. Potential does exist however for joint development projects beteen these two entities and the university. If either entity vacates these locations, the land reverts back to the Board of Regents.



Figure 4-7 Far West and West Campus Building Key

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends redeveloping and intensifying lands, to the extent allowed by soil conditions, that are now occupied by the McClimon Sports complex and Lot 60.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update continues to recommend the relocation of the McClimon Track/Soccer complex to the Lot 60 area to provide a more green pervious surface next to the lake. In order to facilitate this proposal, replacement parking for the cars in Lot 60 would need to be developed first, including a new interior parking structure in the development of expanded Health Science Buildings (W-09A) (1,500 spaces) on the former track location. This, along with the hospital ramp addition (W-02) and potential joint parking at the Veterans Hospital and/or USDA Forest Products Lab, would provide the necessary replacement parking for the loss of the 1,200+ surface spaces at Lot 60.

The new track would provide a fully developed outdoor track complex (W-05) with a competition soccer field in the center. A soccer practice facility would be developed to the east toward the lake, providing infiltration capacity for on-site stormwater needs. Both a separate competition soccer facility and a soccer field incorporated into the track remain options to further investigate.

The recommended relocation of the track complex allows for extensive future development of academic and research facilities for the health sciences. An additional three floors may be added to one wing of Signe Skott Cooper Hall (W-08), and a new 6-story structure may be constructed on Lot 85. A newly created parking structure (W-09A) would be wrapped with potential office/program spaces (W-09B) and have a proposed academic/ research facility to the north (W-09C). Additional health science office-based research space could be created around the base of the existing WARF Building (W-11).

Also in this area, the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends the development of a new mixed-use building that may include meeting rooms, dining, gathering spaces, and possibly academic or office spaces (W-06). As the West Campus redevelops and becomes nearly as dense as the existing South Campus, meeting rooms, food service, and general social space for faculty, staff, students, patients, and visitors is needed on the West Campus. Outdoor terrace seating areas should face and connect to the lake off the northeast corner of the building. A second level terrace would overlook the Soccer complex to the north and the band practice and recreation fields to the east.

In the West Campus, fairly large buildings are being planned around new quadrangles of green space. The mixed-use building should be sited to preserve views of Lake Mendota from the UW Hospital and extend an open space corridor from the Health Sciences Learning Center, south of Rennebohm Hall, and north of Signe Skott Cooper Hall and on to Lake Mendota. Preservation areas, Class of 1918 Marsh, existing and recommended stormwater treatment areas, recreation fields, and the Howard Temin Lakeshore Path maintain a connected open space network along Lake Mendota. The open spaces are also outdoor laboratories for the Department of Botany, the Department of Landscape Architecture, and the College of Engineering, as described in the Lakeshore Nature Preserve Master Plan. The linking of open spaces is key to the overall connectedness of the plan for the West Campus and starts to create a more campus-like neighborhood rather than the existing suburban neighborhood character with huge buildings with no formal outdoor spaces.

The existing West Campus Recreation Fields, north of the Waisman Center and northwest of the Nielsen Tennis Stadium, remain as recreation fields in the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update. The large outdoor fields serve an important function for the campus and will continue to do so in the future.

Other proposed facilities include a near-term reconstruction of the Walnut Street Greenhouses (W-12) that will expand greenhouse space and avoid shading from the Walnut Street Cogeneration Plant to the south.

Several areas on campus are set aside in the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update as major service and infrastructure points. The West Campus service area houses the Physical Plant Operations/Grounds Facilities and the West Campus Cogeneration Facility. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends a long-term redevelopment of the Grounds offices and storage facilities now located along the west bank of Willow Creek. To reduce runoff of stored materials and allow for the creation of wetland and stormwater facilities that will improve the water quality of Willow Creek and Lake Mendota, Grounds facilities will be relocated into new and existing structures. A new office/administration building, controlled temperature storage, and covered vehicle storage facilities will be constructed south of Linden Drive around the existing incinerator. New greenhouse and salt storage facilities will be constructed on the federal Barley and Malt Laboratory site east of Walnut Street and south of the Walnut Street Heating Plant.



Figure 4-8 Far West And West Campus Illustration

Near West Campus

The general goals for the Near West Campus district are to:

- Increase building density to provide for potential future growth in agricultural and life sciences
- Replace single-story buildings to better tie the West and Central Campuses together in a more traditional campus setting building
- Improve the Willow Creek corridor and water quality through adjacent site redevelopment and wetland and stormwater facilities
- Capture and treat stormwater along the Linden Drive and Observatory Drive corridors, creating a new campus "green neighborhood"

Near West Campus Design Neighborhood

In the Near West Campus district, a goal is to increase overall density and expand social and working open spaces. Currently the area is a mixture of low or single-story Agricultural Farm Buildings and higher density research and academic facilities. The Near West Campus will not only continue to maintain its land grant Agricultural Buildings but also increase density to allow for new research facilities to be constructed.

A large near-term academic and research facility is a new Veterinary Medicine hospital and research facility (W-17), which will be an expansion of small animal clinical and research programs in the new building and renewal of portions of the existing small and large animal hospitals. The expansion will occur on the site of the existing 410-stall Lot 62, and parking will be replaced in a new 625-stall parking structure (W-27).

The pre-design for the new Veterinary Medicine hospital and research facility requires two at-grade connector hallways between the existing and proposed structures, cutting off Linden Drive. In order to improve the Willow Creek corridor by replacing impermeable driving surfaces with permeable and attractive open spaces, the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends that Easterday Lane be removed. Circulation to the existing small animal drop-off will be accommodated by a reconstruction of the existing pedestrian/ utility bridge over Willow Creek into a wider bridge that will accommodate vehicles. Access to the east side of the new Veterinary Medicine Hospital will occur off Linden Drive, and large animal loading and drop-off along the east and south sides of the existing hospital.

Systematic reconstruction of facilities along the south side of Observatory Drive and west of Elm Drive will provide additional space for new and expanded agricultural research facilities. The first project, the Meat Science and Muscle Biology Building (W-18), will replace the existing Meat and Muscle Biology facility. This new 2-story, modern teaching, research, and outreach facility will support the meat industry of the State of Wisconsin. Future sites along the south edge of Observatory Drive are a Poultry and Livestock Laboratory Building (W-20) and Biological Systems Engineering Building (W-19).



Figure 4-9 Near West Campus Building Key

These new facilities should be sited along and be serviced by Observatory Drive. Areas south of these new structures should be reserved for an open space corridor between the Horse Barn and Meat Science and Muscle Biology Building. The open space will support the repurposing of the Horse Barn (perhaps as an event space) and provide an appropriate setting for the characteristic agricultural land grant buildings of the Horse Barn and Dairy Cattle Center. The open space should also function as stormwater capture and cleaning, a part of the "green neighborhood" system.

The existing Meat and Muscle Biology facility lies within the railroad rightof-way, and it blocks one of the two remaining missing links of the campus off-street bicycle network. When the existing Meat and Muscle Biology Building is repurposed, the portion of the building in the railroad right-ofway should be studied for removal and any necessary expansion on the north facade (W-26), allowing for the eastward continuation of the commuter path.

To the east of Elm Drive, north of the existing historic Stock Pavilion and north of Linden Drive are sites for a new Plant Sciences Building (W-24) and a Animal Sciences (AHABS) Building (W-22).

Lakeshore Campus Design Neighborhood

With the construction of Dejope Residence Hall and Leopold Hall since the 2005 Campus Master Plan, no expansion of residential beds is planned for the Lakeshore Residences Neighborhood. Incremental renovations and improvements of existing halls will continue, but density will not further increase. Rather, recreational-related projects will improve the desirability of this historic neighborhood. A goal is that the residential neighborhood be organized around major areas of open space and maintain the existing active recreation fields for student enjoyment and active exercise.

The existing Natatorium is undersized, overused, and per the 2012 Recreational Sports Master Plan cannot be renovated effectively. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends a new recreational facility (W-16) on the same site. The replacement facility will be larger to accommodate increased activity and residents in the Lakeshore Residences Neighborhood and recreational facilities relocated from elsewhere on campus. The scale of the new facility will overwhelm the largely small-scale character of the Lakeshore Residential Neighborhood, so it must be sited and planned carefully. Its height should be no higher than Dejope Residential Hall. A minimum 75-foot setback from Willow Creek will provide active and passive open space that is focused on the creek, and a 25-foot setback from the effigy mounds located north of the site. A new pedestrian bridge should connect the Near West Fields with the Natatorium.

The Near West Fields will soon be upgraded. The existing fields, at approximately 383,140 gross square feet, will be re-graded to create five synthetic turf flag football fields and one championship soccer field. A portion of the fields will function as a stormwater management facility via an open graded stone layer. Existing stormwater treatment along the south and east edges of the existing fields will be maintained.

Like the Near West Fields, the Near East Recreation Fields, located on Observatory Drive just west of Elm Drive, are slated to be rebuilt with synthetic turf fields in the Recreational Facility Master Plan. These fields sit at the confluence of several large storm sewers that collect a vast tributary area before discharging to Lake Mendota. Approximately 32 acres of stormwater runoff pass by this site, from as far away as Henry Mall. When reconstructed, the Near East Fields should be constructed above a new underground stormwater detention chamber.



Figure 4-10 West And Near West Campus Illustration

Central Campus

General goals for the Central Campus are:

- Maintain the traditional campus arrangement of buildings around sweeping lawns and quadrangles of open space
- Create a new pedestrian environment along Linden Drive west of N. Charter Street recalling the Greater Mall concept from the 1908 Campus Plan
- Infill with new research/academic facilities where necessary but always in an understanding of the open spaces created with the new spaces
- Maintain and reuse the historic building fabric whenever possible
- Remove buildings from the 1960's and 1970's that have outlived their useful lives and can not be reprogrammed or renovated for a higher and better use

Linden Drive and Henry Mall

The south side of Linden Drive from Henry Mall to N. Charter Street will be completely reconstructed. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update's siting of the academic/research facilities on the south side of Linden Drive seeks to strengthen the Greater Mall concept from the 1908 Campus Plan by Laird and Cret. A consistent street wall on the south side will better define the open space of the Greater Mall. Pedestrians will have an urban sidewalk experience on the south side of the road, and an open space path experience close to the north side building entrances. Building sites on the south side of Linden Drive are pushed north, towards the street, to maximize the open space on their south-facing facades. The inclusion of a new north/south road and an east/west connector to N. Charter Street will break up this "superblock," providing porosity for those pedestrians walking between Central and South Campus. The new road connections will also allow access to the expanded parking facilities in this central block while avoiding the congested N. Charter Street/Linden Drive intersection.

New academic/research buildings (N-04, N-05A, N-05B, and N-06A) will replace the aging structures along the south side of Linden Drive – Stovall Building, Nutritional Sciences, McArdle Cancer Research Center, Middleton Building, Bradley Memorial Building, Bardeen Medical Laboratories, Medical Sciences, and Service Memorial Institute. A partially underground parking structure (N-06B) with 550 stalls should be located under N-05B and N-06A. Lot 20 will be replaced with a larger and more efficient parking structure (N-05C) with 375 stalls. The parking under N-06B and N-05C will allow the removal of several parking lots in the area including Lot 34 near the lake and street parking along Observatory Drive between N. Charter Street and Babcock Drive. This new central location for parking allows those that park in the existing lots and typically work in the Central Campus location to park closer to their offices, while allowing restoration of the Observatory Hill landscape.

Across N. Charter Street, an addition on the west side of Ingraham Hall (N-14) with a possible interior occupied space will expand its footprint and capacity.

The plan recommends a future academic facility on the site of Van Hise Hall (N-03A and N-03B). The project could be developed in two phases with one being taller than the other (N-03B) as it goes up the hill to take advantage of the lake views to the north. The tower should not be more than eight stories tall. The building siting should respect the setback from Linden Drive as established in the Greater Mall concept from the 1908 Campus Plan by Laird and Cret, as demonstrated by Agricultural Hall and Nancy Nicholas Hall.

The N. Charter Street/Linden Drive intersection is the most congested on campus. Enormous volumes of pedestrians crossing the intersection in all directions effectively shuts down the intersection for transit, service, and other vehicles during every class change. Transit busses get behind schedule during these times, and then the schedule never recovers. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends the construction of a grade-separated pedestrian bridge over the N. Charter Street/Linden Drive intersection. The pedestrian bridge should be constructed and connected to in phases. In all phases, the bridge should connect on the east side of N. Charter Street to the middle of the west side of Bascom Hill at the Van Vleck Hall lecture hall entrance/exit landing. In the existing conditions, the bridge should connect to the top of the existing Van Hise plinth deck. When Van Hise is removed and N-03A is constructed, the bridge should be extended to the upper-level pedestrian path so that it connects to the existing path south of Nancy Nicholas Hall. When N-06A is constructed, an addition to the bridge should connect to an upper floor of N-06A. Stairs, escalators, and elevators within N-06A should directly and efficiently connect pedestrians back down to Linden Drive. The concern that pedestrian bridges take away from the vitality and street life created by pedestrians using the street level crossings is outweighed by the sheer volume of pedestrians, which will use both the ground-level and pedestrian bridge.

4. FACILITIES PLAN: PROPOSED CONDITIONS



Figure 4-11 Central Campus Building Key

4. FACILITIES PLAN: PROPOSED CONDITIONS

On the east side of Henry Mall, Stovall Hall and Old Genetics should be removed and replaced by new academic/research facilities – Nutritional Sciences (N-04) and a new academic/research facility (N-07). Both buildings should be designed to maintain the massing and scale of the other buildings along Henry Mall and be of a tan brick or limestone color. Henry Mall continues to be the transition line between buildings in the agricultural campus that have red-brown brick colorations and the cream city brick that lies east of Henry Mall.

King Hall Greenhouse expansion is enabled through N-15. All construction and maintenance near King Hall and Agricultural Hall should protect and highlight the Observatory Hill mounds.

Library Mall

The Library Mall area includes the northern section of the East Campus Mall, Chazen Museum, Humanities, and the planned music performance sites. The concept for an east campus pedestrian promenade has been around for many decades as was most recently defined as "Murray Mall" in the 1995 JJR Campus Master Plan. After the current construction of Alumni Park is complete, the north section of what is now known as East Campus Mall will be complete with the renovation of the Library Mall.

The Mosse Humanities Building, built in 1966-1969 and designed by Chicago architect Harry Weese, is recommended to be removed due to extensive physical issues with the facility and inability to reprogram the building efficiently and economically. The programs in the Humanities Building must be moved first, and they will be relocated into multiple new facilities. Music instruction and music performance will be moved to the Hamel Music Center Phases 1 and 2 (N-13B) at the corner of University Avenue and Lake Street, and Phase 3 north of it on Lake Street (N-13C). Art instruction and galleries will be moved to S-16A and other Mosse Humanities Building occupants will be moved to S-13A, both new facilities in South Campus.

After the Mosse Humanities Building is removed, two smaller academic facilities will be constructed on its site (N-11A and N-11B). Under N-11A and N-11B should be constructed as an underground two-level parking structure for approximately 450 cars to accommodate the parking needs of the lake front. If possible the parking under both building should be designed and constructed for maximum efficiency and capacity. Traffic flow in and out of the new parking facility should be carefully studied, in coordinated with the City of Madison, to minimize congestion at the University Avenue/N. Park Street intersection.



Figure 4-12 Central Campus Illustration

South Campus

General goals for the South Campus district are:

- Maintain and develop the urban campus with higher and more dense buildings (8 to 10 stories tall between University Avenue and W. Dayton Street)
- Improve the pedestrian experience with deeper building setbacks, wider sidewalks, and streetscaping
- Site buildings to create large blocks of south-facing open space
- Maintain the existing street grid network, with the exception of one block of N. Brooks Street
- Design and program W. Dayton Street to be a festival street, related to programming at Union South, Camp Randall, and the Kohl Center
- Consolidate and move Physical Plant Services to the Lot 51 parking lot area
- Provide growth space for additional academic/research facilities by purchasing private parcels within the Campus Development Plan Boundary as they become available

The South Campus will accommodate the greatest share of university growth and change through a significant increase in density and activity. As the most urban area of campus is redeveloped, open spaces and pedestrian spaces are critical to improving the character of this disjointed campus area. This description of future redevelopment generally moves from west to east.

Concurrent with the preparation of the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update, the College of Engineering prepared a college-level facilities master plan that considered space utilization and needs, facility conditions, and the short and long-term vision for the college. The College of Engineering facilities master plan describes a short, mid, long, and extended vision for its facilities. The extended vision, incorporated into the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update, nearly completely reconstructs the southwest academic corner of campus. It is a bold vision that will take decades to implement, but will fundamentally change the effectiveness of the college, the density of South Campus, and the overall capacity of the campus.

The building changes are moderate in the short-term, transformational in the long-term. In the near term 1410 Engineering Drive (S-02) will be replaced for the College of Engineering, and then a replacement for the Engineering Research Building (S-01). In the long-term, Lot 17 is removed and replaced by a new Engineering Academic Building (S-23). The parking demand will

be accommodated by spaces dded in the south campus. Engineering Hall will be replaced by two structures (S-24 and S-25), linking two of campuses most important open spaces – Henry Mall and Camp Randall Memorial Park. The Wendt Commons facility will be removed, allowing Union South to connect through open space to Camp Randall Memorial Park and perhaps the underground expansion of Lot 80. No change in the Campus Development Plan Boundary is necessary to accommodate this revisioned engineering campus, but the university should purchase properties on the N. Dayton Street/N. Orchard Street/Spring Street/N. Randall Avenue block from willing sellers to accommodate future development.

University Research Park and WARF have recently purchased the building at 1403 University Avenue and established WID@1403, offering co-working, networking, and mentoring opportunities. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends a new and larger facility on the same site (S-22), to allow the programming to expand.

A Police and Security Facility Addition (S-18), constructed in 2017, provides private and open office space, conference and training spaces for the department, as well as a secure sally port entrance to the existing detainee unloading area so that officers have a safe area to load and unload detainees into the holding area. A new officer education facility (S-30) will co-locate Aerospace Studies, Naval Science, and Military Science on Monroe Street. Relocating Naval Science allows for future Wisconsin Energy Institute expansion, and relocating Military Science enables W-20.

The Brogden Psychology Building will need to be removed and Physical Plant services will need to be consolidated and moved to the Lot 51 area to make way for the construction of the second phase of the Wisconsin Institutes of Discovery (S-03B). The Meiklejohn House and Lot 13 will be replaced by an Academic/Research Building (S-28).

To the south, on N. Orchard Street just south of the Atmospheric, Oceanic and Space Sciences Building, is currently the site of two former residence halls, the Rust-Schreiner Hall complex. These buildings, currently used as swing space for a variety of on campus units, will be an academic facility (S-08A). No current academic program expansion is driving the need to purchase the remaining properties on this block. They do however remain of interest within the university's long range Campus Development Plan Boundary.



Figure 4-13 South Campus Building Key

Further south lies the Primate Research facilities which have a planned consolidation and phased expansion of their facilities (S-09A, C and D).

To the east of this block, east of N. Charter Street, is Parking Lots 50 and 51, the 30 N. Mills Street facility, and the campus Fleet and Service Garage. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update shows further development of this block for Physical Plant services, as outlined in the 1995 and 2005 Campus Master Plans. This development could include a 400-space parking ramp. The development could possibly include small private retail space(s) on the first floor as well as some meter parking on the first floor of the parking garage for public use. Public parking in this garage could remove on-street parking from N. Charter Street, enabling for conversion of N. Charter Street to a two-way green street. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends an Academic Building on the Lot 45 site (S-11A).

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends the total redevelopment of the Noland Hall and Zoology Research Building block (S-07) to replace these two buildings. They were built in 1972 and 1963 respectfully and both have outlasted their useful lives.

The Chemistry Instructional Addition (S-29) will be a 9-story tower that will address the Chemistry instructional program's anticipated space needs. The new tower will be constructed first, followed by the remodeling of the existing building.

The university should continue to purchase the remaining privately owned parcels on the block directly south of Grainger Hall.

The Fluno Center was designed to accommodate an addition (S-20).

The 2013 Recreational Sports Master Plan recommends the removal of the existing Southeast Recreational Facility (SERF) and reconstruction of a larger and re-programmed facility (S-32) on the same site. The building will serve the residents of the southeast residence hall neighborhood. It will be dedicated to Recreational Sports, other than sharing a 50-meter competition pool and separate diving well with the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics.

The existing Campus Development Plan Boundary passes diagonally through Lot 91; the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends adjusting the Campus Development Plan Boundary to include the entire Lot 91 and planned site for S-16A and S-16C.



Figure 4-14 South Campus Illustration

Table 4-1 Proposed Building Summary

District	Map Reference	Building Name	Building Use	Number of Floors	Total Gross Square Feet	Parking Spaces	Phase
Far West							
	W-29	Preserve Outreach Center	Service/Support	1	8,700	-	2023-2029
West							
	W-01	Wisconsin Institutes for Medical Research Phase 3	Health/Hospital	7	308,000	-	2029-2035
	W-02	Parking Structure (Hospital Ramp Addition)	Parking	3	323,900	1,225	2017-2023
	W-04A	Health Sciences Expansion	Health/Hospital	7	60,500	-	2035+
	W-05	McClimon Track/Soccer Grandstand	Athletics	3	78,000	-	2035+
	W-06	Social/Dining/Meeting Rooms/Health Sciences	Union/Student Center	5.5	126,800	-	2035+
	W-07	Health Sciences Research	Research	6	121,938	-	2035+
	W-08	Cooper Hall Addition	Academic	3	30,000	-	2035+
	W-09A	Parking Structure	Parking	6	504,000	1,500	2035+
	W-09B	Health Sciences Research	Research	5	233,250	-	2035+
	W-09C	Health Sciences Research	Research	5.5	231,000	_	2035+
	W-11	WARF Addition	Research	6	192,000	-	2035+
	W-12	Walnut Greenhouse II	Research	1	24,000	-	2017-2023
	W-13	Health Sciences Research	Research	5	164,185	-	2035+
	W-28	Nielsen Tennis Stadium Expansion	Athletics	2	47,075	-	2023-2029
	W-34	Grounds Office/Administration	Service/Support	1	3,000	-	2035+
	W-30	Grounds Storage A – Controlled Temp	Service/Support	1	3,000	-	2035+
	W-31	Grounds Storage B – Covered	Service/Support	1	-	-	2035+
	W-32	Grounds Greenhouse	Service/Support	1	6,000	-	2035+
	W-33	Grounds Storage C – Salt	Service/Support	1	3,500	-	2035+

* Land not currently owned by the UW-Madison Board of Regents/affiliates and/or non C-I District zoning. Will need to adhere to City of Madison Conditional Use process.

District	Map Reference	Building Name	Building Use	Number of Floors	Total Gross Square Feet	Parking Spaces	Phase
Near West							
	W-16	Gymnasium-Natatorium Replacement	Rec Sports	5	470,900	-	2017-2023
	W-17	Veterinary Medicine Expansion	Research	2	138,911	-	2017-2023
	W-18	Meat Science and Muscle Biology Lab	Academic/ Research	2	228,000	-	2017-2023
	W-19	Biological Systems Engineering	Academic/ Research	6	246,000	-	2035+
	W-20	Poultry & Livestock Lab Building	Academic/ Research	2	52,965	-	2029-2035
	W-22	Animal Sciences (AHABS)	Academic/ Research	5	85,000	-	2035+
	W-24	Plant Sciences	Academic/ Research	5	100,000	-	2035+
	W-25	Babcock Hall Center for Dairy Research Addition	Academic/ Research	3	31,300	-	2017-2023
	W-27	Parking Structure (Lot 62 Site)	Parking	5	198,000	625	2017-2023
Central							
	N-03A	Academic/Research (Van Hise site)	Academic/ Research	6	114,000	-	2035+
	N-03B	Academic/Research (Van Hise site)	Academic/ Research	8	48,000	-	2035+
	N-04	Academic/Research (Stovall Site)	Academic/ Research	6	82,200	-	2029-2035
	N-05A	Academic/Research (Nutritional Sciences site)	Academic/ Research	6	180,000	-	2035+
	N-05B	Academic/Research (Middleton site)	Academic/ Research	6	165,000	-	2035+
	N-05C	Parking Structure (Lot 20 Site)	Parking	5	144,000	375	2029-2035

Table 4-1 Proposed Building Summary (continued)

* Land not currently owned by the UW-Madison Board of Regents/affiliates and/or non C-I District zoning. Will need to adhere to City of Madison Conditional Use process.

Table 4-1 Proposed Building Summary (continued)

District	Map Reference	Building Name	Building Use	Number of Floors	Total Gross Square Feet	Parking Spaces	Phase
	N-06A	Academic/Research (SMI Bardeen Med Sciences site)	Academic/ Research	6	144,000	-	2029-2035
	N-06B	Parking Structure (Under N-05B & N-06A)	Parking	2	194,400	550	2029-2035
	N-07	Academic/Research (445 Henry site)	Academic/ Research	3	30,000	-	2035+
	N-11A	Academic/Research (Mosse site north)	Academic/ Research	4	84,000	-	2029-2035
	N-11B	Parking Structure (Under N-11A and N-12A)	Parking	2	162,000	450	2029-2035
	N-12A	Academic/Research (Mosse site south)	Academic/ Research	5	135,000	-	2029-2035
	N-13B	Hamel Music Center P1&2	Academic	3	135,000	-	2017-2023
	N-13C	Music Phase 3	Academic	5	75,000	-	2029-2035
	N-14	Ingraham Hall Additions	Academic	4	56,000	-	2017-2023
	N-15	King Hall Greenhouse	Research	1	7,500	-	2035+
South							
	S-01	Engineering Research Building Replacement	Academic/ Research	6	271,667	-	2029-2035
	S-02	Engineering Drive 1410 – Replacement	Academic/ Research	6	169,091	-	2023-2029
	S-03B	Wisconsin Institute for Discovery, Phase 2	Research	6	392,000	-	2029-2035
	S-07	Zoology Research and Noland Hall	Academic/ Research	8	419,888	-	2035+
	S-08A	Academic/Research	Academic/ Research	2	22,000	-	2029-2035
	NS	Weeks Hall Addition	Research	1	5,000		
	NS	Academic/Research	Academic/ Research	6	150,000		
	S-09A	Primate Center & Harlow Expansion	Research	6	48,822	-	2035+

* Land not currently owned by the UW-Madison Board of Regents/affiliates and/or non C-I District zoning. Will need to adhere to City of Madison Conditional Use process. NOTE: Refer to the University of Wisconsin-Madison Campus Master Plan Technical Document for additional south campus development information. NS = Not Shown

138 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

District	Map Reference	Building Name	Building Use	Number of Floors	Total Gross Square Feet	Parking Spaces	Phase
	S-09C	Primate Center & Harlow Expansion	Research	6	60,000	-	2035+
	S-09D	Primate Center & Harlow Expansion	Research	6	96,000	-	2035+
	NS	Parking Structure	Parking	4	148,800	400	
	S-11A	Academic/Research (Lot 45 Site)	Academic/ Research	2	30,000	-	2035+
	NS	Parking Structure	Parking	2	129,600	350	
	NS	Academic/Research	Academic/ Research	6	348,000		
	NS	Art Building	Academic/ Research	3	162,000		
	NS	Parking Structure	Parking	2	108,000	375	
	S-18	Police Addition*	Academic	2	24,840	-	2017-2023
	S-20	Fluno Addition	Other	6	43,200	-	2035+
	NS	College of Engineering Research Building*	Research	7	156,364	-	2017-2023
	S-22	University Research Park (Lorch St)	Other	4	34,000	-	2035+
	S-23	New Engineering*	Academic/ Research	5	204,000	-	2035+
	S-24	New Engineering	Academic/ Research	5	236,583	-	2035+
	S-25	New Engineering	Academic/ Research	5	274,986	-	2035+
	NS	New Engineering	Academic/ Research	5	169,506		
	NS	Parking Structure	Parking	6	345,600	1,050	
	NS	Academic/Research (Meiklejohn Site)*	Academic/ Research	5	84,470	-	
	S-29	Chemistry Bldg Expansion	Academic/ Research	9	173,169	-	2017-2023
	S-30	Officer Education Facility*	Academic	4	65,000	-	2017-2023
	S-31	Southeast Recreational Facility*	Rec Sports	4	253,000	-	2017-2023

Table 4-1 Proposed Building Summary (continued)

* Land not currently owned by the UW-Madison Board of Regents/affiliates and/or non C-I District zoning. Will need to adhere to City of Madison Conditional Use process. NOTE: Refer to the University of Wisconsin-Madison Campus Master Plan Technical Document for additional south campus development information.

NS = Not Shown

4.5 Open Space and Landscape Plan

The overall campus plan is the summation of planning and design by an interdisciplinary team, in collaboration with Facilities Planning & Management staff and university stakeholders.

The plan is conceptual, illustrating campuswide improvements based upon the principles established and the landscape concepts presented above. This plan is not a final destination, but a guiding illustration that envisions what campus could look like.

The City reserves the right to determine street design in the city right-of-way. The concepts shown and discussed in the UW Master Plan are only meant to depict or suggest some future design possibilities, and no detailed studies/modeling have been done on those concepts.

Recommended Improvements:

- 1 A revitalized Willow Creek corridor
- 2 A dedicated campus arrival for the School of Veterinary Medicine
- 3 New Near West Commons open space, adaptively re-purposing the historic Horse Barn
- 4 Expanded naturalized and working landscapes on Observatory Hill
- 5 An iconic pedestrian bridge at the intersection of N. Charter Street and Linden Drive
- 6 A boardwalk to safely traverse the steep slope behind Sewell Social Sciences Building
- 7
 - The creation of new campus open spaces through the redevelopment of the Medical Sciences and Humanities
- 8 Improved visitor gateway experience along University Avenue and W. Johnson Street



Green Street initiatives along N. Charter and W. Dayton Streets



Figure 4-15 Proposed Landscape Project Locations

Table 4-2 Proposed Landscape Summary

Мар	Category of Open		3		
Reference ¹	Space Use	Location Description	New ²	Comments	Phase
OS-W-01	Courts/Quads/Gardens	Pharmacy East Quad		Green space directly east of Pharmacy, connect to West Union	4
OS-W-02	Natural Areas	1918 Marsh Improvements		Shoreline, walking path, landscape improvements	2
OS-W-03	Courts/Quads/Gardens	West Union North Green	*	Includes stormwater management component	4
OS-W-04	Courts/Quads/Gardens	West Union Terrace	*	Area immediately surrounding the Union West Building	4
OS-W-05	Pedestrian Mall	Walnut Street Pedestrian Mall		Enhanced streetscape	4
OS-W-06	Natural Areas	Picnic Point Entry Improvements		Alignment, signage, landscape improvements	2
OS-W-07A	Natural Areas	Willow Creek Improvements-South	*	Between Linden Drive and Campus Drive	2
OS-W-07B	Natural Areas	Willow Creek Improvements-Middle	*	Between Observatory Drive and Linden Drive	1
OS-W-07C	Natural Areas	Willow Creek Improvements-North	*	Between Lake and Observatory Drive	4
OS-W-08	Streetscape	Linden Drive between Willow Creek and Elm Dr.	*	Stormwater management, green streets	3
OS-W-09	Courts/Quads/Gardens	Horse Barn Stormwater Facility	*	Restore greenspace around Horse Barn	4
OS-W-10	Recreation	Near East Recreation Fields/Stormwater	*	Underground stormwater facility	1
OS-W-11	Courts/Quads/Gardens	Westside Terrace and Plaza	*	Area adjacent to west side of new Natatorium	1
OS-N-01	Streetscape	Observatory Drive Streetscape	*	Part of Utility Upgrade projects, remove parallel parking/ pull-out addition. Between Babcock and Charter.	4
OS-N-02	Courts/Quads/Gardens	Tripp/Adams Hall Courtyards	*	Restoration	2
OS-N-03	Streetscape	Linden Drive Pedestrian Enhancements		Enhanced pedestrian zone	3
OS-N-04	Natural Areas	Removal and Redevelopment of Lot 34		Stormwater, education, research facility	3
OS-N-05	General Openspace	Observatory Hill Landscape Restoration		Reduced lawn conversion, tree thinning/planting	3
OS-N-06	General Openspace	Pedestrian Land Bridge	*	Over intersection of Charter and Linden	3
OS-N-07	General Openspace	N. Charter Street Lake Terminus Path	*	Transition down slope	1
OS-N-08	Streetscape	Observatory Drive Pedestrian Improvements		At Bascom/Social Science/Ingraham area	1
OS-N-09	Court/Quads/Gardens	Super Block Roof Deck	*	Area around N-06A site	3
1. Format: Op	en Space - Planning Distri	ct - ID#			
2. New Recom	mendation, relative to 20	05 Campus Master Plan			

Мар	Category of Open				
Reference ¹	Space Use	Location Description	New ²	Comments	Phase
OS-N-10	Stormwater	Underground Treatment Stormwater Facility	*	Green infrastructure, superblock adjacent to Medical Sciences	3
OS-N-11	General Openspace	Bascom Hill Stormwater Landscape	*	Reduce lawn, implement green infrastructure	2
OS-N-12	Courts/Quads/Gardens	Library Mall (State Street to Langdon Street)		Redevelopment of Library Mall	2
OS-N-13	Courts/Quads/Gardens Humanities Site Mall		*	Connecting East Campus Mall to N. Park Street (Lathrop)	3
OS-N-14	Streetscape	Campus Gateway Entry Sign	*	At Campus Drive/University Avenue center median	2
OS-S-01	Courts/Quads/Gardens	Engineering Campus Mall	*	Connection between Engineering. Mall and Camp Randall Park	4
OS-S-02	Recreation	Camp Randall North Practice Field	*	Minor addition	1
OS-S-03	Courts/Quads/Gardens	Union South Quadrangle & Open Space		Removal of Wendt Library (relocate)	4
NS	Courts/Quads/Gardens	Block South of Union South			
OS-S-05	Courts/Quads/Gardens	Campus/Orchard Surface Stormwater Facility	*	WID II, South Open Space	3
OS-S-06	Courts/Quads/Gardens	N. Mills Surface Stormwater Facility	*	Nolan Zoology Block Quadrangle	4
OS-S-07A	Streetscape	Dayton Street Green Infrastructure-Randall to Charter	*	Green street	1,2,3,4
OS-S-07B	Streetscape	Dayton Street Green Infrastructure-Charter to Park	*	Green street	1,2,3,4
OS-S-07C	Streetscape	Dayton Street Green Infrastructure-Park to Frances	*	Green street	1,2,3,4
OS-S-08	General Openspace	Witte Hall Yard	*	Open space improvements, stormwater	1
OS-S-09	General Openspace	Sellery Hall Yard	*	Open space improvements, stormwater	2
OS-S-10	Courts/Quads/Gardens	Grainger Hall Courtyard Redevelopment		Redo existing	2
OS-S-11	Streetscape	University Avenue Streetscape Enhancements		Incoordination with City/State/Fed's	4
OS-S-12	General Openspace	Railroad R/W Landscape Enhancement	*	Lessen visual impact of this corridor	2
NS	General Openspace	Art Building open space & sculpture garden			
OS-S-14	Streetscape	Campus Gateway Entry Sign		At 21 N. Park Street island	3
NS	Courts/Quads/Gardens	South Campus Quad			
1. Format: Op	en Space - Planning Distri	ct - ID#			
2. New Recom	mendation, relative to 20	05 Campus Master Plan			

Table 4-2 Proposed Landscape Summary, continued

NS = Not Shown

4.6 Natural Campus Landscapes

Observatory Hill

Observatory Hill is a sacred, historic landscape. It is one of the few remaining large open spaces in Central Campus and its view of Lake Mendota and Picnic Point are treasured by all.

Even before the campus located Washburn Observatory on the apex of the drumlin, this landscape was utilized for thousands of years. Native Americans built effigy mounds atop the hill which visually connected to mound groups at Willow Drive, Picnic Point and across Lake Mendota. Centuries later, the university terraced the hill and built an orchard; the remnants are still visible. Today, the landscape has become a pass-through space that has lost much of its prominence. Beyond winter sledding, the hillside gets little active and dedicated use.

Observatory Hill is a landscape steeped in history worthy of preservation. Despite its revered status, opportunities exist to revitalize this open space, strengthening its connection to the lake while providing both restorative and didactic environments for students and staff.

Recommendations

- Relocate Lot 34 and on-street parking along Observatory Drive to improve the view to Lake Mendota. Provide temporary parking for visitors to access the lookout and Elizabeth Waters Residence Hall.
- In place of Lot 34, construct a naturalized wetland feature to manage stormwater from Observatory Hill and Tripp Hall. Incorporate boardwalks for strolling, teaching, research and accessing the water. Seating nooks for social gathering or quiet reflection will help students and visitors reengage with this landscape.
- Convert traditional lawn areas to a designed oak savanna ecosystem with large copses of oak trees and short-grass prairie plants. This naturalistic landscape will require less frequent maintenance, provide wildlife habitat, and act as a teaching landscape. A more appropriately sized lawn will be retained adjacent to Elizabeth Waters Residence Hall as open space.
- Reroute and improve the connections for ridge line pathways south of the effigy mounds and restore the mound landscape to short-grass prairie per the Indian Mound Management Policy (May 2011) in consultation with Facilities Planning & Management staff.




Figure 4-16 Observatory Hill Proposed Plan

Linden Drive and Willow Creek

The agricultural campus started as a series of experimental farming plots and open spaces. Today, it has expanded, matured, and developed into a modern research campus, losing much of its original agrarian character. It has turned its back on Willow Creek, an urban creek that is the only tributary to Lake Mendota on campus.

The character of Willow Creek has changed substantially since the establishment of the agricultural campus. What once was a meandering creek with natural hydrologic flows, it is now channelized and receives stormwater discharge from nearly 1,400 acres of urban development upstream. The creek is at the level of Lake Mendota, experiences extreme fluctuations in flow and is depositing significant amounts of sediment into University Bay, creating sand bars and further altering the hydrologic conditions and lake limnology.

As this district of campus is poised for redevelopment, incredible opportunity exists to create a new campus vernacular of working landscapes and a revitalized creek, rooted in the agricultural and natural history of the area.

Recommendations – Willow Creek

- Restore the riparian zone by providing an expanded vegetative buffer to manage non-point source pollution and stabilize the steps. The removal of Easterday Lane will provide much needed green space for rain gardens to manage stormwater, cleansing and slowly releasing it to Willow Creek.
- Construct wetlands to manage stormwater and provide habitat. Perched wetlands along the west side of the creek will intercept stormwater runoff from the grounds service yard prior to it entering the creek. Provide boardwalks with interpretive signage to educate visitors.
- Provide a multi-use pathway connecting the Campus Drive Bike Path to the Howard Temin Lakeshore Path.
- Activate Willow Creek with linear terraces stepping down to the water's edge, allowing students to engage with and access the creek. Create outdoor terraces providing direct access from the Veterinary Medicine north building expansion and new Natatorium.

Recommendations – Linden Drive

- Create working landscapes such as rain gardens throughout the agricultural campus to sustainably manage stormwater and brand the Near West Campus as the "Green District." Link the features hydrologically conveying rain water west toward Willow Creek.
- Create a dedicated School of Veterinary Medicine entry sequence along Linden Drive, converting Easterday Lane to green space.
- Create a Near West Commons at the Horse Barn, restoring the historic open space that was the western terminus of the Linden Mall. Adaptively re-purpose the Horse Barn, providing programming to activate the anchor building of the new space. Provide a terrace west of the Horse Barn that reinterprets the footprint of the original animal pens. Maintain the visual connection to the Dairy Barn.



Figure 4-17 Willow Creek and Linden Drive Plan

4. FACILITIES PLAN: PROPOSED CONDITIONS



Existing – Looking North on Observatory Drive



Figure 4-18 Revitalized Willow Creek Corridor

N. Charter Street at Sewell Social Sciences

The north terminus of N. Charter Street is an opportunity to connect the busiest intersections on campus with natural serenity of the lakeshore. The pathway to the lake front has great potential, the walk within the forested canopy is serene and provides a sense of mystery on the trip down to the water. Due to the slope, the existing path becomes steep and dangerous during the winter. It also channels stormwater flowing from the parking area, resulting in excessive soil erosion along the slopes.

Recommendations

- Demarcate the pedestrian spaces and reinforce the crossings. Visually connect N. Charter Street with the trailhead to the lake front path. Clearly mark signage to make crossings easier and safer for pedestrians.
- Construct a boardwalk that navigates the steep slopes safely, without further disturbing the ecosystem. Re-route stormwater from the upper slope to avoid rill and gully erosion.
- Use materials of long-lasting durability and low-maintenance, such as steel with slip-resistant metal gratings.
- Create a new overlook that terminates the axis with secluded views of Lake Mendota. Link the vernacular of the boardwalks and overlooks to create a seamless experience.
- The creation of the boardwalk would result in reduced bicycle accessibility to the Howard Temin Lakeshore Path, forcing cyclists to enter further west at the Lakeshore Residence Halls or east at N. Park Street



Figure 4-19 Lake Access Boardwalk Proposed Section



Figure 4-20 Lake Access Boardwalk Proposed Plan

4.7 Social Campus Landscapes

South Campus Quad

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update proposes the creation of a new quad space on South Campus.

This new quad addresses the vital need for open space in the South Campus. Beyond general use space, it provides an outdoor room that will help define a sense of place for this district. The quad should open up to the south, which will warm the space in spring and fall, and help block the winter winds.

Ideally, the quad will be enclosed by Education Sciences and a new academic program building to the east. With the closure of N. Brooks Street between W. Johnson Street and W. Dayton Street, the space will be reinforced as a pedestrian corridor.

The plaza will be a key node along the W. Dayton Street athletics corridor that links Camp Randall with the Kohl Center. The flexible space will provide additional game day programming for students and alumni alike.



Figure 4-21 Existing Housing Units along N. Brooks Street

Recommendations:

- Create a 'quad' of civic scale and character. The simple design will withstand heavy pedestrian traffic. The layout makes programming the space flexible for large and small events. Large lawn panels lined with trees will be reminiscent of larger campus malls and provide a soft, collegiate feel for informal social gatherings. Diagonal paths cut through the space along desire lines between entries and exits. Trees wrap the space and define the rooms, providing a human scale to the surrounding architecture (see Figure 4-22).
- Reinforce north-south pedestrian movement by creating a tree-lined pedestrian mall. The axis will create a pleasant corridor defining the rooms within the quad, while terminating the viewshed on the historic campus to the north.
- Introduce green infrastructure to manage stormwater on site. The site propitiously coincides with a low point in the terrain and intercepts the storm sewer line in the Brooks Street right-of-way, making it an ideal location for an urban stormwater feature to illustrate green infrastructure on campus. The rain garden ponds replace traditional fountains, providing the noise mitigation and calming effects while treating and managing the sites stormwater.
- A terrace connecting to the west facade of the new academic building provides space to have outdoor classes, socialize with friends or study exam material. This corner gathering space is off the main axis to avoid blocking traffic, while engaging the building and providing a space for groups to congregate.
- Redevelop Dayton Street as a "green street" pilot project. As with N. Charter Street, implement the design guidelines outlined in the streetscape typologies to give W. Dayton Street a clear landscape identity linking Camp Randall Memorial Park, Union South, the South Quad and the Kohl Center along one unified "athletic" streetscape experience.
- Provide pedestrian scale lighting to animate the area at all times of the day, particularly during the short days of the winter months.
- Design the quad lawn such that in can endure significant usage, for example through the incorporation of fiber reinforced soils.





Figure 4-23 South Campus Quad and W. Dayton Street Green Street

4.8 Green Streets

Some of the highest concentrations of polluted runoff in urban areas comes from streets and the UW–Madison campus is no exception. With surface parking lots becoming increasing more rare, the primary source of sediment loading from campus will be streets, roads, and driveways. Green Streets are an effective approach to managing runoff from high-pollutant load areas while offering aesthetic and educational value. Essentially green practices are integrated into the streetscape whether they be rain garden planters, permeable pavements, or suspended pavement root enhancement systems (like Silva Cells) which allow urban street trees to grow to their full potential and provide stormwater detention and treatment as well. Proposed Green Streets include N. Charter Street, W. Dayton Street, and Linden Drive. Figure 4-27 shows the proposed extents. All streets south of, and including University Avenue, and east of and including Park Avenue, are City of Madison streets, except Engineering Drive. Green streetscape improvements will need to be designed in coordination with the City of Madison and implemented in accordance with their street reconstruction schedules. To date, conversations with the city have indicated that they are amenable to Green Streets as long as they are addressed to meet the concerns regarding infiltration of chlorides and other street construction standards. Until technology is developed that removes chlorides from winter management strategies, any proposed infiltration systems must divert infiltration during these months.



Figure 4-24 Green Street, West Union, Iowa



Figure 4-25 Green Street, Normal, Illinois

The City reserves the right to determine street design in the city right-of-way. The concepts shown and discussed in the UW Master Plan are only meant to depict or suggest future design possibilities. There has been no detailed studies/modeling for these concepts.



Figure 4-26 Example Green Street Cross Section

4.9 Proposed Green Infrastructure and Stormwater Management

UW–Madison is already a leader in sustainable stormwater practices, having implemented dozens of progressive practices from green roofs to wetlands throughout the 936-acre campus. However, increased sustainability awareness by students, faculty, staff, and the general public, as well as a more stringent regulatory climate, offer opportunities for UW–Madison to step up and be even more aggressive in greening its facilities. The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update offers both opportunities for enhancing green infrastructure and challenges as the campus continues to densify and space for stormwater management is balanced with other programmatic needs.

Within the context of green infrastructure and stormwater management planning, the primary goal of the UW–Madison Campus Stormwater Management Plan is to identify green infrastructure opportunities so that they can be appropriately budgeted and accommodated during site planning. A secondary goal is to identify and quantify possible impacts (both positive and negative) of proposed building, open space, parking, and roadway changes on stormwater runoff so that appropriate land use decisions can be made or measures incorporated to address potential adverse impacts.

Through this master planning process, there were three primary goals identified for green infrastructure on campus:

- Implement stormwater practices and policies that contribute to a healthy Yahara Lakes system.
- Integrate research and learning into the campus stormwater management approach.
- Connect campus stormwater management to the wider Yahara Lakes watershed community.

Recommendations to achieve these goals fall under a multi-tiered approach.

(1) First, practices were identified which could be implemented in areas where a large multi-site runoff tributary could be collected and treated to maximum benefits for every dollar spent.

(2) Second, a menu of site-specific best management practices (BMP) and the outcomes they are intended to achieve (such as volume reduction, total suspended solids capture, groundwater recharge, etc.) are described which should be implemented as redevelopment occurs block by block based on an overall subwatershed plan.

(3) Third, campus stormwater standards should be updated to ensure that all new redevelopment projects on campus are contributing in a positive way towards overall sustainability and green infrastructure goals.

(4) Fourth, we encourage the continuation of good housekeeping practices on campus including street sweeping, snow and leaf litter collection, and diversion and isolation of waste areas to keep runoff from campus as clean as possible.

The above recommendations are all physical modifications or policy adoptions that will help UW–Madison maintain a strong leadership role in green infrastructure and work towards permit requirements and other sustainability goals such as ecological awareness of the community and serving as a living laboratory. In addition, UW–Madison is participating in water quality initiatives outside of campus which contribute to a healthy watershed. Adaptive Management in the Yahara Lakes watershed is a program that includes dozens of municipalities and other governmental agencies to target urban and non-urban sources of sediment and phosphorus in the watershed. The long-term goal is to achieve water quality standards in the Yahara Lakes for fishable and swimmable lakes, which will ultimately benefit the university as a major landholder along Lake Mendota.

A significant amount of technical analysis went into studying the existing campus conditions and charting a course for the future of green infrastructure on campus. The companion document Green Infrastructure & Stormwater Management Master Plan contains the technical background and detailed recommendations regarding green infrastructure and stormwater management on campus.



Figure 4-27 Recommended Green Infrastructure Projects

4.10 Proposed Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation

Walking and biking are fundamental and widespread forms of transportation on campus throughout the year, and the university places a high priority on providing connected and comfortable facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. The City reserves the right to determine street design in the city right-ofway. The concepts shown and discussed in the UW Master Plan are only meant to depict or suggest future design possibilities. There has been no detailed studies/modeling for these concepts. Coordination between the City and University will be required. Moving forward, the following should be priorities for enhancing the campus walking and biking experience:

N. Charter Street and Linden Drive

Intersections recommended for improvement were identified based on input from UW–Madison and city staff and the public. The highest priority intersection is N. Charter Street and Linden Drive. This intersection is at the center of campus with several primary academic and research locations in the area, including Van Hise, Human Ecology, Van Vleck, Bascom Hall, Sterling Hall, and others.

Pedestrians, mopeds, buses, bicycles, and cars all converge at this intersection. During class change, pedestrian volumes rival pedestrian traffic on the streets of New York City. This causes delays in the transit system, which ripple through the remaining day's schedule. At peak class change times, Metro Transit buses and motor vehicles experience delay at this location waiting for the large numbers of pedestrians and cyclists to clear the intersection. This delay has a lasting effect on the overall performance of the Metro Transit routes traveling through this area.

Coupled with steep topography from Bascom and Observatory Hills, this intersection creates extremely challenging conditions. The university should take advantage of the steep topography and construct a pedestrian plaza/bridge over the intersection. This separated level would capitalize on existing topography and tie into upper levels of future buildings to be built/ redeveloped in this area. Grade separation would provide a continuous connection for pedestrians from the entrance of Van Vleck to the future building in the southwest corner of the intersection as well as the upper plinth of Van Hise (and any new building on the site) and the sidewalk parallel to Linden Drive connecting west to Human Ecology. Removing pedestrians from the street level will reduce intersection transit delay. Motor vehicles, transit users, and cyclists would travel at the existing street level. By linking into future new and redeveloped buildings at the intersection, the vertical circulation would be made primarily through the buildings. Street access would be provided along the east side of N. Charter Street to and from the grade separated area.

Recommendations

- Build a pedestrian bridge that establishes a new primary pedestrian level connecting from Van Vleck to Van Hise. To be successful, the bridge must feel like the natural choice for students. Using the unique topography, the bridge crossing will be easier than current pathways. Separating a portion of pedestrians from vehicular traffic will alleviate traffic congestion, mitigate multimodal conflicts, and improve pedestrian experience.
- Build an iconic bridge. The bridge will be at the eastern terminus of the Linden "Greater" Mall and therefore is a tremendous opportunity to create an architectural icon. Unlike a particular building that only a small portion of the campus may use, this bridge will be used by a large campus cross section.
- Create a destination through the incorporation of planting and seating. The bridge creates a new opportunity that currently does not exist, to create space that accommodates the traffic flow while providing flex space for people to congregate. The bridge will conceptually extend the Linden Mall up toward Bascom Hill connecting two spaces that were previously divided. The bridge design should be such as not to hinder both anticipated and unanticipated programming.
- Provide an open and airy structure. The bridge should incorporate skylights and openings to provide adequate daylight to travelers below. Lighting should be incorporated for safety and to highlight architectural features.



Figure 4-28 N. Charter Street At Linden Drive Pedestrian Bridge

4. FACILITIES PLAN: PROPOSED CONDITIONS



Figure 4-29 Pedestrian Bridge Over N. Charter Street and Linden Drive

Other Intersections

Additional intersections are identified in Figure 4-30 with blue circles. High volumes of pedestrians and cyclists travel through these intersections and around campus every day, and the comfort and connectivity of their travel should be continuously promoted and improved. Each of these intersections has its own unique challenges caused by intersection geometry. These include motor vehicle speed, volume, and turning movements, intersection visibility, pedestrian and cyclist volumes, and other factors.

Pedestrians and cyclists should be offered a direct, convenient, and highly visible shortest path crossing at these intersections. Non-motorized crossings should be given an adequate signal phase time and intersections with high-volumes of pedestrians and cyclists should include a protected pedestrian-only (and in some cases a bicycle-specific/bicycle-only) signal phase to facilitate crossings.

Other potential improvements to be applied to these intersections include:

- Pedestrian-leading intervals
- Curb extensions/bump-outs
- Median pedestrian refuge islands
- High-visibility continental crosswalks
- Bike boxes
- Green paint demarcating the path of bicycles through the intersection

Gaps in the Campus Walking and Biking Network

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update recommends completing the identified gaps in the campus biking network to intra-campus travel, as well as commuting to and from campus. Figure 4-31 displays the recommended walking and biking connections to address known gaps. This plan recommends the following improvements to the overall connectivity of non-motorized travel:

- Install pedestrian routes through redeveloped area around existing Lot 60 in West Campus.
- Develop off-street shared-use path along the east side of Willow Creek.
- Construct off-street shared-use path along Campus Drive connecting Campus Drive Bike Path to Babcock Drive. This requires the partial or complete removal of the existing Meat Science and Muscle Biology Laboratory that currently encroaches on the railroad right-of-way. This plan proposes redevelopment of this building, which will allow for path extension.
- Install a two way-cycle track on the south-side of University Avenue. This improvement shall only be installed following further study and a robust public involvement process.
- Convert N. Charter Street from W. Dayton Street to Regent Street from one-way to two-way and add on-street bicycle lanes in each direction.
- Install on-street bicycle facilities on N. Mills Street.
- Increase pedestrian connectivity with pedestrian-only walking routes on the West Campus, across the N. Charter Street/Linden Drive intersection, and through the reconfigured central block area south of Linden Drive and west of N. Charter Street.
- Convert N. Brooks Street to a pedestrian mall between W. Dayton Street and W. Johnson Street and pedestrian routes through the redeveloped block bounded by W. Dayton Street, W. Johnson Street, N. Park Street, and N. Mills Street.
- Create grade separation linking the west side of Bascom Hill with Van Hise and the upper sidewalk north of and parallel to Linden Drive.



The City reserves the right to determine street design in the city right-of-way. The concepts shown and discussed in the UW Master Plan are only meant to depict or suggest future design possibilities. There has been no detailed studies/modeling for these concepts.

Figure 4-30 Locations of Recommended Intersection Improvements

Pedestrian-Only Walking Path



Pedestrian-Only Walking Path

Figure 4-31 Recommended Walking and Biking Improvements

right-of-way. The concepts shown and discussed in the UW Master Plan are only meant to depict or suggest future design possibilities. There has been no detailed studies/modeling for these concepts.

4.11 Proposed Transit, Parking, Vehicular Circulation

Motor Vehicle Access and Circulation

Facilitating motor vehicle connectivity to and around campus is essential to the long-term vitality of the campus, particularly as buildings and parking are removed, added, and redeveloped. Thousands of faculty, staff, employees, visitors, freight, and service vehicles travel to and around campus each day. Proposed vacation and addition of streets will require adjustments to current transit operations. All proposed modifications will require further coordination with City of Madison Metro Transit. As shown in Figure 4-32, the following modifications to the road network will promote access and circulation in response to proposed land use changes:

- 1. Vacate parts of Marsh Drive, Willow Drive, and Walnut Street; install a new north-south road from Marsh Drive to Observatory Drive to accommodate planned land uses.
- 2. Vacate Easterday Lane and add an east-west connection across Willow Creek.
- 3. Install new north-south access drive from University Avenue to Linden Drive, west of N. Charter Street.
- 4. Install new east-west parallel access road south of Linden Drive, west of N. Charter Street.
- 5. Install a protected left turn phase for N. Charter Street southbound vehicles turning left on to W. Johnson Street.
- 6. Convert N. Brooks Street from W. Johnson Street to W. Dayton Street, into pedestrian mall/shared emergency drive.
- 7. Convert N. Charter Street from W. Dayton Street to Regent Street, from one-way to two-way and add on-street bicycle lanes in each direction.

Vacate Easterday Lane and Add Willow Creek Crossing

In conjunction with the construction of the expansion of Veterinary Medicine, it is recommended that Easterday Lane between Linden Drive and Observatory Drive be vacated. This street does not serve significant transportation purposes and its vacation enables site and stormwater planning opportunities. Vacation of Easterday Lane creates options for engaging Willow Creek as a functional space. This plan also recommends an extension of Linden Drive across Willow Creek south of and parallel to Observatory Drive. These new connections provide access to the current and proposed veterinary medicine buildings, and provide additional emergency access over Willow Creek in the event other routes become impassable.

Manage Building Development and Added Parking Capacity in the Central Campus

Install New Access Drives

Building and parking additions and reductions are planned in the Central Campus between University Avenue and Linden Drive, and N. Charter Street and Henry Mall. In conjunction with these changes, this plan recommends two access roads to be created:

- Parallel to and west of N. Charter Street between Linden Drive and University Avenue
- From N. Charter Street west into the block, parallel to Linden Drive

These access roads will provide vehicular access from inside the block into the proposed buildings and added parking in this location. The roads also will provide increased fine-grain pedestrian and bicycle connectivity through this area. Pedestrians will be prioritized along with motor vehicles accessing parking and loading docks along these access roads. Cyclists will be encouraged to remain on Linden Drive. Transit routes will remain on Linden Drive and N. Charter Street as this is where peak transit demand is in Central Campus.



Proposed Pedestrian Mall/Emergency Access The City reserves the right to determine street design in the city right-of-way. The concepts shown and discussed in the UW Master Plan are only meant to depict or suggest future design possibilities. There has been no detailed studies/modeling for these concepts.

Figure 4-32 Proposed Road Additions, Vacations, and Conversions

Accommodate Additional Traffic

Additional building square footage and parking capacity in the Central Campus will bring added traffic on N. Charter Street and University Avenue. Much of the traffic from the development in this area will desire to turn left onto W. Johnson Street from southbound N. Charter Street. This plan recommends a short, protected, leading left turn phase from southbound N. Charter Street to eastbound W. Johnson Street. This would be in addition to the current permissive left turn phase. A protected left turn phase will provide additional capacity for turning movements without negatively affecting the intersection of Park Street and W. Johnson Street (the key intersection in the area).

Convert N. Brooks Street from W. Johnson Street to W. Dayton Street into Pedestrian Mall/Shared Emergency Drive

In conjunction with future building redevelopment at this block, this plan recommends converting N. Brooks Street from W. Johnson Street to W. Dayton Street into a pedestrian mall/shared emergency access drive.

Convert N. Charter Street from W. Dayton Street to Regent Street

This plan recommends converting N. Charter Street from W. Dayton Street to Regent Street from a northbound one-way street (with a southbound contraflow bicycle lane and on-street parking) to a two-way with minimum 5-foot bicycle lanes in each direction. This recommendation serves to establish N. Charter Street an attractive multimodal gateway from South Campus and provides a connection through the center of campus all the way to Lake Mendota. These modifications require removal of on-street parking from the east side of N. Charter Street. There is sufficient nearby public street and university parking to make up for removal of parking along N. Charter Street.

Parking Operations and Management

The effective operation and management of parking at UW–Madison is paramount to the long-term success of the university and quality of life on campus. The university strives to continue to be a national leader in parking management, the provision of low parking ratios, and a comprehensive and complementary set of alternative commuter solutions. The university also recognizes the importance of providing available and accessible parking spaces for campus visitors and employees.

Future Parking Needs

Future parking needs were modeled under the planned future campus land use scenario. Approximately 900,000 square feet of new programmable building space is planned for West Campus compared to the existing condition. Additional parking supply is recommended for all campus districts to meet demand. Analysis indicates an overall future campus parking deficit of just 18 faculty/staff parking spaces as a result of the development programmed in the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update. Analysis was used to modify and finalize the proposed land use development and redevelopment build-out scenario.

Recommendations

This plan presents several recommendations for the university to effectively and efficiently provide and manage parking in conjunction with this Master Plan's proposed campus development and redevelopment.

- Continue to be leaders in transportation demand management (TDM) and alternative commuter solutions.
- Maintain parking ratios for faculty and staff. Work to shift UW Hospital employee parking demand off campus.
- Strategically add parking supply in conjunction with planned land use changes to continue to provide enough available and convenient parking to support the university's academic, research, and outreach missions.
- Add approximately 2,000 parking spaces over the next 20-40 years for visitors and provide swing space to accommodate parking phasing and construction.

Where possible, remove surface parking lots and consolidate parking supply into centrally located parking structures to allow for green space and campus development, increase parking efficiency, and improve water quality by reducing the amount of impermeable surfaces on campus.

Recommended Parking Additions and Reductions

This plan recommends the addition of approximately 2,000 parking spaces for visitors and to provide swing space over the next 20-40 years. Additional parking is needed to serve development phasing. New parking needs to be built before current parking lots are taken off line to accommodate the future building projects. In addition to providing construction swing space, the additional parking spaces will serve our campus visitors. Visitor parking demand is typically during off-peak hours. Roadways in West Campus and across campus are sized to meet peak demand levels. No significant traffic impacts on local roads during peak or off-peak periods are anticipated due to the recommended increase in visitor parking supply.

This plan recommends an addition of 6,380 and removal of 4,320 parking spaces, for a net increase of 2,060 parking spaces over the next 20-40 years to accommodate the planned build-out. Recommended parking additions and reductions are depicted in Figure 4-36 and Figure 4-37. Additions and reductions result in the following increases by district:

- West Campus: +689 spaces
- Near West Campus: +81 spaces
- Central Campus: +675 spaces
- South Campus: +615 spaces

Parking spaces will be consistently monitored to assure the campus is not overbuilding its parking supply based on current and future parking demands. With the continual improvements in public transit options and latest technologies in autonomous vehicles, it is clear that transportation to, from, and within campus will continue to evolve.

The parking recommendations have been developed with input from the City of Madison Traffic Engineering and Planning agencies, as well as the Pedestrian, Bike, Motor Vehicle Commission (PBMVC). They recognize that some existing parking lots may be reduced or eliminated with additional parking added in other areas of campus. New additions of parking may affect city streets operation and right-of-way widths required. A transportation impact analysis (TIA), right-of-way improvements, and/or dedications may be required.

Refer to amended MGO 28.097(7)(b) for additional information related to 'Final Building, Structured Parking, and Surface Parking Design Review'.



Facilities

Enhance Supporting and End-of-Trip Bicycle

In addition to physical bicycle infrastructure, ancillary features are important to encouraging and supporting bicycling. Efforts such as providing abundant and well-placed bicycle parking and bicycle sharing options encourage greater

Figure 4-33 Existing Bike Parking Spaces on Campus per Area

Table 4-3 Recommended Parking Reductions

Parking Reductions			
Lot/Location	District	Stall Count	
Lot 3 ³	Central	62	
Lot 13 ³	Central	34	
Lot 17 ²	South	787	
Lot 20 ²	Central	207	
Lot 22 ³	South	65	
Lot 23 ¹	Central	42	
Lot 26 ³	Central	88	
Lot 34 ³	Central	267	
Lot 41 ³	Near West	71	
Lot 43 ³	Near West	56	
Lot 45 ³	South	89	
Lot 50 ³	South	176	
Lot 51 ³	South	33	
Lot 54 ³	South	16	
Lot 56 ³	South	43	
Lot 60 ³	West	1,311	
Lot 62 ³	Near West	417	
Lot 79 ³	West	244	
Lot 81 ³	South	81	
Lot 85 ³	West	36	
Lot 91 ³	South	160	
Lot 92 ³	South	28	
Lot 114 ³	South	7	
Total		4,320	

Table 4-4 Recommended Parking Additions

Parking Additions			
Lot/Location	District	Stall Count	
Humanities (N-11B) ¹	Central	450	
Lot 75 (W-02) ²	West	780	
Linden Block (N-06B) ¹	Central	550	
Engineering (S-27) ²	South	1,050	
Vet Med (W-27) ²	Near West	625	
Nursing/Pharmacy (W-09A) ²	West	1,500	
Mills and Spring (S-10A) ²	South	400	
Grainger South (S-13) ¹	South	350	
Art Lofts (S-16A) ¹	South	300	
Lot 20 (N-05C) ²	375		
	1		
Total		6,380	
Net Increase		2,060	

Notes:

- ^{1.} Structured below grade/under building parking facility.
- ^{2.} Structured above grade parking facility.
- ^{3.} Surface parking facility.



Figure 4-34 Recommended Parking Reductions



Figure 4-35 Recommended Parking Additions

1. Refer to MGO Section 28.097(7)(b)

2. Portions of this graphic (primarily in south campus) are currently not owned by the Board of Regents or university affiliates.



5.1 Project Phasing

In order for a master plan to be successful, it must be appropriately phased and implemented over time. To assist with this process, the following initial draft phasing breakdown has been developed. Note that the proposed project opportunities listed are not a definitive comprehensive list of projects in any priority order and in no way suggests that these projects will be approved as part of the standard capital budget process with the State of Wisconsin. Each project will need to be reviewed and prioritized within the context of the 6-year capital plan and within a 2-year biennial capital budget. Projects are strictly initiated first by programmatic need and second by funding availability. Some projects may move between phases as funding becomes available. Some may move more quickly and others may move more slowly.

Tables 5-1 through 5-4 list building projects. See the following supporting master plans for descriptions of other recommended projects:

- Landscape Master Plan
- Green Infrastructure & Stormwater Management Master Plan
- Long Range Transportation Plan
- Utility Master Plan

Parking structures (above and below ground) are not included in building space subtotals.

As a component of the City of Madison Campus Institutional District zoning approval process, two exhibits have been provided at the end of this section denoting buildings which are anticipated for removal and addition within the 10-year life of this master plan. These two exhibits are our current best guess in terms of development and may adjust based on school/department/division program need, funding, and land acquisition.

Per MGO 48025 Section 28.185, demolition of buildings identified in the approved C-I District master plan shall be exempt from Plan Commission approval and the need to seek demolition approvals for those identified buildings. However, projects that involve historic buildings and/or structures, even if they are not landmarks, must be reviewed by the Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS).

Table 5-1 Phase 1 – 2017 to 2023 Near Term Improvements

	ID	Name	GSF
West	0122	Greenhouse-Walnut Street	47,00
	0091	Linden Drive 1645	3,21
Near West	0119	Seeds Building	17,74
	0129	University Avenue 1610	24,58
	0031	Gymnasium-Natatorium	249,57
	0103	Linden Drive 1910	11,26
South	0028	Southeast Recreational Facility	191,25
	1095	Monroe Street 1433	12,51
	0578	Davis Residence Hall, Susan B	11,96
	0577	Bayliss Co-Op, Zoe	11,60
	0788	Brooks Street N 209	5,36
	1082	Bernard Court 206	3,73
	1060	Brooks Street N 215-217	3,73
Total Buildir	g Space F	Removed	593,56



CAMPUS INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT MASTER PLAN - Effective January 1, 2019 175

Proposed Construction			
	ID	Name	GSF
West	W-12	Walnut Greenhouse II*	24,000
	W-16	Gymnasium-Natatorium Replacement	470,900
Near West	W-17	Veterinary Medicine Expansion	138,91
	W-18	Meat Science and Muscle Biology Lab*	228,00
	W-25	Babcock Hall Center for Dairy Research Addition*	31,30
Central	N-13B	Hamel Music Center P1&2*	135,00
	N-14	Ingraham Hall Additions	56,00
South	NS	Academic/Research (Johnson/Park)	348,00
	S-18	Police Addition*	24,84
	NS	College of Engineering Research Building	156,36
	S-29	Chemistry Building Expansion*	173,16
	S-30	Officer Education Facility*	65,00
	S-31	Southeast Recreational Facility*	253,00
Total Buildi	ng Space	Gained	2,104,48
	W-02	Parking Structure (Hospital Ramp Addition)*	323,90
	W-27	Parking Structure (Lot 62 Site)*	198,00
	NS	Parking Structure	129,60
Parking Spa	aces Prop	osed (Does not include those coming off-line)	751 Space

Table 5-1 Phase 1 – 2017 to 2023 Near Term Improvements, continued

NS - Not shown graphically

Phase 1 – 2017 to 2023 Near Term Improvements

Total Building Space Removed	593,565
Total Building Space Gained	2,104,484
Phase 1 Total Net Change	1,510,919



Proposed Ren	noval		
	ID	Name	GSF
Near West	0116	Schuman Shelter, Carl	960
Central	0476	Stovall Building, William D-Hygiene Lab	80,939
South	0470	Psychology Building, Brogden	115,07
	0486	Engineering Drive 1410	63,56
	0530	Service Building	51,060
	0534	Service Building Annex	38,350
Total Building Space Removed		349,95	

Table 5-2 Phase 2 – 2023 to 2029 Mid-Term Improvements



Table 5-2 Phase 2 – 2023 to 2029 Mid-Term Improvements (continued)

Proposed Construction			
	ID	Name	GSF
Far West	W-29	Preserve Outreach Center	8,700
West	W-28	Nielsen Tennis Stadium Expansion	47,075
South	S-02	Engineering Drive 1410 – Replacement	169,091
Total Building Space Gained		224,866	
Parking Spaces Proposed		0 Spaces	

Phase 2 – 2023 to 2029 Mid-Term Improvements

Total Building Space Removed	349,953
Total Building Space Gained	224,866
Phase 2 Total Net Change	(125,087)


Proposed Rem			
	ID	Name	GSF
Near West	0110	Poultry Research Laboratory	24,013
	0115	Livestock Laboratory	35,267
Central	0500	Extension Building	76,318
	0452	Bradley Memorial Building	20,598
	0455	Middleton Building, William S	45,217
	0469	Humanities Building, Mosse, George L	333,363
	0451A	Service Memorial Institute	122,474
	0451B	Bardeen Medical Laboratories	69,344
	0451C	Medical Sciences	72,499
	0468	McArdle Building	96,657
South	0762	Engineering Research Building	157,510
	0158	Rust, Henry & Schreiner, David Hall	21,142
	0035	Meiklejohn House	5,955
Total Building	Total Building Space Removed		

Table 5-3 Phase 3 – 2029 to 2035 Long Term Improvements



	ID	Name	GSF
Near West	W-20	Poultry & Livestock Lab Building	52,96
	W-01	Wisconsin Institutes for Medical Research Phase 3	308,00
Central	N-04	Academic/Research (Stovall Site)	82,20
	N-06A	Academic/Research (SMI Bardeen Med Sciences site)	144,00
	N-11A	Academic/Research (Mosse site north)	84,00
	N-12A	Academic/Research (Mosse site south)	135,00
	N-13C	Music Phase 3	75,00
South	S-01	Engineering Research Building Replacement	271,66
	S-03B	Wisconsin Institute for Discovery, Phase 2	392,00
	S-08A	Academic/Research	22,00
	NS	Academic/Research (Meiklejohn Site)	84,47
Total Bu	ilding Spa	ace Gained	1,651,30
	N-05C	Parking Structure (Lot 20 Site)	144,00
	N-06B	Parking Structure (Under N-06A/B)	194,40
	N-11B	Parking Structure (Under N-11A and N-12A)	162,00
Parking	Stalls Pro	posed (Does not include those coming off-line)	1,375 Space

Table 5-3 Phase 3 – 2029 to 2035 Long Term Improvements, continued

NS - Not shown graphically

Phase 3 – 2029 to 2035 Long Term Improvements

Total Building Space Removed	1,080,357
Total Building Space Gained	1,605,302
Phase 3 Total Net Change	570,945



Table 5-4 Phase 4 – 2035+ Future Capacity

Propose	Proposed Removal			
	ID	Name	GSF	
West	0045	Biotron Laboratory	106,907	
	0089	Barley and Malt Lab	16,900	
	0108	Herrick Drive 505	1,139	
	0109	Herrick Drive 509	2,048	
	0125	Physical Plant-Grounds Storage	2,560	
	0128	Linden Drive 2115	8,756	
	0173	McClimon Track Ticket Booth	60	
	0222	Herrick Drive 525 – Electrical Storage	3,630	
	0223	Physical Plant-Grounds Storage 2	480	
	0465	Linden Drive 2105	1,860	
	1020	McClimon Track Shelter-South	120	
	1021	McClimon Track Shelter-North	120	
	1022	McClimon Track Restrooms	-	
	1023	McClimon Track Concession Stand	-	
	1024	McClimon Track Storage	-	
Near West	0094	Biomedical Sciences Laboratories, Hanson, Robert P	43,519	
	0099	Agricultural Engineering Laboratory	32,654	
	0123	Meat Science and Muscle Biology Lab	30,190	

Proposed	Proposed Removal			
	ID	Name	GSF	
Central	0074A	King Hall (Greenhouse Only)	21,478	
	0102	Henry Mall 445	54,750	
	0449	Nutritional Sciences	56,502	
	0453	School of Social Work Building	41,344	
	0482	Van Hise Hall	226,940	
South	0408	Engineering Hall	464,768	
	0402	Noland Zoology Building, Lowell E	92,818	
	0404	Wendt Commons, Kurt F	74,459	
	0401	Zoology Research Building	44,256	
	0527	Harlow Primate Lab	36,944	
	0526	Primate Center, Wisconsin	31,606	
	0504	Charter St N 45	22,110	
Total Building Space Removed			1,418,918	



Table 5-4 Phase 4 – 2035+ Future Capacity, continued

Propose	d Constru	iction	
	ID	Name	GSF
West	W-04A	Health Sciences Expansion	60,500
	W-05	McClimon Track/Soccer Grandstand	78,000
	W-06	Social/Dining/Meeting Rooms/Health Sciences	126,800
	W-07	Health Sciences Research	121,938
	W-08	Cooper Hall Addition	30,000
	W-09B	Health Sciences Research	233,250
	W-09C	Health Sciences Research	231,000
	W-11	WARF Addition	192,000
	W-13	Health Sciences Research	164,185
	W-30	Grounds Storage A – Controlled Temp	3,000
	W-31	Grounds Storage B – Covered	-
	W-32	Grounds Greenhouse	6,000
	W-33	Grounds Storage C – Salt	3,500
	W-34	Grounds Office/Administration	3,000
Near West	W-19	Biological Systems Engineering	246,000
	W-22	Animal Sciences (AHABS)	85,000
	W-24	Plant Sciences	100,000
Central	N-03A	Academic/Research (Van Hise site)	114,000
	N-03B	Academic/Research (Van Hise site)	48,000
	N-05A	Academic/Research (Nutritional Sciences site)	180,000
	N-05B	Academic/Research (Middleton site)	165,000
	N-07	Academic/Research (445 Henry site)	30,000
	N-15	King Hall Greenhouse	7,500

Proposed Construction			
	ID	Name	GSF
South	S-07	Zoology Research and Noland Hall	419,888
	NS	Weeks Hall Addition	5,000
	NS	Academic/Research (Spring St)	150,000
	S-09A	Primate Center & Harlow Expansion	48,822
	S-09C	Primate Center & Harlow Expansion	60,000
	S-09D	Primate Center & Harlow Expansion	96,000
	S-11A	Academic/Research (Lot 45 Site)	30,000
	S-16A	Art Building	162,000
	S-20	Fluno Addition	43,200
	S-22	University Research Park (Lorch St)	34,000
	S-23	New Engineering	204,000
	S-24	New Engineering	236,583
	S-25	New Engineering	274,986
	NS	New Engineering	169,506
Total Bu	uilding Spa	ace Gained	5,269,058
	W-09A	Parking Structure	504,000
	NS	Parking Structure (Physical Plant)	148,800
	S-16C	Parking Structure	108,000
	NS	Parking Structure (Engineering)	345,600
Parking	Spaces Pr	3,250 Spaces	

NS - Not shown graphically

Phase 4 – 2035+ Future Capacity

Total Building Space Removed	1,418,918
Total Building Space Gained	4,162,658
Phase 4 Total Net Change	2,743,740





Figure 5-9 All Phases Proposed Facility Removal



Figure 5-10 All Phases Proposed Facility Construction



Figure 5-11 2017-2027 Proposed Building Removals



Figure 5-12 2017-2027 Proposed Building Additions

6. DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS



6.1 UW-Madison Design Review Board

Per Madison General Ordinances (MGO 28.097(7)) referenced below and, via the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update approved by the city of Madison, UW-Madison is required to have an architectural review committee to review and approve all major capital building projects within the approved Campus-Institutional (C-I) Zoning District on campus.

Madison General Ordinance 28.097(7)

It is expected that Campus Master Plans will identify building location and maximum height, but will not include detailed designs of each building. All buildings constructed within a CI district must be reviewed and approved by an architectural review committee. The committee shall be established by the institution and shall meet the following standards:

- a) The building design review standards and guidelines, review procedures, categories of membership, and the language of any deed or plat restriction must be approved by the Urban Design Commission.
- b) Membership on the committee, including representation of planning staff and registered neighborhoods, and committee procedures must be approved by the Plan Commission. Committee meetings shall be public.
- c) Until an architectural review committee is established and approved by the Plan Commission, all building and site plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Commission, with an appeal process to the Plan Commission as established in MGO Section 33.24.

Glossary of Terminology

AE = architect/engineer, landscape architect, etc. design team

AVC = UW-Madison Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Planning & Management

C-I, CI = City of Madison "Campus-Institutional" Zoning, per MGO 29.097

CPC = UW-Madison Campus Planning Committee

DRB = UW-Madison Design Review Board (or the Board)

FP&M = UW-Madison Facilities Planning & Management

JWCAC/JSECAC = Joint West/Joint South East Campus Area Committee

MGO = Madison General Ordinances

UDC = City of Madison Urban Design Commission

Committee/Board Charge

The UW-Madison architectural review committee shall be known as the "UW-Madison Design Review Board" (aka "the Board", "the DRB"). The Board is established to review the architectural and site design for all new buildings, building additions, landscape designs, or studies for major physical change on the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus as defined in the most recent, City of Madison approved, Campus Master Plan.

Purpose & Focus

The Design Review Board will review all projects with a focus on:

- Compliance with the current approved Campus Master Plan including building height, mass, scale, setbacks, step-backs and green infrastructure/stormwater management.
- Design quality of public open spaces and landscape architecture, building architectural form and exterior building appearance, as well as primary interior public spaces.
- The relationship between the building and its public interior spaces to the larger campus context including pedestrian and vehicular circulation pattern and open space systems.
- Compliance with approved campus design guidelines.
- Compliance with design modifications recommended by the university and its representatives.
- Compliance with previously approved studies and local neighborhood plans.

DRB Member Composition & Appointment Process

The DRB membership categories are approved by the City of Madison Plan Commission as part of the overall Campus Master Plan Campus-Institutional zoning district approval process, which occurs every 10 years. Specific membership appointments are coordinated by the DRB chair in consultation with the Director of the City of Madison Planning Department and approved by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning & Management. The ideal DRB member will have a background in facilities planning & design and/or campus planning; or will have previously served on a Joint Campus Area Committee with respect to neighborhood appointments.

Membership terms will be for 3-years, starting on a staggered basis. All members may be nominated for a second, 3-year term but shall not serve more than six consecutive years on the Board. In the event that a member of the DRB leaves the Board prior to the end of their term, the DRB chair, in consultation with the AVC for FP&M and the City Planning Director, will appoint a replacement member to serve out the final term of the departing member.



Figure 6-1 Design Review Board Meeting

Categories of Membership

The membership of the Board shall consist of the following categories:

- 1. UW-Madison University Architect or Assoc. Vice Chancellor FP&M designee (chair)
- 2. UW-Madison University Landscape Architect or Assoc. Vice Chancellor FP&M designee
- 3. Private, national-firm Registered Architect as designated by UW FP&M
- 4. Private, national-firm Registered Landscape Architect as designated by UW FP&M
- 5. City of Madison Planning Director or designee
- 6. City of Madison Urban Design Commission member (as designated by the chair of the UDC)
- 7. Joint Campus Area Committee Representative from a registered City of Madison Neighborhood Association (one rotating position based on project location) as designated by the joint area committee impacted (Joint West or Joint Southeast)
- 8. City of Madison Alder (based on project location, ad-hoc, non-voting)
- 9. Registered Neighborhood Association Rep. (based on project location, ad-hoc, non-voting)
- 10. UW-Madison Project Sponsor (one rotating position per project; ad-hoc, non-voting)
- 11. UW Campus Planning Committee Representative (designated by the CPC; ad hoc, non-voting)

Types of projects to be reviewed by the DRB

The following is a list of project types that are to be reviewed by the Design Review Board. This is not an exhaustive list and any questions regarding the need for review or the number of times a project is to be reviewed is at the discretion of the DRB chair and/or the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning & Management.

Projects within the C-I zoning district requiring DRB approval include:

• New buildings, building additions and/or major changes to existing buildings or campus landscapes that modify the exterior of the building(s) or site(s).

NOTE: Projects outside the C-I zoning district will also be reviewed by the DRB with recommendations being made to the City of Madison Plan Commission and/or the Urban Design Commission as required by city ordinances.

Projects that would be beneficial to have DRB input include:

- The Campus Master Plan and any significant updates or changes to the Plan.
- Facilities Master Plans for colleges, schools, departments or major units of the university.
- New public open spaces, landscapes, gathering places or landscape architectural designs.

Project types that typically would not need DRB Review, unless requested **by the DRB chair, include:**

- Utility projects (unless they include significant site restoration upgrades or changes)
- Maintenance activities on existing buildings (unless they include significant exterior changes)
- Maintenance activities on existing campus landscapes or major landscape planting renovations.
- Interior design modifications (unless part of a major public interior space).

- Small landscape design projects that do not impact the overall character of the site or campus design neighborhood (bus stops, benches, picnic tables/chairs, site lighting upgrades, etc.).
- "Minor alternations" to existing zoning approved uses, as defined by the City of Madison ordinance, (unless they include significant impacts to the exterior of buildings or landscapes as defined by the DRB chair). "Minor alternations" on campus, either in or outside the C-I district, follow the City of Madison zoning review process for minor alterations.

Definitions Related to Reviewable Projects:

New Building(s)

- Projects with a total project cost of over \$300,000.
- Projects under \$300,000 if determined by the DRB chair to be reviewable.
- Projects over 4,000 GSF. (Projects <4,000 GSF typically do not require zoning review but may require a minor alternation through the city.)
- Projects within a defined campus historic district.

Building Addition(s) and Major Changes to an Existing Building(s)

- Projects over 4,000 GSF.
- A building addition within a defined campus historic district.
- A building addition or modification as part of an existing historic structure.
- Projects that include over 10,000 SF of exterior site disturbance.
- An addition to an entry or prominent visual side of a building.
- Departure from existing cladding and/or material use on the exterior of a building.
- Addition impedes on an area reserved for development in the approved Campus Master Plan.

Landscape Design and Major Changes to an Existing Site/Landscape

- Alterations in a defined campus historic district or to an historic landscape.
- Alternations to a highly visible corridor, lawn, quadrangle or courtyard.
- Over 10,000 SF of exterior site disturbance.
- Significant site restoration work related to utility projects that disturb over 10,000 SF.

Review Coordination

The designated UW-Madison project manager is responsible for facilitating the design review process for their project, working in coordination with the DRB chair and staff. The DRB staff provides information on DRB policies and procedures to the project manager for distribution to the project team. Once a project is identified as subject to review by the DRB, an outline of the proposed project scope, location, programmatic intent, and project schedule will be provided to the DRB staff by the FP&M project manager.

Meeting Notices and Agenda Posting

All meeting notices, agendas and prior meeting minutes are to be distributed to the DRB members at least one week in advance of the meeting date. All same information are to be posted the FP&M website. All meetings are to be publically noticed by posting on the UW-Madison Events Calendar.



Figure 6-2a Observatory Hill Area of Campus

Quantity & Timing of DRB Meetings

- Projects are reviewed once during the feasibility or planning study phase for adherence to the Campus Master Plan, and at least three times during each of the subsequent design development phases, namely pre-design/programming, schematic design, and design development.
- Some projects may require more or less than three design reviews based on the advice of the DRB and recommendations by FP&M staff.
- District, college/school, departmental, or program master plans will be reviewed once by the DRB during the final draft stage of the planning process, unless the DRB chair, its members, or the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning & Management requests additional meetings. This review is to focus on compliance with overall Campus Master Plan and to set the stage for the DRB on upcoming projects they will review as facility master plans are implemented.

Coordination with the Joint Campus Area Committee(s)

Per the City of Madison approved C-I district Campus Master Plan, all major capital improvement projects will be presented to the Joint Campus Area Committee(s) throughout the planning and design process to gather input from stakeholder groups and neighborhood constituents. All projects are then to be presented for final review and an advisory recommendation to the UW-Madison Design Review Board. Final review meetings by the Joint Campus Area Committee(s) shall be publically noticed per City of Madison standards.

Meeting Format

Each review session on each project or plan will last for 60 minutes per the following format. At the discretion of the DRB chair, a project may be allotted more or less time on the agenda depending on the scope of the review.

The following format should serve as a guide for each review meeting agenda.

- First 20 minutes: the design team presents an overview of the project to the Board. See below for a description of materials and key discussion points for each review.
- Next 30 minutes: design discussion between the Board and the design team, including questions and follow-up items for clarification.
- Next 5 minutes: the DRB chair will take public comment for those interested in speaking on the project that are not represented on the DRB.
- Final 5 minutes: the DRB chair summarizes the discussion and key points for direction to the design team as the project proceeds and what the DRB would like to see when the team returns (if necessary) for further review.

Meeting Materials & Items for Review

Feasibility, Fundraising or Planning Studies

When an initial feasibility study, concept design for fundraising, or an initial planning study is completed, the project will be reviewed by the DRB at least once during the final draft planning stage, or as directed by the DRB chair or by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning & Management.

Materials provided by the design team for this review include:

- Map or aerial photo of general campus area with the project site clearly indicated.
- Site context plan(s) showing vicinity of at least one block in each direction around the project site to show general site context.
- Photos of existing building exteriors on the project site and adjacent to the project area.
- Copy of the approved Campus Master Plan for the project site area to show relationship of proposed project to the Campus Master Plan indicating any areas of concern or non-conformance.
- General site analysis information about the existing site including pedestrian/vehicular/service access and major utility conflicts/potential upgrades (if known).
- If project concept design includes renderings or suggested building materials, include those for initial review and comment by the DRB with the understanding that the final design and materials for the actual project will come later in the design review process.



Figure 6-2b Willow Creek Area of Campus

Pre-Design Phase

The pre-design review may take place during programming or earlier, but is likely to occur before any drawing has been done. Materials to be provided by the design team for this review include:

- Map or aerial photo of general campus area with the project site clearly indicated.
- Site context plan(s) showing vicinity of at least one block in each direction, with entry or grade level plans of each adjacent building. Plans should include existing grades as well as location of existing roads, walks, landscape elements, etc.
- Design and development guideline graphics and text from appropriate planning studies.
- Photos of existing building exteriors on the project site and adjacent to the project area.

Many of the above elements required to generate these materials are available from various University departments. The FP&M project manager will provide contacts for this information to the AE teams.

Key discussion points at this phase of review may include, but are not limited to:

- Analysis of existing Campus Master Plan documents, including other planning studies for the area in which the project is located, and discussion regarding conformance to the approved plan.
- Analysis of existing vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns in the area.
- Analysis of existing bicycle parking in the area.
- Analysis of architectural context, including scale, detail and materials of existing adjacent buildings. AE teams should reference the appropriate Campus Design Neighborhood design guidelines found in the Campus Design Guide.
- Discussion of potential relationships between site and adjacent and campus-wide open space systems, including green infrastructure/ stormwater management practices.
- Discussion of program opportunities such as:
 - Location and organization of major interior public spaces.
 - Program elements which should, or could, benefit from a relationship to exterior spaces.
 - Possible or desired main and secondary entrance locations.

Schematic Design Phase

The schematic design review will focus on the building's relationship to its site, its massing and scale, and its contextual relationships. Materials provided by the design team for this review include:

- Three-dimensional massing studies (physical model or 3D drawing/ rendering/model) of the proposed building, shown in context with adjacent building structures and open spaces.
- Conceptual site plan showing site layout, existing and proposed grading, hard surfaces, and site circulation for pedestrian, vehicles and services access.
- Conceptual floor plans showing relationship between programmed spaces, particularly entrances, lobbies, general assignment classrooms and other shared-use or public spaces.
- Proposed entry or ground level floor plans of adjacent buildings to show relationship to main public entrances and public-use spaces.
- Conceptual elevations, showing overall height and relationship and proportion of materials or type of material (i.e. glass/void vs. solid brick/ stone/precast/metal, etc.), as well as location and proportions of windows, doors and other openings.

Key discussion points at this phase of review may include, but are not limited to:

- Review of recommendations from previous DRB reviews and whether these have been addressed successfully or not.
- Massing and scale of building in relationship to surrounding structures and open space and the Campus Master Plan design guidelines.
- Landscape architectural concept plan planted area versus hard surfaces, relationship of site design and organization to larger campus systems (pedestrian, vehicular and service circulation and open spaces, etc.).
- Relationship of major public and shared interior spaces to building site and landscape architectural concept plan and larger context, such as location of entries with respect to adjacent buildings and campus pedestrian/vehicular circulation systems.
- Understanding of the proposed green infrastructure/stormwater management systems to meet campus goals as defined in the current comprehensive stormwater management plan.
- Relationship of public vs. private zones of building, and of such zone to the surrounding site and buildings.
- Scale and vertical relationship of major public or shared interior spaces.
- Preliminary types and mix of building materials, if known.

Design Development Phase

Design development review will focus on refinements of the schematic design, especially proposed building and site design materials selection and ideas for detailing. Material selections need not be final, and may include presentation of options and alternatives.

Materials provided by the design team for this review include:

- Three-dimensional studies (physical model or 3D drawing/rendering/model) of proposed building, showing refinements of massing and scale concepts, and indicating material and color suggestions.
- Developed landscape plan indicating character of all outdoor spaces, including topography, plant material suggestions, hard surfaces material suggestions, and photographs or drawings of suggested site furnishings and amenities.
- Floor plans showing refinement of relationship between programmed spaces, particularly entrances, lobbies, general assignment classroom and other shared or public spaces.
- Proposed entry or ground level plan shown in site context plan with landscape design, and entry or ground level floor plans of adjacent buildings.
- Building sections showing scale and vertical relationship of spaces.
- Elevations, showing material suggestions and preliminary detailing ideas, as well as location and proportions of windows, doors and other openings.
- Material samples for building exterior and site.

Key discussion points at this phase of review may include, but are limited to:

- Review of recommendations from previous DRB reviews and whether these have been addressed successfully or not.
- Continued discussion of massing and scale of building.
- Landscape architectural design including overall character of space, plant material suggestions, hard scape materials and site furnishings, and continued discussion of relationship of site design and organization to larger campus open space systems.
- Continued discussion of green infrastructure and stormwater management systems to meet the university's green infrastructure goals.
- Continued discussion of relationship of the proposed building and site design to the surrounding site and buildings, including scale and vertical (height) relationships.
- Continued discussion of relationships of proposed major public or shared interior spaces.
- Selection, use and mix of building and site materials and preliminary detailing.

Further Review

On occasion, the DRB may require more than three reviews of a project. In this case, every effort will be made to expedite the review process including holding "in-town/local" DRB members meetings or hold a web-based teleconference to include the out-of-town members to meet any specific time restraints of the project design and approval process.

Reasons why an additional review may be necessary include:

- Design team did not provide adequate materials or was not prepared to discuss key design elements identified at one of the previous reviews.
- Significant changes in the scope or design of a project after the final review has been completed.
- Mutual agreement by all stakeholders that additional review is necessary and desired.
- Determination by the DRB chair that additional review is needed.

Documentation and Follow-up

- The DRB staff will be responsible for recording and distributing the minutes following internal FP&M staff review.
- FP&M staff will strive to provide the design team with written draft minutes of the meeting, summarizing key recommendations of the Design Review Board, within one week after the meeting.
- Comments or questions on the draft minutes should be sent to the DRB staff prior to the next regularly scheduled DRB meeting where the prior meeting minutes will be reviewed and approved.

Committee Process and Process for resolving disagreements and appealing decisions

- For the purposes of holding meetings of the DRB, quorum will be considered one over 50% of the voting members of the Board, (i.e. four members constitutes a quorum for action on any project being reviewed). Ad hock, non-voting members do not count towards quorum but are highly encouraged to participate fully in all DRB meetings and provide comment during the review process.
- It is the goal of the university and FP&M staff that the DRB meeting will be run by a consensus approval process. The DRB chair will determine if a consensus has been reached or if further discussions is needed, or a further review meeting is needed to gain consensus.

202 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

- If consensus is not reached, and the DRB chair determines that a vote of the Board is needed, the chair will use Robert's Rules of Order to ask for a motion/second from the floor. Voting members can make and second motions. Discussion from the floor on the motion may include the ad hoc, non-voting members of the Board. Once a motion passes, that decision is the final. Per Robert's Rules, the chair will only vote in the event of a tie.
- Per MGO. 28.097(9), final decisions of the Board may be appealed by the applicant or the alder to the City of Madison Plan Commission within ten days of the decision by the Board. A public hearing will be scheduled to take public input on the request. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Plan Commission may, by simple majority vote, affirm, reverse or modify the decision of the Board.
- If, as the result of an appeal, the DRB finds that design guidelines or criteria need to be revised, such revisions shall be recommended for consideration to the DRB chair, FP&M staff and/or the Campus Planning Committee for review by the City of Madison Planning Director. Per MGO 28.097(10), significant changes to the Campus Master Plan and or the approved Design Guidelines, may also need further review by the City of Madison Planning staff, Plan Commission and/or the Urban Design Commission for review and approval.

Meeting Scheduling, Timing, and Deadlines

Generally, the UW-Madison Campus Design Review Board will meet 6 times a year, with regular meeting dates defined for each month to allow for maximum scheduling flexibility. At times, there may be a fewer number of projects that need review and therefore the DRB may not need to meet every month. Currently, the third Tuesday of each month is set aside for DRB meetings, with a 14 calendar-day cancellation notice if there are no projects for review in any given month.

- If a project must be reviewed before the next scheduled DRB meeting, a special meeting may be convened at the call of the DRB chair. Such special meetings may be via webcast.
- The Design Review Board staff is responsible for collecting and distributing materials to the members at minimum of one week (seven calendar days), prior to the scheduled meeting date.

- The FP&M project manager is responsible for obtaining materials from the AE design team, and providing them to the DRB staff no later than 14 calendar days before the DRB to insure FP&M staff can review the presentation materials and provide guidance.
- Digital copies of the materials for the meeting shall be provided to the DRB staff based on the recommended meeting materials defined above. All copies should either be able to be printed on a standard 8.5"x11" sheet or a maximum sheet size of 11"x17".
- Materials submitted in advance as a preview, prior to the DRB meeting date, should include reduced versions of the information for the review as outlined above and include any key discussion points previously requested by the DRB.
- All materials provided to the DRB staff and presented at the DRB meetings shall be delivered to the FP&M project manager by the AE team(s) in a digital PDF format.

Reporting of Actions, Annual Report Requirements

Formal actions by the Board are recorded in the official meeting minutes of the Board and posted on the FP&M website for public use and review. By February 15 of each year, staff of the DRB and the DRB chair, shall prepare and submit an annual report of activities to the AVC of Facilities Planning & Management and to the Director of the City of Madison Planning Department. These reports may be shared with the UW-Madison Campus Planning Committee, the surrounding neighborhoods, the City of Madison Plan Commission and in other public venues.

7. CAMPUS DESIGN GUIDELINES & STANDARDS

7.1 Campus Master Plan Graphic

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update provides a framework for open space, circulation, land use relationships, and building placement. To achieve campus objectives, the master plan is envisioned as a flexible framework of land uses, open spaces, and infrastructure. Campus design guidelines ensure each major and minor campus decision is in support of the university's long-term mission, vision, and values. Implementation recommendations create an ambitious yet reasonable action plan.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan Update is not intended to be so constraining and prescriptive as to stifle creativity, analysis, and judgment. The plan and its graphics are not specific building or site designs and they should not predict design solutions. The design standards within this master plan allow flexibility and imagination while ensuring consistent, sustainable, and quality implementation. It is a baseline that guides project designers while allowing and encouraging creativity.

However, the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update should not be interpreted so loosely as to permit entirely different initiatives and conceptual directions. The goal is to achieve a balance between the 2015 Campus Master Plan Update and the mutual decisions that must be reached throughout each project's development process. The skillful use of this master plan by university planners, designers, reviewing agencies, and facility managers will result in a functional, memorable, and sustainable campus.

NOTE: UW-Madison Campus Master Plan graphic indicates development on parcels currenlty not owned by the Board of Regents or university affiliates. Refer to Section 4 for proposed developments specific to C-I District zoning.





7.2 Building Principles & Guidelines Summary

Design Principles

Promote Intellectual and Social Exchange

- Create spaces that increase the opportunity for chance encounters.
- Create spaces that promote collaboration in teaching, learning and research
- Ensure that campus spaces provide opportunity for a variety of activities and functions to accommodate all users.
- Design places to draw people in and make them stay once in the place.
- Strengthen existing civic spaces and create new ones inside and out.

Enhance Sense of Place

- Strengthen the identity of the campus.
- Strengthen the UW-Madison brand and image.
- Draw the essence of the lake into the rest of campus.
- Strengthen the visual unity and coherence of the campus.
- Create a rich composition of campus landscape and buildings.
- Strive for balance in the composition of campus landscape and buildings.

Promote stewardship of physical campus

- Preserve and restore significant historic landscapes and buildings
- Design with adaptability in mind to address current needs and plan for the future.
- Address deferred maintenance.
- Match building use to building type when considering adaptive reuse and renovation.

Promote Environmental Sustainability

- Design with life-cycle cost considerations in mind.
- Conserve and steward university resources.
- Set sustainable design goals for every project from the outset.
- Promote environmental awareness through design and construction.

Promote Health and Wellness

- Encourage walking and biking by design.
- Create inviting and universally accessible campus places.
- Design in a manner that would encourage users to take responsibility for the quality of the air, water and land on campus.

Site Selection

The campus has a clear existing building use pattern and the 2015 Campus Master Plan strengthens and extends that pattern. Once a project is identified, a specific site will then be selected within the parameters set by the Campus Master Plan. Site selection is undertaken during the scoping/feasibility study or the pre-design phase by looking at advantages and disadvantages of available sites with respect to the specific program needs and the future needs of the campus.

In making a site selection, consideration should be given to:

- Options that are compatible with the Campus Master Plan.
- Capacity of site to accommodate future expansion.
- Options that promote environmental sustainability.
- Functional relationships between programs in the neighborhood.
- Minimizing site development costs.
- Site accessibility, visibility and image appropriate for the intended use.
- Aesthetic character that is appropriate for the context and neighborhood.
- Options that preserve or enhance existing open spaces and significant view corridors.



Universal Design

"Universal design is an approach to the design of all products and environments to be as usable as possible by as many people as possible regardless of age, ability or situation."

It is the intent of this guide that all buildings and campus places be physically barrier-free or inclusive. While our technical guidelines adopt the most restrictive provisions of ADAAG and ANSI standards, this guide considers those as minimum standards. The universal design approach goes beyond these standards. No user should receive negative special treatment. The accessible features of all buildings and campus places should be well integrated with the design aesthetically and functionally such that all users are equally accommodated in the same manner. For example, accessible ramps that are not integrated with primary entries, could be substituted with gently sloping sidewalks that bring all users to the same place at building entrances, eliminating the need for stairs or expensive switchback ramps.

The strong message here, is that designers must consciously and actively strive to create buildings and campus landscapes that are inclusively accessible to all, (emotionally, socially, physically, and psychologically).



Sustainable SITES Initiative



Sustainability

UW-Madison is committed to renovating and constructing buildings and landscapes that aid in the success of its students and staff, and are sustainable for years to come. In order to benchmark these practices, the university is pursuing a minimum of LEED Silver certification on its new and renovated facilities. Also, all projects should use the Sustainable SITES Initiative as a guideline for all future development. This initiative along with others, continues to transform UW-Madison's campus to meet the needs of development today, without compromising the needs of future generations. The UW-Madison adheres to the Wisconsin State Building Commission Sustainable Facilities Policy as outlined below:

Purpose

It is the policy of the State Building Commission to be a leader in improving the overall quality and performance of state facilities and to minimize the total cost of occupancy. The Building Commission adopts this Policy to promote the planning, improvement, and management of state facilities in a sustainable manner that:

- Promote the effective use of existing state space;
- Respects the larger environmental and social context into which they fit;
- Promotes human health, comfort and performance;
- Conserves natural resources and reduces detrimental effects on the environment;
- Ensures energy efficiency;
- Considers the life-cycle cost of initiatives.

Policy

"The Department of Administration shall develop and implement guidelines and minimum standards to incorporate environmentally responsible and sustainable concepts and practices into the planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of all state facilities. These guidelines and minimum standards shall include, but not be limited to: establishing performance criteria in the following categories: portfolio management, sustainable sites, water efficiency, energy and atmosphere, materials and resources, adaptive use and preservation of existing buildings, indoor environmental quality, construction waste and recycling, operation and maintenance, and purchasing of furniture, fixtures and equipment."

See DFD Master Specifications/Design Guidelines webpage:

http://www.doa.state.wi.us/Divisions/Facilities-Development/Document-Library/Master-Specifications-Design-Guidelines

Building Siting & Massing

"University Hall (now Bascom Hall) on the crest of the Hill, and the two dormitories, North Hall and South Hall, at the right and the left. Too much credit cannot be given to the architect of these first buildings. Their simple, dignified style, correct proportions and honest treatment of materials gave the keynote for future work. Fewer regrets for present conditions would be felt had his example been followed more closely."

Arthur Peabody, Supervising Architect,
"General Design of University of Wisconsin, d. 1908"

The massing of campus buildings, that is, the overall geometry of their perceived forms – footprint, height, and roof form – should demonstrate sensitivity to nearby buildings within their design neighborhoods as well as their adjacent land use (residential, commercial, institutional, recreation).

The shapes of future building footprints shown in the Master Plan represent broad guidelines. Existing building footprints throughout campus are predominantly simple geometrical shapes such as North Hall or a combination of these simple shapes to form more complex ones for larger buildings. The following architectural elements shall be considered in relationship to each other when creating architectural solutions:

- Build-To Lines
- Facade Organization
- Roofs
- Features
- Materials
- Views
- Miscellaneous Design Considerations

Each of these elements is further summarized (following) to give design teams a general intention for their application across campus. Refer to each individual campus design neighborhood for nuances and specifics to application of these summaries.



Figure 7-3 Build-to Limits



Build-To Lines:

The required build-to lines preserve/create strategic open space and/or promote streetscapes that are consistent with the desired character of the campus design neighborhoods, and reflect the context within which those neighborhoods are located. Build-to lines are determined from existing rightof-way lines or if no right-of-way exists from back of existing sidewalk edge. The area between these lines and the required build-to line shall be known as the buffer zone.

The alignment of future buildings shall follow the build-to lines established within each Design Neighborhood as identified in the Campus Design Guidelines & Standards document. Figure 7-3 indicates the following build-to line requirements:

Build-To lines

- Frontages along corridors, streets, multi-use paths, naturalized landscapes and open spaces.
- Intended to allow campus standard walkway widths, streetscape/site amenities, green infrastructure opportunities where appropriate and limiting encroachments upon campus natural areas and open spaces.
- A minimum 60% and no more than 80% of the structure shall be located at the build-to line. Offset from build-to line shall be 20% of adjacent buffer zone or 5' if not identified.
- Minor projections allowed such as eaves, fire escapes, water collection cisterns and planters, uncovered stairways, wheelchair ramps, and uncovered patios or balconies, may project into the required buffer zone (up to 20% of offset distance, i.e. 20' built-to offset from right-of-way would allow minor projections of up to 4' within the buffer zone).
- The following items are allowed to fully project into the buffer zone: Canopies, awnings, signage, and/or approved signature architectural features. Uncovered stairs and wheelchair ramps that lead to main building entrances assuming adequate walkway widths are met.

Scale & Proportion:

It is important that the size of buildings and campus places be related to the human scale and be perceived to be so. Careful consideration should also be given to the relationship of the parts to the whole; these may be details and elements of a building in relation to larger elements, or relationships between groups of buildings and spaces – or outdoor rooms – they create. In general, those buildings and campus places that exhibit a clear hierarchy of scales, from the largest dimensions to the smallest perceivable differentiations, are among the favorite places on campus.

Facade Organization:

The façade of favorite campus buildings have a tripartite division of base, middle and top. In addition, fenestration patterns and window material, scale and proportions are sensitive to the architectural character of each design neighborhood. The fenestration pattern in the Historic Campus core, for example, consists principally of punched windows that are single or ganged horizontally, and aligned vertically. Sometimes the exterior walls have rhythms of recessions and projections that are coordinated with window placements to create depth, and shadows. In contrast, the Health Sciences Campus is characterized predominantly by horizontal banding or patterns. Buildings in this area are also massive and tall requiring gestures that would relate them more to the human scale.

Roofs:

Roof forms and material also vary throughout campus. There are red tiled pitched roofs, flat roofs, as well as pitched asphalt roofs. The general principal is to unify the design neighborhoods and make them read more like a whole. Therefore areas of campus like the Lakeshore neighborhoods that employ a good amount of red tile roofs, may be best served by employing a similar material. No specific material is prescribed but through dialogue and design review, an appropriate choice would be made.

Architectural designs shall limit the use of flat roof buildings throughout campus in an effort to promote skyline and architectural interest.

It is recommended that architectural responses to program statements consider green roofs, functional roof spaces, and/or hybrid approaches where open space and/or stormwater management can be achieved via integrated architecture blurring the lines between landscape and structure.

Features:

Features such as porticos, gables, cornices, columns, dormers, and canopies are present in some of the favorite buildings on campus. These architectural features are not style-dependent but could help to define the character of buildings and grounds by regulating their massing, scale, and façade rhythm. Canopies and accents at major door ways (such as the main south entry of the new Microbial Sciences building), protective projections (such as entries at the Kronshage Halls), or recessed doorways (as seen at the Red Gym) are encouraged to protect occupants and visitors from inclement weather. These features shall be of a material and character that is consistent with the design of the building and its neighborhood. The main entrance to buildings should be easily identifiable, and part of a larger "entrance feature". This feature should be in scale with its building facade.

Materials:

Durable, quality materials that are consistent with each design neighborhood are to be used for new campus buildings. Materials that do not convey a sense of permanence and institutional quality, such as EIFS, vinyl siding, unfinished poured-in-place concrete, and concrete blocks are not acceptable finish options. Modern and innovative materials shall be encouraged provided that they are composed in a manner that exhibit richness, balance and unity.

Views:

Campus landmarks are important within the specific districts and regions of campus, but the connection to the lake is paramount. Preserving and enhancing views to Lake Mendota and the Capitol is essential. This visual connection reinforces the campus' unique setting and strengthens the sense of place. The following view types are summarized here and referenced more specifically within each campus design neighborhood section as well as the Landscape Master Plan document.

Protected Views:

Two viewsheds are protected on campus, these include views to the natural areas and the lake from both the WARF (Figure 11) and east hospital wing. Proposed building development within these viewsheds are subject to review. The intent is to preserve the uncluttered view of the lake and Lakeshore Nature Preserve.

Campus Views:

• Primary campus views include those visual connections to the lake, significant campus landmarks, open spaces, and city icons. These views are organizing features in the landscape, such as the view to the State Capitol from Bascom Hall and the view down Henry Mall to Engineering from Agricultural Hall.

Elevated Views:

• Observatory Hill is an example of an elevated view, but a collection of viewsheds has also been created through the development of open spaces atop roof deck structures. These occur at the UW Hospital, Nancy Nicholas Hall and Education Sciences. These new open spaces have created new ways to connect with the lake.

Lake Mendota Views:

• Campus is also experienced from Lake Mendota and across University Bay at Picnic Point. The naturalized lakeshore edge unifies and blends campus and the lake together. Opportunities exist to improve the view through the removal and relocation of parking areas and structures adjacent the lake.

Miscellaneous Design Considerations:

Transparency and Permeability:

• To the extent possible and consistent with functional requirements, new buildings should be designed with a certain degree of transparency and permeability at the pedestrian level to encourage visual engagement between the interior and exterior of the building. It is important that buildings and campus landscapes enhance public awareness and feelings of involvement in the institution The large windows or glazed walls along pedestrian paths being used at WID, Biochemistry II, Chazen Museum and other campus buildings, are good examples of how the larger campus, as a public place, can be experienced from within the buildings. Glass also allows those outside to feel like they are a part of what happens inside. Solid walls, particularly at the ground level tend to emphasize boundary and separation, thereby undermining the notion of a campus as public place. Design teams should be sensitive to glazing use in regard to bird strikes and mortality, especially when sited adjacent to open spaces and natural areas.

Screening of Site Elements:

• The following elements shall be screened in a manner that is consistent with the architectural character of the building and campus design neighborhood at a minimum height of 6' above finish surface. Refuse/ recycle areas, outdoor storage areas, loading docks, rooftop and site located mechanical equipment.

Connections, Transitions, & Thresholds:

Pedestrian bridges are good connectors but should only be employed to improve functional ties between facilities where topographically it makes sense. However, primary movement paths should be developed and maintained at the street level to promote "eyes on the street" and safe streets. Pedestrian bridges are proposed at critical locations to alleviate congestion, and traffic conflicts for pedestrians and/or vehicles. Such areas are context specific taking advantage of existing topographic conditions. Bridges and tunnels are highly functional and convenient but they can compromise the quality of the pedestrian environment at the street level. Designer teams are encouraged, whenever possible, to explore the use of colonnades, arcades, and overhangs, not only as transitions and thresholds between exterior and interior spaces, but also as protection from inclement weather (rain, heat, snow)thereby encouraging pedestrians to engage more with such buildings

Parking Structures:

• Parking structures are necessary for our campus to function well but their often austere architectural appearance needs to be softened. The design of parking structures should demonstrate sensitivity to the character of the neighborhoods. Wherever possible, fenestration patterns should more closely resemble inhabited buildings in the neighborhood. Screening may be a useful device to make the façade surface more regular yet not compromise required air flow. Where possible, the first floor level of parking garages should be used for occupied space, such as retail or service functions that will maintain activity at the ground level.

Exterior Signage:

- Each building shall have one campus standard building sign displaying the official Regent-approved name of the building and the official street address. As an option, signage may be incorporated into the face of the building as long as it is up and out of reach of pedestrians passing by at street level.
- (Please see Signage Standards on file with Facilities Planning & Management.)

Building Heights

The following exhibit indicates the proposed maximum building heights within the campus development boundary. The heights are shown in the context of the following three plans:

- University Avenue Corridor Plan (bounded by: •••••• Adopted May 6, 2014 #32635
- Regent Street South Campus Neighborhood Plan (bounded by: _____) Adopted July 1, 2009 #09234
- City of Madison Downtown Plan (bounded by: ••••••••) Adopted July 17, 2012 #24468

Building heights for the UW-Madison campus are shown as a range between 15-17' floor to floor heights, depending on the ultimate program of the facility. Although an adopted plan may indicate a maximum 12 story building, the master plan graphic reflects a 10 story building to match the overall height desired for the area. Not all buildings will be built to the heights indicated, they are assigned more to define potential physical form of the campus and limit heights where views and or adjacencies dictate. Generally the primary arterials of University Avenue and W. Johnson Street are proposed to have taller buildings, while heights decrease as you transition to the neighborhoods and Lake Mendota.

Maximum building heights shall be for the entire physical structure of the building and include roof peaks, dormers, utility enclosures, photovoltaic arrays, etc. Building communication antennas and supporting infrastructure may exceed these heights per city of Madison ordinance requirements.

These heights do not represent rigid prescriptions, but instead a guide to what is considered appropriate for the context. In certain areas of campus, generally east of N. Charter Street, the Capitol View Preservation height limit governs the maximum height of buildings (WI Stat § 16.842 (2013 through Act 380). Proposed heights respect this statute.



8. \Re^2 Viewshed agreement, any proposed buildings require additional approval.



Figure 7-4 Proposed Building Heights

7. CAMPUS DESIGN GUIDELINES & STANDARDS



7.3 Campus Design Neighborhoods

The Campus Design Guidelines outline nine (9) design neighborhoods based on special physical characteristics, challenges or design themes, functions, or land use within these districts. These design neighborhoods represent a complex nested arrangement of compositions and are intended to blend across perceived boundaries. While it may be difficult to differentiate between the East Campus and the Historic Campus, there is a noticeable difference between East Campus and West Campus. Neighborhoods further from each other contain fewer similarities. The landscape matrix throughout campus becomes the connective tissue instilling a greater sense of place and physical continuity. It is important to understand and respect the special characteristics of these neighborhoods in order to successfully implement the current campus master plan. The nine (9) neighborhoods are identified to the right.

This section presents each of the Campus Design Neighborhoods in greater detail. It is recommended that members of both internal and external project development teams familiarize themselves with the specific neighborhood in which their project resides, as well as a general understanding of the adjacent neighborhoods.





Campus Design Neighborhoods Location Map
1. Recreation Neighborhood (218-229)

Defined by large contiguous open spaces that provide outdoor research, recreation, stormwater management, and restorative functions. Areas are considered significant scenic resources and are located primarily along the lake. Architectural development along these edges should consider interplay between these resources.

2. Mealth Sciences Neighborhood (230-241)

Defined by clinical and related health sciences research and teaching functions. In addition, the master plan envisions a series of social opportunities for meetings, food, and gathering. Located on the west side of campus, the area includes both city of Madison and Village of Shorewood Hills jurisdictions.

3. Wind Federal Neighborhood (242-251)

Land not controlled by the University of Wisconsin. Located on the west side of campus, the area includes both city of Madison and Village of Shorewood Hills jurisdictions with ownership being divided among the Federal Government and the Veterans Administration Hospital Authority.

4. Near West Campus Neighborhood (252-263)

Contains both a service and infrastructure area for utility production as well as both public and campus uses. As a topographic low point of campus and seen as a connecting link between Historic and West campus, this area is important for research, teaching, production particularly for the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, and for campus-wide recreation.

5. Kakeshore Neighborhood (264-275)

Defined as the core residential life neighborhood along Lake Mendota shoreline, this area should embrace its natural context and re-orient itself to the lake maintaining view corridors from public spaces, pedestrian walks, and street ends. The neighborhood should create places for community gathering and student oriented activities.

6. In Historic Campus Neighborhood (276-287)

Defined as the academic and historic core of campus, this area primarily includes classrooms and offices for faculty/staff, and administration. As the oldest portion of campus, it presents a traditional collegiate quad aesthetic with an architectural rich building inventory set in a verdant landscape setting.

7. 💹 East Campus Neighborhood (288-299)

Defined as the portion of campus where town and gown interface, this area is mixed use neighborhood with housing and student services set along side performing arts, communication, and administrative activities. The inclusion of the Memorial Union, Library Mall, conference facilities, and dining services make this area a social hub. East Campus Mall provides a critical north-south linkage through the campus.

8. South Campus Neighborhood (300-317)

Defined generally as the area south of University Avenue, this contains a number of individual schools and departments in buildings based around the urban street grid. Research, classroom, and office spaces are the primary use of the area. Taller buildings with minimal setbacks lend a dense urban character that is in need of additional open space. This area should maintain active street frontage uses to encourage a sense of civic life and keep "eyes on the street."

🤉 🌉 Event Center Neighborhood (318-329)

Defined as three distinct nodes within the campus that contain the major event venues and as such, must be accessible for thousands of campus users and visitors. These areas must be respectful of adjacent neighborhoods and consider treatments that break down the scale of the large building masses. They must also provide for extensive pedestrian access and event programming while maintaining a campus feel when not in use. Some of the sites within the Event Center Neighborhood are zoned PD, and therefore not part of the C-I District master plan.



1. Howard Temin Lakeshore Path

John Muir Woods
 Far West Playfields

1. Recreation Neighborhood



Overview & Location

Defined by large contiguous open spaces that provide research, recreation, relaxation, stormwater management, habitat, and restorative functions. These areas are considered significant scenic resources and are located primarily along the lake. Architectural development within this area is atypical. When proposed, development should be heavily influenced by the surrounding natural context and place an emphasis on sustainability. Buildings should be lower in scale and mass to preserve lake viewsheds and reduced densities.

While significantly contributing to UW-Madison sense of place, this neighborhood spans the edge of Lake Mendota and transitions into the 300-acre Lakeshore Nature Preserve. The Recreation Neighborhood's location and character afford the best opportunities for the campus to engage the lake front and promote education and interpretation to a wide audience. The area consists of a wide spectrum of functions, from untouched and naturalized landscapes, to horticultural gardens and active recreation.

The southern boundary of the neighborhood is generally defined by Marsh Drive (extended) on the west and Observatory Drive throughout the remainder of the campus. While the Lakeshore Neighborhood graphically divides this area, buildings here should have the sense of being in nature and situated to preserve views and quality naturalized vegetation. The Recreation Neighborhood areas of Observatory Hill, and Muir Woods to the north of the Historic Campus Neighborhood are considered passive and natural areas and help to define what people consider the traditional collegiate campus, especially along the iconic lake front.

Note: The Lakeshore Nature Preserve that lies approximately north and east of University Bay Drive is not included in this design neighborhood. Reference the Lake Shore Nature Preserve master plan for information specific to this area.

Area: 130 acres (20 percent of 636-acre planning area)



Recreation = Active & Passive The refreshment of mind, body, or spirit through play and/or relaxation





Massing & Scale

- Building edges facing important pedestrian corridors, gathering spaces, or exceptional natural resources shall have transparent treatments to enhance visual access between inside and outside, as well as enliven outdoor spaces to promote activity. Transparency shall occur where building activity is highest to balance energy efficiency needs.
- Proposed building massing shall consider daylight penetration into all spaces of the building.
- Limit buildings and structures within this neighborhood to preserve existing natural amenities and characteristics.
- Proposed buildings shall be smaller in size with maximum footprints of 40,000 GSF within a maximum 4-story structure.
- Building massing shall be of a human scale that is highly articulated to provide visual interest and blend with the natural context.





RECREATION NEIGHBORHOOD

Building Heights

- Building heights are to generally match the urban context to the south and east, crescendo in height along the campus arterials of University Avenue and Johnson Street and become lower as the lakeshore is approached.
- Consider existing topography and the natural campus setting when determining building heights.
- Building heights are recommended to be set below the adjacent tree canopy and have limited visibility when viewed from Lake Mendota.
- Buildings are recommended to be a maximum of 4 floors to promote interaction with the natural environment and respond to the adjacent context.
- Buildings should generally have pitched or butterfly type roofs.
- Consideration of accessible and/or highly visible green roofs shall be considered.

NOTES:

- 1. Colors relate to building heights.
- 2. Where discrepancies arise between adopted plans, most current plan takes precedent.
- 3. X Numbers indicate UW-Madison 2015 Campus Master Plan proposed maximum building heights. Floor quantities indicated equate to 15-17' floor to floor heights.
- 4. 👥 Indicate proposed HIGHER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 5. 🗴 Indicate proposed LOWER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 6. "+2" Additional floors approved for exceptional design/LEED.
- 7. \mathscr{R}^{i} Zoned Conservancy District, buildings not anticipated
- 8. \Re^2 Viewshed agreement, any proposed buildings require additional approval.



Build-To Lines

- Refer to the Build-To Dimensions matrix for specific distances related to street frontages and major open space corridors.
- The primary build-to lines in the recreation neighborhood involve interaction with the Lakeshore Nature Preserve and open space frontages. As such, planning and design associated with tree preservation, construction staging, and erosion control will be of primary interest.
- Where buildings are proposed adjacent to the Recreation Neighborhood and no build-to line is indicated, it is recommended that planning and design be considered on an individual basis to balance program and open space.
- Build-to lines are given to prevent flat, expansive, lifeless street or open space facades. The majority of the building facade should be brought to the suggested buid-to line while still achieving facade articulation and interest that is compatible within the neighborhood.



Note: The placement of new buildings should respond to the alignment of adjacent buildings and adhere to the landscape framework plan which defines signature open space corridors. New buildings should be placed to engage and improve the quality of the campus landscape. While proposed buildings should be placed to maximize efficiency and use of the site, they should not block major pedestrian, habitat, stormwater, or visual corridors. Placement is ultimately dictated on a site by site basis to respond to the immediate context and ensure the building positively contributes to the whole of the campus.

Build-To Dimensions

The neighborhood matrix references each of the streets within the Campus Design Neighborhood and further identifies the nuances along that street frontage to provide guidance when determining architectural build-to limits. These limits ensure architectural framing of the street is occurring where appropriate, green space is preserved, and that a pleasing human-scaled pedestrian space is created that allows for street activation and socialization.

- Street Name: Name of street located within the neighborhood.
- Description: Segment of street in neighborhood, as widths and character may vary.
- Existing Corridor Width*: Identified existing width per Dane County mapping data.
- Orientation: What side of street segment guidelines are being applied.
- Build-To Line¹: Distance from back of the sidewalk where majority of the building should interface.
- Building Ht. Max: As identified by neighborhood/city plans and per anticipated UW program need.
- Step Back Req'ts: Recommended story height at Build-To line/distance (feet) of step back.
- Stormwater²: Is the area between the sidewalk/path and street appropriate for green infrastructure.

1. RECREATION NEIGHBORHOOD			· · ·			÷	·
Street Name	Description	Corridor Width*	Orientation	Build-to Line ¹	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	Stormwater ²
	Oxford Rd. to Colgate Rd.	72-86'		-	2	_	NO
University Bay Drive			N (W/E)	-	2	-	YES
	Oxford Rd. to Marsh Dr.	66'	S (W/E)	-	2	-	YES
Walnut Street (Pedestrian)	Marsh Dr. to Observatory Dr.	80'	F	-		-	NO
Observatory Drive	Walnut St. to Willow Creek	70'	N	-	-	-	YES
	Willow Creek to Babcock Dr.	64'	N	25'	4	None	YES
			N	-	4	None	NO
	Babcock Dr. to Park St.	60-64'	S	25'	4	3rd & Above - 15' Min.	NO
Willow Drive	Lot 58 to Observatory Dr.	68'	W	The Preserve	-	-	YES
		00	E	-	4	None	YES
Elm Drive	Lot 37 to Observatory Dr.	62'	W	20'	4	3rd & Above - 15' Min.	YES
	EUC 37 TO Observatory Dr.	02	E	20'	4	3rd & Above - 15' Min.	YES
Babcock Drive	Tripp Circle to Observatory Dr.	60'	W	30'	4	3rd & Above - 15' Min.	NO

* Corridor Width = Right-of-way width or if no right-of-way, back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk where right-of-way would typically be located.

¹ Right-of-way line or in the case of no right-of-way, the distance from back of sidewalk.

² Does the terrace condition support green infrastructure as part of the development of this area of street?



Landscape Principles

This area contributes to the primary physical identify of campus through its relationship to the lake front, the Lakeshore Nature Preserve, and the naturalized landscape character of rolling topography, woods, riparian corridors, and wetlands. Future development should ensure these resources are preserved and enhanced.

- Vegetation shall be managed to promote engagement with the lakeshore and support native habitat for a diverse mix of flora and fauna.
- Foster naturalized landscapes to reduce maintenance needs and promote ecosystem services. These under used landscapes contribute in functional ways to stormwater management and habitat creation.
- Many of our campus cultural resources, Allen Centennial Gardens, Muir Woods, and Native American burial mounds, reside in this area. Ensure proper management and development respect.
- The Howard Temin Lakeshore Path is a heavily used recreational and transportation corridor along the lakeshore linking the Recreation Neighborhood together. Balance human uses and natural habitat.
- As the physical and psychological lungs of the campus, preserve and restore these areas for health and wellness of campus, as well as the community and the region at large.



Note: The list of statements characterize the neighborhood in regard to the Landscape Master Plan Guiding Principles. These principles were established to assist landscape recommendations in reaching the goals of the Campus Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

RECREATION NEIGHBORHOOD

Landscape Guidelines

The Recreation Neighborhood contains two primary recreation typologies: playing fields and naturalized environments. These scenic areas reveal the natural history of campus and contribute significantly to UW-Madison.

- Naturalized landscapes: Maintain and restore woodland areas such as Muir Woods as natural areas that provide ecosystem services and human enjoyment. New stormwater features should be naturalistic in form and use native plants along the lakeshore and west near the Lakeshore Nature Preserve. Avoid hard edges and provide opportunities for people to interact without dividing contiguous natural areas.
- Athletics and recreation: Maintain contiguous open spaces with minimal plant palette. Maintain views to the lake. Locate playing fields with north-south orientation for optimal playing conditions.
- **Parking and service:** Consider stabilized aggregate or pervious pavers as low impact development alternatives adjacent to the lakeshore. Integrate parking areas into the landscape and provide vegetative screening to buffer views of cars. Consider the view from Lake Mendota and avoid runoff to the lake or natural areas.



Campus Greens
 Courtyards, Plazas, & Gardens
 Campus Fabric
 Naturalized Landscapes
 Streetscapes
 Parking and Service

Note: The list of statements characterize the nature of the identified typologies as defined by the Landscape Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

S.

Materials & Styles: Existing Conditions

Reference the opposite page for material (Mx) and architectural feature (Ax) references.





RECREATION NEIGHBORHOOD

Materials & Styles

The Recreation Neighborhood has very few buildings set within the defined boundaries of the neighborhood. New construction within these areas shall be informed by the context integrating both the natural environment and sustainability features. Aspects related to green building, renewable resources, restorative environments, and low impact development shall be common characteristics of buildings within this neighborhood. This neighborhood shall also have a contextual impact on its adjacencies, informing a relationship between the interior and exterior environment.

Materials

M1. Wisconsin Limestone Screenings
M2. Nature
M3. Limestone Veneer (Ashlar Pattern)
M4. Recreational Fields
M5. Wetland/Marsh
M6. Glacial Erratic Stone (Color Mix)
M7. Tan Brick
M8. Lake



Architectural Styles

- Environmental Modernism



Architectural Features

- A1. Framed Views/Long Views
- A2. Large Open Spaces
- A3. Ornamental Detailing
- A4. Integration with Nature



Building Inventory

The building inventory lists all of the buildings within the defined campus neighborhood. Buildings are listed alphabetically by the official campus building name (per the Campus Map). Additional inventory information includes:

- Year building construction was completed.
- Year(s) major renovation projects were completed.
- Defining architectural style.
- Primary exterior material use.

Building	Built	Renovated	Style	Materials
Agricultural Dean's Residence	1897			Brick
Hasler Laboratory for Limnology	1963	-	Post World War II	Steel, Reinforced Concrete
Water Science & Engineering Lab	1905 19	928 add., 1970-1980's remodel	Georgian Revival	Brick, Concrete

RECREATION NEIGHBORHOOD

Considerations

Considerations include information related to the planning, design, and approval of a typical building and/or landscape architecture campus project. It is to be reviewed as a resource identifying locations of materials that UW project teams reference most often. Not all projects will require each identified item. All projects should review the reference list and determine with the UW project manager applicability to the project.

Site Amenities & Vegetation

- 2015 Landscape Development Standards
- Division of Facilities Development Master Specifications-Division 32
- UW-Madison Technical Guidelines–Division 32

Past Plans

- 2006 Lakeshore Nature Preserve Master Plan Cultural Landscape Report
- 2016 Allen Centennial Garden Master Plan

Restoration/Preservation Efforts

- Class of 1918 Marsh Restoration
- University Bay Restoration
- Willow Creek Restoration Project
- Observatory Hill
- John Muir Woods

Neighborhood Specific Conditions

- Viewshed Protection Agreement-WARF
- Friends of Lakeshore Nature Preserve

Historical and Cultural Resources

- Cultural Landscape Report
- Historic Property Review Requirements
- Archaeological Site Review Requirements
- Archaeological Management Guidelines
- Indian Burial Mound Management Policy

Well Head District/Locations

- City of Madison Unit Well 6 (University Bay Drive & University Ave.)
- City of Madison Unit Well 19 (Lake Mendota Drive)
- City of Madison Unit Well 27 (N. Randall Ave. & Bike Path)

City of Madison Zoning (Chapter 28)

- Campus Institutional District (C-I)
- Conservancy District (CN)



West Campus from Lake Mendota
 Hospital back toward Historic Campus
 Hospital Complex & V.A. Hospital

2. Health Sciences Neighborhood



Overview & Location

Defined by clinical and related health sciences research and teaching functions. In addition the master plan envisions a series of social opportunities for meetings, food, and gathering. Located on the west side of campus, the area includes both city of Madison and Village of Shorewood Hills jurisdictions with ownership being dispersed between the Board of Regents, UW Hospital Authority, and the VA Hospital.

The UW Hospital complex and supporting facilities are the defining characteristic of this area. Many of the buildings are physically connected, but are designed and detailed to appear as separate buildings through material change and setback differentials. A key recommendation to this area is the enhancement of the lake connection. This connection is recommended to occur both visually from the hospital complex and physically via a green corridor from Highland Avenue to the lakeshore. Buildings shall be placed to frame this corridor and programmed to encourage activity.

The northern boundary of the neighborhood abuts the Far West Playfields, which are currently zoned Conservancy (CN) in the Madison General Ordinance (Chapter 28). Buildings and structures along this frontage are recommended to thoughtfully interface with this land use type. The western boundary is defined by residential land in the Village of Shorewood Hills and University Bay Drive. On the east, where much of the proposed development is planned over the long-term, the area consists of recreational fields and Health Sciences expansion. The southern edge is defined by ownership and consists of the VA Hospital and Federal lands. Buildings along this area are recommended to consider VA Hospital master planning efforts.

Area: 64 acres (10% of 636 acre planning area)







Massing & Scale

- Buildings shall have a base, middle, and top. Visual emphasis is to be given to the ground floor through door and window scale, architectural detailing, and greater floor-tofloor heights.
- New buildings should correspond to their neighbors in volume, scale, and level of detail. Necessarily large buildings should either be located among other such buildings or be broken down into smaller masses and given an appropriate level of detail.
- Where buildings are set back at upper stories, use lower roofs as green roofs, balconies, terraces, and gardens.
- Buildings are to be planned around internal open spaces, courtyards, and/or green roofs.
- Utilize architectural articulation such as changes in material, fenestration, architectural detailing, or other elements to break down the scale.
- Joint development projects with and on the Federal Neighborhood lands to the south should consider increased heights and bulk, creating a more cohesive area.
- Limit building/structure heights toward the east boundary to maintain the visual lake connection.
- Density is recommended for the eastern portion of this design neighborhood along Walnut Street.



HEALTH SCIENCES NEIGHBORHOOD

NOTES:

- 1. Colors relate to building heights.
- 2. Where discrepancies arise between adopted plans, most current plan takes precedent.
- X Numbers indicate UW-Madison 2015 Campus Master Plan proposed maximum building heights. Floor quantities indicated equate to 15-17' floor to floor heights.
- 4. 💌 Indicate proposed HIGHER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 5. **x** Indicate proposed LOWER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 6. "+2" Additional floors approved for exceptional design/LEED.
- 7. \Re^{1} Zoned Conservancy District, buildings not anticipated
- 8. \Re^2 Viewshed agreement, any proposed buildings require additional approval.





Building Heights

- Buildings along the edges of the neighborhood may be taller, but should be designed to lessen their mass and bulk against these more natural areas of campus.
- Building heights to step down toward the lake to promote views from the hospital complex.
- Buildings along the northern Walnut Street frontage should be kept at 5 stories or less to ensure the WARF building viewshed is preserved.
- Buildings should generally have flat roofs with a variety of planes and steps. Activate spaces with roof terraces and/or gardens.
- Consideration of accessible and/ or highly visible green roofs shall be considered.



Build-To Lines

- Refer to the Build-To Dimensions matrix for specific distances related to street frontages and major open space corridors.
- The primary build-to lines in the Health Sciences Neighborhood promote a maximizing of available land while being involved with a variety of land owners. program and open space.
- Where buildings are proposed adjacent to open space, it is recommended that building placement be considered on an individual basis to integrate an inside/outside relationship.
- Build-To lines are given to prevent flat, expansive, lifeless street or open space facades. The majority of the building facade should be brought to the suggested build-to line while still achieving facade articulation and interest that is compatible within the neighborhood.



Note: The placement of new buildings should respond to the alignment of adjacent buildings and adhere to the landscape framework plan which defines signature open space corridors. New buildings should be placed to engage and improve the quality of the campus landscape. While proposed buildings should be placed to maximize efficiency and use of the site, they should not block major pedestrian, habitat, stormwater, or visual corridors. Placement is ultimately dictated on a site by site basis to respond to the immediate context and ensure the building positively contributes to the whole of the campus.

HEALTH SCIENCES NEIGHBORHOOD

Build-To Dimensions

The neighborhood matrix references each of the streets within the campus design neighborhood and further identifies the nuances along that street frontage to provide guidance when determining architectural build-to limits. These limits ensure architectural framing of the street is occurring where appropriate, green space is preserved, and that a pleasing human-scaled pedestrian realm is created that allows for street activation and socialization.

- Street Name: Name of street located within the neighborhood.
- Description: Segment of street in neighborhood, as widths and character may vary.
- Existing Corridor Width*: Identified existing width per Dane County mapping data.
- Orientation: What side of street segment guidelines are being applied.
- Build-To Line¹: Distance from back of the sidewalk where majority of the building should interface.
- Building Ht. Max: As identified by neighborhood/city plans and per anticipated UW program need.
- Step Back Req'ts: Recommended story height at Build-To line/distance (feet) of step back.
- Stormwater²: Is the area between the sidewalk/path and street appropriate for green infrastructure.

2. HEALTH NEIGHBORHOOD		·					
Street Name	Description	Corridor Width*	Orientation	Build-to Line ¹	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	Stormwater ²
University Bay Drive	Highland Ave. to Marshall Ct.	60'					
	i ignalia / tor to maronali oti		E	40'	9	3rd & Above - 15' Min.	NO
Highland Avenue	University Bay Dr. to Lot 75 Exit	64-74'	N (W/E)	20' (step as indicated)	7	None	NO
Highliand Avenue	Oniversity Bay Dr. to Lot 75 Exit	04-74	S (W/E)	20' (step as indicated)	9	None	NO
Marsh Drive	Highland Ave. to New Road	60-84'					
			S	10'	7	3rd & Above - 30' Min.	YES
Observatory Drive	Highland Ave. to Walnut St.	62'	N	35'	6 5	5rd & Above - 15' Min.	YES
Observatory Drive			S	30'	10	3rd & Above - 15' Min.	NO
New N/S Road (60' RW* min.)	Marsh Dr. to Observatory Dr.	-	W	15'	6 7	None	YES
			E	15'	5	None	YES
Walnut St. (Pedestrian & Street)	Marsh Dr. to Linden Dr.	56'	W	30'	5	5th & Above - 15' Min.	YES

* Corridor Width = Right-of-way width or if no right-of-way, back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk where right-of-way would typically be located.

¹ Right-of-way line or in the case of no right-of-way, the distance from back of sidewalk.

² Does the terrace condition support green infrastructure as part of the development of this area of street?



Landscape Principles

Develop the character of the Health Sciences Neighborhood as a traditional campus within a campus with large buildings organized around quadrangles, courtyards, and naturalized green spaces.

- Traditional landscape aesthetic on the hospital grounds, becoming increasingly naturalized toward the lake.
- Preserve, enhance, and create new viewsheds to Lake Mendota from the UW Hospital and WARF Building.
- Announce the arrival to UW Hospital, enhance pedestrian comfort, and better manage stormwater through street tree planting and green infrastructure.
- Encourage restorative landscape experiences through the implementation of therapeutic gardens and green roofs, living walls, and naturalistic landscape treatments.
- Continue to foster naturalized landscapes to promote ecosystem services and restorative health qualities.



Note: The list of statements characterize the neighborhood in regard to the Landscape Master Plan Guiding Principles. These principles were established to assist landscape recommendations in reaching the goals of the Campus Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

HEALTH SCIENCES NEIGHBORHOOD

Landscape Guidelines

Reflecting its large building footprints and sprawling pattern of development, the landscape structure of the Health Sciences Neighborhood is composed largely of the campus fabric typology.

- **Campus fabric:** Gardenesque landscape character south of Highland Avenue to project the UW Hospital brand. Plant large deciduous trees to provide human scale and buffer the building mass. Moving east from UW Hospital, the landscape transitions to become increasingly irregular and naturalized as it approaches the lake.
- Naturalized landscapes: Naturalistic stormwater retention ponds and shortgrass meadow planting strengthening the connection to the lake and reducing maintenance costs. Trees planted in irregular stands mimic the original oak savanna.
- Courtyards, plazas, terraces, and gardens: Courtyards and areas between buildings should integrate ornamental deciduous canopy trees to provide a human scale and screen views from upper building levels. Spaces directly reflect the surrounding architectural context, reinforcing the sense of place. Use a high degree of native planting to enhance the connection between the immediate campus and the lands of the Lakeshore Nature Preserve.



Campus Greens Courtyards, Plazas, & Gardens Campus Fabric Naturalized Landscapes Streetscapes Parking and Service

Note: The list of statements characterize the nature of the identified typologies as defined by the Landscape Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

18.

Materials & Styles: Existing Conditions

Reference the opposite page for material (Mx) and architectural feature (Ax) references.



Observatory Dr.

Linden Dr.

HEALTH SCIENCES NEIGHBORHOOD

Materials & Styles

The Health Sciences Neighborhood is primarily composed of a complex of buildings and reads as a singular entity. While material differentiation is visible between the core hospital building and the ring buildings along Highland Avenue, there is a cohesiveness that defines this area of campus. New construction within this area shall be informed by the building use, including aspects of technology, leading-edge research, and health and wellness aspects to design. Building materials and styles should evoke a more natural aesthetic as they approach the lakeshore and recreational fields to the north.

Materials

M1. Brick, Glass, Metal
M2. Precast Concrete
M3. Kasota Limestone
M4. Light Colored Metal
M5. Dark Colored Brick
M6. Glazing Bands



Architectural Styles

- Modern
- Post World War II
- Environmental Modernism



- A1. Large building scales and massings
- A2. Lake views (from & toward)
- A3. Horizontal banding, facade arcs



Building Inventory

The building inventory lists all of the buildings within the defined campus neighborhood. Buildings are listed alphabetically by the official campus building name (per the Campus Map). Additional inventory information includes:

- Year building construction was completed.
- Year(s) major renovation projects were completed.
- Defining architectural style.
- Primary exterior material use.

Building	Built	Renovated	Style	Materials
901 University Bay Drive	1853	1943 restoration		Local Sandstone, Timber
American Family Children's Hospital	2005			Limestone, Sandstone, Brick
Health Sciences Learning Center	2002		Contemporary	Precast Concrete Panels, Masonry, Aluminum, Glass
McArdle	1962	2000 remodeled	Post World War II	Brick, Concrete
Rennebohm Hall	1998			Masonry, Brick, Glass, Metal, Concrete
UW Hospital and Clinics	1977	2012	12 Beaux Arts Brick	
UW Medical Foundation Centennial Building	2008			Sandstone, Brick, Limestone
Waisman Center	1971	2007	Post World War II	Brick, Concrete
WARF Building	1969		Post World War II	Granite, Porcelain Spandrel Panels
Wisconsin Institute of Medical Research	2005		Contemporary	Precast Concrete Panels, Kasota Stone Panel, Aluminum, Glass

HEALTH SCIENCES NEIGHBORHOOD

Considerations

Considerations include information related to the planning, design, and approval of a typical building and/or landscape architecture campus project. It is to be reviewed as a resource identifying locations of materials that UW project teams reference most often. Not all projects will require each identified item. All projects should review the reference list and determine with the UW project manager applicability to the project.

Site Amenities & Vegetation

- 2015 Landscape Development Standards
- Division of Facilities Development Master Specifications-Division 32
- UW-Madison Technical Guidelines–Division 32

Past Plans

- 2013 University of Wisconsin Hospital & Clinics Master Plan
- 2014 University Avenue Corridor Plan

Restoration/Preservation Efforts

Class of 1918 Marsh Restoration

Neighborhood Specific Conditions

- Viewshed Protection Agreement-WARF
- Viewshed Protection Agreement–UW Hospital
- Village of Shorewood Hills

Historical and Cultural Resources

- 2005 Cultural Landscape Report
- Historic Property Review Requirements
- Archaeological Site Review Requirements

Well Head District/Locations

• City of Madison Unit Well 6 (U-Bay Drive & University Ave.)

City of Madison Zoning (Chapter 28)

• Campus Institutional District (C-I)



1. Design Neighborhood Overview

2. Forest Products Laboratory Buildings

3. VA Hospital (Foreground)

3. Federal Neighborhood



Overview & Location

Land not owned by the University of Wisconsin. Located on the west side of campus, the area includes both City of Madison and Village of Shorewood Hills jurisdictions with ownership being divided among the Federal Government and the Veterans Administration (VA) Hospital Authority. The design neighborhood is bounded by Campus Drive to the south, University Bay Drive to the west, the UW Hospital and Observatory Drive to the north, and Walnut Street to the east.

The area is defined by the VA Hospital building complex and the Forest Products Laboratory building complex. The VA Hospital, which varies in height from 2-8 stories, is typical of hospital development where the central core has been added onto over the years creating a complex series of connected buildings. The remainder of this site is composed of surface parking lots and landscape patches. The Forest Products Laboratory area is a series of interconnected low slung buildings laid out on a orthogonal grid. While the land owners and uses are similar throughout this portion of the design neighborhood the area has a research park feel where buildings have corresponding parking lots and landscape buffers separating the structures. Future development in this area is recommended to include greater density and better shared land use strategies.

The Campus Drive Shared-Use Path and the Wisconsin & Southern Railroad (WSOR) line run along the southern frontage. A wooded area at the northeast corner of University Bay Drive and Campus Drive creates a welcoming aesthetic for both the Village of Shorewood Hills and the Far West Campus.

Lands in this area were given by the Board of Regents to the Federal Government when the university was in its infancy. Lands where given with the condition that if the receiving governmental agency no longer needed said lands, they would revert back to campus property, hence the importance of guidelines for this area.





Area: 42 acres (6% of 636 acre planning area)



Massing & Scale

- Where building type or program requires a larger, broad floor area, the building mass should still be articulated. Smaller wings and additions to the main building mass will help modulate the scale.
- Buildings shall have a base, middle, and top. Visual emphasis is to be given to the ground floor through door and window scale, architectural detailing, and greater floor-to-floor heights.
- New buildings should correspond to their neighbors in volume, scale, and level of detail. Necessarily large buildings should either be located among other such buildings or be broken down into smaller masses and given an appropriate level of detail.
- Buildings are to be planned around internal open spaces, courtyards, and/or green roofs.
- Utilize architectural articulation such as changes in material, fenestration, architectural detailing, or other elements to break down the scale.
- Joint development projects with the Health Sciences Neighborhood lands to the north should consider increased heights and bulk, creating a more cohesive area.



FEDERAL NEIGHBORHOOD

NOTES:

- 1. Colors relate to building heights.
- 2. Where discrepancies arise between adopted plans, most current plan takes precedent.
- 3. X Numbers indicate UW-Madison 2015 Campus Master Plan proposed maximum building heights. Floor quantities indicated equate to 15-17' floor to floor heights.
- 4. 🔀 Indicate proposed HIGHER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 5. 🗴 Indicate proposed LOWER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 6. "+2" Additional floors approved for exceptional design/LEED.
- 7. \Re^{i} Zoned Conservancy District, buildings not anticipated
- 8. 😤 Viewshed agreement, any proposed buildings require additional approval.





Building Heights

- Building heights are to generally match the urban context to the south and east, crescendo in height along Campus Drive and become lower as the lakeshore is approached.
- Generally 8 stories is recommended for this area with significant modulation to reduce building mass.
- Buildings should generally have flat roofs with the addition of green roofs where feasible.



Build-To Lines

- Refer to the Build-To Dimensions matrix for specific distances related to street frontages and major open space corridors.
- The primary build-to lines in the Federal Neighborhood involve interaction with the Health Science Design Neighborhood. As such, planning and design associated with these areas shall be coordinated in tandem.
- Build-to lines are given to prevent flat, expansive, lifeless street, or open space facades. The majority of the building facade should be brought to the suggested build-to line while still achieving facade articulation and interest that is compatible within the neighborhood.
- Build-to lines preserve the wooded area on the corner of University Avenue and University Bay Drive.
- Creation of an arrival portal is indicated along Highland Avenue at the existing underpass.
- Walnut Street is indicated to have a wider cross section to provide street tree plantings and better pedestrian experience.



Note: The placement of new buildings should respond to the alignment of adjacent buildings and adhere to the landscape framework plan which defines signature open space corridors. New buildings should be placed to engage and improve the quality of the campus landscape. While proposed buildings should be placed to maximize efficiency and use of the site, they should not block major pedestrian, habitat, stormwater, or visual corridors. Placement is ultimately dictated on a site by site basis to respond to the immediate context and ensure the building positively contributes to the whole of the campus.

Build-To Dimensions

The neighborhood matrix references each of the streets within the campus design neighborhood and further identifies the nuances along that street frontage to provide guidance when determining architectural build-to limits. These limits ensure architectural framing of the street is occurring where appropriate, green space is preserved, and that a pleasing human-scaled pedestrian realm is created that allows for street activation and socialization.

- Street Name: Name of street located within the neighborhood.
- Description: Segment of street in neighborhood, as widths and character may vary.
- Existing Corridor Width*: Identified existing width per Dane County mapping data.
- Orientation: What side of street segment guidelines are being applied.
- Build-To Line¹: Distance from back of the sidewalk where majority of the building should interface.
- Building Ht. Max: As identified by neighborhood/city plans and per anticipated UW program need.
- Step Back Req'ts: Recommended story height at Build-To line/distance (feet) of step back.
- Stormwater²: Is the area between the sidewalk/path and street appropriate for green infrastructure.

3. FEDERAL NEIGHBORHOOD	·						•
Street Name	Description	Corridor Width*	Orientation	Build-to Line ¹	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	Stormwater ²
University Bay Drive	Highland Ave. to University Ave.	70'					
University bay brive	Thighland Ave. to onliversity Ave.	70	E	45'	9	5th & Above - Min. 30'	NO
Highland Avenue	Lot 75 to Campus Dr.	82'	W	20'	9	5th & Above - Min. 30'	NO
	Lot 75 to campus bi.	02	E	20'	8	5th & Above - Min. 30'	NO
Walnut St. Linden Dr. to Ca	Lindon Dr. to Compus Dr.	80'	W	30'	8	3rd & Above - Min. 30'	NO
	Linden Dr. to campus Dr.	00					
Observatory Drive	Highland Ave. to lot 64	62'					
Observatory Drive	Thighland Ave. to lot 04	02	S	40'	8	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO

* Corridor Width = Right-of-way width or if no right-of-way, back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk where right-of-way would typically be located.

¹ Right-of-way line or in the case of no right-of-way, the distance from back of sidewalk.

² Does the terrace condition support green infrastructure as part of the development of this area of street?



Landscape Principles

The Federal Neighborhood landscape is utilitarian in character with little hierarchy of spaces. This area of the campus landscape is under Federal Government jurisdiction.

- Soften landscape edges for a smooth transition between Federal and UW-Madison managed landscapes.
- Use campus typologies to create a hierarchy, emphasizing important spaces and connections to surrounding campus.
- Strengthen the Highland Avenue streetscape to unify the Federal Neighborhood with the Health Sciences Neighborhood.
- Promote robust street tree plantings along Walnut Street and Observatory Drive.



Note: The list of statements characterize the neighborhood in regard to the Landscape Master Plan Guiding Principles. These principles were established to assist landscape recommendations in reaching the goals of the Campus Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

FEDERAL NEIGHBORHOOD

Materials & Styles

The Federal Neighborhood, although consisting of buildings not designed by the university or State of Wisconsin, has a distinctive aesthetic and character. This area is primarily composed of large floor plate, low-expansive buildings that have minimal architectural articulation. Buildings tend to be more blocky in form with repetition in fenestration occurring both vertically (research-based buildings) and horizontally (service-based buildings).

Materials

M1. Wood Elements M2. Light Colored Brick M3. Architectural Medallions M4. Textured Concrete M5. Composite Cladding M6. Precast Panels

* No oblique view provided, intentionally.



Architectural Styles

- Art Deco
- International
- Post World War II
- Environmental Modernisn

Architectural Features

A1. Blocky Massing A2. Vertical Repetition A3. Low Expansive Buildings





Building Inventory

The building inventory lists all of the buildings within the defined campus neighborhood. Buildings are listed alphabetically by the official campus building name (per the Campus Map). Additional inventory information includes:

- Year building construction was completed.
- Year(s) major renovation projects were completed.
- Defining architectural style.
- Primary exterior material use.

Building	Built Ren	ovated	Style		Materials			
3. FEDERAL NEIGHBORHOOD				-				-
Street Name	Description		Existing R/W	Orientation	Build to Line from C/W	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	R/W Stormwater
University Bay Drive	Highland Ave. to University A							
	Highland Ave. to University Ave.		70'	E	45'	9	3rd & Above - Min. 30'	NO
Highland Avenue	Lot 75 to Campus Dr.		82'	W	20'	9	3rd & Above - Min. 30'	NO
				E	20'	8	3rd & Above - Min. 30'	NO
Walnut St.	Linden Dr. to Commun Dr.		001	W	30'	8	3rd & Above - Min. 30'	NO
	Linden Dr. to Campus Dr.		80'					
Observatory Drive	Highland Ave. to lot 64	62'						
			S	40'	8	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO	

Considerations

Considerations include information related to the planning, design, and approval of a typical building and/or landscape architecture campus project. It is to be reviewed as a resource identifying locations of materials that UW project teams reference most often. Not all projects will require each identified item. All projects should review the reference list and determine with the UW project manager applicability to the project.

Site Amenities & Vegetation

- 2015 Landscape Development Standards
- Division of Facilities Development Master Specifications–Division 32
- UW-Madison Technical Guidelines–Division 32

Past Plans

- 2013 University of Wisconsin Hospital & Clinics Master Plan
- 2013 Madison Transit Corridor Study

Neighborhood Specific Conditions

• Village of Shorewood Hills

Historical and Cultural Resources

- Historic Property Review Requirements
- Archaeological Site Review Requirements

Well Head District/Locations

• City of Madison Unit Well 6 (University Bay Drive & University Ave.)

City of Madison Zoning (Chapter 28)

• Campus Institutional District (C-I)



West Campus Cogeneration Facility
 Meat Science Laboratory
 Stock Pavilion
4. Near West Neighborhood



Overview & Location

As a topographic low point of campus between Walnut Street and Babcock Drive, the area is seen as a connecting link between the Historic and West campus design neighborhoods. This area is important for research, teaching, and production particularly for the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Containing both an academic/research function as well as a service and infrastructure function, the design neighborhood also includes the West Campus Cogeneration Facility and the Walnut Street Heating Plant.

The area has two unique ways in which it is experienced and must address both in proposed designs. From the south the experience is via vehicular travel and site lines are toward the back-of-house operations toward many of the buildings. Design should address this situation to create a pleasing aesthetic via architectural features, service access, and/or screening treatments. The other method the area is experienced is internal via pedestrian movements. Architecture and landscape need to work together to ensure a desirable human experience is achieved. As a green district, the area shall employ strategies to reduce energy dependence, enhance eco-system services, honor the historic structures, and promote green infrastructure practices.

The design neighborhood is bounded by Walnut Street to the west, Babcock Drive to the east, Campus Drive to the south, and Observatory Drive to the north. The Natatorium is also included in this neighborhood to reinforce the importance of its architectural design and presence to Observatory Drive and the area in general.

Area: 68 acres (11% of 636 acre planning area)







Massing & Scale

- Where building type or program requires a larger, broad floor area, the building mass should still be articulated. Smaller wings and additions to the main building mass will help modulate the scale.
- Buildings shall have a base, middle, and top. Visual emphasis is to be given to the ground floor through door and window scale, architectural detailing, and greater floor-tofloor heights.
- New buildings should correspond to their neighbors in volume, scale, and level of detail. Necessarily large buildings should either be located among other such buildings or be broken down into smaller masses and given an appropriate level of detail.
- Minimize footprints as necessary to balance program need with providing an exemplary green district and collegiate setting.
- Begin each new building with symmetry in plan, although asymmetrical ideas can be introduced when necessary. Use an assemblage of repeating and overriding forms for interest and economy of costs. Buildings should follow a typology that will allow for flexibility of simple plan forms.
- Utilize architectural articulation such as changes in material, fenestration, architectural detailing, or other elements to break down the scale.



NEAR WEST NEIGHBORHOOD

NOTES:

- 1. Colors relate to building heights.
- 2. Where discrepancies arise between adopted plans, most current plan takes precedent.
- 3. X Numbers indicate UW-Madison 2015 Campus Master Plan proposed maximum building heights. Floor quantities indicated equate to 15-17' floor to floor heights.
- 4. 🔀 Indicate proposed HIGHER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 5. **x** Indicate proposed LOWER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 6. "+2" Additional floors approved for exceptional design/LEED.
- 7. \mathscr{R}^{i} Zoned Conservancy District, buildings not anticipated
- 8. \Re^2 Viewshed agreement, any proposed buildings require additional approval.





Building Heights

- Building heights are to generally match the urban context along campus edges.
- Buildings along the edges of the neighborhood may be taller, but should be designed to lessen their mass and bulk.
- Buildings should generally have flat roofs but reference historical agrarian structures in the area as precedent architecture.
- Consideration of accessible and/ or highly visible green roofs shall be considered.



Build-To Lines

- Refer to the Build-To Dimensions matrix for specific distances related to street frontages and major open space corridors.
- The primary build-to lines in the Near West neighborhood reflect the linear east/west orientation of the area with emphasis placed along Observatory Drive.
- Where buildings are proposed adjacent to the recreation neighborhood and no buildto line is indicated, it is recommended that planning and design be considered on an individual basis to balance program and open space.
- Buildings along open space networks shall be more varied and organic to reflect there unique campus location.
- Build-to lines are given to prevent flat, expansive, lifeless street or open space facades. The majority of the building facade should be brought to the suggested build-to line while still achieving facade articulation and interest that is compatible within the neighborhood.



Note: The placement of new buildings should respond to the alignment of adjacent buildings and adhere to the landscape framework plan which defines signature open space corridors. New buildings should be placed to engage and improve the quality of the campus landscape. While proposed buildings should be placed to maximize efficiency and use of the site, they should not block major pedestrian, habitat, stormwater, or visual corridors. Placement is ultimately dictated on a site by site basis to respond to the immediate context and ensure the building positively contributes to the whole of the campus.

Build-To Dimensions

The neighborhood matrix references each of the streets within the campus design neighborhood and further identifies the nuances along that street frontage to provide guidance when determining architectural build-to limits. These limits ensure architectural framing of the street is occurring where appropriate, green space is preserved, and that a pleasing human-scaled pedestrian

- Street Name: Name of street located within the neighborhood.
- Description: Segment of street in neighborhood, as widths and character may vary.
- Existing Corridor Width*: Identified existing width per Dane County mapping data.
- Orientation: What side of street segment guidelines are being applied.
- Build-To Line¹: Distance from back of the sidewalk where majority of the building should interface.
- Building Ht. Max: As identified by neighborhood/city plans and per anticipated UW program need.
- Step Back Req'ts: Recommended story height at Build-To line/distance (feet) of step back.
- Stormwater²: Is the area between the sidewalk/path and street appropriate for green infrastructure.

Street Name	Description	Corridor Width*	Orientation	Build-to Line ¹	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	Stormwater ²
	Walnut St. to Willow Creek	70'					
		70	S	25'	4	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
Observatory Drive	Willow Creek to Elm Dr.	66'	N	25'	4	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
			S	25'	4	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
	Elm Dr. to Babcock Dr.	60'					
			S	25'	6	3rd & Above - Mn. 15'	YES
inden Drive	Walnut St. to Willow Creek	68'	N	15'	4	None	NO
			S	10'	6	5th & Above - Min. 30'	NO
	Willow Creek to Elm Dr.	55'	N	20'	4	None	YES
		55	S	30'	4	None	YES
	Elm Dr. to Babcock Dr.	60-70'	Ν	100	5	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
		00-70	S	10'	5	5th - Min. 15'	NO
Campus Drive	Walnut St. to Babcock Dr. (incld. RR)	140'	N	Not Applicable	4 5 6	3rd & Above - Min. 30'	NO
Nolout Charact		001					
Walnut Street	Observatory Dr. to Campus Dr.	80'	E	45'	4 6	5th & Above - Min. 30'	NO
Easterday Lane (new location)	Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.	62'	W	20'	4	None	YES
	Observatory Dr. to Einderr Dr.		E	20'	4	None	YES
Willow Drive	Lot 58 to Observaotry Dr.	68'	W	-	4	None	YES
			W	15'	4	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
Elm Drive	Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.	74'	E	30'	5 6	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
Babcock Drive	Observatory Dr. to University Ave.	54'	W	40'	5 6	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO

* Corridor Width = Right-of-way width or if no right-of-way, back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk where right-of-way would typically be located.

¹ Right-of-way line or in the case of no right-of-way, the distance from back of sidewalk.

² Does the terrace condition support green infrastructure as part of the development of this area of street?



Landscape Principles

The Near West Neighborhood is a transitional area on campus between the academic Historic Campus Neighborhood and the mixed professional Health Sciences and Federal neighborhoods. Originally developed with few space limitations, the redevelopment of this neighborhood places emphasis on improving the aesthetic, performing and restorative qualities of the landscape and its brand as a modern agricultural research campus.

- Develop the Near West Neighborhood as a unified green district of sustainable working landscapes. Manage stormwater on site through green infrastructure approaches such as rain gardens, bioswales, and constructed wetlands.
- Promote a naturalistic landscape aesthetic of no-mow lawns and irregular groupings of trees.
- Use native plants to transition the landscape from the formal Historic Campus Neighborhood to Willow Creek and the Lakeshore Nature Preserve.
- Provide outdoor spaces that engage with Willow Creek as a restorative landscape experience.
- Back of house operations should be screened from view along Campus Drive.



Note: The list of statements characterize the neighborhood in regard to the Landscape Master Plan Guiding Principles. These principles were established to assist landscape recommendations in reaching the goals of the Campus Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

NEAR WEST NEIGHBORHOOD

Landscape Guidelines

Similar to the Health Sciences Neighborhood, the Near West Neighborhood is composed largely of the campus fabric typology. As this area has matured, its needs have evolved resulting in the creation of new open spaces like the Near West Commons and a re-vitalized Willow Creek.

- **Campus fabric:** Transitional landscape between the formal lawns of the Historic Campus Neighborhood and the naturalized Willow Creek corridor. Accordingly, the campus fabric should be picturesque becoming increasingly naturalized moving west toward Willow Creek.
- **Campus green:** The new campus green at the Horse Barn should be pastoral in character with open lawn and irregular stands of oak trees. Incorporate naturalistic rain garden swales to manage stormwater on site.
- Naturalized landscapes: Restore the riparian edge of Willow Creek and create naturalistic constructed wetland features west of the creek to manage stormwater from the immediate watershed.
- Courtyards, plazas, terraces, and **gardens:** Courtyards and plazas should respond to the surrounding architectural context while unifying the neighborhoods transitional aesthetic.





- INaturalized Land
 Streategenes
- Streetscapes
- Parking and Service

Note: The list of statements characterize the nature of the identified typologies as defined by the Landscape Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.



Materials & Styles: Existing Conditions

Reference the opposite page for material (Mx) and architectural feature (Ax) references.



Campus Dr. University Ave.

NEAR WEST NEIGHBORHOOD

Materials & Styles

The Near West Neighborhood covers 68 acres of the original agricultural campus. As such the area has developed around three architecturally significant agrarian-style buildings (Dairy Barn, Horse Barn, and the Stock Pavilion). Although materials and styles throughout this area do not directly relate to these historic structures, the ideas of form, texture, and mass are recommended to relate. New buildings should maintain a red/tan brick field with darker base materials with styles dictated by the building program and use.

Materials

M1. Red Brick M2. Concrete Form M3. Green Tile Roof M4. Ochre Brick M5. Dark Granite M6. Precast Panels



Architectural Styles

- Modern
- Post World War II
- Picturesque



Architectural Features

- A1. Agrarian Elements
- A2. Buildings which show their function
- A3. Lower Elevation Buildings (Horizontal)



Building Inventory

The building inventory lists all of the buildings within the defined campus neighborhood. Buildings are listed alphabetically by the official campus building name (per the Campus Map). Additional inventory information includes:

- Year building construction was completed.
- Year(s) major renovation projects were completed.
- Defining architectural style.
- Primary exterior material use.

Building	Built	Renovated	Style	Materials
1645 Linden Dr.	1868			Stucco, Wood Panels
1910 Linden Dr.	1956			Brick
502 Herrick Dr.	1961			Limestone Brick
Animal Sciences Building	1970		Post World War II	Brick, Concrete
Babcock Hall	1948	1956-milk tower add., 1988	International Style	Steel Reinforced Concrete, Brick, Aluminum
Barley and Malt Laboratory	1949		Unknown	Concrete, Brick
Biotron Laboratory	1964			Brick
Dairy Barn	1897		Normandy Design	Brick, Asphalt Shingles
Dairy Cattle Center	1953		Post World War II	Metal
Hanson Biomedical Sciences Building	1962			Brick
Horse Barn	1899	1935 reno	Normandy Design	Stone
Livestock Laboratory	1991			Brick,Aluminum
Meat Science and Muscle Biology Lab	1930			Limestone Brick
Natatorium Gymnasium	1965		Post World War II	Brick, Concrete
Poultry Research Laboratory	1956			Brick
Russell Labs	1963	1989 add.	Post World War II	Concrete, Brick
Seed Building	1936			Brick
Steenbock Memorial Library	1967	1995, 2006	Post World War II	Concrete, Brick
Stock Pavilion (animal husbandry)	1909	1957 add.	Picturesque	Red Brick, Concrete Trim, Yellow Brick, Green Tile
US Dairy Forage Research Center	1980	1988		Brick
Veterinary Medicine Building	1981	2003, 2013		Steel, Concrete Sheathed, Face Brick, Aluminum
Walnut Street Greenhouses	1954	1968 add.	Post World War II	Glass, Metal
Walnut Street Heating & Cooling Plant	1974	2013 add.	Post World War II	Precast Ribbed Panels, Brick, Concrete
West Campus Cogeneration Facility	2002	2013 add.	Unknown	Brick, Concrete
Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Lab	2004		Unknown	Brick, Concrete

Considerations

Considerations include information related to the planning, design, and approval of a typical building and/or landscape architecture campus project. It is to be reviewed as a resource identifying locations of materials that UW project teams reference most often. Not all projects will require each identified item. All projects should review the reference list and determine with the UW project manager applicability to the project.

Site Amenities & Vegetation

- 2015 Landscape Development Standards
- Division of Facilities Development Master Specifications–Division 32
- UW-Madison Technical Guidelines–Division 32

Past Plans

- 2006 Lakeshore Nature Preserve Master Plan
- 2007 Recreational Sports Facilities Master Plan
- 2014 University Avenue Corridor Neighborhood Plan
- 2016 Letters & Science Facilities Master Plan

Restoration/Preservation Efforts

• Willow Creek Restoration Project

Neighborhood Specific Conditions

- Viewshed Protection Agreement–WARF
- Friends of Lakeshore Nature Preserve
- Regent Neighborhood Association

Historical and Cultural Resources

- 2005 Cultural Landscape Report
- Historic Property Review Requirements
- Archaeological Site Review Requirements

Well Head District/Locations

• City of Madison Unit Well 27 (N. Randall Ave. & Bike Path)

City of Madison Zoning (Chapter 28)

• Campus Institutional District (C-I)



Dejope Residence Hall
 Porter Boathouse

3. Carson Gulley Center

5. Lakeshore Neighborhood



Overview & Location

Defined as the core residential life neighborhood along the Lake Mendota shoreline, this area should embrace its natural context and reorient itself to the lake. The neighborhood shall create places for community gathering and student-oriented activities.

Development in this area should be kept to an appropriate human scale with generally lower height buildings oriented around community quadrangles, terraces, and/or courtyards. An emphasis should be placed on creating a cohesive environment between building and site that heightens the student-life experience while fostering interaction and with peers and nature. Design should embrace its context through the use of natural materials and organic forms. Where appropriate, design is encouraged to inform and educate the user and/or viewer in the areas of stormwater management, ecosystem services, flora and fauna habitat, renewable energy, geomorphology, and sustainability.

The design neighborhood is bounded by Willow Drive to the west, Observatory Hill to the east, Near East Playfields/Cole Beach to the south, and Lake Mendota to the north. It contains a mix of traditional residence halls oriented around interior courtyards (Tripp/Adams Halls) as well as the more recent DeJope Hall which embraces the lake via expansive views and open space to the water's edge.

Area: 24 acres (4% of 636 acre planning area)







Massing & Scale

- Building edges facing important pedestrian corridors, gathering spaces, or exceptional natural resources shall have transparent treatments to enhance visual access between inside and outside as well as enliven outdoor spaces to promote activity. Transparency shall occur where building activity is highest to counterbalance energy efficiency needs.
- Buildings shall have a base, middle, and top. Visual emphasis is to be given to the ground floor through door and window scale, architectural detailing, and greater floor-tofloor heights.
- Minimize footprint widths as necessary to balance program need with interior building daylighting and energy efficiency.
- Begin each new building with symmetry in plan, although asymmetrical ideas can be introduced when necessary. Use an assemblage of repeating and overriding forms for interest and economy of costs. Buildings should follow a typology that will allow for flexibility of simple plan forms.
- Utilize architectural articulation such as changes in material, fenestration, architectural detailing, or other elements to break down the scale.
- Proposed building massing shall consider daylight penetration into all spaces of the building.



LAKESHORE NEIGHBORHOOD

NOTES:

- 1. Colors relate to building heights.
- 2. Where discrepancies arise between adopted plans, most current plan takes precedent.
- 3. X Numbers indicate UW-Madison 2015 Campus Master Plan proposed maximum building heights. Floor quantities indicated equate to 15-17' floor to floor heights.
- 4. 🔀 Indicate proposed HIGHER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 5. **x** Indicate proposed LOWER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 6. "+2" Additional floors approved for exceptional design/LEED.
- 7. \Re^{i} Zoned Conservancy District, buildings not anticipated
- 8. 😤 Viewshed agreement, any proposed buildings require additional approval.



Building Heights

- Building heights are to generally match the context and stay below the mature tree canopy heights.
- Consider existing topography and the natural campus setting when determining building heights.
- Building heights are recommended to be set below the adjacent tree canopy and have limited visibility when viewed from Lake Mendota.
- Buildings should generally have hip or gabled roofs.
- Consideration of accessible and/or highly visible green roofs shall be considered above building steps.





Build-To Lines

- Refer to the Build-To Dimensions matrix for specific distances related to street frontages and major open space corridors.
- The primary build-to lines in the Lakeshore neighborhood involve interaction with uses to the south and allow for more freedom of placement along Lake Mendota.
- Where buildings are proposed adjacent to open spaces and the lake, it is recommended that planning and design reference and acknowledge this unique and limited campus condition.
- Build-to lines are given to prevent flat, expansive, lifeless street or open space facades. The majority of the building facade should be brought to the suggested build-to line while still achieving facade articulation and interest that is compatible within the neighborhood.



Note: The placement of new buildings should respond to the alignment of adjacent buildings and adhere to the landscape framework plan which defines signature open space corridors. New buildings should be placed to engage and improve the quality of the campus landscape. While proposed buildings should be placed to maximize efficiency and use of the site, they should not block major pedestrian, habitat, stormwater, or visual corridors. Placement is ultimately dictated on a site by site basis to respond to the immediate context and ensure the building positively contributes to the whole of the campus.

Build-To Dimensions

The neighborhood matrix references each of the streets within the campus design neighborhood and further identifies the nuances along that street frontage to provide guidance when determining architectural build-to limits. These limits ensure architectural framing of the street is occurring where appropriate, green space is preserved, and that a pleasing human-scaled pedestrian realm is created that allows for street activation and socialization.

- Street Name: Name of street located within the neighborhood.
- Description: Segment of street in neighborhood, as widths and character may vary.
- Existing Corridor Width*: Identified existing width per Dane County mapping data.
- Orientation: What side of street segment guidelines are being applied.
- Build-To Line¹: Distance from back of the sidewalk where majority of the building should interface.
- Building Ht. Max: As identified by neighborhood/city plans and per anticipated UW program need.
- Step Back Req'ts: Recommended story height at Build-To line/distance (feet) of step back.
- Stormwater²: Is the area between the sidewalk/path and street appropriate for green infrastructure.

5. LAKESHORE NEIGHBORHOOD							
Street Name	Description	Corridor Width*	Orientation	Build-to Line ¹	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	Stormwater ²
Tripp Circle	Lot 35 to Lot 34	62'	N	10'	3	None	NO
Thipp clicle	201 33 10 201 34	02	S	10'	4	None	NO
Observatory Drive	Babcock Dr. to King Hall	64'	N	80'	4	None	NO
		64					
Willow Drive	Lot 58 to Observatory Dr.	68'					
		00	E	-	3	None	YES
Elm Drive	Lot 37 to Cole Beach	60'	W	10'	3	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
LIIII DIWE		00	E	10'	3	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
Babcock Drive	Lot 35 to Observatory Drive	62'	W	30'	3	None	NO
SADCOCK DIIVE			E	55'	4	None	NO

* Corridor Width = Right-of-way width or if no right-of-way, back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk where right-of-way would typically be located.

¹ Right-of-way line or in the case of no right-of-way, the distance from back of sidewalk.

² Does the terrace condition support green infrastructure as part of the development of this area of street?



Landscape Principles

The Lakeshore Neighborhood is unique in that it is in use 24 hours a day, seven days a week, during the academic year. This high level of use puts additional demands on the landscape. Dominated by residence halls, the landscape spaces are intimate in scale, defined by the historic buildings. The character of the neighborhood is one of a small community nestled in the remnant forest along the lake.

- Maintain the UW-Madison identity through the preservation and enhancement of the lakeshore. Manage vegetation to promote engagement with the lakeshore and support habitat for a diverse mix of flora and fauna.
- Promote a park-like, naturalistic aesthetic of irregular groupings of native trees with a clear ground plane and open sight lines.
- Create key interventions where natural plantings interrupt the park character, bleeding the transition between the natural lakeshore edge and picturesque residence hall grounds.
- Manage stormwater on site implementing green infrastructure approaches such as rain gardens and bioswales.



Note: The list of statements characterize the neighborhood in regard to the Landscape Master Plan Guiding Principles. These principles were established to assist landscape recommendations in reaching the goals of the Campus Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

LAKESHORE NEIGHBORHOOD

Landscape Guidelines

- **Campus fabric:** Transitional landscape from the formal lawns of the Historic Campus Neighborhood to the naturalized lakeshore edge. The campus fabric should be naturalistic, enhancing the connection to the lake. Plant irregular stands of native trees and convert low-use areas of turf grass to no-mow fescue or short-grass meadow.
- **Campus green:** Maintain the campus greens at DeJope Residence Hall and Carson Gulley as flexible, passive open spaces.
- Naturalized landscapes: Maintain the natural lake edge and the character of the Howard Temin Lakeshore Path. Selectively remove trees to open up views to the lake.
- Courtyards, plazas, terraces, and gardens: Intimate courtyards and plazas should respond to the surrounding building architecture and be designed with enduring-high quality materials. Integrate pervious paving to promote infiltration of stormwater, reducing direct discharge to the lake.
- **Parking and service:** Screen views of parking from Lake Mendota. Maintain view sheds to the lake.



Campus Greens Courtyards, Plazas, & Gardens Campus Fabric Naturalized Landscapes Streetscapes Parking and Service

Note: The list of statements characterize the nature of the identified typologies as defined by the Landscape Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

S.

Materials & Styles: Existing Conditions

Reference the opposite page for material (Mx) and architectural feature (Ax) references.



Observatory Dr.

272 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

Observatory Dr.

LAKESHORE NEIGHBORHOOD

Materials & Styles

The Lakeshore Neighborhood is defined by both it's materials and spaces created by its architecture. Materials reference the lakeside setting and are typically more rusticated, earth toned, and natural in origin than throughout the rest of campus. Appropriately scaled materials are imperative to maintaining a sense of intimacy and reflecting its context within campus. Durability and weathering are also important considerations due to the users of these buildings and the location along Lake Mendota.

Materials

M1. Red Brick/Bedford Limestone/Terra Cotta (Roof)
M2. Bedford Limestone
M3. Tan Brick/Limestone
M4. Limestone (Multiple Finishes)
M5. Tan Brick



Architectural Styles

- Beaux Arts
- Classical Revival
- Richardsonian Romanesque
- Environmental Modernism



Architectural Features

- A1. Human Scaled Spaces and Courtyards
- A2. Classical Forms and Ornamentation
- A3. Natural Picturesque Views



Building Inventory

The building inventory lists all of the buildings within the defined campus neighborhood. Buildings are listed alphabetically by the official campus building name (per the Campus Map). Additional inventory information includes:

- Year building construction was completed.
- Year(s) major renovation projects were completed.
- Defining architectural style.
- Primary exterior material use.

Building	Built Renovated		Style	Ма	aterials		
5. LAKESHORE NEIGHBORHOOD		÷	÷		÷		
Street Name	Description	Existing R/W	Orientation	Build to Line from C/W	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	R/W Stormwater
Tripp Circle	Lot 35 to Lot 34	62'	Ν	10'	3	None	NO
		02	S	10'	4	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
Observatory Drive	Babcock Dr. to King Hall	64'	N	80'	4	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
Observatory Drive							
Willow Drive	Lot 58 to Observatory Dr.	68'					
			E	-	3	6	YES
Elm Drive	Lot 37 to Cole Beach	60'	W	10'	3	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
EIIII Drive			E	10'	3	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
Babcock Drive	Lot 35 to Observatory Drive	62'	W	40'	3	None	NO
			E	55'	4	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO

Considerations

Considerations include information related to the planning, design, and approval of a typical building and/or landscape architecture campus project. It is to be reviewed as a resource identifying locations of materials that UW project teams reference most often. Not all projects will require each identified item. All projects should review the reference list and determine with the UW project manager applicability to the project.

Site Amenities & Vegetation

- 2015 Landscape Development Standards
- Division of Facilities Development Master Specifications–Division 32
- UW-Madison Technical Guidelines–Division 32

Past Plans

- 2006 Lakeshore Nature Preserve Master Plan
- 2006 UW Housing Facilities Master Plan

Restoration/Preservation Efforts

- University Bay Restoration
- Tree Canopy Preservation

Neighborhood Specific Conditions

• Friends of Lakeshore Nature Preserve

Historical and Cultural Resources

- 2005 Cultural Landscape Report
- Historic Property Review Requirements
- Archaeological Site Review Requirements

Well Head District/Locations

• City of Madison Unit Well 27 (N. Randall Ave. & Bike Path)

City of Madison Zoning (Chapter 28)

• Campus Institutional District (C-I)



Agricultural Hall
 DeLuca Biochemical Sciences Building
 Education Building

6. Historic Campus Neighborhood



Overview & Location

Defined as the academic and historic core of campus the area primarily includes classrooms and offices for faculty and staff. As the oldest portion of campus it presents a traditional collegiate aesthetic with an architecturally rich building inventory set in a verdant landscape setting.

While being the most building-dense neighborhood on campus, the entire area feels less urban than south of University Avenue. This is related to quantity and quality of open spaces, including the iconic Bascom Mall quadrangle which is appropriately scaled and massed to relate to the architecture. An emphasis is placed on pedestrian walkability and scale, with limited street infrastructure throughout the area. This design neighborhood is most commonly associated with the UW-Madison identity and as such material use and design principles shall be of a quality and craftsmanship on par with a world class institution.

Although the streets around and through this design neighborhood shall have a clear and consistent quality per the streetscape typology recommendations, the architecture is allowed more freedom to draw from its immediate adjacencies. The identified Architectural Mixing Zones are highlighting primary streets within the campus development boundary where building styles and materials can most appropriately draw from their immediate context. In essence, the goal is promote a dialogue along these corridors that is not identifiable with any one design neighborhood, but part of the UW-Madison physical experience.

The design neighborhood is bounded by Babcock Drive to the west, N. Park Street to the east, University Avenue to the south, and primarily Observatory Drive to the north. The area also includes Elizabeth Waters Hall and Williams H. Sewell Social Science Building located north of Observatory Drive.







Massing & Scale

- Buildings are to support the campus civic structure, giving architectural definition to the campus streets, quadrangles, and other open spaces. Buildings are to front directly onto these spaces and to support them by their form, massing, and the design of their facades.
- Buildings shall have a base, middle, and top. Visual emphasis is to be given to the ground floor through door and window scale, architectural detailing, and greater floor-to-floor heights.
- Minimize footprints as necessary to balance program need with providing an exemplary collegiate setting.
- Begin each new building with symmetry in plan, although asymmetrical ideas can be introduced when necessary. Use an assemblage of repeating and overriding forms for interest and economy of costs. Buildings should follow a typology that will allow for flexibility of simple plan forms.
- Utilize architectural articulation such as changes in material, fenestration, architectural detailing, or other elements to break down the scale.
- Proposed building massing shall consider daylight penetration into all spaces of the building.



HISTORIC CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

NOTES:

- 1. Colors relate to building heights.
- 2. Where discrepancies arise between adopted plans, most current plan takes precedent.
- 3. X Numbers indicate UW-Madison 2015 Campus Master Plan proposed maximum building heights. Floor quantities indicated equate to 15-17' floor to floor heights.
- 4. 🔀 Indicate proposed HIGHER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 5. 🗴 Indicate proposed LOWER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 6. "+2" Additional floors approved for exceptional design/LEED.
- 7. \Re^{i} Zoned Conservancy District, buildings not anticipated
- 8. \Re^2 Viewshed agreement, any proposed buildings require additional approval.



Building Heights

- Building heights are to generally match the urban context to the south and east, crescendo in height along the campus arterials of University Avenue and Johnson Street and become lower as the lakeshore is approached.
- Consider existing topography and the natural campus setting when determining building heights.
- Buildings along the edges of the neighborhood may be taller, but should be designed to lessen their mass and bulk against these more natural areas of campus.
- Consider building heights in conjunction with exemplary view corridors (i.e. Looking up Bascom Hill to Bascom Hall and seeing Van Hise in the background).
- Buildings should generally have hip or gabled roofs.



Build-To Lines

- Refer to the Build-To Dimensions matrix for specific distances related to street frontages and major open space corridors.
- The primary build-to lines in the Historic neighborhood promote existing quadrangle definition and arterial corridor definition.
- Build-to lines are given to prevent flat, expansive, lifeless street or open space facades. The majority of the building facade should be brought to the suggested build-to line while still achieving facade articulation and interest that is compatible within the neighborhood.
- Build-to lines are the most strict around open spaces in this neighborhood to reinforce the importance and prominence of structures in these areas.



Note: The placement of new buildings should respond to the alignment of adjacent buildings and adhere to the landscape framework plan which defines signature open space corridors. New buildings should be placed to engage and improve the quality of the campus landscape. While proposed buildings should be placed to maximize efficiency and use of the site, they should not block major pedestrian, habitat, stormwater, or visual corridors. Placement is ultimately dictated on a site by site basis to respond to the immediate context and ensure the building positively contributes to the whole of the campus.

HISTORIC CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

Build-To Dimensions

The neighborhood matrix references each of the streets • within the campus design neighborhood and further • identifies the nuances along that street frontage to provide guidance when determining architectural build-to limits. These limits ensure architectural framing of the street is • occurring where appropriate, green space is preserved, and • that a pleasing human-scaled pedestrian realm is created • that allows for street activation and socialization. •

- Street Name: Name of street located within the neighborhood.
- Description: Segment of street in neighborhood, as widths and character may vary.
- Existing Corridor Width*: Identified existing width per Dane County mapping data.
- Orientation: What side of street segment guidelines are being applied.
- Build-To Line¹: Distance from back of the sidewalk where majority of the building should interface.
- Building Ht. Max: As identified by neighborhood/city plans and per anticipated UW program need.
- Step Back Req'ts: Recommended story height at Build-To line/distance (feet) of step back.
- Stormwater²: Is the area between the sidewalk/path and street appropriate for green infrastructure.

Street Name	Description	Corridor Width*	Orientation	Build-to Line ¹	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	Stormwater ²
	Babcock Dr. to King Hall	64'					
			S	10' (steps)	6	None	NO
Observatory Drive	King Hall to N. Charter St.	64'	N	20'	4	None	NO
5			S N	70' 20'	4 8	None None	NO NO
	N. Charter St. to N. Park St.	60'	S	20	4 5 7 8	None	NO
		(0)	N	100'	5	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
Linder Deter	Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall	68'	S	30'	4 6	4th & Above - Min. 15'	YES
Linden Drive	Llonge Moll to N. Charter St	(0)	N	100'	5	None	NO
	Henry Mall to N. Charter St.	68'	S	30'	4 6	4th & Above - Min. 15'	YES
New E/W Street (60' RW* min.)	New N/S Street to N. Charter St.		Ν	10'	6	5th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
New E/W Street (80 RW THIT.)	New N/S Street to N. Charter St.	-	S	10'	6	5th & Above - Min. 15'	YES
University Avenue	Henry Mall to N. Charter St.	100'	N	50'	4 6	5th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	N. Charter St. to N. Park St.	100'	N	50'	10	5th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.	60'	F	35'	5 6	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
Babcock Drive		42'			50	4(11 & Above - 10111, 15	NU
	Linden Dr. to University Avenue		E	20'	6		NO
Henry Mall	Linden Dr. to University Avenue	114'	W	15'	4	4th & Above - Min. 30'	NO
			E	15'	4	4th & Above - Min. 30'	NO
New N/S Street (60' RW* min.)	Linden Dr. to University Avenue	68'	W	10'	6	None	NO
	Ender Dr. to oniversity Avenue	00	E	10'	6	None	YES
	Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.	62'	W	30'	5 8	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Charter Street		02	E	20'	4	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	Linden Dr. to University Ave.	62'	W	40'	6	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
		02	E	20'	6 10	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
	Observatory Dr. to State Street Mall	62'	W	50'	8	5th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Park Street	State Street Mall to University Ave.	70'	W	45'	10	8th & Above - Min. 15'	NO

* Corridor Width = Right-of-way width or if no right-of-way, back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk where right-of-way would typically be located.

¹ Right-of-way line or in the case of no right-of-way, the distance from back of sidewalk.

² Does the terrace condition support green infrastructure as part of the development of this area of street?



Landscape Principles

The Historic Campus Neighborhood is the heart of campus. This landscape encapsulates the history of campus. Care should be taken to restore and enhance these spaces with attention to reinforcing the original formal design gestures.

- Preserve and enhance the formal quality of the landscape.
- Restore original malls to give campus clearer legibility.
- Focus on high quality materials that enhance the stature of the Historic Campus Neighborhood.
- Expand naturalized landscapes on Observatory Hill.
- Manage stormwater on site through green infrastructure approaches such as rain gardens and constructed wetlands.



Note: The list of statements characterize the neighborhood in regard to the Landscape Master Plan Guiding Principles. These principles were established to assist landscape recommendations in reaching the goals of the Campus Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

HISTORIC CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

10

Landscape Guidelines

The Historic Campus Neighborhood is composed of a series of formal malls and greens between which the campus fabric connects and knits together the space.

- **Campus fabric:** Traditional lawn and irregularly spaced shade trees.
- **Campus green:** Maintain the Bascom green and add new greens through the redevelopment of the Medical Sciences campus.
- **Campus malls:** Reinforce originally designed spaces that organized the first expansion of the UW-Madison campus preserving the original sense of place.
- Naturalized landscapes: Restore and naturalize Observatory Hill creating a contrast between the two major drumlins on campus and showing the importance of natural spaces within campus.
- Courtyards, plazas, terraces, and gardens: Courtyards and plazas should respond to the surrounding architectural context and be constructed of high quality materials and craftsmanship.



Campus Greens
 Courtyards, Plazas, & Gardens
 Campus Fabric
 Naturalized Landscapes
 Streetscapes
 Parking and Service

Note: The list of statements characterize the nature of the identified typologies as defined by the Landscape Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

10

Materials & Styles: Existing Conditions

Reference the opposite page for material (Mx) and architectural feature (Ax) references.



HISTORIC CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

Materials & Styles

Many materials have been used on campus over the years, with good effect. The Historic Campus Neighborhood has a large number of Madison Sandstone and Superior Sandstone buildings that identify this part of campus. Other common materials and styles are identified below. New construction need not duplicate these historical features, however consideration should be made towards achieving a similar level of quality through detail and fenestration of building facades. Context should inform proposed materials and styles, but ultimately development should be of the present time.

Materials

M1. Grey Brick/Bedford Limestone
M2. Red Brick
M3. Terra Cotta/Anodized Aluminum
M4. Limestone Quoins/Lintels/Pediments
M5. Berlin Rybolite
M6. Madison Sandstone
M7. Superior Sandstone
M8. Bedford Limestone



Architectural Styles

- Beaux Arts
- Classical Revival
- Richardsonian Romanesque
- Modern
- Environmental Modernism

Architectural Features

- A1. Articulation and Ornamentation
 A2. Density of Architectural Variety
 A3. Courtyards and Insets
 A4. Dentity
- A4. Portico





Building Inventory

The building inventory lists all of the buildings within the defined campus neighborhood. Buildings are listed alphabetically by the official campus building name (per the Campus Map). Additional inventory information includes:

- Year building construction was completed.
- Year(s) major renovation projects were completed.
- Defining architectural style.
- Primary exterior material use.

			tyle	Materials		
DRHOOD						
Description	Existing R/W	Orientation	Build to Line from C/W	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	R/W Stormwater
Babcock Dr. to King Hall	64'					
	04	S	10'	6	None	NO
King Hall to N. Charter St.	64'		-	4	None	NO
		-			None	NO
N. Charter St. to N. Park St.	60'	-	=-			NO
		-	-			NO
Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall	68'					NO
		-				YES
Henry Mall to N. Charter St.	68'			-		NO
- ,		-				YES
New N/S Street to N. Charter St.	68'		-	-		NO
		S	÷	-		YES
Henry Mall to N. Charter St.	100'	N	50'	4 6	5th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Charter St. to N. Park St.	100'	N	45'	10	5th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.	60'					
		E	35'	5 6	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
Linden Dr. to University Avenue	42'		201			
						NO
Linden Dr. to University Avenue	114'					NO
			_			NO
Linden Dr. to University Avenue	68'			-		NO YES
			-	-		NO
Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.	62'					NO
		-		-		YES
Linden Dr. to University Ave.	62'		-	÷		YES
		_	-			
Observatory Dr. to State Street Mall	62'	W	50'	8	Stn & Above - Min. 15'	NO
State Street Mall to University Ave	70'	W	45'	10	5th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
· · · ·	Babcock Dr. to King Hall King Hall to N. Charter St. N. Charter St. to N. Park St. Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall Henry Mall to N. Charter St. New N/S Street to N. Charter St. Henry Mall to N. Charter St. New N/S Street to N. Charter St. N. Charter St. to N. Park St. Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr. Linden Dr. to University Avenue Linden Dr. to University Avenue Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr. Linden Dr. to University Avenue Linden Dr. to University Avenue Diservatory Dr. to Linden Dr. Linden Dr. to University Avenue	Babcock Dr. to King Hall64'King Hall to N. Charter St.64'N. Charter St. to N. Park St.60'Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall68'Henry Mall to N. Charter St.68'New N/S Street to N. Charter St.68'Henry Mall to N. Charter St.68'New N/S Street to N. Charter St.68'Under St. to N. Park St.100'N. Charter St. to N. Park St.100'N. Charter St. to N. Park St.100'Unden Dr. to University Avenue42'Linden Dr. to University Avenue42'Linden Dr. to University Avenue68'Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.62'Linden Dr. to University Avenue62'Linden Dr. to University Avenue62'Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.62'Linden Dr. to University Avenue62'	Babcock Dr. to King Hall $64'$ SKing Hall to N. Charter St. $64'$ NN. Charter St. to N. Park St. $60'$ NBabcock Dr. to Henry Mall $68'$ NBabcock Dr. to Henry Mall $68'$ NHenry Mall to N. Charter St. $68'$ NNew N/S Street to N. Charter St. $68'$ NHenry Mall to N. Charter St. $68'$ NNew N/S Street to N. Charter St. $68'$ NNo. Charter St. $100'$ NN. Charter St. to N. Park St. $100'$ NN. Charter St. to N. Park St. $100'$ NObservatory Dr. to Linden Dr. $60'$ ELinden Dr. to University Avenue $114'$ ELinden Dr. to University Avenue $68'$ WLinden Dr. to University Avenue $68'$ WUnder Dr. to University Avenue $62'$ WObservatory Dr. to Linden Dr. $62'$ WUnden Dr. to University Avenue $62'$ <	Babcock Dr. to King Hall $64'$ S $10'$ King Hall to N. Charter St. $64'$ N-N. Charter St. to N. Park St. $60'$ S $20'$ Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall $68'$ N $45'$ Henry Mall to N. Charter St. $68'$ N $100'$ Henry Mall to N. Charter St. $68'$ N 0 New N/S Street to N. Charter St. $68'$ N 0 Henry Mall to N. Charter St. $68'$ S 0 New N/S Street to N. Charter St. $68'$ S 0 N. Charter St. to N. Park St. $100'$ N $45'$ Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr. $60'$ E $35'$ Linden Dr. to University Avenue $114'$ E $15'$ Linden Dr. to University Avenue $68'$ W $15'$ Linden Dr. to University Avenue $68'$ W $15'$ Unden Dr. to University Avenue $68'$ E $15'$ Unden Dr. to University Avenue $68'$ W $15'$ Unden Dr. to University Avenue $68'$ W $15'$ Unden Dr. to University Avenue $68'$ E $15'$ Unden Dr. to University Avenue $62'$ W $30'$ Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr. $62'$ W $40'$ Unden Dr. to University Ave. $62'$ W $50'$ <td>Babcock Dr. to King Hall $64'$ S $10'$ 6 King Hall to N. Charter St. $64'$ N - 4 N. Charter St. to N. Park St. $60'$ N $20'$ $4 8$ N. Charter St. to N. Park St. $60'$ S $20'$ $4 5 7 8$ Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall $68'$ N $445'$ 5 Henry Mall to N. Charter St. $68'$ N $100'$ 5 New N/S Street to N. Charter St. $68'$ N 0 6 N. Charter St. to N. Park St. $100'$ N $50'$ $4 6$ Now N/S Street to N. Charter St. $100'$ N $50'$ $4 6$ N. Charter St. to N. Park St. $100'$ N $45'$ 10 Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr. $60'$ E $35'$ $5 6$ Linden Dr. to University Avenue $114'$ W $20'$ 4 Linden Dr. to University Avenue $68'$ W $15'$ 6 Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.<!--</td--><td>Babcock Dr. to King Hall 64' S 10' 6 None King Hall to N. Charter St. 64' N N - 4 None N. Charter St. to N. Park St. 60' N 20' 4 None Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall 68' S 20' 4 5 7 8 None Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall 68' S 30' 4 6 3rd & Above - Min. 15' Henry Mall to N. Charter St. 68' S 30' 4 6 3rd & Above - Min. 15' New N/S Street to N. Charter St. 68' N 0 6 None Henry Mall to N. Charter St. 68' S 0 6 None M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 10 5 None M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 10 5 None M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 10 5 Sh & Above - Min. 15' M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 1</td></td>	Babcock Dr. to King Hall $64'$ S $10'$ 6 King Hall to N. Charter St. $64'$ N - 4 N. Charter St. to N. Park St. $60'$ N $20'$ $4 8 $ N. Charter St. to N. Park St. $60'$ S $20'$ $4 5 7 8 $ Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall $68'$ N $445'$ 5 Henry Mall to N. Charter St. $68'$ N $100'$ 5 New N/S Street to N. Charter St. $68'$ N 0 6 N. Charter St. to N. Park St. $100'$ N $50'$ $4 6$ Now N/S Street to N. Charter St. $100'$ N $50'$ $4 6$ N. Charter St. to N. Park St. $100'$ N $45'$ 10 Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr. $60'$ E $35'$ $5 6$ Linden Dr. to University Avenue $114'$ W $20'$ 4 Linden Dr. to University Avenue $68'$ W $15'$ 6 Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr. </td <td>Babcock Dr. to King Hall 64' S 10' 6 None King Hall to N. Charter St. 64' N N - 4 None N. Charter St. to N. Park St. 60' N 20' 4 None Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall 68' S 20' 4 5 7 8 None Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall 68' S 30' 4 6 3rd & Above - Min. 15' Henry Mall to N. Charter St. 68' S 30' 4 6 3rd & Above - Min. 15' New N/S Street to N. Charter St. 68' N 0 6 None Henry Mall to N. Charter St. 68' S 0 6 None M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 10 5 None M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 10 5 None M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 10 5 Sh & Above - Min. 15' M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 1</td>	Babcock Dr. to King Hall 64' S 10' 6 None King Hall to N. Charter St. 64' N N - 4 None N. Charter St. to N. Park St. 60' N 20' 4 None Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall 68' S 20' 4 5 7 8 None Babcock Dr. to Henry Mall 68' S 30' 4 6 3rd & Above - Min. 15' Henry Mall to N. Charter St. 68' S 30' 4 6 3rd & Above - Min. 15' New N/S Street to N. Charter St. 68' N 0 6 None Henry Mall to N. Charter St. 68' S 0 6 None M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 10 5 None M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 10 5 None M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 10 5 Sh & Above - Min. 15' M. Charter St. 100' N 45' 1

see next page ...

HISTORIC CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

30)

...continued

Building	Built Renovated		Style		Materials		
	Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.	60'					
Babcock Drive			E	35'	5 6	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	Linden Dr. to University Avenue	42'					
		12	E	20'	6		NO
Henry Mall	Linden Dr. to University Avenue	114'	W	20'	4	4th & Above - Min. 30'	NO
	Linden Dr. to Oniversity Avenue	114	E	15'	4	4th & Above - Min. 30'	NO
New N/S Street	Linden Dr. to University Avenue	68'	W	15'	6	None	NO
New N/S Street	Linden Dr. to Oniversity Avenue		E	15'	6	None	YES
	Observatory Dr. to Linden Dr.	62'	W	30'	5 8	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Charter Street	Observatory Dr. to Ender Dr.		E	15'	4	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Charter Street	Linden Dr. to University Ave.	62'	W	40'	6	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
	Linden Dr. to Oniversity Ave.		E	20'	6 10	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
N. Park Street	Observatory Dr. to State Street Mall	62'	W	50'	8	5th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	State Street Mall to University Ave.	70'	W	45'	10	5th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	State Street Wall to Olliversity Ave.						

Considerations

Considerations include information related to the planning, design, and approval of a typical building and/or landscape architecture campus project. It is to be reviewed as a resource identifying locations of materials that UW project teams reference most often. Not all projects will require each identified item. All projects should review the reference list and determine with the UW project manager applicability to the project.

Site Amenities & Vegetation

- 2015 Landscape Development Standards
- Division of Facilities Development Master Specifications-Division 32
- UW-Madison Technical Guidelines–Division 32

Past Plans

- 2006 Lakeshore Nature Preserve Master Plan
- 2006 UW Housing Facilities Master Plan
- 2016 Letters & Science Facilities Master Plan

Restoration/Preservation Efforts

- Bascom Mall
- Henry Mall Historic District
- Observatory Hill

Neighborhood Specific Conditions

• Friends of Lakeshore Nature Preserve

Historical and Cultural Resources

- 2005 Cultural Landscape Report
- Historic Property Review Requirements
- Archaeological Site Review Requirements
- Archaeological Management Guidelines

Well Head District/Locations

• City of Madison Unit Well 27 (N. Randall Ave. & Bike Path)

City of Madison Zoning (Chapter 28)

• Campus Institutional District (C-I)



1. East Campus Mall & Chazen Museum of Art 2. Memorial Union

3. Ogg Residence Hall

EAST CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD
7. East Campus Neighborhood



Overview & Location

Defined as the portion of campus where town and gown interface. A mixed use neighborhood with housing and student services set along side performing arts, communication, and administrative activities. The inclusion of Memorial Union, Library Mall, and conference facilities make this area a social hub. East Campus Mall provides a critical north-south linkage through this area connecting the following uses and characteristics of each block (north to south):

- Lake Mendota to State Street. Buildings with traditional architecture buildings frame Library Mall and Alumni Park. Beyond the university faculty, staff, and student populations, a large percentage of users include visitors and public patrons making this area a vibrant node of campus at all times of the year.
- State Street to University Avenue. Composed of a mix of architectural styles and urban courtyards the area supports both academic buildings and performance/ visual art facilities.
- University Avenue to W. Johnson Street. An area consisting of large-footprint buildings that are a mix of institutional and partnership development.
- Regent Street to W. Johnson Street. The location of the southeast residence halls and home to a large population of underclassmen including supporting recreational and food establishments.

The design neighborhood is most cleanly bounded by N. Park Street on the west and Lake Mendota on the north. The remaining two edges interface with the City of Madison but can generally be defined as Regent Street/Railroad to the south and N. Lake Street/N. Francis Street to the east. It is important to denote the sliver of State Street that is not within the campus development boundary and the far southeastern corner of the campus which includes the Art Loft Building and parking Lot 91 which is shared with the Madison Metropolitan School District located in the Doyle Administration Building.

Area: 76 acres (12% of 636 acre planning area)





Massing & Scale

- Buildings are to support the campus civic structure, giving architectural definition to the campus streets, quadrangles, and other open spaces. Buildings are to front directly onto these spaces and to support them by their form, massing, and the design of their facades.
- Architectural composition should particularly emphasize a distinct identity for the buildings along East Campus Mall. This identity should be legible from critical viewpoints, as well as within the overall campus skyline when seen from a distance.
- Buildings shall have a base, middle, and top. Visual emphasis is to be given to the ground floor through door and window scale, architectural detailing, and greater floor-to-floor heights.
- Begin each new building with symmetry in plan, although asymmetrical ideas can be introduced when necessary. Use an assemblage of repeating and overriding forms for interest and economy of costs. Buildings should follow a typology that will allow for flexibility of simple plan forms.
- Where buildings are set back at upper stories, use lower roofs as green roofs, balconies, terraces, and gardens.
- Utilize architectural articulation such as changes in material, fenestration, architectural detailing, or other elements to break down the scale.







Park Street - Railroad to W. Dayton St. (View North)



Bike Path - Park St. to Kohl Center (View Easterly)





7. CAMPUS DESIGN GUIDELINES & STANDARDS

EAST CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD



NOTES:

- 1. Colors relate to building heights.
- 2. Where discrepancies arise between adopted plans, most current plan takes precedent.
- 3. 🗶 Numbers indicate UW-Madison 2015 Campus Master Plan proposed maximum building heights. Floor quantities indicated equate to 15-17' floor to floor heights.
- 4. 💌 Indicate proposed HIGHER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 5. 🗴 Indicate proposed LOWER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 6. "+2" Additional floors approved for exceptional design/LEED.
- 7. \mathscr{R}^{\prime} Zoned Conservancy District, buildings not anticipated
- 8. \Re^2 Viewshed agreement, any proposed buildings require additional approval.

Building Heights

- Building heights are to generally match the urban context to the south and east, crescendo in height along the campus arterials of University Avenue and Johnson Street and become lower as the lakeshore is approached.
- When directly abutting the community, building heights should not significantly exceed that of neighboring community buildings. Height differences shall be mitigated by orienting taller building masses toward the campus. Similarly, upper floors may be stepped back away from the street frontage.
- Buildings should generally have a mix of roof shapes.
- Consideration of accessible and/or highly visible green roofs shall be considered.



Build-To Lines

- Refer to the Build-To Dimensions matrix for specific distances related to street frontages and major open space corridors.
- The primary build-to lines in the East Campus neighborhood involve interaction with existing street right-of-ways and the creation of traditional urban forms.
- Build-to lines along the East Campus are indicated as open space and therefore shall interplay and offer a diversity of first floor offsets and indoor/outdoor experiences.
- Build-to lines are given to prevent flat, expansive, lifeless street or open space facades. The majority of the building facade should be brought to the suggested build-to line while still achieving facade articulation and interest that is compatible within the neighborhood.



Note: The placement of new buildings should respond to the alignment of adjacent buildings and adhere to the landscape framework plan which defines signature open space corridors. New buildings should be placed to engage and improve the quality of the campus landscape. While proposed buildings should be placed to maximize efficiency and use of the site, they should not block major pedestrian, habitat, stormmater, or visual corridors. Placement is ultimately dictated on a site by site basis to respond to the immediate context and ensure the building positively contributes to the whole of the campus.

EAST CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

Build-To Dimensions

The neighborhood matrix references each of the streets within the campus design neighborhood and further identifies the nuances along that street frontage to provide guidance when determining architectural 'Build-To' limits. These limits ensure architectural framing of the street is occurring where appropriate, green space is preserved, and that a pleasing human-

- Street Name: Name of street located within the neighborhood.
- Description: Segment of street in neighborhood, as widths and character may vary.
- Existing Corridor Width*: Identified existing width per Dane County mapping data.
- Orientation: What side of street segment guidelines are being applied.
- Build-To Line¹: Distance from back of the sidewalk where majority of the building should interface.
- Building Ht. Max: As identified by neighborhood/city plans and per anticipated UW program need.
- Step Back Req'ts: Recommended story height at Build-To line/distance (feet) of step back.
- Stormwater²: Is the area between the sidewalk/path and street appropriate for green infrastructure.

7. EAST CAMPUS NEIGHBOR	HOOD						
Street Name	Description	Corridor Width*	Orientation	Build-to Line ¹	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	Stormwater ²
Langdon Street	N. Park St. to N. Lake St.	68'	Ν	50'	6	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	N. Park St. to N. Lake St.	00	S	25'	6	5th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
State Street	N. Park St. to N. Lake St.	66'	N	10'	3 stepping to 6	3rd & Above - Min. 30'	NO
State Street	N. Park St. to N. Lake St.	00	S	10'	3 stepping to 5	3rd & Above - Min. 30'	NO
University Avenue	N. Park St. to N. Francis St.	100'	N	20' / 100' Step	10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
University Avenue	N. Fark St. to N. Francis St.	100	S	20'	10	8th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
W. Johnson Street	N. Park St. to N. Franics St.	68'	N	10'	10	8th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
W. Johnson Street	N. Fark St. to N. Franks St.	00	S	15'	10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	N. Park St. to N. Lake St.	68'	N	10'	10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	YES
W. Dayton Street			S	20'	10	8th & Above - Min. 15'	YES
W. Buyton Street	N. Lake St. to Frances St.	68'	N	20'	10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	YES
	Lakashara nath ta Langdon St	46'	W	30'	2	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	Lakeshore path to Langdon St.	40	E	5'	6	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	Langdon St. to University Ave.	70'					
		,,,	E	10'	5 6 10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	YES
N. Park Street	University Ave. to W. Johnson	120'	F	0'	10	5th & Above - Min. 15'	YES
		120'	L		10		TES
	W. Johnson St. to W. Dayton St.		E	10'	10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	YES
	W. Dayton St. to 21 N Park St.						
	W. Bayton St. to 21 W1 ark St.	134	E	20'	10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	YES
	State St. to University Ave.	66'	W	15'	5 10	4th & 9th - Min. 15'	YES
		00	E	15'	5 10	4th & 9th - Min. 15'	YES
East Campus Mall	University Ave. to W. Johnson St.	66'	W	15'	10	4th & 9th - Min. 15'	YES
		00	E	15'	10	4th & 9th - Min. 15'	YES
	W. Johnson St. to Railroad Bridge	66'	W	15'	10	4th & 9th - Min. 15'	YES
	W. Johnson St. to Kaliload Bhage	00	E	15'	10	4th & 9th - Min. 15'	YES
	Lake Mendota to University Ave.	68'	W	10'	5 6 10	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
L Lalva Churat		701	W	20'	10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Lake Street	University Ave. to W. Johnson St.	72'	E	20'	10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
		(0)	W	20'	10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	W. Johnson St. to W. Dayton St.	68'	E	20'	10	4th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
	University Ave. to W. Dayton St.	62-72'	W	15'	10	3rd & 9th - Min. 15'	NO
N. Frances Street	chiversity Ave. to w. Dayton St.	02.72					
א. דו מוונידג גון פפן	W. Dayton St. to Railroad Tracks	66'		151	0	Eth & Above Mir 15	VEC
			E	15'	8	5th & Above - Min. 15'	YES

* Corridor Width = Right-of-way width or if no right-of-way, back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk where right-of-way would typically be located.

¹ Right-of-way line or in the case of no right-of-way, the distance from back of sidewalk.

² Does the terrace condition support green infrastructure as part of the development of this area of street?



Landscape Principles

The East Campus Neighborhood's civic character transitions the City of Madison to the Historic Campus Neighborhood. The East Campus Mall is the defining spatial organizing element, providing free pedestrian movement from Regent Street to Lake Mendota. Library Mall, one of the most prominent and heavily used spaces on campus, functions as a confluence between the two malls at the termination of State Street.

- Predominated by urban hardscape spaces amid higher building densities.
- Simple, low-maintenance landscapes. Avoid overly fussy detailing and design.
- Consider underground stormwater management approaches where space is limited.
- Material use should be robust, durable, and relate to the greater campus vernacular.
- Robust street tree program, calming streets, and reinforcing character.
- Consider landscape experience and views from the pedestrian level as well as the elevated adjacent residential tower perspective.



Note: The list of statements characterize the neighborhood in regard to the Landscape Master Plan Guiding Principles. These principles were established to assist landscape recommendations in reaching the goals of the Campus Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

EAST CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

Landscape Guidelines

The East Campus Neighborhood is organized along the East Campus Mall.

- **Campus mall**: Maintain the East Campus Mall as a linear corridor and civic space. Hardscape materials and planting should remain simple and highly resilient. State Street Mall is a continuation of the city State Street corridor.
- **Campus green:** Maintain the campus greens associated with residence halls Gordon Dining & Event Center and Vilas Hall as flexible, passive open spaces. Create a new campus green through the redevelopment of the Humanities Building. These lawns should be designed with proper drainage and base materials to withstand heavy pedestrian use.
- Courtyards, plazas, terraces, and gardens: Courtyards and plazas should respond to the surrounding building architecture. Maintain civic scale and urban character.
- **Streetscapes**: Invest in streetscapes, implementing the streetscape guidelines recommended in the Landscape Master Plan. Create a contiguous urban tree canopy with robust understory planting in terraces.

Note: The list of statements characterize the nature of the identified typologies as defined by the Landscape Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.



Naturalized Landscapes

Streetscapes Parking and Service

(V)

Materials & Styles: Existing Conditions

Reference the opposite page for material (Mx) and architectural feature (Ax) references.



EAST CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

Materials & Styles

The East Campus Neighborhood draws heavily on its adjacent context to the west. North of University Avenue the neighborhood reflects the Historic Campus Neighborhood with classical styles and architectural ornamentation. South of University Avenue building materials and styles are more mixed and reflect the time period they were constructed. Most recently buildings in this area are using more golden buff-toned stone along with large expanses of glazing. Ultimately, all materials and styles in this area shall engage the East Campus Mall and effectively transition the university to the City of Madison. Town and gown blend within this neighborhood.

Materials

M1. Stone Textural Variety
M2 Golden Buff Limestone
M3. Anodized Aluminum/Glazing
M4. Brown Brick
M5. Berlin Rhyolite/Red Brick
M6. Green Tile Roof
M7. Bedford Limestone/Madison Sandstone (Winona Travertine)
M8. Buff Brick



Architectural Styles

- Italianate
- Romanesque Revival
- Classical Revival
- Modern
- Post World War II
- Environmental Modernism

Architectural Features

- A1. Orientation Around Pedestrian Mall
- A2. Mixed-Use Urban Interaction
- A3. Larger Expanses of Glazing
- A4. Rusticated Stone
- A5. Buildings Frame Open Spaces





Building Inventory

The building inventory lists all of the buildings within the defined campus neighborhood. Buildings are listed alphabetically by the official campus building name (per the Campus Map). Additional inventory information includes:

- Year building construction was completed.
- Year(s) major renovation projects were completed.
- Defining architectural style.
- Primary exterior material use.

Building	Built	Renovated	Style	Materials		
21 N. Park Street	2004		Postmodernism	Steel, Concrete, Stone		
432 East Campus Mall				Brick		
711 State St.	1971	1996	Postmodernism	Concrete		
Art Lofts	2009		Unknown	Concrete, Brick		
Below Alumni Center	1965		Post World War II	Steel, Reinforced Concrete		
Chazen Museum of Art	1970	2009-addition	Post World War II, Modern	Concrete, Steel		
Conrad A. Elvehjem Building	1965			Sandstone Brick		
East Campus Mall	2009		Unknown	Steel, Brick, Concrete, Glass		
Environmental Protection & Safety Building	1984		Post World War II	Brick		
Extension Building	1960			Limestone Brick, Concrete		
Fluno Center	1998		Postmodern	Brick, Limestone		
Gordons Dining and Event Center	1964	2013 remodeled	Post World War II, Modern	Brick, Sandstone		
Lowell Center	1965			Limestone Brick		
Memorial Library	1950	1975, 1988 add.	Post World War II	Steel, Bedford Limestone, Brick		
Memorial Union	1927	1939, 1956, 1964, 1975 add.	Renaissance Revival	Bedford Limestone, Madison Sandstone, Tile Roof, Winona Travertine		
Mosse Humanities Building	1966			Concrete, Sandstone Brick		
Ogg Hall	1963	2007 new	Post World War II	Stone, Concrete		
Pyle Center	1956	1998 reno.	Modern	Brick		
Red Gym	1894		Richardsonian Romanesque	Red Brick		
Sellery Hall	1961	1998, 2016	Post World War II	Reinforced Concrete, Brick		
Smith Residence Hall	2004			Limestone, Concrete		
Southeast Recreational Facility	1982			Steel, Concrete, Brick, Aluminum		
State Historical Society	1901	1914, 1940, 1965, 2009 reno.	Classical Revival	Steel, Bedford Limestone		
University Club	1908	1912, 1924 add.	Eclectic Resurgence	Dark Brick, Concrete		
University Square	2006		Modern	Brick, Metal, Concrete, Glass		
Vilas Communications Hall	1969		Post World War II	Brick, Precast Concrete		
Witte Hall	1962	2001, 2011, 2018	Post World War II	Reinforced Concrete, Brick		

EAST CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

Considerations

Considerations include information related to the planning, design, and approval of a typical building and/or landscape architecture campus project. It is to be reviewed as a resource identifying locations of materials that UW project teams reference most often. Not all projects will require each identified item. All projects should review the reference list and determine with the UW project manager applicability to the project.

Site Amenities & Vegetation

- 2015 Landscape Development Standards
- Division of Facilities Development Master Specifications-Division 32
- UW-Madison Technical Guidelines–Division 32

Past Plans

- 2006 Lakeshore Nature Preserve Master Plan
- 2006 Wisconsin Union Facilities Master Plan
- 2006 UW Housing Facilities Master Plan
- 2007 Recreational Sports Facilities Master Plan
- 2012 City of Madison Downtown Plan
- 2016 Letters & Science Facilities Master Plan

Restoration/Preservation Efforts

- Memorial Union Terrace
- Library Mall

Neighborhood Specific Conditions

- Capitol Neighborhood Inc.
- Friends of Lakeshore Nature Preserve

Historical and Cultural Resources

- 2005 Cultural Landscape Report
- Historic Property Review Requirements
- Archaeological Site Review Requirements

Well Head District/Locations

• City of Madison Unit Well 27 (N. Randall Ave. & Bike Path)

City of Madison Zoning (Chapter 28)

- Campus Institutional District (C-I)
- Planned Development (PD)



1. College of Engineering Overview

3. Union South

8. South Campus Neighborhood



Overview & Location

Defined generally as the area south of University Avenue, it contains a number of individual schools and departments. Research, classroom, and office space are the primary uses of the area. Taller buildings with minimal setbacks lend an urban character that is in need of additional open space. Area should maintain active street frontage uses to encourage a sense of civic life. This area is also unique to the campus in that the street right-of-ways are owned and maintained by the City of Madison. Close collaboration and planning needs to occur between the city and university to ensure the vision and goals of both entities are being met.

This design neighborhood can be divided into a variety of identifiable areas which the Master Plan intends to better unify through the following:

- Open space creation and connectivity.
- Streetscape definition and consistency.
- Civic-use and transparent ground floor building spaces.
- Sustainable architecture that blurs the line between indoor and out.
- Emphasis on pedestrian and multi-modal transportation enhancements.

The design neighborhood is bounded by the Regent Neighborhood to the west, N. Park Street to the east, University Avenue/Campus Drive to the north, and private student housing/Regent Street corridor businesses to the south. The southern edge of the campus development boundary generally aligns with the Southwest Commuter Path, receding back to Spring Street for one-block between N. Randall Avenue and N. Orchard Street and pushing down to Capitol Court/College Court extension between N. Orchard Street and N. Mills Street.

Area: 90 acres (14% of 636 acre planning area)







Massing & Scale

- Buildings are to support the campus civic structure, giving architectural definition to the campus streets, quadrangles, and other open spaces. Buildings are to front directly onto these spaces and to support them by their form, massing, and the design of their facades.
- Buildings shall have a base, middle, and top. Visual emphasis is to be given to the ground floor through door and window scale, architectural detailing, and greater floor-tofloor heights.
- Build out structures toward railroad rightof-way with the understanding this area may become a public transportation corridor in the future. Do not neglect the public face this corridor could play in the future.
- Provide larger, more meaningful open spaces framed by architecture with a strong indoor/ outdoor relationship.
- Where buildings are set back at upper stories, use lower roofs as green roofs, balconies, terraces, and gardens.
- Buildings to be planned around internal open spaces, courtyards, and/or green roofs.
- Utilize architectural articulation such as changes in material, fenestration, architectural detailing, or other elements to break down the scale.



SOUTH CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

NOTES:

- 1. Colors relate to building heights.
- 2. Where discrepancies arise between adopted plans, most current plan takes precedent.
- 3. X Numbers indicate UW-Madison 2015 Campus Master Plan proposed maximum building heights. Floor quantities indicated equate to 15-17' floor to floor heights.
- 4. 🔀 Indicate proposed HIGHER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 5. 🗴 Indicate proposed LOWER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 6. "+2" Additional floors approved for exceptional design/LEED.
- 7. \mathfrak{R}^{i} Zoned Conservancy District, buildings not anticipated
- 8. \Re^2 Viewshed agreement, any proposed buildings require additional approval.



Building Heights

- Building heights are to generally match the urban context. Crescendo in height along the campus arterials of University Avenue and Johnson Street and become lower as Regent Street is approached.
- When directly abutting the community, building heights should not significantly exceed that of neighboring community buildings. Height differences shall be mitigated by orienting taller building masses toward the campus. Similarly, upper floors may be stepped back away from the street frontage.
- Buildings should generally have flat roofs with an emphasis on multiple planes.
- Consideration of accessible and/ or highly visible green roofs shall be considered to create a greater availability of usable open space in the south campus.
- New development(s) should relate to the First Congregational Church at the southwestern corner of University Avenue and Breese Terrace with preservation of the sightline to the east. Articulation, mass, and scale will be important considerations in new building designs to ensure the relationship of the building to University Avenue is one that is pedestrian friendly.

Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan

///// UW C-I District minimum height



Monroe St. - Regent St. to N. Randall St. (View Northeast)





Bike Path - Regent St. to Kohl Center (View Easterly)





Spring St. - N. Randall St. to N. Mills St. (View East)



Section to 101 10 4 1 die 1 Martal. IT.L.BY

Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan



1 MAR AND A CONTRACT DOWNER OF

There is still

· 10.90

Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan

///// UW C-I District minimum height



N. Orchard St. - Capitol Ct. to W. Dayton St. (View North)











Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan



Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan

///// UW C-I District minimum height



(View North)









Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan





Build-To Lines

- Refer to the Build-To Dimensions matrix for specific distances related to street frontages and major open space corridors.
- The primary build-to lines in the South Campus neighborhood involve interaction with the city of Madison right-of way.
- Build-to lines are given to prevent flat, expansive, lifeless street or open space facades. The majority of the building facade should be brought to the suggested build-to line while still achieving facade articulation and interest that is compatible within the neighborhood.
- Buildings should visually embrace the rail line and physically embrace the multi-use commuter path as prominent corridors of campus.



Note: The placement of new buildings should respond to the alignment of adjacent buildings and adhere to the landscape framework plan which defines signature open space corridors. New buildings should be placed to engage and improve the quality of the campus landscape. While proposed buildings should be placed to maximize efficiency and use of the site, they should not block major pedestrian, habitat, stormwater, or visual corridors. Placement is ultimately dictated on a site by site basis to respond to the immediate context and ensure the building positively contributes to the whole of the campus.

Build-To Dimensions

The neighborhood matrix references each of the streets • within the campus design neighborhood and further • identifies the nuances along that street frontage to provide guidance when determining architectural build-to limits. • These limits ensure architectural framing of the street is • occurring where appropriate, green space is preserved, and • that a pleasing human-scaled pedestrian realm is created • that allows for street activation and socialization. •

• Street Name: Name of street located within the neighborhood.

- Description: Segment of street in neighborhood, as widths and character may vary.
- Existing Corridor Width*: Identified existing width per Dane County mapping data.
- Orientation: What side of street segment guidelines are being applied.
- Build-To Line¹: Distance from back of the sidewalk where majority of the building should interface.
- Building Ht. Max: As identified by neighborhood/city plans and per anticipated UW program need.
- Step Back Req'ts: Recommended story height at Build-To line/distance (feet) of step back.
- Stormwater²: Is the area between the sidewalk/path and street appropriate for green infrastructure.

8. SOUTH CAMPUS NEIGHBORHO	OD									
Street Name	Description	Corridor Width*	Orientation	Build-to Line ¹	RSSC Setback	Building Ht. Max [Min]	RSSC Ht. Max [Min]	Step Back Req'ts	RSSC Step Back Req'ts	Stormwater ²
Campus Drive	West edge to University (incld. RR)	156'	0.001/(5)			([2]		Nega		NO
			S (W/E)	20'	1	6 [3] 6 [3]		None 3rd & Above - Min. 15'		NO NO
	1848 University Ave. to Breese Ter. ³	Varies	N	-		0 [3]		3rd & Above - Iviin. 15		NO
University Avenue	Intersection to N. Charter St.	100'	S	10'		4 6 10[3]		5th & Above - Min. 15'		Buffer Only
	N. Charter St. to N. Francis St.	100'		10'		10 [3]		5th & Above - Min. 15'		Buffer Only
Engineering Drive	Lot 17 to N. Randall Ave.	64'	S N	25'		4 6 [3]		None		YES
	Eot IV to N. Kandali VVC.	04	S	20'		4 6 [3]		4th & Above - Min. 15'		YES
W. Johnson Street	N. Orchard St. to N. Park St.	68'	N S	20' 20'		10 [3] 10 [3]		8th & Above - Min. 15' 4th & Above - Min. 15'		NO NO
W. Dayton Street	N. Randall Ave. to N. Park St.	66'	N S	20' 20'	10' 10'	10 [3] 7 8 [3]	12 [3] 8 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15' 4th & Above - Min. 15'	none	YES YES
			5	20	10	/ 0 [3]	0 [3]	4th & Above - Will. To	none	TES
Monroe Street	N. Breese Ter. to Randall Ave.	66'	S	10'	5'	10 - 170' [3]	10 [3]	4th/9th & Above - 15'/10'	7th - 15' & 9th - 10'	YES
Spring Street	N. Randall Ave. to N.Mills St.	66'	N	15'	10'	7 - 116' [3]	8 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15'	YES
spring street	N. Randall We. to Rawins St.	00	S	15'	10'	7 [3]	8 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15'	YES
Capitol Court	N. Orchard St. to N. Charter St.	30'	N S	15' 0'		6 [3] 6 [3]		None None		NO NO
N. Breese Terrace	University Ave. to Engineering Dr.	60'		101						
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	_	E	10'		6 10[3]		4th & Above - Min. 15'		NO
	University Ave. to W. Dayton St.	66'	W E	35' 25'	10'	6 - 102' [3] 10 - 120' [3]	12 [3]	None 4th & Above - Min. 15'	6th - 15'	NO NO
N. Randall Avenue	W. Dayton St. to Monroe St.	66'	E E	25'	10'	6 - 116' [3]	8 (116') [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	7th - 15'	NO
			W	35'	10'	10 - 170' [3]	12 (172') [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	7th -15' & 9th - 10'	NO
	Monroe St. to bike path	66'	E	25'	10'	6 - 116' [3]	8 (116') [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	7th - 15'	NO
	University Ave. to W. Dayton St.	66'	W	15'	10'	7 - 119' [3]	12 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15'	YES
N. Orchard Street	University Ave. to W. Dayton St.	00	E	15'	10'	10 - 170' [3]	12 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15'	YES
	W. Dayton St. to Capitol Ct.	66'	W F	15' 15'	10' 10'	7 [3]	8 [3] 8 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15' 4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15' 4th - 15'	YES
			E W	30'	10'	10 - 170' [3]	8 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15 4th & Above - Min. 15	4th - 15	YES
	University Ave. to W. Dayton St.	66'	F	20'	10'	10 - 170 [3]	12 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15'	YES
N. Charter Street	W. Davidara Ch. ta anathi le sura daras		Ŵ	20'	10'	7 - 116' [3]	8 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15'	YES
	W. Dayton St. to south boundary	66'	E	20'	10'	7 - 116' [3]	8 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15'	YES
	University Ave. to W. Dayton St.	66'	W	15'	10'	10 - 170' [3]	12 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15'	NO
N. Mills Street			E	30'	10'	10 - 170' [3]	12 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15'	NO
	W. Dayton St. to College Ct.	66'	W	15'	10'	7 - 116' [3]	8 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15'	NO
	- · ·		E W	30' 15'	10' 10'	7 - 116' [3] 10 - 170' [3]	8 [3] 12 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15' 4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15' 4th - 15'	NO YES
N. Brooks Street	University Ave. to W. Dayton St.	66'	F VV	15	10	10 - 170 [3]	12 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15 4th & Above - Min. 15'	4th - 15 4th - 15'	YES
	University Ave. to W. Dayton St.	120'	W	10'	10	10 [3]	12 [0]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	401 10	YES
N. Park Street	University Ave. to w. Dayton St.	120								
	W. Dayton St. to railroad	120'	W	20'	0'	7 - 116' [3]	8 [3]	4th & Above - Min. 15'	none	YES

RSSC = Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan

* Corridor Width = Right-of-way width or if no right-of-way, back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk where right-of-way would typically be located.

¹ Right-of-way line or in the case of no right-of-way, the distance from back of sidewalk.

² Does the terrace condition support green infrastructure as part of the development of this area of street?

³ New development shall relate to First Congretional Church at the southwestern corner of University and Breese, with preservation of the sightline to the east.

SOUTH CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD



Landscape Principles

The South Campus Neighborhood is an increasingly urban and institutional neighborhood that is experienced primarily by streetscape.

- Improve neighborhood streetscapes making them more walkable and sustainable.
- Plant a robust and contiguous urban tree canopy improving human comfort, while providing urban wildlife habitat and reducing the heatisland effect.
- Provide new campus open spaces for social interaction.
- Emphasis shall be placed on subgrade soils and infrastructure to support vegetative growth and to meet stormwater goals.



Note: The list of statements characterize the neighborhood in regard to the Landscape Master Plan Guiding Principles. These principles were established to assist landscape recommendations in reaching the goals of the Campus Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

SOUTH CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

Landscape Guidelines

The South Campus Neighborhood is structured by the urban grid. Invest heavily in streetscapes to improve the landscape quality of the neighborhood.

- **Streetscapes:** Develop a clear hierarchy of streetscape treatments as defined in the Landscape Master Plan.
- **Campus fabric:** Urban character characterized by minimal building setbacks. Provide shade trees and understory planting between the building and sidewalk for human scale and comfort. Lawn areas are discouraged.
- **Campus green:** Flexible and programmable open spaces, these lawns should be designed with proper drainage and base materials to withstand heavy pedestrian use.
- Courtyards, plazas, terraces, and **gardens:** Courtyards and plazas should respond to the surrounding building architecture's general urban character. Planting may be native, but primarily ornamental.



Courtyards, Plazas, & Gardens Campus Fabric Naturalized Landscapes Streetscapes Parking and Service

Note: The list of statements characterize the nature of the identified typologies as defined by the Landscape Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

10

Materials & Styles: Existing Conditions

Reference the opposite page for material (Mx) and architectural feature (Ax) references.



SOUTH CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

Materials & Styles

The South Campus Neighborhood is defined by the urban street grid and the repetition this land use creates. Materials and styles are the most varied throughout this neighborhood and reflect a block by block development pattern. While there are connections in material use and styles to other parts of the campus it is the heterogenous collection within the urban grid that is most distinctive. Structures proposed within this campus design neighborhood have the most latitude in material use and architectural style. Ultimately, the increase in green space and indoor/outdoor engagement shall help inform building materials and architectural styles.



Architectural Styles

- Modern
- Post World War II
- Modern Prairie Style
- Modern Historicism
- Environmental Modernism

Architectural Features

- A1. Sustainable Design
- A2. Prominent corner/views Architecture
- A3. Dense Pedestrian and Vehicular Traffic





Building Inventory

The building inventory lists all of the buildings within the defined campus neighborhood. Buildings are listed alphabetically by the official campus building name (per the Campus Map). Additional inventory information includes:

- Year building construction was completed.
- Year(s) major renovation projects were completed.
- Defining architectural style.
- Primary exterior material use.

Building	Built	Renovated	Style	Materials
1220 Capitol Ct.	1946			Brick
1410 Engineering Dr.	1938			Brick
1610 University Ave.	1942			Brick
1800 University Ave.	1909			Wood Panels
206 Bernard Ct.	1911			Wood Panels
209 N. Brooks St.	1929			Brick
215-217 N. Brooks St.	1931			Brick
30 N. Mills St.	2009			Brick
45 N. Charter St.	1962			Mixed Rock
Atmospheric, Oceanic and Space Sciences	1966	1989		Limestone Brick
Brogden Psychology Building	1964			Brick
Charter Street Heating & Cooling Plant	1958	1965, 1973 add.	Post World War II	Brick
Chemistry Building	1960	1999 add. & reno.		Brick, Concrete, Steel, Glass
Computer Sciences & Statistics	1965	1970 add., 1986 add.	Post World War II	Concrete, Steel
Davis Residence Hall	1961			
Discovery Building	2008			Granite, Metal
Educational Sciences	1970		Post World War II	Concrete, Brick
Engineering Centers Building	2000		Modern	Stone, Glass
Engineering Hall	1948	1952, 1962, 1993	Post World War II	Brick, Steel
Engineering Research Building	1966			Limestone Brick, Concrete
Enzyme Institute	1949	1959, 1968 add.	Post World War II	Brick
Fleet & Service Garage	2004		Garage	Brick, Steel
Grainger Hall	1992	2002 add.	Contemporary	Limestone, Glass
Harlow Primate Lab	1964	2009 add.	Post World War II	Brick
Materials Science and Engineering Building	1910	1975, 1996 add.	Georgian Revival	Red Brick, Red Tile Rood, Brick, Modillion Cornice
Mechanical Engineering	1929	1959, 2007 add., 1978, 1981 remodel	Renaissance Revival	Madison Rubble Sandstone, Bedford Limestone, Red Tile Roof
Meiklejohn House	1914			Wood Panels
Merit House	1985	2011		Brick
Noland Zoology Building	1970			Limestone Brick
Rust-Schreiner Hall	1955			Limestone
Service Building	1910			Limestone Brick
Service Building Annex	1908			Limestone Brick
Teacher Education	1971	2014	Post World War II	Concrete, Brick

see next page ...

SOUTH CAMPUS NEIGHBORHOOD

30

...continued

Building	Built	Renovated	Style	Materials	
Union South	2009		organic prairie-style	Stone, Metal, Brick	
UW Foundation	1994			Metal	
UW Police Station	1927	1990		Limestone Brick	
Weeks Hall	1972		Post World War II	Brick	
Wendt Library	1976	2011	Post World War II	Brick	
Wisconsin Energy Institute	2010			Limestone Brick, Metal	
Wisconsin Institutes for Discovery	2008		Modern	Terra Cotta Tiles, Glass	
Wisconsin Primate Center	1964			Limestone Brick, Concrete	
Zoe Bayliss Co-Op	1955			Limestone	
Zoology Research Building	1962			Limestone Brick	

Considerations

Considerations include information related to the planning, design, and approval of a typical building and/or landscape architecture campus project. It is to be reviewed as a resource identifying locations of materials that UW project teams reference most often. Not all projects will require each identified item. All projects should review the reference list and determine with the UW project manager applicability to the project.

Site Amenities & Vegetation

- 2015 Landscape Development Standards
- Division of Facilities Development Master Specifications–Division 32
- UW-Madison Technical Guidelines–Division 32

Past Plans

- 2006 Wisconsin Union Facilities Master Plan
- 2006 UW Housing Facilities Master Plan
- 2007 Regent Street South Campus Neighborhood Plan
- 2015 College of Engineering Master Plan
- 2016 Letters & Science Facilities Master Plan

Neighborhood Specific Conditions

- Greenbush Neighborhood Association
- Vilas Neighborhood Association
- Regent Neighborhood Association
- Wisconsin & Southern Railroad

Historical and Cultural Resources

• Historic Property Review Requirements

Well Head District/Locations

• City of Madison Unit Well 27 (N. Randall Ave. & Bike Path)

City of Madison Zoning (Chapter 28)

- Campus Institutional District (C-I)
- Conservancy District (CN)
- Commercial Corridor-Transitional District (CC-T)
- Planned Development (PD)
- Traditional Residential-Urban District 2 (TR-U2)
- Traditional Shopping Street District (TSS)



Kohl Center
 Camp Randall

3. Nielsen Tennis Stadium & Goodman Softball Complex

9. Event Center Neighborhoods



Overview & Location

Defined as three distinct nodes within campus that contain the major event venues and as such must be accessible for thousands of campus users and visitors. Areas must be respectful of adjacent neighborhoods and consider treatments that break down the scale of the large building masses. Areas must provide for extensive pedestrian access, event security, and programming while maintaining a campus feel when not in use.

The area north of the Health Sciences Neighborhood currently sees events at both Goodman Field and the Nielsen Tennis Stadium. The 2015 Campus Master Plan is recommending the relocation of the McClimon Track facility north of Marsh Drive, making this area a multi-season event center. Bounded by Lake Mendota and the Lakeshore Nature Preserve to the east, the 1918 Marsh to the north, and active recreation fields to the west, the area is set within a more natural landscape with broad expanses of lawn and lake. Considerations during project development shall consider the historical lake-bed land use, northeasterly winds off Lake Mendota, and the adjacent neighborhood in regard to noise, light pollution, structure height, and visual aesthetic.

W. Dayton Street is an important internal campus transportation corridor and also connector between Camp Randall and the Kohl Center. Constructed in 1916, Camp Randall borders the Regent, Dudgeon-Monroe, and Vilas neighborhoods. Any proposed development within this area shall have close resident coordination as well as convey a design aesthetic and quality fitting of a Division I athletic program. The Kohl Center area is located in the southeast portion of campus and also provides a large green space for use by the general public.

Many of the proposed projects within this Campus Design Neighborhood are zoned PD and not subject to the C-I District master plan.

Area: 62 acres (11% of 636 acre planning area)





Massing & Scale

- Buildings are to support the campus civic structure, giving architectural definition to the campus streets, quadrangles, and other open spaces. Buildings are to front directly onto these spaces and to support them by their form, massing, and the design of their facades.
- New buildings should correspond to their neighbors in volume, scale, and level of detail. Necessarily large buildings should either be located among other such buildings or be broken down into smaller masses and given an appropriate level of detail.
- Utilize architectural articulation such as changes in material, fenestration, architectural detailing, or other elements to break down the scale.
- The existing Field House building is a recommended reference for architectural detail, scale adjacent to a neighborhood, and materiality.
- Design neighborhood appropriate for signature architectural expressions.





EVENT CENTER NEIGHBORHOODS

EVENT CENTER NEIGHBORHOODS



NOTES:

- 1. Colors relate to building heights.
- 2. Where discrepancies arise between adopted plans, most current plan takes precedent.
- 3. **X** Numbers indicate UW-Madison 2015 Campus Master Plan proposed maximum building heights. Floor quantities indicated equate to 15-17' floor to floor heights.
- 4. 💌 Indicate proposed HIGHER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 5. 🗴 Indicate proposed LOWER maximum heights than approved plans.
- 6. "+2" Additional floors approved for exceptional design/LEED.
- 7. \mathscr{R}^{i} Zoned Conservancy District, buildings not anticipated

*More recent plan takes priority

8. \Re^2 Viewshed agreement, any proposed buildings require additional approval.



*More recent plan takes priority

Building Heights

- Building heights shall remain sensitive to their context and in the case of south campus may be taller to reflect existing conditions or to support Division I athletic programming needs.
- Height differences shall be mitigated by orienting taller building masses toward the campus. Similarly, upper floors may be stepped back away from the street frontage.
- Buildings roofs should generally reflect the program for which they are constructed. Variation and articulation in both the vertical and horizontal plane is encouraged.
- The Field House is an appropriate example of a large building with a gabled roof.



Build-To Lines

- Refer to the Build-To Dimensions matrix for specific distances related to street frontages and major open space corridors.
- The primary build-to lines in the Event Center neighborhood reflect a strong campus edge condition and allow for prominent building placement.
- Build-to lines are given to prevent flat, expansive, lifeless street or open space facades. The majority of the building facade should be brought to the suggested build-to line while still achieving facade articulation and interest that is compatible within the neighborhood.
- Camp Randall Memorial Park and the Kohl Center Lawn are two important open spaces that shall not be infringed upon with facility expansion.



Note: The placement of new buildings should respond to the alignment of adjacent buildings and adhere to the landscape framework plan which defines signature open space corridors. New buildings should be placed to engage and improve the quality of the campus landscape. While proposed buildings should be placed to maximize efficiency and use of the site, they should not block major pedestrian, habitat, stormwater, or visual corridors. Placement is ultimately dictated on a site by site basis to respond to the immediate context and ensure the building positively contributes to the whole of the campus.

Build-To Dimensions

The neighborhood matrix references each of the streets within the campus design neighborhood and further identifies the nuances along that street frontage to provide guidance when determining architectural build-to limits. These limits ensure architectural framing of the street is occurring where appropriate, green space is preserved, and that a pleasing human-scaled pedestrian

- Street Name: Name of street located within the neighborhood.
- Description: Segment of street in neighborhood, as widths and character may vary.
- Existing Corridor Width*: Identified existing width per Dane County mapping data.
- Orientation: What side of street segment guidelines are being applied.
- Build-To Line¹: Distance from back of the sidewalk where majority of the building should interface.
- Building Ht. Max: As identified by neighborhood/city plans and per anticipated UW program need.
- Step Back Req'ts: Recommended story height at Build-To line/distance (feet) of step back.
- Stormwater²: Is the area between the sidewalk/path and street appropriate for green infrastructure.

9. EVENT CENTER NEIGHBORHOOD			· · ·		÷	÷	· · · ·
Street Name	Description	Corridor Width*	Orientation	Build-to Line ¹	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	Stormwater ²
University Bay Drive	Lot 76 entry to Marsh Dr.	68'	W	40'	3	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
University bay brive		00	E	20'	3	None	YES
Marsh Drive	Highland Ave. to Walnut St.	60-82'	N	15' (Nielsen) / 100'	3	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
		0002					
Monroe Street	N. Breese Ter. to Randall Ave.	70'	N (W/E)	65'	6	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
		-					
N. Breese Terrace	Lot 17 to Regent St.	60'		10	(110		NO
	-		E	10'	6 10	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Randall Avenue	W. Dayton St. to Monroe St.	70'	W	•	-	None	NO
East Campus Mall	W. Dayton St. to Railroad	68'	F	10'	10	3rd & 9th - Min. 15'	NO
				10	10		110
W. Dayton Street	N. Lake St. to N. Frances St.	70'	S	195'	10	9th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Frances Street	W. Dayton St. to railroad	66'	W	30'	10	5th & 11th - Min. 15'	YES
וא. דומוונפג גוופפנ	W. Dayton St. to rain Odu	00					

* Corridor Width = Right-of-way width or if no right-of-way, back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk where right-of-way would typically be located.

¹ Right-of-way line or in the case of no right-of-way, the distance from back of sidewalk.

² Does the terrace condition support green infrastructure as part of the development of this area of street?



Landscape Principles

The Event Center Neighborhood landscape must be resilient and endure infrequent but very intense use. Designed open spaces must accommodate large volumes of people, provide a strong visual brand to visitors and be enjoyable during all seasons of the year.

- Use vegetation to provide pedestrian scale and soften building massing, particularly along campus edges.
- Construct simple, low-maintenance landscapes; use robust and durable landscape construction materials to withstand heavy pedestrian use.
- Integrate security barrier design early in project development for seamless design solutions that protect the safety of pedestrians during large sporting events.
- Mimic collegiate feel of the historic campus greens to reinforce the connection to the main campus.



Goodman Field & Nielsen Tennis Center



Camp Randall Stadium & Camp Randall Memorial Park



Note: The list of statements characterize the neighborhood in regard to the Landscape Master Plan Guiding Principles. These principles were established to assist landscape recommendations in reaching the goals of the Campus Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.
7. CAMPUS DESIGN GUIDELINES & STANDARDS

EVENT CENTER NEIGHBORHOODS

Ν

 \bigcirc



Landscape Guidelines

The Event Center Neighborhood is composed of a series of athletic competition and practice fields, campus greens, and plaza spaces. The campus fabric connects and knits together the different landscape spaces.

- Athletics and recreation: Both competition and non-competition synthetic turf athletic fields. Limited plant palette; maintain views to the lake or major landmarks where applicable.
- **Campus fabric:** Low-maintenance lawn with large tree and shrub massings to buffer the scale of the architecture. At the Goodman Field and Nielsen Tennis Center, the connective spaces between facilities may assume a naturalistic appearance in connection with the lake.
- **Campus green:** Maintain the green in front of the Kohl Center as an open and flexible passive use space. Maintain the picturesque quality of Camp Randall Memorial Park as a cultural landscape.
- Courtyards, plazas, terraces, and gardens: Open hardscape plazas designed to accommodate large pedestrian volumes. Integrate safety barrier design early in project development. Planting should be simple and low-maintenance, responding to the scale of the gathering space.

Goodman Field & Nielsen Tennis Center



Camp Randall Stadium & Memorial Park



Parking and Service

Note: The list of statements characterize the nature of the identified typologies as defined by the Landscape Master Plan. Refer to the Landscape Master Plan and Landscape Development Standards for further information.

18

Materials & Styles: Existing Conditions

Reference the opposite page for material (Mx) and architectural feature (Ax) references.



EVENT CENTER NEIGHBORHOODS

Materials & Styles

The Event Center Neighborhood consists of three different areas of campus, each embedded within and adjacent to more traditional campus design neighborhoods. Athletic venues are unique programmatic venues on campus. Context should inform proposed materials and styles, but ultimately development should be of the present time. Generally, the Far West Neighborhood shall impose architecture more fitting of the natural environment and Lakeshore Nature Preserve. Camp Randall area additions should respect the Fieldhouse materials and the Kohl Center area should reflect more contemporary materials, forms, and styles.

Materials

M1. Madison Sandstone Rubble
M2. Bedford Limestone
M3. Ochre Brick
M4. Large Expanses of Glazing
M5. Concrete/Metal Panels Terra Cotta Trim
M6. Turf (Real & Artificial)



Architectural Styles

- Italian Renaissance
- Post World War II
- Modern



Architectural Features

- A1. Accommodation of Large Crowds
- A2. Security Requirements
- A3. Precast Concrete Graphics
- A4. Roof Reflects Interior Sport Use



Building Inventory

The building inventory lists all of the buildings within the defined campus neighborhood. Buildings are listed alphabetically by the official campus building name (per the Campus Map). Additional inventory information includes:

- Year building construction was completed.
- Year(s) major renovation projects were completed.
- Defining architectural style.
- Primary exterior material use.

Building	Built Renovated		Styl	e	Materials		
9. EVENT CENTER NEIGHBORHOOD			•	•	•		
Street Name	Description	Existing R/W	Orientation	Build to Line from C/W	Building Ht. Max.	Step Back Req'ts	R/W Stormwater
University Bay Drive	Lot 76 entry to Marsh Dr.	68'	W	40'	3	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
Oniversity Bay Drive		08	E	20'	3	None	YES
Marsh Drive	Highland Ave. to Walnut St.	60-82'	N	15'	3	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	YES
	nightana Ave. to Wallat St.	00 02					
Monroe Street	N. Breese Ter. to Randall Ave.	70'	N (W/E)	65'	6	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Breese Terrace	Lot 17 to Regent St.	60'					-
			E	10'	6 10	3rd & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Randall Avenue	I. Randall Avenue W. Dayton St. to Monroe St.	70'	W	-	-	None	NO
East Campus Mall	ast Campus Mall W. Dayton St. to Railroad 68'						
····			E	10'	10	3rd & 9th - Min. 15'	NO
W. Dayton Street	N. Lake St. to N. Frances St.	ces St. 70'					-
,			S	195'	10	9th & Above - Min. 15'	NO
N. Frances Street W. Dayton St. to railroa	W. Dayton St. to railroad	66'	W	30'	10	5th & 11th - Min. 15'	YES
	-,						

EVENT CENTER NEIGHBORHOODS

Considerations

Considerations include information related to the planning, design, and approval of a typical building and/or landscape architecture campus project. It is to be reviewed as a resource identifying locations of materials that UW project teams reference most often. Not all projects will require each identified item. All projects should review the reference list and determine with the UW project manager applicability to the project.

Site Amenities & Vegetation

- 2015 Landscape Development Standards
- Division of Facilities Development Master Specifications-Division 32
- UW-Madison Technical Guidelines–Division 32

Past Plans

- 2006 Lakeshore Nature Preserve Master Plan
- 2007 Recreational Sports Facilities Master Plan
- 2007 Regent Street South Campus Neighborhood Plan
- 2012 City of Madison Downtown Plan
- 2016 Athletics Facilities Master Plan

Restoration/Preservation Efforts

- Class of 1918 Marsh
- Camp Randall Memorial Park

Neighborhood Specific Conditions

- Friends of Lakeshore Nature Preserve
- Greenbush Neighborhood Association
- Regent Neighborhood Association
- Village of Shorewood Hills

Historical and Cultural Resources

- 2005 Cultural Landscape Report
- Historic Property Review Requirements

Well Head District/Locations

- City of Madison Unit Well 6 (University Bay Drive & University Ave.)
- City of Madison Unit Well 19 (Lake Mendota Drive)
- City of Madison Unit Well 27 (N. Randall Ave. & Bike Path)

City of Madison Zoning (Chapter 28)

- Campus Institutional District (C-I)
- Conservancy District (CN)
- Planned Development (PD)

8. NEIGHBORHOOD COORDINATION



Figure 8-1 Neighborhood Associations of Madison

8.1 Joint Campus Area Committee

Purpose & Focus

The UW-Madison's main campus is contained within the City of Madison and the Village of Shorewood Hills. It is also bordered by a number of established neighborhood associations. There is a robust tradition of shared decision making and transparency at the university (and in Madison's neighborhoods) that is deeply rooted in shared governance and the belief that we are all passionate problem solvers that can bring insights, expertise, and ideas to create a better solution.

The development that occurs on campus maintains a strong commitment to the context in which the physical campus resides. During the development of the Campus-Institutional District Master Plan, the Joint West and Joint Southeast Campus Area Committees were combined into a singular Joint Campus Area Committee consisting of nineteen (19) voting members and one (1) non-voting member. The intention of this committee is to facilitate participation in facilities planning activities which affect the campus, city, village, and surrounding neighborhoods. The committee is composed of university, city, and village staff, as well as neighborhood representatives, alders, and a UW student. The charge of the committee (Madison General Ordinance Sec. 33.32) is to identify community-wide and neighborhood impacts of campus initiated, city/village related, and private sector development projects within the context of sound planning principles that afford the greatest benefit.

Committee Responsibility

The committee provides feedback on UW-Madison projects to the Design Review Board established under the UW-Madison Campus Master Plan as follows:

35% - Introductory Presentation

The Introductory Presentation is to gain an understanding of the scope of the project and anticipated program elements. Committee members are to report back to their neighborhoods/organizations with this information and receive input to bring to the 60% project presentation meeting.

60% - Recommendation Presentation.

The Recommendation Presentation will present Design Development level materials to the committee. It is also an opportunity for members to insure their constituents views have been addressed or if further work is necessary. Ultimately, the committee is asked to make a recommendation to the Design Review Board for their approval.

Joint Campus Area Committee Composition

Alder District 4 Representative Alder District 5 Representative Alder District 8 Representative Alder District 13 Representative (non-voting) Neighborhood Representative - Greenbush Neighborhood Representative - Vilas Neighborhood Representative - Regent Capitol Neighborhoods or State-Langdon Neighborhood Representative Plan Commission Member Transportation related City committee Member Village of Shorewood Hills Representative #1 Village of Shorewood Hills Representativ #2 UW Special Assistant to the Chancellor UW Facilities Planning & Management Representative **UW** Transportation Services Representative UW Athletic Department Representative UW University Housing Representative UW School of Medicine and Public Health Representative UW Hospital and Clinics Representative Associated Students of Madison Representative

9. AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED PLAN

PROCESS FOR AMENDMENTS

No alteration of an approved Campus Master Plan, including changes to the proposed use of identified open space areas and other open space uses, shall be permitted unless approved by the Plan Commission, provided however, the Zoning Administrator may, following consideration by the alderperson of the district, issue permits for minor alterations that are approved by the Director of Planning and Community and Economic Development and are consistent with the concept approved by the Original plan, the procedure in Sec. 28.097(6) is required. Substantial changes to the plan will be determined by the City of Madison Director of Planning and Community and Economic Development, or designee, and must receive Common Council approval following a recommendation from the Plan Commission to become part of the approved Campus Institutional District Master Plan.

NOTE: All relevant sections of the Zoning Code and Madison General Ordinances, which may be amended from time to time, shall apply to this Campus Master Plan.

Amendments to the approved Campus Master Plan Update from 2018-2028

- 1.
- 2.
- 2۰
- 3.

{Campus Institutional District Master Plan amendments}



A. Acknowledgements

The 2015 Campus Master Plan internal core group would like to thank the scores of people from the university and city communities who devoted time and effort to work with us in developing the 2015 Campus Master Plan; their efforts will enhance the university for years to come.

This work was done under the auspices of the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration (VCFA), Darrel Bazzell/Michael Lehman, Laurent Heller, and their office. Special thanks go to Bill Elvey, Associate Vice Chancellor of FP&M/Leadership, Gary Brown, Director of Campus Planning & Landscape Architect/Project Manager. Additional appreciation goes to the Campus Planning & Landscape Architecture, Capital Planning & Development, and Space Management Office divisions. Thank you to University Communications for your timely reviews and branding efforts. We would especially like to thank Aaron Williams, Assistant Campus Planner, for his work in coordinating all the many meetings, taking notes, and facilitating the review process.

Appreciation to the City of Madison, Mayor Paul Soglin, Director of Planning, Community & Economic Development Natalie Erdman, City of Madison Planning, Zoning, Metro, Traffic Engineering, and Stormwater Engineering staff – for their assistance in understanding the political and physical interface between the university and city_Architecture

Executive Leadership Team

- Rebecca Blank Chancellor
- Sarah Mangelsdorf Provost
- Darrell Bazzell Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration
- Michael Lehman Interim Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration
- Laurent Heller Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration
- Charles Hoslet Vice Chancellor for University Relations
- Bill Elvey Associate Vice Chancellor, FP&M
- Paul Soglin Mayor, City of Madison
- Natalie Erdman City of Madison, Director of Planning & Community & Economic Development
- Mark Sundquist President, Village of Shorewood Hills
- Karl Frantz Administrator, Village of Shorewood Hills

Internal Core Group

An internal group of state and university facilities staff worked directly on the project with the consultants, coordinating all meetings and facilitating development of the entire project.

- Gary Brown Director, FP&M Campus Planning & Landscape Architecture
- Matt Collins Civil Engineer, FP&M Capital Planning & Development
- Bill Elvey Associate Vice Chancellor, FP&M
- Julie Grove AE Supervisor, FP&M Capital Planning & Development
- Pete Heaslett AE Supervisor, FP&M Capital Planning & Development
- Rhonda James* Senior Landscape Architect, FP&M Campus Planning & Landscape Architecture
- Patrick Kass Director, FP&M Transportation Services
- Rob Kennedy Transportation Planner, FP&M Transportation Services
- Daniel Okoli University Architect & Director, FP&M Capital Planning & Development
- Lisa Pearson Project Manager, State of WI DOA Division of Facilities Development (1/1/16-completion)
- Jeff Pollei Utilities Engineer, FP&M Physical Plant Engineering Group
- Doug Rose Director, FP&M Space Management Office (5/30/14-2/28/16)
- Beth Reid Project Manager, State of WI DOA Division of Facilities Development (6/1/15-12/31/15)
- Alex Roe Associate Vice Chancellor UW-System, Capital Planning & Budget
- Daniel Stephens Project Manager, State of WI DOA Division of Facilities Development (5/30/14-5/31/15)
- Aaron Williams Asst. Campus Planner, FP&M Campus Planning & Landscape

Campus Planning Steering Committee

- Sarah Mangelsdorf Provost (Committee Chair)
- Teresa Adams Staff, FP&M Capital Planning & Development
- Marwa Bassiouni Academic Staff Representative
- Seth Blair Professor, University Committee
- Gary Brown Director, FP&M Campus Planning & Landscape
 Architecture
- Chris Bruhn Assistant Dean, College of Letters & Sciences
- Derrick Buisch Professor, Humanities
- Thomas Chitwood ASM student representative
- Aaron Crandall Research Administrator, Academic Staff Representative
- David Drake Associate Professor, UW Arboretum representative
- Bill Elvey Associate Vice Chancellor, FP&M
- Gail Geiger University Representative, Committee on Women
- Aris Georgiades Professor, School of Education
- Pamela Herd Committee on Women
- Shawn Kaeppler Professor, Biological Sciences
- Jim LaGro Professor, Department of Urban & Regional Planning
- David Marcouiller Professor, Urban and Regional Planning
- Jesse Markow Researcher, Recreational Sports Board
- Trina McMahon Professor, Environmental representative
- Melanie Meyer, ASM Student Representative (alternate)
- Linda Oakley Professor, University Committee
- Michael Pflieger Assistant Dean, Information Technology Committee
- Gary Pine Classified Staff Representative
- Lance Raney Facilities, Wisconsin Union
- Ian Robertson Dean, College of Engineering
- James Schauer Professor, Physical Sciences
- Karl Scholz Dean, College of Letters & Sciences
- Petra Schroeder Space and Remodeling Policies Committee
- Kyle Schroekenthaler ASM student representative
- James Skinner Professor, University Committee Representative
- Bill Tracy Professor, Campus Transportation Committee
- Katharyn Vandenbosh Dean, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
- David Weimer Professor, Social Sciences
- Mark Wells Space and Remodeling Policies Committee

Campus Planning Steering Committee Invited Guests

- Lori Berquam Dean of Students
- Deborah Biggs Associate Dean, School of medicine & Public Health
- Brian Bridges Captain, UW–Madison Police Department
- Paul Broadhead Assistant Director, Wisconsin Union
- Katharine Cornwell Director, City of Madison Planning Department (3/26/15-6/1/15)
- Luis Fernandez Director, General Services, UW Extension
- Mike Grady Planning Coordinator, UW Health
- Mark Guthier Director, Wisconsin Unions
- · John Hahn Policy Analyst, State of WI DOA Division of Facilities Development
- Mike Hanson Engineering, State of WI DOA Division of Facilities
 Development
- Ann Hayes Project Manager/Interior Designer, FP&M Capital Planning & Development
- John Horn Director, UW-Madison Recreational Sports
- Andy Howick Director, UW Health
- Eden Inoway-Ronnie Assistant, Provost Office
- Kathy Kalscheur Project Manager, State of WI DOA Division of Facilities Development
- Jason King Associate Director, UW-Madison Athletics
- Jeff Kosloski Architect, UW System (5/30/14-3/26/15)
- Kari Knutsen UW–Madison University Communications
- Stu LaRose Project Manager/Architect, FP&M Capital Planning & Development
- John Lind Lieutenant, UW–Madison Police Department
- Bruce Maas Director & CIO, UW-Madison Information Technology (DoIT)
- Scott McKinney Director, UW Foundation/Wisconsin Alumni Association
- Jocelyn Milner Director, University Academic Planning
- Everett Mitchell Representative, Chancellor's Office
- Jeff Novak Director, UW–Madison Housing
- Sue Riseling Chief, UW–Madison Police Department
- Doug Sabatke Assistant Dean, College of Letters & Sciences
- Kari Sasso Assistant Chief, UW–Madison Police Department
- Karen Soley Captain, UW-Madison Police Department

B. Campus and Community Engagement Summary

The following document describes the outreach, communications and University community engagement summary for the Campus Master Plan process. The following list includes the meeting number, entity that was met with, and the date the meeting occurred. Shaded rows indicate the meeting was conducted during a consultant team campus visit. Non-shaded rows indicate the meeting was led by the FP&M project management team with local consultant representation present as necessary.

#	ITEM DESCRIPTION	DATE
1	Briefing with Vice Chancellor Darrell Bazzell	May 30, 2014
2	FP&M, Consultant Team	June 12, 2014
3	Briefing with UW Foundation CEO Mike Knetter	July 10, 2014
4	Public Relations & communications strategy meeting	July 30, 2014
5	Review LOIs, submit consultant recommendations to UWSA & DOA	July 7-10, 2014
6	Briefing with Chancellor Blank & Provost Mangelsdorf	Aug. 20, 2014
7	Joint West Campus Area Committee (overview)	Aug. 27, 2014
8	Lakeshore Nature Preserve Committee (overview)	Sept. 4, 2014
9	Briefing with VCFA Directors	Sept. 8, 2014
10	Briefing with Deans Council	Sept. 10, 2014
11	Joint Public Works (city of Madison) (overview)	Sept. 11, 2014
12	Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee (overview)	Sept. 15, 2014
13	Briefing with Chancellor's Leadership Council	Sept. 30, 2014
14	Briefing with Campus Planning Committee	Oct. 2, 2014
15	UHS meeting - Healthier Campus Initiative	Oct. 3, 2014
16	Consultant Kick Off Meeting	Sep.11, 2014
17	City of Madison Planning, Zoning & Engineering staff overview	October 3, 2014
18	Briefing with Wisconsin Alumni Association	
19	Briefing with University Committee (faculty governance leadership)	April 20, 201
20	Briefing with Academic Staff Assembly	Dec. 8, 2014
21	Joint South East Campus Area Committee	January 5, 2015
	-Updated committee	
22	Bi-monthly Conference Call	February 2, 2015
23	Briefing with DoIT leadership	February 18, 2015

24	UWell Meeting	March 5, 2015	73	Stakeholder Meeting: UW Trans + Commuter Solutions	May 1, 2015
25	Bi-monthly Conference Call		74	Stakeholder Meeting: UW Athletics	May 1, 2015
26	Joint Public Works Meeting		75	Stakeholder Meeting: Village of Shorewood Hills	May 1, 2015
27	Joint South East Campus Area Committee		76	Stakeholder Meeting: Faculty Senate Meeting (briefing)	May 4, 2015
	-Updated committee		77	Stakeholder Meeting: UW Rubbish & Recycle	May 7, 2015
28	Briefing with the UWell Council		78	Joint South East Campus Area Committee	May 11, 2015
29	Campus Visit #1 - (3 days)	March 24-26, 2015		-Updated committee	
30	Campus Building Review & Base Map		79	Campus Visit #2 Download Meeting	May 13, 2015
31	Campus Tour	March 25, 2015	80	Stakeholder Meeting: Phone Conference, University Relations	May 14, 2015
32	Campus Planning Steering Committee Mtg #1	March 26, 2015	81	Stakeholder Meeting: Clean Lakes Alliance	May 15, 2015
33	Tech Coordinating Committee Mtg #1	March 26, 2015	82	Design Review Board Update	May 19, 2015
34	Lunch/Campus Visit #1 Wrap-Up	March 26, 2015	83	Forest Products Lab Meeting with regional director	May 27, 2015
35	Joint West Campus Area Committee	March 25, 2015	84	Regent Neighborhood Association	May 27, 2015
	-Updated committee				
36	Bi-monthly Conference Call		85	Civil Utitity Review (Meeting #2) - rescheduled	May 28, 2015
37	Workgroup: Stormwater Campus Tour		86	Sunset Village Neighborhood Association	June 1, 2015
38	Stakeholder Meeting: ASM Shared Governance		87	Joint West Campus Area Committee	June 10, 2015
39	Webinar: TMDL Guidance		88	Joint Public Works Meeting	June 11, 2015
40	FP&M Scoping Meeting		89	Bi-monthly Conference Call	June 30, 2015
41	TCC Web Conference – discovery & goal setting	April 15, 2015	90	"Madison Common" Interview	July 2, 2015
42	Civil Utility Review (Meeting #1)	ADT11 10, 2013	91	Park+ Meeting	July 7, 2015
43	Stakeholder Meeting: University Committee	April 20, 2015	92	Bi-monthly Conference Call	July 14, 2015
44	Bi-monthly Conference Call	ADIII 21, 201.)	93	Technical Coordinating Committee Mtg #3.5	July 16, 2015
45	Skateholder Meeting: UWell Partnership		94	Design Review Board Update	July 21, 2015
46	Campus Visit #2 - (4 days)	ADIII 20-WAV I	95	Bi-monthly Conference Call	July 28, 2015
47	 Technical Coordinating Committee Mtg #3 	ADIII 20. 210.)	96	Campus Visit #3 - (3 days)	July 29-July 31
48	Executive Leadership Team Meeting #1		97	Historical/Cultural Landscape Tour	July 29, 2015
49	Stakeholder Meeting: UW-Housing	ADIII 20. 201.)	98	Stakeholder Meeting: Historical/Cultural Landscapes, Mtg #2	July 29, 2015, 2:00-3:00PM
50	Stakeholder Meeting: Wisconsin Union Leadership	April 26, 2015	99	CPC Steering Committee Mtg #2	July 30, 2015, 8:30-10:00
51	Stakeholder Meeting: UW-Police	April 20, 2015	100	Stakeholder Meeting: City of Madison Planning Department,	July 30, 2015, 10:30-noon
52	Public Open House #1A	710111 20, 2013	101	Technical Coordinating Committee Mtg #4	July 30, 2015, 12:30-4:00PM
53	Stakeholder Meeting: COM Traffic Engineering	11pm 29, 2015	102	 Alternative Development Concept Wksp 	July 31, 2015, 1:00-4:00PM
54	Stakeholder Meeting: COM Stormwater Eng.	11pm 29, 2010	103	UWell Partnership Meeting	August 11, 2015
55	Stakeholder Meeting: UW Landscape Arch. Dept.	11pm 20, 2010	104	Bi-monthly Conference Call	August 14, 2015
56	Stakeholder Meeting: Madison Area MPO	11pm 29, 2010	105	City of Madison Officials + Alders Meeting	August 17, 2015
57	Stakeholder Meeting: UW Recreational Sports	11p111 29, 2010	106	City of Madison Plan Commission Meeting	August 24, 2015
58	Stakeholder Meeting: Historical/Cultural Landscapes	11pm 29, 2010	107	Bi-monthly Conference Call	August 25, 2015
59	Student Open House #1: Memorial Union	11pm 29, 2010	108	Joint West Campus Area Committee Meeting	August 26, 2015
60	Public Open House #1B		109	SGJJR Conference Call	August 31, 2015
61	Stakeholder Meeting: Spring Facility Manager Mtg.		110	City of Madison Stormwater Meeting	September 3, 2015
62	Class Meeting: ES600 Class, Sustainability Non-Human Perspective	11p11 50, 2015	111	TCC Web Conference – Analysis & Conclusions	September 3, 2015
63	Stakeholder Meeting: Facility Access/McBurney	11p11 50, 2015	112	City of Madison Transportation Eng. Meeting	September 10, 2015
64	Student Open House #2: Union South	11.01.00,2010	113	Bi-monthly Conference Call	September 11, 2015
65	Stakeholder Meeting: UW Office of Sustainability	11011 50, 2015	114	Campus Visit #4 - (3 days)	September 15-September 17
66	Stakeholder Meeting: UW Health Sciences Council	11pm 00, 2010	115	Design Review Board: Workshop	September 15, 2015
67	Stakeholder Meeting: Academic Staff Executive Committee		116	UWell Partnership	September 15, 2015
68	Stakeholder Meeting: COM Planning		117	Executive Leadership Team Mtg #2	September 15, 2015
69	Stakeholder Meeting: UW Grounds		118	Open House meeting #2A - Present analysis and framework plan	September 15, 2015
70	Stakeholder Meeting: Lake Shore Nature Preserve		119	Technical Coordinating Committee Mtg #6	September 16, 2015 8-11AM
71	Stakeholder Meeting: UW Hospital Team Leadership		120	Student Open House #2 - Present analysis and framework plans	September 16, 2015
72	Stakeholder Meeting: UW Transportation	May 1, 2015	121	Open House meeting #2B - Present analysis and framework plans	September 16, 2015

• CPSC Steering Committee Mtg #3	September 17, 2015	170	Bi-monthly Conference Call	February 23, 2016
123 • Campus Visit #4 Download (if needed)	September 17, 2015	171	UW Campus Designers	February 23, 2016
123 WARF Board of Trustees meeting	September 18, 2015	172	Campus Visit #6 – (2 days)	February 24-25, 2016
124 Bi-monthly Conference Call	September 22, 2015	173	Technical Coordinating Committee Mtg #10	February 24, 2016
125 • CALS Dean's Leadership Group	October 5, 2015	174	Design Review Board	February 24, 2016
126 Bi-monthly Conference Call	October 6, 2015	175	Open House meeting #4	February 24, 2016
127 • CMP presentation Nazarbayev University	October 20, 2015	176	CPSC Steering Committee Mtg #5	February 25, 2016
128 • Preserve Committee Meeting	October 21, 2015	177	Debrief Meeting	February 25, 2016
129 Wisconsin Vet Diagnostic Lab (WVDL)	October 27, 2015	178	FP&M CPD, CPLA, SMO, AVC	March 8, 2016
130 Open House meeting #3 - Present Preliminary Draft Alternatives	October 27, 2015	179	Bi-monthly Conference Call	March 8, 2016
131 Joint West Campus Area Committee	October 28, 2015	180	AVC Schedule Update	March 10, 2016
132 Stakeholder Meeting: Fall Facility Manager Mtg.	November 3, 2015	181	Academic Staff Assembly	March 14, 2016
133 Bi-monthly Conference Call	November 4, 2015	182	FP&M Physical Plant PAC & AE Staff	March 15, 2016
134 TCC Coordinating Committee Mtg #7	November 11, 2015	183	City of Madison: Traffic Engineering	March 16, 2016
135 ASM Leadership	November 11, 2015	184	City of Madison: Stormwater/Green Infrastructure	March 16, 2016
136 Neighborhood Association Presentation	November 16, 2015	185	FP&M EHS University Staff	March 17, 2016
137 Bi-monthly Conference Call	November 17, 2015	186	City of Madison: Planning + Legal Counsel	March 17, 2016
138 ASM Shared Governance Committee	November 17, 2015	187	University Committee (Ex. Com. to Faculty Senate)	March 21, 2016
139 ASM Sustainability Committee	November 18, 2015	188	Bi-monthly Conference Call	March 22, 2016
140 Web Conference – Draft Preliminary Master Plan	November 19, 2015	189	Joint West Campus Area Committee	March 23, 2016
141 Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee	November 23, 2015	190	Downtown Madison Inc. (DMI)	March 24, 2016
142 City of Madison PBMVC CMP presentation	November 24, 2015	191	FP&M Transportation Services	March 24, 2016
143 Design Review Board Materials Due	November 30, 2015	192	ASM Shared Governance - Leadership	March 29, 2016
144 Campus Visit #5 Draft Materials due to UW	November 30, 2015	193	CALS Meeting-Presentation	March 30, 2016
DRB, TCC, CPSC		194	FP&M Grounds Management	March 30, 2016
145 Bi-monthly Co	December 4, 2015	195	TCC Leads: Material Review	March 30, 2016
146 Campus Visit #5 – (2 day)	December 9-December 10	196	City of Madison: Mayor Mobility Meeting	March 31, 2016
 147 • Cultural Resource (Effigy Mounds) 	December 9, 2015	197	City of Madison: Alders Meeting	April 1, 2016
148 • Design Review Board	December 9, 2015	198	Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee	April 11, 2016
 149 Technical Coordinating Committee Mtg #8 	December 9, 2015	199	Campus Visit #7 – (2 days)	April 13-14, 2106,
150 • CPSC Steering Committee Mtg #4	December 10, 2015	200	 TCC Joint Meeting: Landscape & GI 	April 13, 2016
151 • Debrief Meeting	December 10, 2015	201	 Executive Leadership Team Mtg #4 	April 13, 2016
152 City of Madison Joint Public Works	December 10, 2015	202	Open House meeting #5	April 13, 2016
153 Bi-monthly Conference Call	December 17, 2015	203	CPSC Steering Committee Mtg #6	April 14, 2016
154 VCFA D. Bazzell Progress Meeting	December 23, 2015	204	Debrief Meeting	April 14, 2016
155 Bi-monthly Conference Call	December 29, 2015	205	University Staff Congress	April 18, 2016
156 Bi-monthly Conference Call	January 12, 2016	206	VA Hospital	April 19, 2016
157 WARF meeting	January 12, 2016	207	UW Athletics	April 21, 2016
158 DOA/DFD Project Manager Update	January 13, 2016	208	Forest Products Lab Meeting with regional director	April 27, 2016
159 Press Release on Open House Mtg #4	January 18, 2016	209	Neighborhood Presentation (Joint)	May 2, 2016
160 Bi-monthly Conference Call	January 29, 2016	210	Neighborhood Presentation (Joint)	May 4, 2016
161 Executive Leadership Team Mtg #3	February 2, 2016	211	Wisconsin State Journal Editorial Board	May 10, 2016
162 Bi-monthly Conference Call	February 9, 2016	212		May 10, 2016
163 University Communications	February 9, 2016	213	A	May 11, 2015
164 Web Conference – Revised Prelim Master Plan	February 10, 2016	214		May 14, 2016
165 City of Madison: Planning Staff	February 10, 2016	215		May 16, 2016
166 Wisconsin Historical Society	February 11, 2016	216	·	May 17, 2016
167 UW-Madison Campus Transportation Committee	February 12, 2016	217	Campus Open House	June 17, 2016
168 Lakeshore Nature Preserve Committee	February 22, 2016	218	Consultant Design Guidelines Review Meeting	July 7, 2016
169 Greenbush-Vilas Partnership	February 22, 2016	219		July 8, 2016
		220	Campus Visit #8 – DRB Additional Campus Visit	July 19, 2016

221	Consultant Landscape Master Plan Review Meeting	July 19, 2016
222	Isthmus Article Meeting	August 12, 2016 10:00-12:00Noon
223	Overview & Status Briefing with Laurent Heller, new VCFA	Late August
224	City of Madison: Mayor Meeting	August 31, 2016
225	Clean Lakes Alliance Presentation	September 8, 2016
226	Executive Leadership Team Mtg #4	September 13, 2016
227	Open House meeting #6	September 13, 2016
228	Luther Memorial Church Forum	September 19, 2016
229	SMPH Space Advisory Committee	October 26, 2016
230	Joint West Campus Area Committee	October 26, 2016
231	CPC Meeting (NO MASTER PLAN)	October 27, 2016
232	Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee	October 31, 2016
233	VCFA Directors Presentation	November 7, 2016
234	Faculty Senate	November 7, 2016
235	University Staff Congress	November 21, 2016
236	City of Madison: Leadership Team Meeting	November 30, 2016 10:30-12PM
237	Ye Ol' War Club	December 13, 2016
238	City Transit Parking Commission and LRTC joint meeting	December 14, 2016 5:00-6:30PM
239	City of Madison: Leadership Team Meeting	December 16, 2016 12-1:30PM
240	Board of Regents Meeting	February 2, 2017
241	Kauffman Institute Seminar	January 20, 2017
242	City of Madison: Leadership Team Meeting	January 23, 2017 2-3:30PM
243	UW Campus Planning Committee	Feb. 23, 2017
244	City of Madison: Leadership Team Meeting	February 27, 2017 2:30-4:30PM
245	City of Madison: Plan Commission Informational II	March 6, 2017
246	City of Madison: Urban Design Commission Informational	March 8, 2017
247	Village of Shorewood Hills-Board of Trustees Meeting	March 20, 2017
248	Joint West Campus Area Committee	March 22, 2017
249	Regent Neighborhood Association-Board Meeting	March 22, 2017
250	Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee	March 27, 2017
	CITY OF MADISON LAND USE APPLICATION:	April 5, 2017
	CI-DISTRICT MASTER PLAN	
251	UW-Madison Showcase	April 5, 2017
252	Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee	May 22, 2017
253	City of Madison: Urban Design Commission ACTION	May 24, 2017
254	Joint West Campus Area Committee	June 7, 2017
255	City of Madison: Plan Commission ACTION	June 19, 2017
256	City of Madison: Common Council	July 18, 2017



© 2018

Materials Available: cpla.fpm.wisc.edu EFFECTIVE DATE 01/01/19

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

AB

CAMPUS-INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT MASTER PLAN - APPENDIX C

Table of Contents

Executive Summary
Introduction
Existing Conditions
Transportation Recommendations
1. Introduction
Background and Context
Transportation Improvements Made Since 2005
2. Transportation Context
Existing Conditions Assessment and Analysis
Current Travel Patterns and Behavior
Vehicle Access and Circulation
Walking and Biking Network
Public Transportation
Parking on Campus
3. Transportation Recommendations
Alternatives Development and Recommendations
Emphasize Walking and Biking as Primary Forms of Transportation To
and Around Campus
Improve the Service and Efficiency of Transit Operations
Increase Road Network Connectivity and Efficiency
Parking Operations and Management

List of Figures and Tables

Figure E-1 Existing Walking and Biking Routes and Identified Challenges	11			
Figure E-2 Parking Spaces per Person (Employees + Students) at Select Peer				
Universities	14			
Figure E-3 Concept Rendering of the Proposed Grade Separation at N. Ch	narter			
Street and Linden Drive, Elevation (Top) And Plan View (Bottom)	.15			
Figure E-4 Recommended University Avenue Cross Section where Right-	of-			
Way Allows				
Figure E-5 Plan View of Proposed University Avenue Re-Design				
Figure E-6 Proposed Road Additions, Vacations, and Conversions	.18			
Figure E-7 Recommended Parking Reductions				
Figure E-8 Recommended Parking Additions				
Figure 1-1 Transportation Improvements Made Since 2005 Master Plan				
Figure 2-1 Trip Distribution for Faculty, Staff, and Hospital Employees				
Figure 2-2 Faculty/Staff, Student, and Employee Mode Split to and From				
Campus	31			
Figure 2-3 Motor Vehicle Traffic and Congestion on Campus	34			
Figure 2-4 Campus Loading Docks	35			
Figure 2-5 Existing Campus Walking Facilities				
Figure 2-6 Existing Campus Biking Facilities and Features	40			
Figure 2-7 Existing Walking and Biking Routes and Identified Challenges.	.43			
Table 2-1 Summary of Gaps in Walking and Biking Connectivity	44			
Table 2-2 Summary of Locations Where Challenges Exist	44			
Figure 2-8 Metro Transit Bus Routes Circulating UW-Madison Campus	47			
Figure 2-9 Average Daily Transit Boardings	.48			
Figure 2-10 Existing Campus Parking Facilities	53			
Table 2-3 Existing Campus Parking Spaces, as of July 2016	54			
Figure 2-11 Parking Spaces per Person (Employees + Students) at Select P	eer			
Universities				
Figure 2-12 Mid-day Parking Occupancies for Faculty and Staff				
Figure 2-13 Mid-day Parking Occupancies for Visitors				
Figure 3-1 Concept Rendering of the Proposed Grade Separation at N. Charter				

Street and Linden Drive, Elevation (Top) And Plan View (Bottom)	61
Figure 3-2 Locations of Recommended Intersection Improvements	62
Figure 3-3 Bike boxes and Green Conflict Markings are Proposed at All	
Intersections of University Avenue on Campus	64
Figure 3-4 Recommended Walking and Biking Improvements	65
Figure 3-5 Recommended Campus Drive Path Extension	66
Figure 3-6 Dunsmuir Street in Vancouver, BC, Canada	67
Figure 3-7 Recommended University Avenue Cross Section where Right-o	of-
Way Allows	67
Figure 3-8 Plan View of Proposed University Avenue Re-Design	67
Figure 3-9 Proposed University Avenue Intersection Configuration at Hen	ry
Mall	68
Figure 3-10 Recommended Concept for W. Dayton Street	68
Figure 3-11 Existing and Recommended N. Charter Street Cross Section	.69
Figure 3-12 Proposed Road Additions, Vacations, and Conversions	75
Table 3-1 Recommended Parking Reductions	78
Table 3-2 Recommended Parking Additions	78
Figure 3-13 Recommended Parking Reductions	.79
Figure 3-14 Recommended Parking Additions	.80

Photo Credits

All photos taken or created by Kimley-Horn unless otherwise noted.

UW-Madison University Communications	1
Hoerr Schaudt	
Hoerr Schaudt	
National Association of Transportation Officials (NACTO)	
Hoerr Schaudt	

Document Composition









2015 Campus Master Plan Executive Summary

A full color 24-page report that summarizes the major goals and guiding principles for the Master Plan. The document includes the Chancellor's vision and the major goals and initiatives for each of the identified focus topics (appendices to the Technical Document). Welcomes and sets the tone for users and viewers of the master plan document. It is both a marketing piece for future development and a summary of the planning process.

2015 Campus Master Plan Technical Document

The unabridged thought and support behind the goals and guiding principles for the Master Plan. This more than 250-page document presents a roadmap for campus development over the next 30-50 years by referencing what has come previously and embracing what the future holds. Together with the Campus Design Guidelines, the Technical Document strives to give physical form to the university's mission, vision, and programs through the effective use of human, environmental and fiscal resources.

UW-Madison Campus Design Guidelines

The site specific framework that has been established to create the ground rules for a fruitful dialogue between planners, architects, engineers, campus community, and city/state authorities. Divided into nine Campus Design Neighborhoods, the goal of the guidelines is to enhance the university's sense of place by creating well-defined, functional, sustainable, beautiful and coherent campus environments that promote intellectual and social exchange.

Appendices:

Landscape Master Plan Establishes a 'sense of place' where phased growth and future development can occur while maintaining a cohesive environment.

Utility Master Plan: Confirms status of the 2005 recommendations, acknowledges completed projects, and makes recommendations to meet the 2015 plan revisions.

Long Range Transportation Plan: Updated from the previous LRTP, the plan is the university's transportation vision and describes baseline conditions, travel behaviors, and trends all modes.

Green Infrastructure & Stormwater Management Master Plan: A campuswide plan that recommends solutions to meet stormwater management LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN



Introduction

A comfortable, efficient, and connected multimodal transportation network is critical to the ongoing vibrancy and success of the University of Wisconsin–Madison (UW–Madison).

The university strives to maintain walking and biking as the primary modes of transportation on campus through maintenance and improvement of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Projected growth in programmed teaching and research space will alter the demand for campus parking. A connected street network and high-quality transit operations will move students, faculty, staff, and visitors around campus. The university will prioritize the effective balancing of existing and future parking resources to provide an adequate and convenient supply of parking now and into the future.

Ongoing campus sustainability is a guiding principle of this LRTP. The Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) recommends practical solutions for addressing the primary transportation challenges of the university, for the benefit of the students, faculty, staff, and daily campus visitors. Recommendations are intended to address known deficiencies, improve connectivity and transportation operations, and complement projected campus development.

Analyzing and evaluating campus travel trends and multimodal use data, as well as existing infrastructure and services provides a basis for understanding current and ongoing needs to be addressed over the life of the LRTP.



Existing Conditions

Travel Patterns and Behavior

Over 70% of students walk or ride their bike to campus, while more than half of faculty and staff drive alone to campus. Among UW Hospital employees, 70% drive alone to campus. Ongoing university transportation demand management (TDM) efforts are a key reason that the university is able to operate with only 13,000 parking spaces, which is one of the lowest parking ratios of any major university in the United States. Continuing to focus on and expand these strategies is consistent with the university's continued pursuit of campus sustainability, health, and well-being.

UW-Madison is a national leader in providing effective travel demand management and alternative commuting strategies and messaging. Singleoccupancy vehicle trip reduction is accomplished through a variety of incentives and the provision of desirable travel alternatives. These include:

- Strong multimodal travel options, including Metro Transit bus and a comfortable walking and biking network
- UW-Madison Employee Bus Pass Program
- Free campus bus routes and subsidized Metro Transit bus passes for students, faculty, and staff
- Paratransit service
- Accessible Circulator Shuttle PILOT
- Carpool/vanpool options
- Emergency ride home
- Limited parking supply and permit parking requirements
- Park-and-ride
- Car sharing
- BCycle bicycle share
- Abundant and convenient bicycle parking

Vehicle Travel/Roadway Capacity

Most of the minor roadways on campus experience little congestion throughout the course of an entire day. Observatory Drive, Linden Drive, N. Mills Street, and N. Randall Avenue are examples of low-volume roadways that see little congestion over an average day but may have short periods of congestion or delay at certain peak periods. The Campus Drive and University Avenue arterials have the highest levels of congestion of roads on the campus network.

Loading and service docks are located across campus serving the movement and delivery of goods. All campus roads can support truck loads. To the extent possible, the university tries to limit truck deliveries on campus to times of the day where pedestrian volumes are low.

Walking and Biking

A network of sidewalks, on-street bike accommodations, welcoming streetscapes, and off-street shared-use trails connect pedestrians and bicyclists around the UW–Madison campus, and to the surrounding City of Madison transportation network. The university is a leader in providing comfortable and connected non-motorized transportation options. UW–Madison has been designated a Gold-Level Bicycle Friendly University by the League of American Bicyclists. A robust non-motorized transportation network is complemented by abundant and convenient bicycle parking and seven campus BCycle bike share stations. Despite numerous assets, several challenges exist:

- Critical gaps in pedestrian and bicycle connectivity exist, most prominently in west campus in the Vet Med area crossing University Avenue and connecting the existing Campus Drive shared use path with Babcock Drive to the east
- Intersections and crossings are an issue in some locations, with modal conflicts and transit delay arising due to heavy pedestrian and bicycle volumes, particularly at class change times
- There is a need for more consistent and standard maintenance of pedestrian and bicycle facilities across university and city-owned streets on campus, more attention paid to improving wayfinding and signage to increase accessibility, and a continued focus on placing bike-supportive features on campus such as abundant and convenient bicycle parking, and other bicycle equipment resources

Critical locations where gaps in walking and bicycle infrastructure reduce campus connectivity are displayed in Figure E-1.





Figure E-1 Existing Walking and Biking Routes and Identified Challenges

Transit Use

The UW–Madison currently contracts with the local transit provider, Metro Transit, to provide transit service to students, faculty, and staff on campus. Metro Transit routes 80, 81, 82, and 84 circulate around the UW–Madison campus and are free to all riders. Routes 2, 11, 27, 28, 38, and 44 provide additional campus circulation. Currently, there is an average of 16,900 boardings on the UW–Madison's campus each weekday during the academic year. According to available Metro Transit data, the busiest stop on campus is at University Avenue and N. Park Street, with an average of 1,460 daily boardings.

Other transit options available to campus students, faculty, and staff include paratransit services, carpool services operated by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation in Verona, DeForest, Sauk City, Northwest Dane County, Middleton, Mount Horeb, and Mazomanie, and vanpools serviced by the Wisconsin State Vanpool Program. Additionally, Zipcar has shared cars at seven campus locations accessible for personal use, and Monona Express offers express bus service to downtown Madison and campus.

Metro Transit serves five area park-and-ride locations throughout the Madison area. The university also has its own park-and-ride locations. These include Lot 202 (served by a UW–Madison shuttle), and Lot 203 (served by a UW–Madison shuttle). These park-and-rides are serviced by UW–Madison independent of Metro Transit in order to improve commuters' access to campus.

Finally, plans are underway by Madison Metro for a bus rapid transit (BRT) service routes throughout the greater Madison area, including a route between the east and west sides of Madison through the isthmus and along University Avenue through campus. The university and city are planning integration of this service with other campus transit and multi-modal infrastructure.

Several ongoing transit challenges exist:

- Street Network Connectivity: There is a lack of connecting roadways and a significant number of one-way streets so transit routes are required to operate in a circuitous and indirect manner. There is an identified desire to explore allowing transit vehicles to operate through the Observatory Drive switchback.
- Route Structuring: Some routes on campus currently serve competing purposes. This is particularly an issue for the current structure of Route 80. This route is currently structured to serve as a connector between the east and west ends of campus and as a circulator. As a result of these contradictory roles, the route is inhibited from performing well in either one.
- Travel Time and Delay: High volumes of pedestrians and bicyclists moving through intersections, particularly at class change, cause transit delay. For instance, a peak volume of 2,199 pedestrians was recorded at the intersection of N. Charter Street and Linden Drive.
- Capacity Limits: More demand-responsive campus routes should be examined to deal with peak capacity issues, and underutilization during slow times.
- Express Service: Direct, express transit service for area park-and-rides should be explored as a viable option to reducing on-campus vehicle use and parking demands.
- Others: Other transit needs include establishing an intercity bus terminal near campus to eliminate observed queuing of intercity buses on University Avenue, examining placement of stop locations of Route 80 to optimize efficiency, and continue to analyze the benefits and feasibility of articulated buses.

Parking

In total, there are approximately 13,000 parking stalls on the UW–Madison campus. These stalls are located in surface lots or in underground and above-ground structures. The inventory includes approximately 9,400 faculty/ staff spaces, 1,600 visitor spaces, and 2,000 service/fleet spaces. These 13,000 parking spaces serve approximately 22,000 faculty and staff, 8,600 UW Hospital Employees, and 43,000 students. This yields a parking ratio of 0.18 parking spaces provided per person. This is the second lowest parking ratio of peer universities in the United States as indicated in Figure E-2. With limited physical and financial resources, the university focuses on providing a minimal but efficiently managed parking supply to meet the needs of its faculty, staff, employees, visitors, and select students. Attractive commute options have allowed UW–Madison to maintain low parking ratios and a high quality campus experience with limited space and constrained parking ratios.

Overall, campus parking supply is operating between 85-90 percent full during the peak period—occupancies between 85 percent and 95 percent are considered to be effective capacity maximums. This indicates that current observed parking occupancies on campus are at or very near the overall effective capacity. Visitor parking is particularly challenging to find, especially in South and Central Campus. The university tightly controls and manages parking supply on a daily basis to allocate available spaces (including visitor parking spaces), depending on events and other situations which drive demand. Transportation Services is challenged with allocating the correct supply of visitor spaces in the correct locations to meet changing demand, while maintaining permit parking supply. Visitor parking allocations fill up daily and requests exceed available supply. Transportation Services indicates a need of approximately 2,000 additional parking spaces to accommodate increasing visitor parking demand, and to provide flexibility and "swing space" (i.e. additional parking needed to accommodate parking phasing during campus construction that results in the loss of existing campus parking spaces.)

Current TDM policies and practices nearly halve the actual amount of parking necessary to serve the land uses and destinations on campus. Additional campus growth and development will require continued focus on TDM strategies to maintain consistently low faculty/staff parking ratios, with limited additions of parking to serve campus visitors and to serve as swing space.







Figure E-2 Parking Spaces per Person (Employees + Students) at Select Peer Universities
Transportation Recommendations

The recommendations presented in this plan are meant to strategically build off of existing transportation assets and address known deficiencies to maximize system efficiency, safety, and operations within the future campus land use scenario.

The university strives to continue to be a national leader in multimodal transportation and commuter solutions, the provision and encouragement of non-motorized transportation and transit use, and the effective and sustainable management and operations of campus parking.

This section includes recommendations for maintaining high quality transportation operations and connectivity for all modes and is separated into the following four recommendations (by mode), described below.

Walking and Biking

The LRTP recommends filling identified walking and biking network gaps, and prioritizing best practice improvements at key network intersections that experience modal conflicts and transit delay. A prominent recommendation is the creation of a pedestrian plaza/bridge over the intersection of N. Charter Street and Linden Drive, depicted in the concept rendering. This separated level would capitalize on existing topography and tie into upper levels of future buildings to be built/redeveloped in this area. This recommendation assumes the removal of a majority of the pedestrians from the street level to reduce intersection transit delay. Motor vehicles, transit users, and bicyclists would travel at the existing street level.



Figure E-3 Concept Rendering of the Proposed Grade Separation at N. Charter Street and Linden Drive, Elevation (Top) And Plan View (Bottom)



Figure E-4 Recommended University Avenue Cross Section where Right-of-Way Allows

Among the route connections recommended in this plan is an extension of the shared-use path along Campus Drive to connect to Babcock Drive, and the re-design of University Avenue that includes a two-way protected cycle track on the south side of the street. Proposed University Avenue crosssection and plan view concept renderings are included below.

Additionally, the plan recommends improvements to the cross-section of W. Dayton Street and N. Charter Street to increase the sidewalk capacity, and pedestrian streetscape experience in South Campus.



Figure E-5 Plan View of Proposed University Avenue Re-Design

Transit

This master plan recommends four priorities for improving transit service ridership, efficiency, and operations:

- Address intersection locations with transit delay: Recommendations for grade separation at N. Charter Street and Linden Drive should be implemented to address critical transit delay at the intersection
- Implement limited stop and/or express bus service to serve campus: To complement planned Bus Rapid Transit, the university should work with Metro Transit to add a limited stop and/or express bus service from area park-and-ride locations to campus. There is a particular opportunity to divert UW Hospital employees from driving single-occupancy vehicles to transit with this premium service
- Improve intra-campus bus connectivity: It is recommended Metro Transit revert back to the previous routing of Route 80 to provide more direct connections between the east and west sides of campus. Additionally, bus stops should continue to be examined closely for possible elimination or consolidation, and where feasible, doubleheaders (two simultaneously arriving buses) are operated on routes with capacity issues during class change time
- Establish a permanent inter-city bus terminal: This plan recommends a permanent inter-city bus terminal in east campus to remove queuing buses from University Avenue and East Campus Mall. The new bus terminal should be in a location that is easily serviceable by transit without adding new routes. Opportunities to integrate Metro Transit connections and mixed-use development into the terminal facility should be evaluated

One potential location for an east campus bus terminal is the current City of Madison Lake Street parking garage which is central to campus destinations and population density. UW–Madison will continue to work with the City of Madison and Metro Transit to locate a site for a new intercity bus terminal.

Road Network

The LRTP recommends the following modifications to the road network to promote access and circulation in light of planned land use changes, depicted in Figure E-6:

- Vacate parts of Marsh Drive, Willow Drive, and Walnut Street, and install a new north-south road from Marsh Drive to Observatory Drive to accommodate planned land uses
- Vacate Easterday Lane and add an east-west connection across Willow Creek
- Install new north-south access drive from University Avenue to Linden Drive, west of Charter Street
- Install new east-west parallel access road south of Linden Drive, west of Charter Street
- Install protected left turn phase for N. Charter Street southbound vehicles turning left on to Johnson Street
- Convert Brooks Street into a pedestrian mall/shared emergency drive
- Convert Charter Street from one-way to two-way and add on-street bicycle lanes in each direction from W. Dayton Street to Regent Street



Figure E-6 Proposed Road Additions, Vacations, and Conversions

Parking

This plan presents several recommendations for the university to effectively and efficiently provide and manage parking in conjunction with this Master Plan's proposed campus development and redevelopment.

- Continue to be leaders in transportation demand management (TDM) and alternative commuter solutions
- Maintain current parking ratios for faculty and staff. Work to shift UW Hospital employee and other faculty and staff parking demand off campus through enhanced park-and-ride transit service
- Add 2,000 parking spaces over the next 20-40 years for visitors and provide swing space to accommodate parking phasing and construction
- Where possible, remove surface parking lots and consolidate parking supply into centrally located parking structures to allow for green space and campus development, increase parking efficiency, and improve water quality by reducing the amount of impermeable surface on campus

Parking Additions and Reductions

This plan recommends an addition of 6,380 and removal of 4,380 parking spaces, for a net increase of 2,000 parking spaces over the next 20-40 years to accommodate the planned build-out. Recommended parking additions and reductions are depicted in the table and figures below. Additions and reductions result in the following increases by district:

- West Campus: +689 spaces
- Near West Campus: +81 spaces
- Central Campus: +615 spaces
- South Campus: +615 spaces

Recommended additions and reductions are summarized in Figures E-7 and E-8.



Figure E-7 Recommended Parking Reductions



This page left intentionally blank.

1. INTRODUCTION



Background and Context

The 2015 University of Wisconsin–Madison (UW–Madison) Long Range Transportation Plan is an update to the 2005 UW–Madison Long Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Demand Management Plan. Moving around the UW–Madison campus safely, comfortably, and efficiently using a variety of modes is central to the experience of students, faculty, staff, and visitors.

This plan sets the vision for the development and improvement of parking and transportation options across all modes. Its objective is to leverage and build off past success and manage current and future travel and parking demands on campus in a balanced way. This plan seeks to further refine and improve transportation systems to encourage alternative modes of transportation to, from, and around campus. Although no significant growth in the campus population is expected, projected growth in programmed teaching and research space will alter the demand for campus parking. The university desires to effectively balance existing and future parking resources to provide an adequate and convenient supply of parking now and into the future.

UW–Madison Transportation Services is a national leader in educating students, faculty, staff, and campus visitors about the range of available transportation options, as well as providing and promoting alternative transportation choices to its clients. Transportation defines how students, faculty, and visitors experience the university as they move between buildings and across campus to get to class, to work, and to appointments.

Sustainability is a central theme of this plan and the transportation recommendations put forth. Recommendations aim to continue and expand on the culture and practice of sustainability that is part of the university's operation. With this in mind, the plan strives to concentrate parking and make it more efficient, and make key improvements to further expand the convenient and comfortable alternative travel options to, from, and around campus.



Transportation Improvements Made Since 2005

Various transportation system improvements made on or in the vicinity of campus by the university and city have been implemented since the university's 2005 Campus Master Plan. Figure 1-1 displays these improvements.



1. INTRODUCTION



2. TRANSPORTATION CONTEXT

Existing Conditions Assessment and Analysis

This section describes the existing transportation conditions on the UW– Madison campus, including what is working and what needs improvement. Identification of the assets and challenges associated with all modes of transportation was informed by a broad analysis process that included site visits; discussions with students, university officials, and other stakeholders; and modeling and mapping exercises. Later sections of this plan describe recommendations for addressing current and future demands on the transportation and parking infrastructure network and reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips through targeted improvements.



Current Travel Patterns and Behavior

Current travel patterns and behavior among students, faculty, staff, and hospital employees at UW–Madison were determined using home address information and results from a 2014 Biennial Transportation Survey Report completed by Transportation Services.

Trip Origin

Daily campus visitors come from locations near campus, throughout Madison, Dane County, and beyond.

Students

Parking is available to students on campus only under very specific limited conditions. Students are encouraged to live in university residence halls; in Eagle Heights; in nearby neighborhoods on the near south and west side city neighborhoods such as Regent, Vilas, and Greenbush; and in the neighborhoods of the State Street, Capitol, and near east side parts of the city. The robust walking, bicycling, and public transit network on campus and in Madison supports commuting to campus using alternative modes.

Faculty/Staff

The highest density of faculty and staff live on the near west and near east sides of Madison and in Shorewood Hills.

UW Hospital Employees

High densities of hospital employees live on the west, southwest, and east sides of Madison and the surrounding communities of Middleton, Verona, Monona, Waunakee, McFarland, Oregon, and Sun Prairie.

Trip Distribution

To better understand the travel behaviors of those working on campus, trip distribution was analyzed using address data of university faculty and staff, as well as UW Hospital staff. The distribution was broken into five sectors.

Individuals living in the northwest sector constitute 30 percent of total travelers and likely access campus using University Avenue to the west of campus. Those coming from the southwest of campus likely use Monroe Street and Regent Street and make up 20 percent of total travelers. In the southeast part of campus, 15 percent of people use US 151 to Park Street to access the campus area. Individuals making up the 30 percent of total travelers located in the northeast sector access campus via West Dayton Street, West Gorham Street, West Gilman Street, and Langdon Street from the Isthmus. Data indicates that 5 percent of total travelers are internal to the university campus.

Figure 2-1 on the following page depicts trip distribution among UW– Madison faculty, staff, and hospital employees.

2. TRANSPORTATION CONTEXT



Figure 2-1 Trip Distribution for Faculty, Staff, and Hospital Employees

Mode of Travel

Transportation Services completed its Biennial Transportation Survey Report, detailing the process and results of a survey administered in the fall of 2014. The survey gathered information about the travel characteristics of students, faculty, and staff traveling both to and around campus.

Over 1,900 surveys were completed by students, faculty, staff, and UW Hospital employees. Responses received are a metric for understanding mode splits to campus and the percentage of people using different modes of travel to get to campus. Existing travel mode split estimates are as follows (data is shown for good weather conditions):

Students

Nearly half (49 percent) of students walk to campus, 22 percent ride their bicycle, 8 percent ride Metro Transit, and the remaining students use carpool/ vanpool services, arrive via moped or motorcycle, or drive alone.

Faculty/Staff

More than half (52 percent) of faculty/staff drive alone to campus, 14 percent ride Metro Transit, 17 percent ride a bicycle, 4 percent walk, and the remaining use carpool, vanpool, and other options.

UW Hospital Employees

Among UW Hospital employees, 70 percent drive alone to campus, 11 percent ride Metro Transit, 5 percent ride a bicycle, 4 percent walk, and the remaining use carpool, vanpool, and other options.

UW Hospital employees have the most varied schedules of anyone traveling to campus. Hospital employees report more than any other group that they arrive to the hospital before 7:00 a.m. and leave after 7:00 p.m. There are eight recommended parking lots (Lots 59, 60, 76, 64, 79, 82, 85, and 95) within a short walk of the UW Hospital.

Weather as a Determining Factor

For all user groups poor weather significantly affects mode choice. Bicycling as a mode choice for students sees an 86 percent decrease during poor weather, while the use of Metro Transit service increases from 18 to 52 percent. Figure 2-2 depicts the mode split among all user groups coming and going from campus. Percentages shown are blended averages.



Other (Moped, Motorcycle, Private Bus, Drop-off, Campus Bus, Other)

Figure 2-2 Faculty/Staff, Student, and Employee Mode Split to and From Campus

Source: 2014 UW Transportation Services Biennial Transportation Survey Report

Existing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies

Parking space is limited on the UW–Madison campus and plans for continued growth in facilities on campus will place additional demands on the network. UW Transportation Services currently employs a number of transportation demand management (TDM) strategies to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips. These efforts are a key reason that the university is able to operate with only 13,000 parking spaces, which is one of the lowest parking ratios of any major university in the United States. Continuing to focus on and expand these strategies is consistent with the university's continued pursuit of campus sustainability, health, and well-being.

Single-occupancy vehicle trip reduction is accomplished through a variety of incentives and the provision of desirable travel alternatives. These include:

- Strong multimodal travel options, including Metro Transit bus and a comfortable walking and biking network
- UW-Madison Employee Bus Pass Program
- Free campus bus routes and subsidized Metro Transit bus passes for students, faculty, and staff
- Paratransit service
- Accessible Circulator Shuttle PILOT
- Carpool/vanpool options
- Emergency ride home
- Limited parking supply and permit parking requirements
- Park-and-ride
- Car sharing
- BCycle bicycle share
- Abundant and convenient bicycle parking



Vehicle Access and Circulation

Campus Road Network

Campus Drive and University Avenue runs east-west through campus and acts as the primary arterial "spine" on campus. Park Street is the primary north-south campus arterial. A variety of other lower volume collector streets run north-south including N. Randall Avenue, N. Mills Street, N. Orchard Street, and N. Charter Street. The lower volume east-west collectors include Observatory Drive, Linden Drive, and W. Dayton Street. Campus Drive and Observatory Drive provide the only vehicle connections across Willow Creek and to the West Campus.

Traffic Volumes

Traffic volumes on the roads leading into and circulating around campus are varied.

The highest motor vehicle traffic volumes on campus occur on University Avenue and W. Johnson Street between N. Charter Street and N. Park Street, with Average Weekday Traffic (AWT) counts of between approximately 25,000-30,000 vehicles per day.

In order to determine traffic volumes at key locations on campus streets, tube counts were taken at nine locations across campus on two consecutive weekdays in spring 2015:

- 1. Observatory Drive east of N. Charter Street
- 2. N. Charter Street north of Linden Drive
- 3. Observatory Drive east of Babcock Drive
- 4. Linden Drive west of N. Charter Street
- 5. Babcock Drive south of Linden Drive
- 6. Linden Drive west of Babcock Drive
- 7. Observatory Drive east of Elm Drive
- 8. Observatory Drive west of Elm Drive
- 9. Linden Drive east of Easterday Lane

Observatory Drive on the west end of campus saw the highest traffic volumes among the tube counts with 7,100 vehicles per day recorded just west of Elm Drive. A selection of these counts are shown in Figure 2-3 as Average Daily Traffic (ADT) counts.



Traffic Operations and Control

Campus intersections are both signalized and unsignalized and the signalized intersections feature standard traffic controls.

The Wisconsin and Southern Railroad passes through campus, and several points along the west and south sides of campus feature at-grade railroad crossings. These crossings occur at major intersections, such as Highland Avenue and University Avenue, and have standard railroad crossing controls.

Roadway Capacity

Overall, UW–Madison's vehicular traffic flows relatively well. When looking at traffic over the course of an entire day, most of the minor roadways on campus experience little congestion. Observatory Drive, Linden Drive, N. Mills Street, and N. Randall Avenue are examples of low-volume roadways that see little congestion over an average day but may have short periods of congestion or delay at certain peak periods. The Campus Drive and University Avenue arterials have the highest levels of congestion of roads on the campus network.

Several streets offering direct access to and from campus, such as Highland Ave, N. Randall Avenue, and Regent Street, have moderate levels of congestion over the course of a day. Some intersections on campus experience significant transit delay due to high volumes of pedestrians and bicyclists. The intersection of N. Charter Street and Linden Drive is an example of vehicular traffic delay occurring during short peak periods of the day due to high pedestrian traffic despite the low traffic volumes. This vehicular delay slows down transit vehicles and may get them off schedule. This is discussed in more detail later in the plan.

Figure 2-3 displays traffic volumes and congestion on campus.

Loading Docks and Truck Routes

Loading and service docks are located across campus serving the movement and delivery of goods. All campus roads can support truck loads. To the extent possible, the university tries to limit truck deliveries on campus to times of the day where pedestrian volumes are low. Figure 2-4 displays loading docks on campus.



ADT and AWT. Based on campus counts and 2015 City of Madison

Figure 2-3 Motor Vehicle Traffic and Congestion on Campus



Figure 2-4 Campus Loading Docks

Walking and Biking Network

Non-Motorized Circulation: Connecting Campus Destinations

Walking and biking are the predominate modes of transportation on campus. Attractive streetscapes and comfortable walking and biking facilities connect pedestrians and bicyclists around campus on a daily basis.

Similar to the City of Madison, UW Transportation Services gives highest priority to the comfort of pedestrians and bicyclists (i.e. non-motorized travelers) on campus through a number of programs and amenities. The high quality walking and biking network is a primary reason the campus gets such high marks for accessibility, sustainability, and beauty. Facilities for bicycling and walking are the central components of the campus transportation network.



This emphasis serves as the basis for analyzing issues and formulating recommendations in this master plan.

The walking and biking network on campus can be divided into primary and secondary pathways, connecting nodes of walking and biking destinations and activity.

Primary points of entry into campus for bicyclists include State Street, Park Street, the Southwest Path, the Howard Temin Lakeshore Path, and the Campus Drive Path. Major nodes for pedestrian and bicycle activity include Park Street and University Avenue, the Library Mall/Langdon Street/East Campus Mall area, and Linden Drive and N. Charter Street. University Avenue and W. Dayton Street are the primary east-west pedestrian and bike connections. Linden Drive and Observatory Drive carry pedestrians and bicyclists across the center and west parts of campus. North-south connectivity is served by streets from the Greenbush-Vilas Neighborhood including N. Randall Avenue, N. Mills Street, N. Orchard Street, and Park Street. University Avenue serves as the "spine" that runs through the heart of campus. This street must be crossed by pedestrians and bicyclists traveling north-south on campus. Intersections and other crossing points are priority locations for enhancing pedestrian comfort and connectivity.

Despite all of the campus' pedestrian and bicycle assets, there are areas that deserve targeted improvements. Issues are described in this section with detailed recommendations provided in the following section.

Current Walking Facilities

UW–Madison consists of a dense building network interconnected with walking facilities, particularly on the east part of campus. With nearly 22,000 faculty and staff and over 43,000 students on a nearly 1.5 square mile campus, walking continues to be the most accessible and popular form of transportation. It has been prioritized in the campus planning process and supported heavily by UW Transportation Services.

The UW–Madison campus consists of a comprehensive network of separated pedestrian-only and shared-use walking facilities. These pathways exist in the form of sidewalks, paved and unpaved walking paths, and paved and unpaved shared-use paths. Pathways connect major nodes of pedestrian activity such as Bascom Hill, Library Mall, Henry Mall, and State Street. The East Campus Mall, connecting Library Mall with the University Avenue pedestrian node, is a recently established and crucial connection that sees high volumes of pedestrian use each day.

Figure 2-5 on the following page displays the locations and types of current campus walking facilities. The campus is well-connected with comfortable and accessible walking facilities.

Current Biking Facilities and Features

UW–Madison is a leader in providing comprehensive and comfortable bicycling facilities. The City of Madison recently became a Platinum-Level Bicycle Friendly Community as designated by the League of American Bicyclists, and the university and Transportation Services reflect this excellence in their own prioritization of cycling infrastructure. UW–Madison itself was recently designated a Gold-Level Bicycle Friendly University by the League of American Bicyclists due to its commitment to providing comfortable and connected bicycle accommodations, as well as abundant and convenient bicycle parking.

High volumes of bicyclists ride through campus on a daily basis, particularly in warmer months. The Southwest Path at Monroe Street saw a peak volume of 2,223 bicycles a day during counts from October 2014 to April 2015.



On-Street and Off-Street Bicycling Facilities

The UW–Madison bicycling network consists of infrastructure ranging from bike priority streets (painted sharrows) to fully dedicated trails and curbseparated biking lanes on streets under city and university jurisdiction.

Several dedicated bike routes on campus are separated from vehicles and facilitate travel to and through campus. Sharrows (shared lane pavement markings) are present on Linden Drive west of N. Charter Street. There is a contraflow, eastbound protected bike lane, separated by a concrete barrier on the south side of University Avenue. A westbound bike lane exists on University Avenue south of the westbound transit/vehicle turn lane. Other bike routes on campus include the unpaved Howard Temin Lakeshore Path along Lake Mendota, and the 5.6 mile City Southwest Path that is a rails-to-trails bike route beginning in Fitchburg and passing through the southern part of campus. W. Dayton Street is the only east-west street in South Campus with bicycle accommodations.

Bike lanes exist across campus providing bicyclists with dedicated space but no physical separation from vehicles. Major biking corridors that contain bike lanes include W. Dayton Street, N. Randall Avenue, Park Street, N. Charter



Figure 2-5 Existing Campus Walking Facilities



Street north of University Avenue, and Observatory Drive on the west side of campus. Contraflow bicycle lanes (traveling in the opposite direction of motor vehicle traffic) exist on N. Charter Street south of W. Dayton Street, as well as on N. Orchard Street north of W. Johnson Street, and on Babcock Drive south of Linden Drive.

Figure 2-6 displays the locations and types of existing campus biking facilities, as well as features that support campus bike use. In general, the campus is well-covered with comfortable, accessible, and connected biking facilities. However, there are specific areas of concern that need improvement.

Bicycle Parking

Abundant and convenient bicycle parking is essential to supporting bike use in any environment with high bike volumes. There are currently 13,600 bicycle parking spaces across campus today among about 290 rack locations of varying types. The goal of the university is to have 14,500 bicycle parking spaces on campus by the end of summer 2017, and eventually have 16,000. The demand for bicycle parking is very location-specific. In many cases bicycle parking is not appropriately located relative to specific building entrances that see high demand. Locations such as Linden Drive at N. Charter Street see spillover bicycle parking demand, where bikes are often locked to trees and sign posts during peak times. The university has worked to standardize bicycle parking and provide high-density racks where needed.

BCycle Bike Share

In 2011 the City of Madison began offering a bike sharing system called BCycle, which has grown to include 39 stations and 350 bikes around the city and campus, including 7 stations on campus. In 2014, over 104,000 trips were made using BCycle. Students, faculty, and staff are eligible to join BCycle at a discounted rate of \$20 (2016 rate) per year.





Specialized/Adapted Bicycle Signal

Figure 2-6 Existing Campus Biking Facilities and Features

Bicycle-Supportive Features

Madison and the university offer other features that support and encourage bicycling on campus. Applicants can sign up to gain access to paid bike lockers and cages that are located at various locations around campus. Bike Madison offers free maintenance bike pumps along some paths and bike racks are located in the front of all Metro Transit buses. Transportation Services has a program offering free refurbished bicycles for departments to use for campus travel.

Additionally, the university Bicycle Resource Center is located within the Helen C. White parking structure at the north end of N. Park Street near the Memorial Union. This facility is staffed by Commuter Solutions student employees, is open during the week, and offers tools for bike repair and other biking resources.

Walking and Biking Analysis

The following sections describe the current assets and challenges with the non-motorized transportation network. The findings presented below form the basis of recommendations offered in the next section of this plan.

Gaps in Connectivity

For Pedestrians

Paved pedestrian-only pathways represent the primary routes carrying students, faculty, and staff across campus grounds and between buildings; these pathways provide micro-level connections. Paved shared-use facilities such as the Southwest Path and unpaved facilities like the Lakeshore Path serve longer distance, cross-campus connections. Campus destinations are well-connected, with a few exceptions.

Sidewalks exist on the majority of campus streets and carry high volumes of pedestrian traffic on a daily basis. Interior connecting roads such as Lathrop Drive, Clymer Place, Conklin Place, and Fitch Court do not always have sidewalks present on either side of the road but alternate pathways are present nearby. However, analysis identified Lathrop Drive as being particularly uncomfortable for pedestrians because there is an absence of infrastructure or design elements indicating whether pedestrians or automobiles have priority in this space.



There is a primary gap in pedestrian connectivity on the west side of campus. The Campus Drive shared-use path ends near the School of Veterinary Medicine. A connection to Babcock Drive and University Avenue to the east would better connect pedestrians and bicyclists along this corridor.

Busy arterial roads and railroads act as barriers to pedestrian connectivity on campus because of uncomfortable intersections and the absence of adequate crossing locations. There is limited pedestrian connectivity across Campus Drive and the railroad corridor west of Babcock Drive. This crossing is served by the Alicia Ashman Bridge at the Stock Pavilion, as well as Walnut Street and Highland Avenues, approximately 1/2 mile and 0.70 mile to the west, respectively. Limited connectivity in this area is a concern due to the number of campus destinations that are present, and the concentration of students living in the Old University Avenue corridor and Camp Randall Stadium area.

For Bicyclists

Corridors without designated biking markings or signage discourage bicycling, especially where motor vehicle speeds and volumes are high. Adding biking infrastructure in the listed gaps will work to boost bicycling, reduce instances of bicyclists riding on sidewalks, and promote overall efficiency and safety for all modes.

Critical locations where gaps in walking and bicycle infrastructure reduce campus connectivity are summarized in Table 2-1 (the Route IDs correspond to the map in Figure 2-7).

Challenging Crossings and Interactions with Other Modes

Pedestrians and bicyclists travel in large volumes across streets, railroad crossings, and intersections throughout campus. Many pedestrians cross streets at mid-block locations or at locations without designated pathways or crossings. Pedestrian and bicyclist compliance with walk signals and other control devices is often low. People are often in a hurry to get to class or appointments because of limited time and long travel distances. Pedestrians and bicycles regularly interact with Metro Transit buses, personal automobiles, delivery trucks, service vehicles, and mopeds across campus. Interactions often result in close calls and delay as the modes wait for each other to pass through the intersection. Crossings are made more difficult in some locations due to long crossing distances, intersection configuration, and



in some cases, low visibility from weather or sun glare, such as on westbound University Avenue in the afternoon.

Table 2-2 summarizes intersections and crossings identified as critical locations where pedestrian and bicyclist interactions with other modes diminishes overall efficiency and safety. The Location IDs correspond to those on the map in Figure 2-7.

Quality and Maintenance of Facilities

Smooth, well-maintained, and high quality walking and biking facilities are essential to comfortable and accessible pedestrian and bicycle travel, particularly for those with assistance devices (further discussed below). Sidewalks, walking paths, and on and off-street bicycle facilities should be clear of debris and snow; free of cracks, gaps, and roots; and have a wide travel space free of obstacles such as light poles, utility boxes, or trees. Paths should be routed appropriately around buildings and to building entrance points.

Overall the walking and biking facilities on campus are high quality, wellplaced, and well-maintained. Specific issues encountered through analysis that deserve attention for improvement include:

- The width of sidewalks on the south side of campus is inadequate to comfortably and safely accommodate the large volumes of users in many locations on W. Dayton Street, N. Randall Avenue, N. Orchard Street, and N. Mills Street
- The university works to maintain consistency of pavement markings across campus. However, with many campus streets under the control of the City of Madison, there is not a standard pedestrian crosswalk marking on campus. Crosswalks in some locations are worn and faded
- The routing of the Lakeshore Path from the Memorial Union area around the Limnology Building is unclear
- The westbound bicycle lane on University Avenue is currently unprotected and buses and turning vehicles must cross this facility
- Better snow clearance on the eastbound University Avenue protected bike lane during the winter since this is a high-volume priority bike route
- Intercity buses frequently park in the dedicated bus lane in front of the Chazen Museum, requiring Madison Metro buses to use the bike lane to get around intercity buses picking up and dropping off long-distance passengers. This creates congestion and unsafe traffic conditions, especially for bicyclists



Pedestrian-Only Walking Path

Figure 2-7 Existing Walking and Biking Routes and Identified Challenges

Table 2-1 Summary of Gaps in Walking and Biking Connectivity

Route ID	Location	Challenge/Need
A えぐつ	Campus Drive Path and Linden Drive	Need for connection between end of path at Veterinary Medicine to Babcock Drive and University Avenue to the east
B CO	West Campus Connection over Campus Drive	Additional north-south crossing of Campus Drive for pedestrians and bicyclists between existing bridge and Walnut Street
۲. ۲. ۲۰	N. Charter Street between W. Dayton Street and University Avenue	Primary north-south route connecting north campus with campus and neighborhoods to the south Need for bicycle accommodations on N. Charter Street between W. Dayton Street and University Avenue
⊳ १ १	N. Mills Street between W. Dayton Street and University Avenue	Primary north-south route, similar to N. Charter Street Need for bicycle accommodations between W. Dayton Street and University Avenue to connect northern parts of campus to the neighborhood area to the south Will have to integrate with on-street parking

Table 2-2 Summary of Locations Where Challenges Exist

Location ID	Location	Challenge
次 ~~~	N. Charter Street and Linden Drive	High non-motorized volumes; peak 15 minute pedestrian volume from 10:45 – 11:00 a.m. on a Tuesday in April 2015 of 2,199 pedestrians and 95 bicyclists Conflicts between modes, major transit delays
50 S	N. Charter Street and Observatory Drive	High non-motorized volumes; peak 15 minute pedestrian volume from 10:45 – 11:00 a.m. on a Tuesday in April 2015 of 1,299 pedestrians and 26 bicyclists Conflicts between modes, major transit delays
***	Campus Drive and N. Randall Avenue	Skewed intersection, long crossing Various turning movements, high vehicle speeds and volumes Pedestrian, bicyclist, and vehicle yielding confusion Railroad crossing

Location ID	Location	Challenge
DD C	Campus Drive, University Avenue, and Babcock Drive	Skewed intersection, long crossing Various turning movements, high vehicle speeds and volumes Pedestrian, bicyclist, and vehicle yielding confusion Railroad crossing
EE XOO	N. Park Street and University Avenue	Various turning movements, high vehicle speeds and volumes Pedestrian, bicyclist, and vehicle yielding confusion Very high pedestrian and bicycle traffic
	N. Park Street and Observatory Drive	Highly skewed and offset intersection Transit layover area on west side of Memorial Union All mode turning movements Low pedestrian and bicycle compliance
_{GG} رونگری کری کری کری کری کری کری کری کری کری ک	Southwest Path, Regent Street, Breese Terrace, Crazy Legs Lane, and Monroe Street	City has worked to address green pavement markings, bike specific signal going westbound, and other measures Highly skewed intersection results in a lot of confusion between all modes and intersection shared-use path
	University Avenue and N. Charter Street	Skewed intersection with difficult crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists Modal conflicts, transit delay
৾	University Bay Drive and Campus Drive Path	Bicyclists crossing this intersection come into conflict with buses, emergency hospital vehicles, and high vehicle volumes
" えぐっ	University Avenue and N. Randall Avenue	No pedestrian crosswalk at the west leg of the intersection Long crossing with high motor vehicle traffic speeds and volumes
КК	University Avenue in front of Chazen Museum	Intercity buses park in front of the museum, forcing Metro Transit buses to use the westbound bike lane to pass
৸	Lakeshore Path at the Limnology Building	Lakeshore Path ends and users must use the narrow sidewalk next to the Limnology Building or travel through the building's parking lot to access N. Park Street

Limitations in Accessibility

Accessibility for those who rely on assistance vehicles is an important issue on campus. There are currently 1,300 registered students with disabilities. Having wide, smooth paths with strongly contrasted pavement, as well as clear and audible crossing control devices are important features for those with mobility and visual limitations. Clear and abundant wayfinding and signage are also essential to accessible travel.

Additionally, it was identified that wayfinding is often difficult on campus and service vehicles often surprise the visually-impaired.

Improved Wayfinding, Lighting, and Personal Safety Measure Placement

Abundant and well-placed lighting is critical to supporting a pleasant walking and biking experience. Outside of the Howard Temin Lakeshore Path, walking and biking facilities on campus are well-lit. UW Transportation Services operates a SAFEwalk program featuring walking escorts for students after dark. This service is available by request from 7 p.m. to 1 a.m. from October to March and 8 p.m. to 1 a.m. April to September, seven days a week. This program is not available on holidays or to the far western portion of campus that includes the University Hospital and Eagle Heights. Additionally, there are emergency phones including "blue-light" call boxes placed at various locations across campus.

There are several different signs and wayfinding elements that guide pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists to destinations around campus. The 2003 Exterior Graphics, Wayfinding, and Signage Policies and Design Guidelines document details how and where the university will place certain types of signs and what the different sign types will look like. A Signage and Wayfinding Implementation Subcommittee under the Campus Planning Committee developed the policy, and staff in Facilities Planning & Management oversees the signage master plan and reviews requests as needed.

Campus signs are unified by their black color, arched shape, university crest, white lettering, and a red bottom stripe. This consistency provides clarity to pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and visitors as to when they are on campus and identifies which buildings are university buildings.

Campus signs are divided into several distinct categories, each serving a different purpose:

- Off-campus trailblazer wayfinding signs
- Main campus identification signs
- On-campus directional signs
- Parking lot signage
- Wayfinding maps and directories
- Building identification signs
- Building information signs

Dane County is adopting a bicycle wayfinding plan that will serve as a resource to the university and others in unifying the form and function of county bikeway signage.

There are several larger elements that provide visual cues to travelers signifying that they have entered campus including pre-cast concrete and brick signs, and the pedestrian bridge over N. Park Street at Bascom Hill has "UW–Madison" written across its side. There also are numerous banners and flags hung up at buildings and other locations across campus. There is a need for more wayfinding information to direct pedestrians and bicyclists around campus. Signage and wayfinding could be integrated into plans to help promote the overall sense of place and identity on campus.

Improved Bike-Supportive Features

Analysis indicated several opportunities for improving the facilities and accommodations that support bicycling. The following concerns were noted and should be addressed:

- There is a desire for an improved and centrally-located bike resource center on campus. This center could be located within or nearby Union South. In addition to providing educational resources, the center would provide biking amenities to the public, such as a shower and changing area, repair shop, and bike locker area.
- The type and placement of bike parking needs to be improved. There is a desire for more attractive and covered bicycle parking and better placement of bicycle parking areas adjacent to building entrances. Bicycle parking could serve artistic and placemaking purposes as well.

Public Transportation

Existing Service Options

There are a variety of service options that connect to and around the UW–Madison campus.

Metro Transit Bus Routes

Metro Transit provides frequent service to and from campus, as numerous east-west Metro Transit routes travel on University Avenue and W. Johnson Street. Routes 80, 81, 82, and 84 circulate around the UW–Madison campus and are free to all riders. Routes 2, 11, 27, 28, 38, and 44 provide additional campus circulation function. Figure 2-8 displays peak transit service circulating campus, as well as transit stops.

Currently, there is an average of 16,900 boardings on the UW–Madison's campus each weekday during the academic year.. According to available Metro Transit data, the busiest stop on campus is at University Avenue and N. Park Street, with an average of 1,460 daily boardings. See Figure 2-9 for a depiction of transit boardings on campus (ridership data was not available for all stops).

The UW–Madison currently contracts with the local transit provider, Metro Transit, to provide transit service to students, faculty, and staff on campus. Metro Transit bus passes for an unlimited number of rides are available for eligible UW–Madison faculty and staff for \$24 per year. Students pay \$55.48 per semester for an unlimited pass on Metro Transit routes. Those without a pass can ride Metro Transit routes for \$2 per ride.

Paratransit

Paratransit service is available on campus for eligible students and staff. Those utilizing the service must have a valid UW–Madison ID, Metro Transit bus pass, and also fill out an application with Metro Transit to get registered. This service is available by scheduled appointment and must be requested by 4:30 p.m. the day prior to travel. Service is available from 5:30 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. on weekdays, 7:00 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. on weekends, and 7:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on holidays.

Accessible Circulator Shuttle Pilot

Throughout the 2014-2015 school year the UW–Madison piloted an accessible circulator shuttle. This service was created as a result of comments received during the Campus Transit and Accessible Transportation Study. The service was a hybrid between a fixed-route service and a demand responsive route. The fixed-route portion traveled between the Humanities Building, the Social Sciences Building, Allen Gardens, Ag Engineering, and the WID Building. Those wishing for service at another location were able to request service by phone or e-mail.

The accessible circulator shuttle was available Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. during fall and spring class sessions and exam periods. Analysis of the accessible circulator shuttle's performance is currently underway. Future availability of this service will depend on funding and the shuttle's performance.





The service on this map reflects the time period between approximately 7 p.m. and 10 p.m.

Figure 2-8 Metro Transit Bus Routes Circulating UW–Madison Campus



Figure 2-9 Average Daily Transit Boardings

Carpool

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation administers carpool locations in Verona, DeForest, Sauk City, Northwest Dane County, Middleton, Mount Horeb, and Mazomanie. Carpools may elect to register for a carpool permit with UW Transportation Services to give them priority in acquiring a parking permit in the parking lot of their choice from a select list of lots across campus. Each carpool member is entitled to the Emergency Ride Home Program, as well as six complimentary daily parking passes per year for days that carpoolers need to drive their own vehicles. Since employees may not live near their coworkers the university has highlighted seven locations for carpool groups to meet in addition to the transit park-and-ride facilities.

Vanpool

Vanpools are another option that the UW–Madison provides for employees commuting to campus. Vanpools consist of 8-15 employees that travel to work in a State of Wisconsin van and cover its operating costs by paying a fare. Vanpools are serviced by the Wisconsin State Vanpool Program. Vanpool groups operate routes from many outlying communities into Madison, and the only requirement for the vanpool is that a state employee is on board. All vanpool riders are eligible for Emergency Ride Home service in case they need to return home suddenly and unexpectedly during the day.

Car Sharing

The car sharing service Zipcar has a partnership with the university that offers discounts for students, faculty, staff, and UW Health employees. Car sharing expands transportation and mobility options for those who may only occasionally need access to a vehicle. Zipcar has cars available at seven campus locations and two locations east of campus, as well as numerous locations throughout the city that are accessible for personal use and travel.

Intercity Buses

Megabus, Van Galder, and Badger Bus offer intercity bus service to Chicago, LaCrosse, Minneapolis/St. Paul, and other regional destinations from a stop at the Chazen Museum of Art on University Avenue. Buses layover in the northern bus lane at this location. During bus layover, Metro Transit buses are forced into the adjacent vehicle travel lane, which necessitates crossing the westbound bicycle lane.

Park-and-Ride Service

Metro Transit serves five designated park-and-ride lots with direct transit service to and from campus. Complimentary parking is provided to riders at these locations. The existing Metro Transit park-and-rides include the North Transfer Point (served by Routes 2, 4, 17, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 56, and 57), Dutch Mill (served by Routes 11 and 12), Northside Town Center (served by Routes 21, 22, and 29), American Center (served by Route 25), and Verona (served by Routes 55 and 75).

The university also has its own park-and-ride locations. These include Lot Lot 202 (served by a UW–Madison shuttle), and Lot 203 (served by a UW–Madison shuttle). These park-and-rides are serviced by UW–Madison independent of Metro Transit in order to improve commuters' access to campus. UW–Madison and Metro Transit recognize the need to improve service from area park-and-ride locations. More convenient schedules and direct connecting service is desired.

Monona Express

The City of Monona provides its own express bus service direct from Monona to downtown Madison and UW–Madison. The express bus makes 15 stops within Monona before traveling directly to downtown Madison. The bus travels during peak periods in peak direction, from 5:50 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. in the morning and 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in the evening. The route costs \$3 for adults, \$1.50 for students, and \$1.50 for seniors/those with disabilities.

Bus Rapid Transit

Plans are underway by Madison Metro for a bus rapid transit (BRT) service routes throughout the greater Madison area, including a route between the east and west sides of Madison through the isthmus and along University Avenue through campus. The university and city are planning integration of this service with other campus transit and multi-modal infrastructure.

Transit System Analysis

The current UW–Madison transit system works well and those wishing to access campus via a high-occupancy vehicle have several options. Transit is available for those traveling just around the corner as well as those traveling to the other side of campus. Transit service is also available during the peak period, the middle of the day, and the evening.

The transit system analysis presented here builds off of the 2013 Campus Transportation System Evaluation completed by Nelson Nygaard, currently serving as a reference for Transportation Services. There are several areas in need of improvement within the UW–Madison transit system. These include the street network, route structuring, travel time, capacity, and express service. Each of these items is discussed in further detail below.

Street Network Connectivity

The street network throughout UW–Madison is a significant limitation to the transit network. There is a lack of connecting roadways and a significant number of one-way streets so transit routes are required to operate in a circuitous and indirect manner. This prohibits bi-directional service, creates inefficiencies, and provides less optimal service with longer travel times. There is an identified desire to explore allowing transit vehicles to operate through the Observatory Drive switchback.

Route Structuring

Some routes on campus currently serve competing purposes. As discussed previously, this is particularly an issue for the current structure of Route 80. This route is currently structured to serve as a connector between the east and west ends of campus and as a circulator. As a result of these contradictory roles, the route is inhibited from performing well in either one. There is a strong desire for a Memorial Union to Union South circulator route that would operate back and forth between these popular destinations.


Travel Time & Delay

Several factors contribute to the issues associated with travel time on buses on the UW–Madison campus. As discussed previously, the road network and route structures create several travel time limitations. Additionally, there are a large number of pedestrians and bicyclists on campus during peak times, which often conflict with bus operations, particularly at intersections such as N. Charter Street and Linden Drive, and N. Park Street and University Avenue. Buses are forced to wait for pedestrians and bicyclists to clear busy intersections and crossings. The current bus stop spacing on campus also is a detriment to travel time since buses stop frequently along with slow fare collection and manual rider counting methods contributing to delays. Finally, buses often face increased delay and poor performance during times of inclement weather and high transit use.

Capacity Limits

Capacity is another issue with the transit system on the UW–Madison's campus, especially following class change times. This issue causes students to have to wait for the next bus or commute via another mode. As with other issues, capacity is exacerbated during times of inclement weather since buses are delayed and have more passengers per stop than usual. During other times of the year buses are well below capacity. A more demand-responsive set of routes on campus should be examined. Improving the efficiency and reducing the capacity limitations of Route 80 is a high priority on campus. Metro Transit is currently unable to address overcrowding on routes serving the campus because of the inability to increase fleet size, a direct result of the garage being well beyond design capacity.

Limited to No Express Service

Currently there is limited or no express bus service to the UW–Madison campus. This results in those taking transit from outlying areas to transfer or experience an indirect, time-consuming trip to campus. There is likely latent transit demand not being captured, since direct service to campus is not available—this is evident based on the substantial amount of "hide-andride" activity that occurs in the residential areas near campus. Direct, express transit service for area park-and-rides should be explored as a viable option to reducing on-campus vehicle use and parking demands.



Other Transit Needs

Additional campus transit needs include the following:

- Establish an intercity bus terminal near campus to eliminate observed queuing of intercity buses on University Avenue
- Examine placement of Route 80 stop locations to optimize efficiency
- Continue to analyze the benefits and feasibility of articulated buses

Parking on Campus

Existing Inventory Supply

In total, there are approximately 13,000 parking stalls on the UW–Madison campus. These stalls are located in surface lots or in underground and above-ground structures. The inventory includes approximately 9,400 faculty/ staff spaces, 1,600 visitor spaces, and 2,000 service/fleet spaces. There are also approximately 350 motorcycle stalls which are not included in the parking inventory total.

A total of 12 structured parking areas are located on campus and are available for visitors. The Transportation Services website displays real-time stall availability per garage in order to assist visitors in planning their parking destination. About half of these garages are located in Central and South Campus, with the remainder in other various locations.

There also are numerous surface parking lots on campus. The hours of availability vary depending on general campus location and the specific lot. Many of the surface lots in the Central and South Campus area are available for use all day, while most lots in the Near West and West Campus area are only open Monday through Friday. Campus development consumes available surface parking which is causing the university to seek replacement parking often in more consolidated (but more expensive) parking structures.

All mopeds on campus must be licensed by the State of Wisconsin and must have a university permit to park in designated moped parking stalls and lots across campus. Some lots allow "all access" moped parking that is open to all those with moped parking permits no matter what lot they have been assigned. The city and university lack consistent regulations and standards managing moped parking. Parked mopeds tend to accumulate on city terraces within campus boundaries and riders often need to illegally operate on sidewalks and crosswalks to access these areas.

Figure 2-10 and Table 2-3 display existing campus parking facilities.

Permitting and Pricing

Parking rates vary depending on location on campus, and parking duration. Although most stalls are reserved for permitted vehicles, numerous permit types exist within the UW–Madison system, depending on the user's need. Daytime permits are most commonly used by UW–Madison faculty, emeriti, and staff. Daytime permits for students are limited to those who live outside the central Madison transit area or to those with other special circumstances. The current waiting list for permits is 374 for all user groups. Approximately 370 cars park at the UW Park Street/Wingra, University Crossing, and Research Park park-and-ride lots.

Other permit types include afternoon, nighttime, carpool, park-and-ride, disabled user, motorcycle, and departmental permits. Non-UW–Madison affiliated permits for vendors and construction contractors and monthly permits are also available. Regular annual permit rates range between \$265 for park-and-ride spots to \$1,199 for high-demand lots.

Event parking is deployed during peak periods, such as athletic and commencement events. A large number of regularly permitted lots are affected during events; these impacted lots and the recurring events that impact them are listed on the Transportation Services website.

The UW–Madison issues an annual Parking Lot Rate Redesignation Plan that re-categorizes parking area priorities. In fall 2013, the university detailed various steps to condense pricing and prioritization categories. The changes will align all garages, ramps, and high-demand surface lots in one category and all remaining surface lots in a separate category.



Figure 2-10 Existing Campus Parking Facilities

Table 2-3 Existing Campus Parking Spaces, as of July 2016

					, or sary		
Lot	Total	Lot	Total	Lot	Total	Lot	Total
lumber	Spaces	Number	Spaces	Number	Spaces	Number	Space
1	57	33	60	63	255	103	10
3	70	34	272	64	131	105	8
4	31	35	19	65	51	106	6
5	45	36	457	68	13	107	5
6	190	37	37	69	12	109	4
7	412	38	146	72	12	110	3
8	23	39	69	74	78	112	6
9	16	40	170	75	1197	114	7
10	37	41	128	76	1290	115	13
11	37	43	58	78	15	116	6
12	19	44	66	79	229	120	8
13	45	45	102	80	168	123	8
14	10	46	734	81	57	124	27
16	143	48	10	82	317	125	11
17	797	50	176	83	296	129	28
18	48	51	35	85	43	130	93
19	43	53	21	86	8	131	95
20	220	54	37	87	42	133	18
21	47	55	27	88	27	134	4
22	68	56	43	91	170	135	6
23	43	57	65	92	30	136	3
26	95	58	44	93	78	137	12
27	48	59	167	94	29	138	4
28	12	60	1316	95	152		
29	339	61	30	101	4		
30	22	62	420	102	2	Total	12,717

National Leaders in Parking and Transportation Demand Management

UW–Madison has approximately 13,000 parking spaces that serve approximately 22,000 faculty and staff, 8,600 UW Hospital Employees, and 43,000 students. This yields a parking ratio of 0.18 parking spaces provided per person. This is the second lowest parking ratio of peer universities in the United States. With limited physical and financial resources, the university focuses on providing a minimal but efficiently managed parking supply to meet the needs of its faculty, staff, employees, visitors, and select students. Figure 2-11 illustrates how UW–Madison's parking ratio compares with peer universities.

UW–Madison is a national leader in providing effective travel demand management and alternative commuting strategies and messaging. The City of Madison provides services and infrastructure that support travel to and around the UW–Madison. Alternative commuting options include connected and comfortable walking and biking facilities, Metro Transit bus service, park-and-ride options, and carpool and vanpool programs. These options have allowed UW–Madison to maintain low parking ratios along with an attractive, livable environment on a campus with limited space and constrained parking resources.

Without the current policies in place, traditional land use-based parking calculations would estimate a necessary supply of nearly 24,000 spaces to meet the faculty, staff, employee, and visitor parking demand. If students were permitted to park on campus this demand would increase by as many as 18,000 more parking spaces. In summary, the current supply is about 13,000 parking spaces. Unconstrained demand would be as high as 24,000 parking spaces of demand (or higher if students were allowed to park). Current parking supply is effectively full. The current constrained demand is approximately 13,750 spaces, which includes those that are on the waiting list and those that park at area park-and-ride lots.

Occupancy Analysis

An occupancy analysis was conducted to determine the current supply and demand pattern for each user type for all parking lots on campus. Knowledge of these existing parking behaviors helps to identify spatial and temporal opportunities to improve parking efficiency and highlight needs of the system as the university undergoes physical changes across the 20+ year period of this master plan.

Overall, campus parking supply is operating between 85-90 percent full during the peak period—occupancies between 85 percent and 95 percent are considered to be effective capacity maximums. This indicates that current observed parking occupancies on campus are at or very near the overall effective capacity. Figures 2-12 and 2-13 display mid-day parking occupancies for faculty and staff, as well as visitors. Lots colored in orange and red are effectively full.

Visitor parking is particularly challenging to find, especially in South and Central Campus. The university tightly controls and manages parking

supply on a daily basis to allocate available spaces (including visitor parking spaces), depending on events and other situations which drive demand. Transportation Services is challenged with allocating the correct supply of visitor spaces in the correct locations to meet changing demand, while maintaining permit parking supply. This problem is further exacerbated by consumption of parking supply by ongoing campus building development.

Visitor parking allocations fill up daily and requests exceed available supply. Transportation Services indicates a need of approximately 2,000 additional parking spaces to accommodate increasing visitor parking demand, and to provide flexibility and "swing space" (additional parking space needed to accommodate parking phasing during campus construction that results in the loss of existing campus parking spaces). As a result of limited supply in the desired locations, visitors and other university parkers spend considerable time searching for available parking spaces and usually end up parking in locations far from their destinations. Visitors are less likely to use alternative modes of travel due to lack of knowledge or their inability to access alternatives from where they are traveling.

UW–Madison will never reach an equilibrium in placing an adequate supply of parking directly adjacent to building destinations. Some parking will always occur in adjacent districts. Parking supply must be continuously evaluated relative to the demand for academic and research building sites.

Current TDM policies and practices nearly halve the actual amount of parking necessary to serve the land uses and destinations on campus. Additional campus growth and development will require continued focus on TDM strategies to maintain consistently low faculty/staff parking ratios, with limited additions of parking to serve campus visitors and to serve as swing space.



Figure 2-11 Parking Spaces per Person (Employees + Students) at Select Peer Universities



Figure 2-12 Mid-day Parking Occupancies for Faculty and Staff



The infographic below summarizes the key characteristics of the university's transportation system.

VEHICLES



- Vehicle flow through campus is adequate
- University Avenue is the spine of campus and offers city and regional connectivity



WALK/BIKE

- Heavy pedestrian and bike volumes around campus
- University Avenue cycle track and other dedicated facilities make travel more comfortable and connected



TRANSIT

- Well-used system with a high number of boardings particularly at the center of campus
- Paratransit and other commuter solutions are offered



PARKING

• Low parking ratios and strong TDM programs

WHAT IS NOT WORKING



- Some areas of congestion on University Avenue and Johnson Street
- Vehicle delay occurs at intersections such as University Avenue and Charter Street with heavy pedestrian and bicycle movements



- Critical gaps in connectivity exist
- Various intersections present challenging conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists that often contributes to transit and vehicle delay
- Continued need for more and



- Park-and-ride facilities offer potential for direct service routes
- Locations with high pedestrian and bicycle volumes cause transit delays
- Lack of intercity bus terminal causes model conflicts



- Visitor parking proximate to buildings is often difficult to find
 Many parking lots operate as
 - Many parking lots operate as effectively full

This page intentionally left blank.

3. TRANSPORTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

966

Metro

Alternatives Development and Recommendations

The recommendations presented in this plan are meant to strategically build off of existing transportation assets and address known deficiencies to maximize system efficiency, safety, and operations within the future campus land use scenario.

The university strives to continue to be a national leader in multimodal transportation and commuter solutions, the provision and encouragement of non-motorized transportation and transit use, and the effective and sustainable management and operations of campus parking.

This section includes recommendations for maintaining high quality transportation operations and connectivity for all modes and is separated into the following four recommendations (by mode):

- 1. Emphasize walking and biking as the primary forms of transportation to and around campus
- 2. Improve the service and efficiency of transit operations
- 3. Increase road network connectivity and redundancy while carefully managing single-occupant vehicle demand on the transportation network
- 4. Strategically add limited automobile parking supply to address visitor parking deficiencies and meet projected demand by campus district



City of Madison Coordination

As part of the master plan, it is anticipated that there will be some University of Wisconsin improvements with the City right-of-ways. The coordination of these improvements within the right-of-way may require, but are not limited to maintenance agreements, encroachment agreements, air/subterranean leases, street vacations, or intergovernmental agreements.

All proposed right-of-way vacations shall be approved or denied at the time of the proposed project and after the approval of a TIA reviewed and approved by the City Traffic Engineer.

The City reserves the right to determine street design in the city right-of-way. The concepts shown and discussed in the UW Master Plan are only meant to depict or suggest future design possibilities. There has been no detailed studies/modeling for these concepts.

Emphasize Walking and Biking as Primary Forms of Transportation To and Around Campus

Walking and biking are fundamental and widespread forms of transportation on campus, and the university places a high priority on providing connected and comfortable facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists. Moving forward, the following should be priorities for enhancing the campus walking and biking experience:

- Improve intersections with modal conflicts and transit delay
 - Create grade separation at N. Charter Street and Linden Drive
 - Address difficult crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists at other campus intersections
- Complete the gaps in the campus walking and biking network
- Enhance the comfort and operations of the University Avenue corridor
- Increase sidewalk capacity and improve the pedestrian experience in south campus
- Enhance supporting and end-of-trip bicycle facilities

Improve Intersections with Modal Conflicts and Transit Delay

Engagement with the public and coordination with stakeholders has identified various intersections which deserve attention to increase the comfort and connectivity of pedestrian travel and reduce transit and vehicle delay. This master plan recommends intersection improvements at the locations displayed in Figure 3-2 on the following page.

N. Charter Street and Linden Drive

This intersection is at the center of campus with several primary academic and research locations in the area, including Van Hise, Human Ecology, Van Vleck, Bascom Hall, Sterling Hall, and others. The intersection sees some of the highest transit, pedestrian, and bicycle activity on campus. At peak class change times, Metro Transit buses and motor vehicles experience delay at this location waiting for the large numbers of pedestrians and bicyclists to clear the intersection. This delay has a lasting effect on the overall performance of the Metro Transit routes traveling through this area.



Figure 3-1 Concept Rendering of the Proposed Grade Separation at N. Charter Street and Linden Drive, Elevation (Top) And Plan View (Bottom)



Figure 3-2 Locations of Recommended Intersection Improvements

Numerous potential solutions were explored for application at this intersection with ranging levels of intervention. Alternatives included increased enforcement, a pedestrian scramble phase, gates, fencing, and grade separation. This plan recommends creating a pedestrian plaza/bridge over the intersection. This separated level would capitalize on existing topography and tie into upper levels of future buildings to be built/redeveloped in this area.

Grade separation would provide a continuous connection for pedestrians from the entrance of Van Vleck to the future Medical Sciences building as well as the upper plinth of Van Hise and the sidewalk parallel to Linden Drive connecting west to Human Ecology. This recommendation assumes the removal of a majority of the pedestrians from the street level to reduce intersection transit delay. Motor vehicles, transit users, and bicyclists would travel at the existing street level. By linking into future new and redeveloped buildings at the intersection, the vertical circulation would made primarily through the buildings. Street access would be provided along the east side of N. Charter Street to and from the grade separated area.

The recommended grade separation concept is depicted in the rendering. More information about this concept is available in the Landscape Master Plan. Detailed analysis and design will be required before any such concept is constructed. New building development at this location should concentrate primary ingress/egress on the floor level with the pedestrian plaza.

Additional Intersections

Intersections recommended for improvement were identified based on input from UW–Madison staff, city staff, and the public. High volumes of pedestrians and bicyclists travel through these intersections and around campus every day, and the comfort and connectivity of their travel should be continuously promoted and improved. Each of these intersections has its own unique challenges caused by intersection geometry: motor vehicle speed, volume, and turning movements, intersection visibility, pedestrian and bicyclist volumes, and other factors.

Pedestrians and bicyclists should be offered a direct, convenient, and highly visible path crossing at these intersections. Non-motorized crossings should be given an adequate signal phase time and intersections with high-volumes of pedestrians and bicyclists should include a protected pedestrian-only (and in some cases a bicycle-specific/bicycle-only) signal phase to facilitate crossings.

Other potential improvements to be applied to these intersections include:

- Pedestrian-leading intervals
- Curb extensions/bump-outs
- Median pedestrian refuge islands
- High-visibility continental crosswalks
- Bike boxes
- Green paint identifying the path of bicycles through the intersection

This plan recommends working with appropriate city and other stakeholders to evaluate these intersections and incorporate modifications into long-term university and other improvement plans. Additionally, the university should work with the city to develop a standard set of pavement markings and infrastructure improvements to maintain consistency across campus.

Complete the Gaps in the Campus Walking and Biking Network

This master plan recommends completing the identified gaps in the campus biking network to intra-campus travel, as well as commuting to and from campus. Figure 3-4 displays the recommended walking and biking connections to address known gaps. Further study and coordination with the City of Madison on proposed modifications to the city street network outlined below will be required.

This plan recommends the following improvements to the overall connectivity of non-motorized travel:

- Install pedestrian routes through redeveloped area around existing Lot 60 in West Campus
- Develop off-street shared-use path along the east side of Willow Creek
- Construct off-street shared-use path along Campus Drive connecting Campus Drive Bike Path to Babcock Drive. This requires the partial or complete removal of the existing Meat Science and Muscle Biology Laboratory that currently encroaches on the railroad right-of-way. This Master Plan proposes redevelopment of this building, which will allow for path extension
- Install a two-way cycle track on the south-side of University Avenue. Further study and evaluation with the City of Madison is required
- Convert N. Charter Street from W. Dayton Street to Regent Street from one-way to two-way and add on-street bicycle lanes in each direction
- Install on-street bike facilities on N. Mills Street
- Increase pedestrian connectivity with pedestrian only walking routes on West Campus, across the N. Charter Street/Linden Drive intersection, and through the reconfigured central block area south of Linden Drive and west of N. Charter Street
- Convert N. Brooks Street to a pedestrian mall between N. Dayton Street and W. Johnson Street and pedestrian routes through the redeveloped block bounded by W. Dayton Street, W. Johnson Street, N. Park Street, and N. Mills Street
- Create grade separation linking the west side of Bascom Hill with Van Hise and the upper sidewalk north of and parallel to Linden Drive

See Figure 3-5 for an illustration of the recommended connection between the Campus Drive Path and Babcock Drive along the railroad track and through the animal and plant sciences area.



Figure 3-3 Bike boxes and Green Conflict Markings are Proposed at All Intersections of University Avenue on Campus



Figure 3-4 Recommended Walking and Biking Improvements



Figure 3-5 Recommended Campus Drive Path Extension

Enhance the Comfort, Operations, and Aesthetics of the University Avenue Corridor

University Avenue is a primary corridor that serves as the "spine" in the center of the UW–Madison campus. Thousands of vehicles, transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists travel along and across the street every day. To better facilitate this travel and make University Avenue a more comfortable, attractive, and identifiable street for all users, this plan recommends the following enhancements:

- A protected two-way cycle track on the south side of the street (see Figure 3-6 for a two-way cycle track that is similar to what is being recommended for University Avenue)
- Signature boulevard experience from increased plantings along the sidewalk, upgraded aesthetically pleasing fencing along the north side of the street, and a planted median between the south side cycle track and motor vehicle traffic
- A dedicated north side transit lane equipped for future bus rapid transit (BRT) integration
- A protected vehicle left turn lane at each intersection
- Bicycle queue boxes on the north-south streets intersecting University Avenue where possible and appropriate to facilitate turning movements
- Bicycle-specific signal timing and leading bicycle intervals where possible and appropriate



Figure 3-6 Dunsmuir Street in Vancouver, BC, Canada

Although University Avenue was recently reconstructed, another reconstruction is likely within the timeline of this master plan. The university should work closely with the City of Madison in planning and designing University Avenue when it becomes time for re-paving, re-striping, and/ or re-construction. The recommendations put forth by this plan serve to connect the recommended Campus Drive Path extension from the west to the proposed bicycle facilities on Bassett Street on the east. Proposed University Avenue cross-section and plan view concept renderings are included below.



Figure 3-7 Recommended University Avenue Cross Section where Right-of-Way Allows



Figure 3-8 Plan View of Proposed University Avenue Re-Design

Additionally, this plan recommends simplifying the intersection of Babcock Drive and University Avenue/Campus Drive. Recommendations for this intersection include:

- Establish visual and tangible connection and crossing from Henry Mall to Engineering Mall, and eventually to Camp Randall
- Remove the pedestrian crossing at Babcock Drive and establish a single prominent crossing of pedestrians and bicyclists east of Henry Mall with a relocated traffic signal at this location
- Establish a bicycle crossing at the transition from the two-way cycle track on University Avenue to the bike facility on Babcock Drive
- Add a vertical barrier to restrict crossings of University Avenue at noncrosswalk locations

The concept rendering below depicts the proposed changes at this intersection.

Increase Sidewalk Capacity and Improve the Pedestrian Experience in South Campus

Narrow sidewalks and limited aesthetic consistency dominate the South Campus. W. Dayton Street and N. Charter Street in particular serve important connectivity functions. This plan recommends enhancing the multimodal function and aesthetics of these streets to establish them as signature and lively streets on campus.

W. Dayton Street

W. Dayton Street connects the Kohl Center with Union South and Camp Randall. This plan recommends establishing W. Dayton Street as a programmable events street that is attractive, lively, green, and flexible to different uses (see concept rendering). Since it sees lower traffic volumes than arterials University Avenue, W. Johnson Street, and Regent Street, it offers more flexibility of use. It connects two primary athletic facilities on campus and is a frequent destination for game day visitors. The street is recommended to be flexible and host programming such as Game Day parades, food trucks, fairs, exhibitions, and other events to create a clear sense of place in South Campus.



Figure 3-9 Proposed University Avenue Intersection Configuration at Henry Mall



Figure 3-10 Recommended Concept for W. Dayton Street

N. Charter Street

This plan recommends establishing N. Charter Street as a gateway green street with terraces serving as bio swales. It is recommended that N. Charter Street between W. Dayton Street and Regent Street be converted from one-way to two-way with the addition of 5-foot minimum on-street bicycle lanes in each direction. North of University Avenue, it is recommended that street trees and bio swales/infiltration planters are introduced along the street, along with relocating the bicycle parking to the inside (closer to the buildings) of the pedestrian sidewalk on the east side of N. Charter Street. The recommended cross-section is displayed in the rendering below.



Figure 3-11 Existing and Recommended N. Charter Street Cross Section

Guidance on Campus Street Design Guidelines

The Landscape Master Plan includes guidance on streetscape cross-section features for campus streets based on four streetscape typologies:

- 1. Gateway Streets
- 2. Primary Streets
- 3. Secondary Streets
- 4. Green Streets

The Landscape Master Plan should be consulted for additional information on sidewalk width, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, and other streetscape design considerations.

Additionally, the university's Campus Design Guidelines provides a set of recommended "Build-To Dimensions" for campus streets within various designated design neighborhoods across campus.

The Build-To Dimensions ensure architectural framing of the street is occurring where appropriate, green space is preserved, and that a comfortable and active human-scaled pedestrian streetscape is created.

Enhance Supporting and End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities

In addition to physical bicycle infrastructure, ancillary features are important to encouraging and supporting bicycling. Efforts such as providing abundant and well-placed bicycle parking and bicycle sharing options encourage greater bicycling on campus. This plan has the following recommendations:

- The duckbill rack should continue to be the standard preferred bicycle rack
- Place high-capacity bicycle racks, such as those at Union South where space is limited and does not allow for duckbill racks
- Provide additional bicycle parking in the near-term at the corner of Linden Drive and N. Charter Street
- Incorporate convenient bicycle parking relative to primary building entrances in all new campus building construction and remodeling projects, without blocking the accessibility of building entrances
- Establish covered bicycle parking where possible and appropriate
- Integrate bicycle parking into the landscape to buffer the visual clutter of bicycle parking
- Work with BCycle to explore the placement of additional bike share station locations on campus

The Landscape Master Plan contains additional guidance about bicycle parking type, design, and placement.



Improve the Service and Efficiency of Transit Operations

Introduction

Metro Transit service is one primary way that faculty, staff, students, and employees travel to and from and around campus. This master plan recommends four priorities for improving transit service ridership, efficiency, and operations:

- 1. Address intersection locations with transit delay
- 2. Implement limited stop and/or express bus service to serve campus
- 3. Improve intra-campus bus connectivity
- 4. Establish a permanent inter-city bus terminal

Address Intersection Locations with Transit Delay

As discussed in the previous section, several intersections across campus see transit delay due to high volumes of pedestrians and bicyclists at peak travel times. Most notably among these is the intersections of N. Charter Street and Linden Drive, N. Charter Street and University Avenue, and University Avenue and N. Park Street. Recommended improvements to these intersections are meant to reduce transit (and vehicle) delay and improve conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Implement Express Bus Service

This plan recommends the university work with Metro Transit to add a limited stop and/or express bus service from area park-and-ride locations to campus, stopping in South Campus (Park Street/University Avenue), Central Campus (Charter Street/Linden Drive), and West Campus at the UW Hospital and Health Sciences Learning Center. Such a premium service with 20 minute headways and high quality vehicles would increase transit ridership and reduce the parking demand on campus. There is a particular opportunity to divert UW Hospital employees from driving single-occupancy vehicles to transit with this premium service. West Campus has a higher parking generation ratio of any district on campus. UW Hospital employees commute from further out and use single-occupancy vehicles in a larger percentage than other UW–Madison faculty and staff. Planned BRT connecting the east and west sides of Madison would complement this express bus service by offering more opportunities for connecting across campus during the day and for return trips.

BRT, a concept officially adopted by the City of Madison, will allow for quicker commutes to and from the campus, for both students and staff. It will also provide increased capacity, reducing the chronic overloads that are being experienced now. Operation of BRT will require enhanced passenger stations located on or near the UW campus.

The university should work closely with the City of Madison, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, and other stakeholders to implement BRT service in the city and through campus, including developing routes and schedules, and locating appropriate station locations.

Improve Intra-Campus Transit Connectivity

In order to improve the efficiency and customer experience of intra-campus transit, this plan recommends reverting back to the previous routing of Route 80 to provide more direct connections between the east and west sides of campus. Prior to reintroducing the circulating Route 85, the university should explore the demand for this route. While the route carried many passengers when it was in operation, it was slow due to its circulatory nature. The distance covered by the previous Route 85 was minimal, so those who took this circulator could likely walk more quickly to their destination. If this or any other circulators are introduced on the UW–Madison campus it is recommended further evaluation be done to determine whether they can operate in both directions so that riders are not traveling extra distance in the opposite direction of destinations.

It also is recommended that as Metro Transit is able to increase their bus storage facilities that articulated buses are introduced on the UW–Madison campus. These buses would address capacity issues as well as provide better maneuvering ability near Observatory Hill. It is critical that buses are able to safely maneuver this hill for bi-directional circulation. Articulated buses cost approximately \$800,000 per bus. In lieu of articulated buses, the university should explore the use of intelligent transportation systems (ITS) technology at the base of the hill to alert westbound vehicles of oncoming eastbound buses.

Bus stops should be examined closely for possible elimination or consolidation. Eliminating extraneous and unnecessary bus stops would serve to decrease rider delay. The current frequency of stops creates significant delays for those on board. Off-board fare payment collection also is recommended as a method for decreasing transit delay and improving travel times and passenger experience.

Since capacity is currently an issue on buses during class change times, it is recommended that doubleheaders (two simultaneously arriving buses) are operated on routes with capacity issues during class change time. Schedules also could be adjusted so they deviate from strict clocked headways and buses would operate more frequently while students are changing classes and less frequently while they are in class. These changes would impact Metro Transit's overall operations and should be carefully explored before implementing them.

Establish a Permanent Inter-City Bus Terminal

This plan recommends a permanent inter-city bus terminal in east campus to remove queuing buses from University Avenue and East Campus Mall. The new bus terminal should be in a location that is easily serviceable by transit without adding new routes. Opportunities to integrate Metro Transit connections and mixed-use development into the terminal facility should be evaluated.

One potential location for an east campus bus terminal is the current City of Madison Lake Street parking garage which is central to campus destinations and population density. The first floor of a redeveloped parking structure may be able to serve as an inter-city bus terminal facility, to serve the needs of the university and the City of Madison. UW–Madison will continue to work with the City of Madison Planning Division, Traffic Engineering Division, Metro Transit, and others to locate a site for a new intercity bus terminal.

Increase Road Network Connectivity and Efficiency

Introduction

Facilitating motor vehicle connectivity to and around campus is essential to the long-term vitality of the campus, particularly as buildings and parking are removed, added, and redeveloped. Thousands of faculty, staff, employees, visitors, freight, and service vehicles travel to and around campus each day. This plan recommends the following modifications to the road network to promote access and circulation in light of planned land use changes:

- 1. Vacate parts of Marsh Drive, Willow Drive, and Walnut Street, and install a new north-south road from Marsh Drive to Observatory Drive to accommodate planned land uses
- 2. Vacate Easterday Lane and add an east-west connection across Willow Creek
- 3. Install new north-south access drive from University Avenue to Linden Drive, west of Charter Street
- 4. Install new east-west parallel access road south of Linden Drive, west of Charter Street
- 5. Install protected left turn phase for N. Charter Street southbound vehicles turning left on to Johnson Street
- 6. Convert Brooks Street into a pedestrian mall/shared emergency drive
- 7. Convert Charter Street from one-way to two-way and add on-street bicycle lanes in each direction from W. Dayton Street to Regent Street

Figure 3-12 on the following page summarizes the recommended road additions, modifications, and vacations.

Vacate Easterday Lane and Add Willow Creek Crossing

In conjunction with the expansion of Veterinary Medicine, it is recommended that Easterday Lane between Linden Drive and Observatory Drive be vacated. Easterday Lane does not serve significant transportation purposes and its vacation enables site planning opportunities. Vacation of Easterday Lane creates options for developing Willow Creek as a functional space. This plan also recommends an extension of Linden Drive across Willow Creek south of and parallel to Observatory Drive providing additional access across Willow Creek in the event Observatory Drive is obstructed. Extending Linden Drive across Willow Creek enhances connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists, and establishes the possibility of a future connection to Walnut Street to the west.

Manage Building Development and Added Parking Capacity in the Central Campus

Install New Access Drives

Building and parking additions and reductions are planned in the Central Campus between University Avenue and Linden Drive, and N. Charter Street and Henry Mall. In conjunction with these changes, this plan recommends two access roads to be created:

- Parallel to and west of N. Charter Street between Linden Drive and University Avenue
- From N. Charter Street west into the block, parallel to Linden Drive

These access roads also will provide increased fine-grain pedestrian and bicycle connectivity through this area, as well as limited access to parking garages and loading docks. Through traffic will be discouraged. Transit routes will remain on Linden Drive and N. Charter Street.

Accommodate Additional Traffic

Additional building square footage and parking capacity in the Central Campus will bring added traffic on N. Charter Street and University Avenue. Much of the traffic from the development in this area will desire to turn left onto Johnson Street from southbound N. Charter Street. This plan recommends a short protected leading left turn vehicle phase from southbound N. Charter Street to eastbound W. Johnson Street. Pedestrians will be held during this phase. This would be in addition to the current permissive left turn phase. A protected left turn phase will provide additional capacity for turning movements without negatively affecting the intersection of N. Park Street and W. Johnson Street (the key intersection in the area).

Convert N. Brooks Street from W. Johnson Street to Dayton Street into Pedestrian Mall/Shared Emergency Drive

In conjunction with future building redevelopment at this block, this plan recommends converting N. Brooks Street from W. Johnson Street to W. Dayton Street into a pedestrian mall/shared emergency access drive.

Convert N. Charter Street from W. Dayton Street to Regent Street

This plan recommends converting N. Charter Street from W. Dayton Street to Regent Street from a northbound one-way street (with a southbound contraflow bicycle lane and on-street parking) to a two-way street with minimum 5 foot bicycle lanes in each direction. This recommendation serves to establish N. Charter Street as an attractive multimodal gateway from South Campus and providing a connection through the center of campus all the way to Lake Mendota. These modifications require removal of on-street parking from the east side of N. Charter Street. There is sufficient nearby public street and university parking to make up for removal of parking along N. Charter Street.



Figure 3-12 Proposed Road Additions, Vacations, and Conversions

Parking Operations and Management

The effective operation and management of parking at UW–Madison is paramount to the long-term success of the university and quality of life on campus. The university strives to continue to be a national leader in parking management, the provision of low parking ratios, and a comprehensive and complementary set of alternative commuter solutions. The university also recognizes the importance of providing available and accessible parking spaces for campus visitors and employees.

Future Parking Needs

Future parking needs were modeled under the planned future campus land use scenario. Approximately 900,000 square feet of new programmable building space is planned for West Campus compared to the existing condition. Additional parking supply is recommended for all campus districts to meet demand. Analysis indicates an overall future campus parking deficit of just 18 spaces as a result of the development programmed in this master plan. Analysis was used to modify and finalize the planned master plan land use development and redevelopment build-out scenario.

Recommendations

This plan presents several recommendations for the university to effectively and efficiently provide and manage parking in conjunction with this Master Plan's proposed campus development and redevelopment.

- 1. Continue to be leaders in transportation demand management (TDM) and alternative commuter solutions
- 2. Maintain current parking ratios for faculty and staff. Work to shift UW Hospital employee and other faculty and staff parking demand off campus through enhanced park-and-ride transit service
- 3. Add 2,000 parking spaces over the next 20-40 years for visitors and provide swing space to accommodate parking phasing and construction
- 4. Where possible, remove surface parking lots and consolidate parking supply into centrally located parking structures to allow for green space and campus development, increase parking efficiency, and improve water quality by reducing the amount of impermeable surface on campus

Recommended Parking Additions and Reductions

This plan recommends the addition of 2,000 parking spaces for visitors and to provide swing space over the next 20-40 years. Additional parking is needed to serve development phasing. New parking needs to be built before current parking lots are taken off line to accommodate building projects. In addition to providing construction swing space, the additional parking spaces will serve visitors. The demand for visitor parking is typically during off-peak travel periods, especially in the middle of the day, when lots are full of faculty and staff vehicles. Campus roads see much lower demand during these time periods. Roadways in West Campus and across campus are sized to meet peak demand levels. No significant traffic impacts during peak or off-peak periods are anticipated due to the recommended increase in visitor parking supply.

This plan recommends an addition of 6,380 and removal of 4,380 parking spaces, for a net increase of 2,000 parking spaces over the next 20-40 years to accommodate the planned build-out. Recommended parking additions and reductions are depicted in Tables 3-1 and 3-2 on the following page, Figure 3-13 and Figure 3-14. Additions and reductions result in the following increases by district:

- West Campus: +689 spaces
- Near West Campus: +81 spaces
- Central Campus: +615 spaces
- South Campus: +615 spaces

Table 3-1 Recommended Parking Reductions

Parking Reductions						
Lot/Location	District	Stall Count				
Lot 1	Central	60				
Lot 3	Central	62				
Lot 13	Central	34				
Lot 17	South	787				
Lot 20	Central	207				
Lot 22	South	65				
Lot 23	Central	42				
Lot 26	Central	88				
Lot 34	Central	267				
Lot 41	Near West	71				
Lot 43	Near West	56				
Lot 45	South	89				
Lot 50	South	176				
Lot 51	South	33				
Lot 54	South	16				
Lot 56	South	43				
Lot 60	West	1,311				
Lot 62	Near West	417				
Lot 79	West	244				
Lot 81	South	81				
Lot 85	West	36				
Lot 91	South	160				
Lot 92	South	28				
Lot 114	South	7				
Total		4,380				

Table 3-2 Recommended Parking Additions

Parking Additions							
Lot/Location	District	Stall Count					
Humanities (N-11B)	Central	450					
Lot 75 (W-02)	West	780					
Linden Block (N-06B)	Central	550					
Engineering (S-27)	South	1,050					
Vet Med (W-27)	Near West	625					
Nursing/Pharmacy (W-09A)	West	1,500					
Mills and Spring (S-10A)	South	400					
Grainger South (S-13)	South	350					
Art Lofts (S-16A)	South	300					
Lot 20 (N-05C)	Central	375					
Total	6,380						
Net Increase		2,000					

Note:

This is anticipated over a 20-30 year time period. Additional parking would be built on an as-needed basis after public review.



Figure 3-13 Recommended Parking Reductions



Figure 3-14 Recommended Parking Additions





UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN -MADISON | CAMPUS-INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT MASTER PLAN



C-I DISTRICT ZONING & CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT PLAN BOUNDARY

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON | CAMPUS-INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT MASTER PLAN

Ε.



STREET & OPEN SPACE BUILD-TO LINES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON | CAMPUS-INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT MASTER PLAN F.



. UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN -MADISON | CAMPUS-INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT MASTER PLAN

G.