University Avenue Corridor Plan

Blending the Past, Present and Future



Prepared by

Adopted by the Common Council on May 14, 2014

City of Madison

Adopted by the Madison Common Council on May 6, 2014

Legislative File: 32635

Enactment No: RES – 14-00371

Acknowledgements

Regent Neighborhood Association

Jon Miskowski, President 2013-2014

John Schlaefer, Past President

Darsi Foss, Past President

Plan Preparation

Corridor Plan Committee (current and former members)

Sarah Canon

Darsi Foss

Elizabeth Greene

Ronnie Hess

Chris Petit

John Schlaefer

Marcia Vandercook

Thanks to Mary Czynszak-Lyne and L. D. Oakley for moderating meetings and to the many other individuals who worked with the Regent Neighborhood Association on the planning process and gave feedback on the plan.

Photography: Darsi Foss, Elizabeth Greene, Archie Nicolette, John Schlaefer

Special thanks to the InnTowner Hotel for hosting the public meetings.

Alderperson

Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, District 5

Technical Assistance

Planning Division, Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development

Steve Cover, Former Director, PCED

Katherine Cornwell, Director, Planning Division

Bill Fruhling, Principal Planner

Jule Stroick, Planner IV

Archie Nicolette, Planner III (ret.)

Ryan Jonely, GIS Specialist

Dave Kress, Planning Intern

Donna Collingwood, Graphic Technician

Other city staff members

Rob Phillips, Christy Bachmann, and Glen Yoerger, Engineering Division

Tim Sobota, Madison Metro

Matt Mikolajewski and Peggy Yessa, Office of Business Resources

David Dryer, Dan McCormick, & Scott Langer, Traffic Engineering Division

Michael Waidelich, Rick Roll, Heather Stouder, Planning Division

Matt Tucker, Zoning

Natalie Erdman, Community Development Authority

View of Campus Drive and University Avenue Corridor looking easterly

Table of Contents

Residential housing at the 2000 block of University Avenue

Executive Summary

The University Avenue Corridor runs along the northern edge of the Regent Neighborhood on Madison's near west side. It encompasses the area between Breese Terrace on the east, Campus Drive on the north, Farley Avenue on the west, and the rear lot line of the parcels on the south side of University Avenue.

Since the construction of Campus Drive in 1968, the Corridor and the land immediately adjacent to it have seen tremendous change. Fearing that further development might overwhelm the predominantly single-family residential area to the south, the neighborhood initiated a planning process for the Corridor to express its vision for the area. The purpose of the plan is to offer guidelines for further development along University Avenue as it passes through the Regent Neighborhood.

Input from the neighborhood was gathered over the course of many months, through five neighborhood open houses, an art and design charette, interviews and meetings with corridor business owners, and written comments. From that input, it is evident that the neighborhood wants the University Avenue Corridor to be more pedestrian friendly, to remain predominantly residential, to maintain its current scale of limited height and density, to manage traffic and parking problems, and to be a model of sustainability.

Those values were used to craft the following vision statement:

> The Corridor connects a world-class university and large hospital complex with the historic Regent Neighborhood. Residents are a cross-section of students, adult renters, and long-term homeowners. Due to its proximity to the university and hospitals, the Corridor also sees many daytime visitors. The Corridor is a vibrant mix of residential, university and business locations which offers residents and visitors a variety of locally-oriented services, retail, commercial and dining opportunities. These uses are in balance with the residential character of the neighborhood. Characteristics of the Corridor include mixed-use development, building design that emphasizes human scale, sustainable practices, and a range of housing types for students and long-term residents. The Corridor is a livable, walkable community that is a pleasure to live and work in.

The plan divides the Corridor into six distinct areas based on existing conditions, uses and potential for redevelopment. Special attention has been paid to the commercial nodes at Highland and University and Walnut and University. The plan recommends that the area around those nodes be designated for mixed-use development of no more than three stories facing the street. On the north side of the street, adjacent to Campus Drive, it recommends that an additional two stories be considered as a conditional use.

For the rest of the corridor, the plan recommends small-scale residential buildings with a height restriction of three stories. Neighborhood residents expressed a clear desire to stem the proliferation of tall buildings to avoid an undesired "canyon" effect. The plan recommends changes to the city's Comprehensive Plan to maintain an appropriate scale.

Mixed-use building at 1931 University Avenue

To make the street more pedestrian friendly, minimum front setbacks have been recommended for the residential and commercial nodes, along with front stepbacks. Recommended rear setbacks are also addressed, particularly as they affect residences on the north side of Kendall Avenue.

Traffic and parking are issues of perennial concern to the neighborhood because of its proximity to the university campus and two hospitals. The plan makes recommendations to facilitate the use of public transportation, decrease the impact of daily parking on residential neighborhoods, and promote walking and biking. It recommends additional on- and off-street parking for business needs, along with other measures to support small-scale businesses and fill empty commercial spaces.

The plan includes design and sustainability recommendations to be used for review of conditional use and rezoning requests. The objective is to foster a walkable, enjoyable urban environment that will contribute to the sustainability of the neighborhood. Recommendations include articulation on buildings with frontages longer than forty feet, improved landscaping, use of environmentally-friendly building materials and alternative energy sources, and innovative stormwater management systems. The plan also includes public art and streetscape design recommendations and illustrations.

Parts of the corridor have been stable for years and may not change over the ten-year life of this plan. For those areas where redevelopment is proposed, the plan gives developers, institutions, city staff, and residents a sense of the values and vision of the neighborhood. The goal is to ensure that these values and vision are used to guide the design and review of new projects.

I. Introduction

The University Avenue Corridor lies along the northern edge of the Regent Neighborhood on the near west side of Madison, Wisconsin (See Map 1). This historic, primarily residential neighborhood abuts the western end of one of the most important institutions in Madison, the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

University Avenue has been a major transportation route since the early days of Madison's development. Today, the University Avenue Corridor (hereinafter referred to as the Corridor) still serves as a collector street between Downtown, UW-Madison, two major hospital complexes (UW Hospital and Clinics and the William S. Middleton Memorial Veterans Hospital) and the near west side.

The Corridor has a number of low-grade features and conditions that give the street an overall "dated" appearance. The diversion of traffic from the street with the construction of Campus Drive in 1968 has made it difficult to maintain the amount of retail business that was on the street before. Single-family homes, small neighborhood-oriented businesses, and the once numerous transportation-related businesses have been replaced over the years with larger institutional buildings and multifamily apartment buildings.

Three distinct segments make up the street: the eastern edge is a gateway to the UW-Madison Campus, the middle segment is primarily a home for college-age students living in larger, multifamily apartment buildings, and the western edge is still a neighborhood-oriented commercial node. There are few cohesive elements to pull the street together; hence the keen interest by residents and the business community in determining how new investment could remake the street into a more attractive and functional place to live, shop and work.

The *University Avenue Corridor Plan* presents a ten-year vision for preservation and redevelopment along the street. The intent is to plan for expected redevelopment in the area, strengthen and expand neighborhood-oriented businesses, and take advantage of multimodal transportation links and the area's key location near the UW-Madison Campus, UW Hospital and Clinics and the Veterans Hospital.

Over the next few decades, older, underutilized buildings may be renovated or replaced. Maintaining a viable street with small-scale businesses and mixed-use buildings that complement the traditional character of the Regent Neighborhood is paramount. The Plan promotes design quality, sustainability, and creation of great places where people can live, work, shop, and interact.

Planning Area

The project area includes the 1600 through 2600 blocks of University Avenue. It is bounded by Farley Avenue on the west, Campus Drive on the north, Breese Terrace on the east, and the back lot line of parcels abutting University Avenue on the south. The primary focus is on the physical improvement and future development of the Corridor. The project also examines the connectivity of the street to the surrounding area and the vitality of the Highland Avenue business node (See Map 2).

Project Scope

The Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development (DPCED), Planning Division assisted the Regent Neighborhood Association (RNA), University Avenue businesses, residents and other stakeholders in preparing this plan for the Corridor.

The goals of the planning process were to:

- Develop a vision and a set of goals for the residential and commercial areas along the 1600-2600 blocks of University Avenue;
- Formulate strategies and recommendations to address key issues in the areas of land use, design, economic development, transportation, sustainability, and other concerns identified by the primary stakeholders;
- Create an identity that will complement the historic neighborhood and help to market the existing retail, service, and restaurant establishments as well as improve the economic climate for new redevelopment opportunities;
- Identify public infrastructure improvements that not only preserve the traditional neighborhood character of the Corridor but improve the aesthetic and pedestrian-scale experience;
- Identify opportunities for public art, such as lighting, sculptures and murals that are integrated into new developments and any public right-of-way improvements to enliven the street;
- Maximize landscape opportunities in existing and proposed private developments to create a sense of place and contribute to a cleaner environment;
- Institute green building practices and other innovative conservation practices (e.g., on-site storm water management, roof top gardens) to become a model for sustainable development in Madison;
- Improve pedestrian and bicycle access, crossings, and routes, especially those leading to the UW-Madison Campus and area hospitals, to make it safer to reach these destinations;
- Initiate a concerted effort by the neighborhood to support locally-owned businesses, which are in fierce competition with nearby shopping areas;
- Develop an action plan. Identify short (1-3 years) and long-term (4+ years) strategies for government officials and staff, the Regent Neighborhood Association, businesses and property owners to implement and monitor high priority recommendations; and
- Identify opportunities in timing, funding, and public-private collaborations to achieve desired outcomes.

> "Growth is inevitable and desirable, but destruction of community character is not. The question is not whether your part of the world is going to change. The question is how.
>
> *—Edward T. McMahon*

Map 1: Regional Context

Map 2: Planning Study Boundaries



II. Planning Process

In May 2006, the Regent Neighborhood Association (RNA) issued a Request for Proposals to draft "Design and Development Guidelines for the Old University Avenue Corridor." This project was partially funded by a grant from the City of Madison and was seen as part of a larger project to produce a plan for the Regent Neighborhood. In the face of ongoing interest from developers, the Corridor project focused on building size and design and did not deal with other issues (e.g. transportation) in any depth. The Planning and Design Institute, Inc. (PDI) of Milwaukee, now part of the engineering and design firm GRAEF, was hired to serve as the consultant.

A 25-member advisory committee was appointed which included residents of the project area and the immediately adjoining streets, RNA members, business and property owners along the Corridor, and developers. This committee held nine working sessions from April through October 2007. A Design Charrette, attended by approximately 60 neighborhood residents, was held on May 12, 2007. On July 4, 2007, at the annual Regent Neighborhood Fourth of July celebration, a questionnaire based on comments from the May 12, 2007 charrette was distributed and 53 usable questionnaires were returned.

On October 18, 2007 PDI issued its "final draft" of the plan. The plan included five different building profiles showing front and (in some cases) rear stepbacks and maximum heights ranging from four stories (45 feet) to twelve stories (125 feet). Specific blocks of the Corridor to which these profiles should apply were designated. Building design guidelines were also included. The plan was presented to the RNA Board at its October 24, 2007 meeting, and a special neighborhood meeting was held on November 28, 2007, attended by approximately 150 people. Neighborhood reaction to the draft plan, as expressed at the November 28, 2007 meeting, was quite negative (see Appendix 2). At subsequent meetings the RNA Board considered how to proceed with the plan. On February 27, 2008, after much discussion, the Board passed the following motion: "It is the sense of the Board that the plan as presented needs more review and input before it can be formally considered." In fact, the October 2007 "PDI plan" (as it came to be known) was never submitted to the City of Madison for approval, although some material from it may be found in the current plan. The Board continued discussing the plan throughout 2008 and early 2009 and received reports from a small committee of neighborhood residents which met regularly to identify next steps and opportunities for more neighborhood involvement.

Neighborhood residents visit the University Avenue Corridor information booth at the 2010 Regent Neighborhood Fourth of July Festival.

In late 2009, the RNA Board renewed the planning process. In February 2010, at the request of Alder Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, the City of Madison committed staff resources to help the neighborhood finish the plan. The RNA Board authorized formation of a new subcommittee to work with City staff on the plan, and a kickoff meeting for the new planning process was held on May 19, 2010, coinciding with the RNA annual membership meeting. City staff described the planning process, followed by an open house where participants were asked to provide input on a series of general questions. (See Appendices 1 and 2 for a list of all information gathering events and links to public comments).

An Art & Design Charrette was held on June 30, 2010 and July 7, 2010. At the first session, sites were identified and design teams formed; at the second, the teams presented their ideas (see Appendix 6). City staff also set up an informational booth at the 2010 RNA Fourth of July Festival with materials explaining what had been done on the plan to that point.

As the recommendations evolved, neighbors were asked for input at a series of three additional City-sponsored open houses. City staff also interviewed business owners and held a meeting on October 25, 2010 for business owners along the Corridor (see Appendix 3). The RNA listserv and newsletter provided up-to-date information to area residents. University Avenue property owners and residential and commercial tenants received notices of the four open houses.

The subcommittee and City staff continued to meet in Spring 2011. There was a hiatus for three months in Summer 2011. In Fall 2011, the subcommittee met with City zoning staff on possible zoning for the Corridor that would reflect the neighborhood's desired heights and setbacks. In Spring 2012, meetings were held with several Madison area east side developers (who had no interest in investing in the Corridor) and with sustainability staff from the City and Madison Gas and Electric Company (see Appendices 4 and 5).

City staff completed preparation of a draft text and illustrations in May 2012. The key points of the draft were presented to the RNA Board at its June 2012 meeting in preparation for a vote to release the draft plan to the neighborhood. However, it became clear that the Board needed more time for study and discussion of the draft. To facilitate this, the subcommittee prepared a document with just the actual recommendations from the plan, which were discussed by the Board at subsequent meetings. A neighborhood meeting was held on November 14, 2012 to discuss the list of recommendations. Notes from that meeting and subsequent comments received, along with responses to some of the comments, are presented in Appendix 2.

Input from the November 2012 meeting was considered and some modifications to the recommendations were made. In February 2013, a postcard was sent to Corridor property owners asking for their feedback on the recommendations. In April 2013, the Board approved a final list of recommendations and appointed a new subcommittee to complete writing of the plan based on the City's May 2012 draft text and the approved list of recommendations.

Another neighborhood meeting was held on July 24, 2013 to present the final draft recommendations. Prior to this meeting, the District Alderperson sent a postcard notice to neighborhood residents, and the RNA President called a number of Corridor property owners to invite them to attend the meeting and/or submit written comments to him. Notes from that meeting and responses to some of the comments are included in Appendix 2. Some modifications were made in response to the comments. In September 2013 the Board approved the final plan.

The City's adoption process of the University Avenue Corridor Plan was initiated upon its submission by RNA. A resolution to adopt the plan was introduced at the request of the District Alderperson at the January 7, 2014 Madison Common Council meeting. The University Avenue Corridor Plan was referred to ten City Boards, Commissions, and Committees. Final adoption of the University Avenue Corridor Plan occurred at the May 6, 2014 Common Council meeting. The adopting resolution is located at the end of the Plan.

Entrance to the Regent Neighborhood at University Avenue and Breese Terrace

II. Historical Context

As Madison began to grow more rapidly at the turn of the 20th century, University Avenue, then part of federal highways 12 and 14, became the primary route into the City, connecting the west side to the University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW-Madison) campus and Downtown.

As one might expect of a major thoroughfare, auto-oriented businesses such as gas/service stations and auto dealerships were prevalent along the Corridor. Four of these business locations remain today. Other businesses also developed to meet the community's needs, including:

- Neighborhood commercial businesses, such as grocery stores, restaurants, dry cleaners and drug stores, were located primarily in the 2400-2600 blocks. From the 1940s to the 1980s, a strip shopping mall was the core for much neighborhood business. The strip mall was demolished in 1984 to make way for what is now the Best Western InnTowner Hotel.
- Light industrial uses, such as lumber companies, bottling distributors, and an ice cream factory, were located on the north side of the 2400-2600 blocks. These large tract sites took advantage of the active rail line.
- Professional services, such as dentists, doctors, or research offices, were located primarily in the 1800-2100 blocks. A few of the buildings remain today with professional services as tenants.

Single-family homes and smaller scale apartment buildings were constructed primarily on the south side of the street in the 1920s, '30's and '40s. A three-block enclave of single-family homes and small-scale apartment buildings grew up on the north side of University Avenue between Paunack Place and Birge Terrace.

Pre-1968 Campus Drive Bypass

In 1957, the City of Madison commissioned a study to analyze increasing traffic congestion along University Avenue. The traffic, the report argued, was fueled by the nation's growing reliance on the automobile and, more locally, by west side real estate development. The report, *A Plan for University Avenue,* projected that average daily traffic volume would increase from approximately 21,000 vehicles per day in 1960 to 42,000 in 1980.

Nehi Bottling Company was one of the commercial distribution businesses located on the 2600 block of University. Smart Motors, Universal Cleaners & Laundry, Studebaker Used Car Lot, and Gervasi Radio & Television were some of the other businesses located on the north side of the street prior to construction of the Campus Drive bypass.
Photo credit: Wisconsin Historical Society

The report proposed four alternatives to improve traffic conditions:

- Alternative A: An elevated roadway above the railroad line with a narrow median and a full diamond interchange at Highland Avenue. Local traffic would use University Avenue.
- Alternative B: A limited access roadway alongside relocated railroad tracks, with a signal point at Farley Avenue and an eastbound ramp at Walnut Street. This alternative preserved most of the structures along University Avenue.
- Alternative C: A limited access roadway adjacent to the railroad without relocation of any tracks, and a signal point at Farley Avenue with eastbound ramp at Walnut Street. Most structures along University Avenue between Farley and Highland Avenues to be removed.
- Alternative D: University Avenue would operate as a one-way route eastbound between Farley Avenue and Breese Terrace with westbound traffic handled by a new roadway paralleling the railroad tracks.

In the end, construction of a new four-lane bypass parallel to the existing railroad tracks, called Campus Drive, was agreed to, along with a half diamond rather than full diamond interchange at Highland Avenue. The bypass was part of a federal-state highway project which cost roughly $10 million (in 1964 dollars) and was completed in three stages stretching from Bassett Street to N Segoe Road. The section from Farley Avenue to Breese Terrace took the longest time to complete since land had to be acquired for the public right-of-way.

There is still discussion in the neighborhood about construction of an east-bound on-ramp at Highland Avenue or Walnut Street, which might be useful in improving local traffic. (See Chapter IV: Demographics and Existing Conditions, for more information.)

Post-1968 Campus Drive Bypass

Construction of the Campus Drive bypass resulted in critical changes in the neighborhood, including:

- Acquisition and removal of roughly fifteen businesses for public right-of-way on the north side of the 2500-2600 blocks of University Avenue;

figure 1: Average Daily Vehicular Trips



Vehicular traffic was diverted from University Avenue with the construction of the Campus Drive bypass in 1968. The result was a significant decline in traffic on University Avenue. Source: City of Madison Traffic Engineering

View of University Avenue prior to construction of the Campus Drive bypass. Roughly fifteen businesses were relocated from the north side of University Avenue to make way for the highway project. The Veterans Hospital construction in upper left. Photo credit: Wisconsin Historical Society.

- Reduced vehicular traffic in the Corridor (see Figure 1).
- A slow but steady redevelopment of commercial property to multifamily housing in the 2100-2400 blocks of University Avenue; and
- Expansion of institutional facilities north of Campus Drive, resulting in more noise and increased demand for parking in the neighborhood.

Construction of the Campus Drive bypass created what could be called a hard edge, impeding easy movement between the Regent Neighborhood and destinations to the north. Three crossings bisect the four-lane roadway:

- Highland Avenue and Walnut Street, north-south streets, carry the bulk of vehicular traffic as well as pedestrians and bicyclists to the UW-Madison Campus, the Veterans Hospital, the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory, and UW Hospital and Clinics. There are key safety issues along these busy traffic corridors.
- The Alicia Ashman Bridge, located near the eastern end of the Corridor, is a pedestrian and bicycle bridge spanning Campus Drive and connecting the neighborhood to academic buildings and athletic facilities in the west campus area. Improved visibility of the entrance, accessibility and community awareness of buildings and routes served by the bridge would make it a more valuable resource.

Association of Women in Agriculture, 1909 University Avenue

IV. Demographics & Existing Conditions

A. Demographics

Approximately 2,633 persons live along the Corridor. The Corridor is a youthful place to live, with 55 percent of the population ranging in age between 18 and 24 years (See Figure 2). Out of the total minority population of 1020 persons in the Regent Neighborhood in 2010, 650 persons (63.7%) lived along University Avenue between Breese Terrace and Farley Avenue.

figure 2: Population by Age along the Corridor, 2010



With UW-Madison in close proximity, many college-age students have chosen to live on University Avenue. 55% of the total 2,986 people living along the Corridor are between the ages of 18 and 24 years. Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2010

University Avenue dwellers are not only younger and racially diverse but also more transient and earn significantly less than householders living in the predominantly single-family, owner-occupied housing south of University Avenue. Based on the 2010 census, mean incomes of the population living along the Corridor were in the $15,000 range compared to a mean income for Regent Neighborhood households of $56,031 and for City of Madison households of $49,502.

Anecdotally, property managers have indicated that their tenants are college-aged students primarily enrolled in the Engineering, Nursing and Veterinary schools, located on the western side of the UW-Madison Campus.

B. Business and Investment

Existing Commercial Core

The University Avenue Corridor has approximately 40 businesses with 375 employees. The major employer along the Corridor is the University of Wisconsin-Madison, which has over 18,000 faculty and staff on its entire campus.

Until the late 1960s, the 2400-2600 blocks of University Avenue featured a range of commercial enterprises. A bowling alley, grocery store, upholstery stores, bakeries, bottle distributors, an ice cream company, and car sales and service stations were operating on the street.

Today, the 2400 and 2500 block section of University Avenue retains a commercial core identity. The four corners at Highland and University Avenues have neighborhood-oriented businesses, along with a full service hotel with restaurant. Lombardino's Restaurant is the oldest surviving establishment. New Seoul Korean Restaurant, Blue Moon Bar & Grill, Import Auto Clinic, Miller's Liquors, and Suzen Sez Boutique have been based in the neighborhood for over 10 years. All of these businesses rely heavily on patrons from the greater Madison area. A key to increased revenues for these businesses is capturing new consumers from the neighborhood, nearby employers, and passing traffic. New retail space is part of a mixed-use development/ apartment complex recently constructed on the 2500 block of University Avenue.

At the corner of Walnut Street and University Avenue, a gas station, car wash, and auto repair shop have been fixtures of the neighborhood for decades. These auto-oriented businesses are welcome in the neighborhood; however, if they should close, this intersection would be a prime site for mixed-use development with neighborhood-oriented businesses situated on the street level.

Economic Climate

There are advantages to doing business along the Corridor:

- It is bordered on the south by a stable, moderate to higher income residential neighborhood;
- There is foot traffic from people who live nearby and walk to work at the major institutions to the north of Campus Drive.

There are also disadvantages:

- There is minimal visibility of University Avenue businesses from Campus Drive, with limited wayfinding signage for local businesses;
- Local businesses and potential businesses are concerned about a perceived lack of customer parking;
- There is strong competition with Hilldale Mall, Shorewood Shopping Center, and other businesses on University Avenue west of Farley Avenue;
- It is challenging for new businesses to break into the market unless the entrepreneur has a very unique business model, product or service.

Six University Avenue businesses were interviewed during the planning process. Highlights from these interviews are summarized below:

- Businesses appear to be comfortable with their location;
- The vast majority of the customers of these businesses reside outside the immediate neighborhood;
- The vast majority of employees do not live in the Regent Neighborhood, nor are they UW-Madison students;
- Businesses would like to see aesthetic and safety improvements made to the streets, sidewalks and terraces along the Corridor, especially those affecting pedestrians, such as more visible, marked crosswalks;
- Site limitations (size, configuration, lot depth, setbacks) restrict the type and size of businesses that can locate in the business node;

At the northwest corner of University and Highland Avenues, part of the 2550 University Avenue comple rises behind Lombardino's Restaurant

- No official business association exists and there is no joint marketing or coordination of events along the Corridor.

Recent Private and Public Investment

Several new projects have recently been completed in the Corridor:

- Wisconsin Energy Institute (1552 University Avenue). A UW-Madison facility for renewable energy research and outreach activities. Phase 1 of this public/private project was completed in 2013; after Phase 2 is added the building will total 200,000 gross square feet.
- 2550 University Avenue (Mullins Group LLC). A mixed-use infill development with four street level retail spaces (totaling 8,500 square feet) coupled with outdoor plazas, eight townhouses and 126 apartments. A private project completed in 2012.
- Brownlofts Apartments (1815 University Avenue). A 64-unit, four-story multi-family development. A private project completed in 2013.
- Resurfacing of University Avenue and reconstruction of Highland Avenue occurred in the summer of 2011. This $5.6 million public improvement project provided the opportunity to implement key improvements identified earlier in the planning process, such as upgrading pedestrian crossings and adding bicycle and parking lanes. A public project.

(above) Brownlofts Apartments, 1815 University Avenue

(left) The Wisconsin Energy Institute, 1552 Universi;ty Avenue

C. Land Use

The challenge of the University Avenue Corridor Plan is to determine the land use changes that will benefit residents and the business community and improve the overall appearance and function of the Corridor.

Figure 3: Change in Land Use along the Corridor, 1960-2010



University Avenue auto-oriented commercial and light industrial uses have been replaced with multifamily uses.

Land Use: Past

Land use on University Avenue has changed over time, with the most significant changes occurring after construction of the Campus Drive bypass. Large tracts of land on the north side of University Avenue between North Prospect and Farley Avenues with low building to land ratios became prime redevelopment sites, because the new roadway cut off access from the active railroad line. University Avenue's auto-oriented, commercial and light industrial uses were replaced with multifamily residential uses. Redevelopment increased the total population living along the Corridor. By mid-2013 the total number of residential units had reached 1,373.

Land Use: Present

Along the one-mile stretch of University Avenue from Breese Terrace to Farley Avenue, multifamily residential is the most predominant use. Approximately 53% of the acreage is devoted to residential use, 16% to commercial, 10% to mixed-use, and 21% to institutional (See Map 3).

- **Residential:** Of the total residential parcels, 12% are occupied by single-family structures, 19% by two-family structures, 21% by 3 to 4 units, 20% by 5 to 8 units, 9% by 9 to 16 units, 7% by 17 to 50 units, and 11% by 50+ units (See Map 4). Newer developments have a greater density as a result of a compact housing style (See Map 5 for residential density by parcel).

In 2010, there were 1,175 housing units in the Corridor, of which 900 were in buildings with twenty or more units. Since then, two new large residential buildings have been added: Mullins Group LLC has built a 126-unit building at 2550 University Avenue, and Steve Brown has built a 64-unit building at 1815 University Avenue. Therefore, in 2013 there are 1,361 housing units in the Corridor, 1086 (79.8%) in buildings with twenty or more units.

- **Commercial:** Commercial uses are clustered predominantly along the 2400-2600 blocks of University Avenue. (See above, "Existing Commercial Core," for a description of businesses). Three auto-related businesses are located on the north side of the 2200 block. Mixed-use buildings are located at 1941 and 2133 University Avenue.
- **Institutional:** The University of Wisconsin-Madison, the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, and two religious institutions occupy 6.9 acres on the eastern end of the Corridor.

Existing Building Stories and Heights

Most of the multifamily buildings are two to four stories in height. The tallest residential building in the neighborhood is eight stories. The majority of commercial businesses are one or two stories in height. (See Maps 7 and 8 for existing building stories and heights.)

Map 3: Existing Land Use



Map 4: Type of Residential Structure



Map 5: Dwelling Units Per Acre



- **Property value:** The assessed value of property is roughly $92.3 million (2012). Residential uses make up $76.3 million (82.7%), commercial retail $12.7 million (13.8%), and commercial services $3.3 million (3.5%).

Existing Setbacks

On the 1600-2200 blocks of University Avenue, buildings set back approximately 15 feet with front yard lawns provide a sense of continuity along the street. Zero lot line buildings and surface parking lots to the property edge are most common on the 2300-2600 blocks. (See Map 6 for existing building setbacks, front parking lots, and zero lot line buildings.)

Map 6: Existing Building Setbacks



Map 7: Existing Building Height (Stories)

Map 8: Existing Building Height (Feet)



Zoning (See Map 9)

The west end of the Corridor, from Farley Avenue to Allen Street, is mostly zoned Traditional Shopping Street (TSS), except for three Planned Developments (see list below) and the south side of the 2200 block, which contains smaller apartment buildings and is zoned TR-U1. The TSS area includes the Highland Avenue and Walnut Street commercial nodes and the parcel at the southeast corner of University Avenue and Allen Street (2133-2145 University Avenue), which contains a mixed-use building.

East of Allen Street, the Corridor is mostly residential, except for the mixed-use buildings at 2133-2145 University Avenue and the institutional buildings at the far east end. The 2100 and 2000 blocks on the north side of University Avenue are zoned TR-U2, reflecting the fact that they contain several large, high-density multifamily structures, including 2130 University Avenue (Allen House, 131 units); University Bay Apartments (see below, PDs); 2110 University Avenue (Oak Tree Apartments, 56 units); and 2020 University Avenue (Carpenter Apartments, 52 units). In the rest of the eastern section, two- to eight-unit buildings predominate. This area is zoned TR-U1, except for 2133-2145 University Avenue (TSS), 1815 University Avenue (PD), the UW Foundation Building (CI-Campus Institutional), and phase 1 of the Wisconsin Energy Institute (PD).

Residential buildings at the following locations were approved under the Planned Development (PD) process, which is typically used to permit higher density development than allowed under existing zoning.

- 2550 University Avenue (Mullins LLC, 126 units, 8 townhouses, and commercial space);
- 2335 University Avenue (Old University Place, 119 units);
- 2308 University Avenue (University Heights Apartments, 80 units);
- 340 N. Allen Street (Dunsinane, 24 units);
- 2116/ 2120/ 2124 University Avenue (University Bay Apartments, 164 units in 3 buildings);
- 1815 University Avenue (Brownlofts, 64 units).

Map 9: Existing Zoning Map



Map 10: Madison Comprehensive Plan (2006)



CMU: Community Mixed-Use
HDR: High-Density Residential
TOD: Transit-Oriented Development

Note (9): Development density and the heights of buildings should be greatest adjacent to Campus Drive and then step down to lower densities and heights on the University Avenue frontage, and again along the south frontage of University Avenue to provide a good transition to the low density residential neighborhood to the south.

University Heights Historic Districts

Platted in 1883, adjacent to the rapidly expanding University of Wisconsin Campus, University Heights was one of Madison's first suburbs. This historic area is known nationally for its buildings by Louis Sullivan and George Elmslie, Frank Lloyd Wright, and George Maher, as well as local architects Claude and Starck, Alvin Small, and Frank Riley. Craftsman, Prairie, Queen Anne, and other styles line the curvilinear street system.

The south side of University Avenue between Breese Terrace and North Allen Street lies in the University Heights Local Historic District, which was established by the City's Common Council in 1985. Preserving the buildings along the south side of the Corridor is important in retaining the historic character of the neighborhood. There is also a national and state University Heights Historic District, but the only Corridor building included in that district is the First Congregational Church (See Map 11).

Existing Plans

Madison Comprehensive Plan

The 2006 City of Madison Comprehensive Plan provides a strategic long-term vision and basic goals, objectives, policies and recommendations to help guide the City's future growth and development. Neighborhood plans provide greater detail on land use in specific areas and can recommend changes to the Comprehensive Plan.

- The Comprehensive Plan divides the Corridor into two designations: High Density Residential (HDR) and Community-Mixed Use (CMU) (See Map 10). In addition, a specific note is attached to the area between University Avenue and Campus Drive: Development density and the heights of buildings should be greatest adjacent to Campus Drive and then step down to lower densities and heights on the University Avenue frontage, and again along the south frontage of University Avenue to provide a good transition to the low density residential neighborhood to the south.
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD): A designation of TOD in the area near the intersection of Highland and University Avenues indicates that this area of the neighborhood should include a mix of residential, retail, office, open space and public use in a compact, pedestrian-friendly environment that makes it convenient to travel by public transit, bicycle, foot or car.

The Comprehensive Plan's vision for the Corridor includes a higher density of land use than the neighborhood is willing to support.

UW Campus Master Plan

The 2005 UW-Madison Campus Master Plan **(**www.uc.wisc.edu/masterplan/) describes proposed development for the next 20 years. However, it has not been submitted for approval by the City's Common Council. The plan outlines these future improvements in the west campus area:

- Pedestrian/bicycle improvements: Campus Drive bicycle path from Babcock Drive to University Bay Drive (partially built); pedestrian/bicycle bridge over Campus Drive at Birge Terrace; pedestrian/bicycle bridge across University Avenue at the intersection with Farley Avenue and University Bay Drive, proposed in conjunction with a commuter rail station at that location.
- Roadway improvements: An eastbound on-ramp to Campus Drive at Walnut Street; on- and off-ramp improvements at Highland Avenue; improvements at the University Avenue/ University Bay Drive/ Farley Avenue intersection.
- Facilities: The Wisconsin Energy Institute in the 1500-1600 blocks of University Avenue (phase I completed in 2013); a new west campus student union, academic buildings and parking structures north of Campus Drive. These new facilities will put additional traffic and parking pressure on the Regent Neighborhood.

Map 11: University Heights Historic Districts Map



D. Transportation

Automobile traffic

Average Daily Traffic volumes (ADT) are shown for different segments of University Avenue on Map 12. In 2011, the traffic volumes for the street segments were:

Street Segment	Average Daily Traffic
University Avenue between Farley and Highland Ave	12,250
University Avenue between Highland Avenue and Walnut Street	12,000
University Avenue between Walnut Street and Breese Terrace	11,150 and then drops to 10,650 at Breese Terrace
Highland Avenue between Regent Street and University Avenue	6,150
Highland Avenue between University Avenue and Campus Drive	11,250
Highland Avenue between Campus Drive and UW Hospital and Clinic	9,800
Walnut Street between University Avenue and the UW Campus	7,200

Traffic volumes are three times greater on Campus Drive and on University Avenue west of Farley Avenue (38,550 and 53,250 ADT respectively). However, those segments are serviced by four traffic lanes, while the Corridor portion of University Avenue is now mostly a two-lane street.

Motorists at the University and Farley Avenues intersection traveling eastbound continue along University Avenue (instead of taking Campus Drive) in order to access the hospitals and the west campus area. Almost 10,000 vehicles travel through the Highland-University Avenues intersection daily to reach these destinations, mostly on two-lane streets.

Residents continue to discuss the feasibility of an eastbound on-ramp at Highland Avenue and Walnut Street to provide more direct access to Campus Drive from the hospitals and the west campus and to help divert traffic from University Avenue. Significant land acquisition would be necessary to make this feasible.

Map 12: Average Weekday Traffic Volume



Bus Rapid Transit

The Madison metropolitan area has grown substantially in recent years, placing pressure on the transportation system and prompting conversations about high-capacity transit. *The Madison Transit Corridor Study: Investigating Bus Rapid Transit in the Madison Area Report* (May 2013) evaluated the feasibility of implementing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service along arterial street corridors. Since that time, the Madison in Motion (Transportation Master Plan) Oversight Committee has recommended advancing a start-up BRT system to the next phase of planning and evaluation.

University Avenue was one of the four heavily travelled transit corridors studied. In the University Avenue corridor, four sub-alternatives were developed between Farley Avenue and Randall Avenue: 1) direct service via Campus Drive, 2) via University Bay Drive and Campus Drive, 3) via "Old" University Avenue, and 4) via University Bay Drive and "Old" University Avenue. After further analysis, the direct route via Campus Drive was recommended for further planning and evaluation because it provided the fastest and most direct travel along that corridor, which was one of the key project goals. In that regard, Campus Drive improved the convenience of the service and integrates well with the existing and planned transit system.

Proposed BRT stations that were identified as viable locations included: University at Farley Avenue; Campus Drive at Walnut Street; and University at Randall Avenue. See Maps 14 and 20. Although the Walnut Street Station was identified as a potential location it was not recommended for further study due to the fact that it has engineering challenges associated with it (due to steep grades which would make it difficult for pedestrian access).

Parking

On-Street Parking

Parking is not permitted on University Avenue except for the 2300 through 2600 blocks, where the majority of neighborhood businesses are located. There are approximately 70 on-street stalls on University Avenue between Farley Avenue and Walnut Street. Two-hour parking is allowed in the neighborhood to the south of the Corridor, except for the north side of Kendall Avenue, where no parking is allowed. (See "Bicycle Boulevard," below.) Neighborhood residents can purchase an annual residential parking permit, which allows a registered vehicle to be parked on the street for 48 hours without having to be moved (See Map 13 for the existing on-street parking restrictions in the Corridor and on nearby residential streets).

Map 13: On-Street Parking Restrictions



On weekdays, parking on the streets near the Corridor is at a premium. There is competition for parking spaces between customers of area businesses, neighborhood residents, and visitors to neighborhood residents' homes. Parking enforcement is key to ensure continued turnover of on-street parking spaces; however, due to a limited number of parking enforcement officers, patrolling occurs less frequently than needed.

Two-hour parking was instituted on the streets near the Corridor to prevent commuters from parking all day in the residential neighborhood. These commuters are primarily employed at the Veterans Hospital, UW Hospital and Clinics, UW-Madison, and Madison West High School.

Off-Street Parking

There are no official records for the total number of off-street parking stalls, either residential or commercial, along University Avenue.

Bicycle Boulevard, Paths and Routes

The Regent Neighborhood has received several new bicycle improvements in the last few years. Through public planning meetings, neighborhood residents and the business community identified segments of University Avenue to mark as bicycle lanes, on-street restrictive parking spaces, and crosswalk markings. The University Avenue resurfacing project was completed in the fall of 2011 with these improvements as part of the overall project.

Kendall Avenue, from Lathrop Street to North Franklin Street, was redesigned to give priority to cyclists as through-going traffic. The Kendall Avenue Bicycle Boulevard opened in 2010.

Bicyclists can access an off-street bicycle path that parallels Campus Drive to the north. This paved path is part of a larger bicycle network on the UW-Madison Campus. Highland Avenue, Walnut Street and the Alicia Ashman Bridge are access points from the neighborhood. These entry points are not clearly marked. There are also concerns about safety on streets without bicycle lane markings (See Map 14).

Map 14: Bike, Bus and Pedestrian Facilities

E. Environmental Issues

Gas stations, oil companies, and paint stores were located along University Avenue until the late 1960s. These types of businesses, as well as others such as dry cleaners, may have spilled or disposed of materials that caused contamination. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment Tracking System (BRRTS) is monitoring several sites. In addition, historic records indicate that there are additional properties not in the DNR tracking system where such activities may have taken place. For information concerning known contaminated properties in the Corridor, the Department of Natural Resources contaminated sites database can be accessed at: http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/brownfields/botw.html.

It is important to note that the above database represents sites where a discharge has been reported to the state. It does not represent a complete list of all possible environmental issues on properties in the Corridor. It is recommended that a Phase I environmental assessment consistent with the Environmental Protection Agency's "All Appropriate Inquiries" standard be conducted for any new developments or major renovations. This involves a historical records search and a site visit. Tests performed at the site through a Phase II environmental assessment may be warranted given the historic land uses of many of the properties in or near the Corridor.

The intersections of University Avenue with Farley Avenue and Highland Avenue are low lying spots that flood temporarily with significant rainfalls. This problem is compounded by a water table that is within 10 feet of the surface (See Map 15). As part of the 2011 University Avenue resurfacing project, new storm water sewers and catch basins were installed west of Highland Avenue to help alleviate flooding issues. These systems were enhanced in 2012 when they were connected to a larger storm sewer project along University Avenue to the west. The overall project was completed in 2013 with the installation of new storm sewers along Campus Drive between Highland Avenue and Walnut Street.

The 2600 block of University Avenue lies in Wellhead Protection District No. 6. Any changes in land use and/or expansion of existing use in Zone A or Zone B need to receive approval from the Madison Water Utility. Zone A is the area around the well in which groundwater or potential contaminants will take five years or less to reach the pumping well. Zone B is the area around the well in which groundwater and or potential contaminants will take 100 years or less, or the area within a 1200-foot radius around the well, whichever is smaller

A City of Madison street tree inventory conducted from 2007 through 2009 identified ash trees (Fraxinus spp.), which are susceptible to the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB). As shown on Map 15, several clusters of ash trees are located on the 1800-1900 and 2300-2600 blocks of University Avenue. In addition, the 2500 block of Campus Drive, the entire length of Kendall Avenue parallel to the Corridor, and several streets intersecting the Corridor from the south have numerous ash trees. The City's Forestry Department has prepared a report which addresses the impact of EAB and possible strategies to address the pest (see http://www.cityofmadison.com/ parks/services/forestry/pests/ EmeraldAshBorer.cfm). There may be a need for replacement of numerous trees along the Corridor in the coming years.

Map 15: Natural Features and Environmental Issues



V. Vision and Guiding Principles

The University Avenue Corridor is an integral part of the Regent Neighborhood as well as a gateway to UW-Madison, UW Hospital and Clinics, the Veterans Hospital and the Forest Products Laboratory. The Corridor has evolved over the years without the benefit of a well-thought out vision. There is a strong desire from the residential and business communities to craft a vision and solutions that will transform the Corridor into a more sustainable community with a stronger sense of place.

Vision Statement

The Corridor connects a world-class university and large hospital complex with the historic Regent Neighborhood. Residents are a cross-section of students, adult renters, and long-term homeowners. Due to its proximity to UW-Madison and area hospitals, the Corridor also sees many daytime visitors. The Corridor is a vibrant mix of residential, university and business locations which offers residents and visitors a variety of locally-oriented services, retail, commercial and dining opportunities. These uses are in balance with the residential character of the neighborhood. Characteristics of the Corridor include mixed-use development, building design that emphasizes human scale, sustainable practices, and a range of housing types for students and long-term residents. The Corridor is a livable, walkable community that is a pleasure to live and work in.

Guiding Principles

1. Maintain the existing character of the neighborhood through appropriate land use and density.

The Corridor Plan supports a land use pattern that is primarily residential, with neighborhood-oriented businesses clustered on University Avenue at Highland Avenue and at Walnut Street. Other uses should be respectful of the existing character of the neighborhood. The scale of new infill development is extremely important to the neighborhood. The Corridor already has a number of large apartment buildings that house student residents, with attendant issues of parking, noise, and disengagement from the neighborhood. The Corridor also has a number of older, smaller apartment buildings and converted houses and a few vacant lots. Where structures or uses are suboptimal, new development is welcome. However, a major concern for residents is that redevelopment on these lots could add significantly to the overall crowding and transience of the neighborhood. For that reason, new developments that significantly increase density will be seriously scrutinized. The Plan does not encourage frequent use of planned developments (PDs). The neighborhood would like to maintain the residential character on those block faces where it currently exists and strengthen the neighborhood services and retail character on those blocks where it currently predominates.

2. Balance the residential nature of the neighborhood with university and hospital uses.

The Regent Neighborhood's proximity to UW-Madison, two hospitals and the Forest Products Laboratory is one of its defining characteristics. Many neighborhood residents work at these institutions and use their facilities, and relationships with the university and the hospitals have traditionally been very good. However, each new institutional building has a significant impact on the neighborhood due to parking needs, traffic, noise and lighting. New buildings should be respectful of the scale of other neighborhood buildings and recognize that the Corridor is not an extension of the UW Campus. The neighborhood will continue to closely review and provide input on university and hospital plans on and near the Corridor. It would be helpful if the federal entities (VA, FPL) would participate in the planning process.

3. Create a visually appealing corridor.

In addition to density, aesthetic concerns are important to the Regent Neighborhood. New development should respect the historic character of the adjoining neighborhood and contribute to a strong sense of place. Articulation of buildings, building separation, setbacks, stepbacks, and adequate landscaping are design features that would bring a human scale to any development projects along the Corridor. The Corridor contains many well-maintained

buildings with a variety of interesting architectural styles. New developments should respond to existing structures' architectural elements while continuing to offer variety. The neighborhood strongly encourages high-quality architectural design and materials. Overall, the Corridor should offer variation in the skyline, breathing space between buildings, green space and landscaping, and living units of varying sizes. Mature trees should be maintained whenever possible. The gateways to the neighborhood should be made visually appealing to attract and guide visitors. Outdoor spaces, upgraded façades, and public streetscape amenities are encouraged. Even small pockets on both public and private properties can be transformed into places that reflect and enhance the character of the area. The use of a unified, overarching theme and other aesthetic approaches would help create a stronger sense of place throughout the Corridor.

4. Retain and attract neighborhood-oriented businesses.

This Plan seeks to promote economic development along the Corridor. The neighborhood would welcome additional small-scale retailers and restaurants at the existing business nodes where University Avenue crosses Highland Avenue and Walnut Streets. The goal is to attract long-term, locally-oriented businesses embedded in the neighborhood. We want a balance of residential and commercial uses, with commercial uses in proportion to residential density. The goal is a neighborhood where people stay in the neighborhood to shop and eat and get out on the streets at night, in order to foster a safer, more pedestrian friendly atmosphere.

The Plan supports off-street and on-street parking to improve customer access, shared use of parking facilities, car sharing, and bicycle parking. Improving the walking and biking routes to the commercial areas will help create easier access to Corridor businesses.

5. Promote walking, biking, and mass transit; manage auto traffic and parking.

Efficient movement of people is a vital function of any neighborhood. University Avenue is part of the primary transportation corridor for transit. Promoting alternative modes of transportation, making streets safer and more pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly, and reducing traffic volume are priorities. Safe crossings, bridge and street lighting, and wayfinding signs are needed to move residents and visitors safely through the neighborhood and make connections to existing bicycle paths and routes. The City and UW-Madison have already taken actions to address transportation issues in the Corridor. The neighborhood would like to see these efforts continue, in order to enhance the residential character of the neighborhood and promote the Corridor as a livable, walkable neighborhood street. The Plan seeks to promote parking for businesses along the Corridor and encourages coordination with the university and the hospitals to control traffic and promote alternative transit options for employees and students, so as to reduce daily parking from university and hospital buildings and parking spillover onto neighborhood streets.

6. Promote sustainable development and practices.

Sustainability is a theme that emerged in early conversations with Regent neighbors. Sustainability is defined here as "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."[1] Three kinds of sustainability are important to the neighborhood. Environmental sustainability protects the natural environment and ensures that the built environment promotes human health and well-being. Social sustainability allows equity of access to key services, including health, education, transport, housing, recreation, and participation in community life. Economic sustainability promotes long-term economic stability and fiscal health by diversifying the economy, strengthening existing commercial areas, providing quality services, and increasing local opportunities for quality employment.

To the neighborhood, this means long-range planning, permanent businesses, well-built buildings, local employment, and the ability to walk to schools and stores. Sustainable attributes should be incorporated into all private and public investments in the Corridor. Existing buildings should be reused and upgraded wherever possible rather than replaced. New projects will be assessed for their level of economic, social, and environmental sustainability as one factor in determining neighborhood support.

[1]Bruntland Commission of the United Nations

VI. Land Use Guidelines

Through the public input process (see Appendix 1), the Regent Neighborhood Association identified changes in the Madison Comprehensive Plan that would better reflect the existing conditions and future redevelopment desired for the Corridor. Maps 16-18 depict the land use, maximum building height and minimum building setback guidelines for the Corridor. Table 1 compares existing and proposed land use districts and summarizes the height and setback guidelines for the various areas of the Corridor. See also the section on Specific Area Recommendations.

With regard to building height, the actual number of feet is more important than the number of stories. However, the guidelines state both stories and feet to match the City's practice in the zoning code, and use the City's conventions for the match between stories and heights: 2 stories/35 feet, 3 stories/40 feet, 4 stories/52 feet, 5 stories/65 feet and 6 stories/78 feet. Institutional buildings commonly use more feet per floor and may be able to fit fewer stories into the overall height.

Special Development Considerations for the University Avenue Corridor

The University Avenue Corridor should function as a multi-use corridor that successfully ties together – in style, use and density of development - the major employment area to its north and the historic residential area to its south. University Avenue is a high-traffic, transit-oriented development corridor which could support greater density in the area. Any future development should be carried out in ways that do not increase the traffic and parking pressure on the Corridor and the Regent Neighborhood, and that preserve and enhance a pedestrian-friendly environment along the Corridor. To that end, the neighborhood would like the Madison Comprehensive Plan to be amended as outlined in Table 1 and shown on Maps 16-17.

The following guidelines are intended to help achieve these goals. The special circumstances in the Corridor which led to these guidelines are discussed at the end of this section.

Guidelines supplemental to zoning code

1. New development or major renovations should avoid further canyonization of University Avenue.

2. North side: 2100 through 2500 blocks: New development or major renovations should be limited to three stories or 40 feet fronting the street side (with stepbacks after the 3rd story on both University Avenue and side streets) and a maximum of 6 stories in height or 78 feet in height on the Campus Drive side.

3. North side: Birge Terrace to the extension of Forest Street: The predominantly small-scale residential character of these streets should be maintained and density should increase only slightly, if at all. Any new development should be limited to townhouses or small apartment buildings not to exceed 3 stories or 40 feet. Small park-like spaces should be created at the north ends of Chamberlain Avenue and Paunack Place to enhance the residential nature of these streets as they abut Campus Drive.

4. South side: New development or major renovations on the entire south side of the Corridor should be limited to three stories or 40 feet in height.

5. Pedestrian factors: University Avenue is predominantly residential, so one of the major desires of the neighborhood is to make University Avenue as pedestrian friendly as possible, by limiting the heights of buildings and by having setbacks that are greater than the minimum required under the zoning. Buildings, including commercial buildings, should not be set right up to the sidewalk. Setbacks should be at least five feet for commercial buildings and 15 feet (Zoning Code requirement) for residential buildings, so that there is some comfortable space for pedestrians between the sidewalk and the façade of the building and an opportunity for landscaping.

6. Currently, newer apartment developments along the Corridor have greater demand for parking than there are on-site spaces. Residential and commercial parking needs should be managed through adequate off-street parking, shared parking, parking meters, limitations on residential parking permits, car-sharing programs, and transportation demand management.

7. Allen-Walnut Street Commercial Node: While the main business node in the Corridor is centered at the corner of Highland and University Avenues, another important node is the area between Allen and Walnut Streets. There are currently four businesses located in this area. The neighborhood wants to protect this area from the possibility of a big-box type business locating here, preferring smaller neighborhood-oriented businesses instead. The traffic demands on this section of University Avenue are already high, particularly when shift changes are occurring at the UW and Veterans Hospitals.

Although a TSS zone allows up to 25,000 square feet for a mixed-use or multi-tenant building, the neighborhood would strongly oppose a building of that size being built. This part of University Avenue would be ideal for live-work space or other small mixed-use buildings.

Rationale

The following factors were considered when proposing the "special design considerations" for the Corridor.

1. Physical location of the Corridor

The Corridor is a mix of commercial and residential development that runs eleven city blocks from east to west. It separates an historic, residential neighborhood of mostly single family homes on the south side of the Corridor from one of the largest employment destinations in Madison: the University of Wisconsin–Madison Campus, UW Hospital and Clinics, the Veterans Hospital and the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory on the north side of the Corridor. This narrow corridor serves as a buffer between two areas of very different densities and land uses.

2. Traffic and parking demands

A. Due to the traffic and parking demands existing on the neighborhood from the employers to the north, the residential streets to the south of the Corridor already have the high commuter traffic congestion and on-street parking shortages that would be associated with a "high density" development scenario along the Corridor. This challenge exists even though the current development in the Corridor does not uniformly meet the definition of High Density.

B. UW Hospital and Clinics has over 1800 physicians/residents and 7600 employees who commute to work. The annual "patient" visits to the entrance on Highland Avenue, which is an arterial street to the Corridor, total over 650,000 a year.[2] A 700-gross parking spaces addition to the UW Hospital and Clinics parking ramp is being built to mitigate the loss of the parking lot being replaced by the new UW School of Nursing across the street from the hospital. The net increase is 347 parking spaces, which may further increase traffic volume on Highland Avenue. The ongoing traffic study of the area adjoining West Campus will provide relevant data.

C. The Veterans Hospital serves 130,000 veterans living in 15 south-central Wisconsin counties with 208 providers and 1770 employees. The new 473-stall parking ramp built by the VA to accommodate more visitors and employees may increase traffic counts because some VA employees are no longer being bused to the VA from a parking lot on Sheboygan Avenue.

D. Other employers, such as the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory, with sixty research scientists, also add to the parking and commuter traffic demands from the north along Highland Avenue. Proposed new development at the Forest Products Laboratory may also increase traffic demand on the Corridor.

E. Nearly 10,000 cars per day travel on Highland Avenue between the UW and VA hospitals and University Avenue. Some 6,150 cars per day travel on Highland Avenue from Regent Street to the intersection of Highland and University Avenues. Another three thousand travel on Franklin Street and 4,800 on Farley Avenue.[3]

F. UW-Madison has over 40,000 students, 2,000 faculty members and 18,000 employees, many of them commuting to Campus each day along Highland and University Avenues.[4] Some of them park in the neighborhood to the south of the Corridor for part or all of the day. Although neighborhood parking is restricted to two hours, parking enforcement is intermittent.

G. Madison West High School adds to this challenging parking/traffic situation. There are approximately 50 on-site parking places, but over 230 teachers/employees and over 2,100 students.[5] Also, the high traffic volume on Highland Avenue poses a danger to students and staff commuting to West High on foot and crossing Highland Avenue from the school to the athletic fields.

H. It is difficult to provide sufficient on-site parking for new developments along the Corridor, especially underground parking, due to physical limitations and high costs. The shallow water table along the Corridor limits underground parking to one or two levels. If more levels are contemplated, construction becomes very expensive.



Looking easterly on 2100-2200 blocks of University Avenue

[2]UW-Madison Facilities Planning and Management
[3]*City of Madison Average Weekday Traffic Volume 2011*, sheet 8
[4]UW-Madison Facilities Planning and Management
[5]Madison Metropolitan School District, West High web site

Table 1. Land Use, Building & Site Recommendations						
	Area 1 Highland Node	**Area 2 Walnut Node**	**Area 3 Center Block**	**Area 4 Paunack-Birge**	**Area 5 South Side** (Allen Street to Breese Terrace)	**Area 6 University Edge**
Existing comp plan district	CMU (Community Mixed Use) + TOD (Transit Oriented Development) overlay	HDR (High Density Residential)	HDR (High Density Residential)	HDR (High Density Residential)	HDR (High Density Residential)	C (Campus)
Proposed comp plan district	NMU (Neighbor-hood Mixed Use), TOD	Northside: NMU (Neighborhood Mixed Use) Southside: MDR (Medium Density Residential)	Same	Same	MDR (Medium Density Residential)	Same
Existing Zoning	TSS (Traditional Shopping Street), PD	TSS (Traditional Shopping Street), TR-U1 (Multifamily Residential), PD	TR-U2 (Multi-family residential), PD	TR-U1, TR-U2 (Multi-family residential)	TR-U1 (Multi-family residential), PD	TR-U1 (Residential Multifamily), CI (Campus Institutional), PD
Building heights and stepbacks	North side: Max 3 st/ 40 ft fronting the street. Stepback after 3rd story. 6 st/ 78 ft along Campus Dr. South side: Max 3 st/ 40 ft, min 2 st. Rear stepback above 2 stories.	North side: Max 3 st/ 40 ft fronting the street. Stepback after 3rd story. 6 st/ 78 ft along Campus Dr. South side: Max 3 st/ 40 ft, min 2 st. Rear stepback above 2 stories.	(North side only) North side: Max 3 st/ 40 ft fronting the street. Stepback after 3rd story. 6 st/78 ft along Campus Dr.	(North side only) Max 3 st/40 ft.	(South side only) Max 3 st/40 ft, min 2 st. Rear stepback above 2 stories. Nothing higher than First Cong. Church roof ridge line* in 1600-1800 blocks even if rezoned.	(North side only) North side: Max 3 st/40 ft fronting the street. Stepback after 3rd story. 5 st/65 ft along Campus Dr. Nothing higher than First Congregational Church roof ridge line* even if rezoned.
Front yard setbacks	Where front yard set not required by zoning ordinance, a min 5' setback is required.	North side: Commercial: Min 5 ft.	Refer to Zoning Ordinance	Refer to Zoning Ordinance	Refer to Zoning Ordinance	Refer to Zoning Ordinance

*Height of First Congregational Church roof ridge line (above nave) is 953.5 feet above sea level.

Map 16: Future Land Use Map

1. This proposed NMU district, the area north of University Avenue flanked by Highland Avenue to the east and west, is recommended for mixed-use buildings, or purely residential buildings. Building heights of 3 stories fronting University and Highland Avenues, with step backs after 3rd story up to 6 stories along Campus Drive, is recommended. High density residential uses up to 140 units per acre. Buildings should maintain a strong relationship with the street; provide a range of dwelling unit types and the infrastructure and amenities to support this density. Chapter XII provides specific design recommendations regarding articulation, rhythm, and multiple entrances for buildings exceeding 80 feet in width. Minimum 5 foot front yard setback unless zoning ordinance is greater.

2. This proposed NMU district, is located on the south side of 2400-2600 blocks of University Avenue. For the 2400-2500 blocks, commercial or mixed-use buildings with first floor retail are recommended. The pedestrian environment should be enhanced with pedestrian and bicycle amenities. Neighborhood-serving businesses should be compatible with the existing residential neighborhood. For the 2600 block, purely residential buildings are recommended with exception of the southeast corner of University at Farley Avenue where commercial space is recommended. Building heights should not exceed 3 stories or 40 feet. Minimum 5 foot front yard setback unless zoning ordinance is greater.

3. This proposed NMU district, is located north of University Avenue roughly to the east and west of Walnut Street, is recommended for mixed-use buildings or purely residential buildings. First floor neighborhood serving commercial spaces is recommended in mixed-use buildings. Building heights of 3 stories fronting University Avenue and cross streets, with step backs after 3rd story up to 6 stories along Campus Drive. High density residential uses up to 104 units per acre are recommended.

4. This proposed NMU district is currently a two-story, mixed-use building with two first floor commercial spaces with second floor apartments. Any new development or remodeling should be compatible in scale, materials, and texture with existing buildings. New buildings should be oriented to the street, parking underground or in the side/rear yard, and heights not to exceed three stories/40 feet.

5. This currently designated HDR district, located roughly between Allen Street extended to rear lot lines of properties flanking Paunack Place, is recommended for continued high density residential uses not to exceed 99 dwelling units per acre. Replace existing structures or excess surface parking lots with more efficient, coordinate redevelopment with structured parking and a wider range of dwelling units to support a variety of household types. Building heights of 3 stories fronting University Avenue and cross streets, with step backs after the 3rd story up to 6 stories along Campus Drive.

6. This currently designated HDR district, located between Paunack Place and Princeton Avenue extended, is recommended for continued high density residential, smaller scale buildings not to exceed 50 dwelling units per acre. Provide opportunities for lot by lot redevelopment in small building format, broader variety of unit types, and up to three stories in height. Retain small lot rhythm. Small park-like spaces should be created at the north ends of Chamberlain Avenue and Paunack Place to enhance the residential nature of these streets.

7. This proposed MDR district, located on the Southside of the 1600-2300 blocks of University Avenue, is recommended for medium density residential use, small scale buildings, with any new development to occur on existing lots. Since this area abuts University Heights Historic District, maintaining or reusing the existing structures is desired. Any new development or remodeling should be compatible in scale, materials, and texture with existing buildings. New buildings should be oriented to the street, parking underground or in the side/rear yard, and heights not to exceed three stories/40 feet. Front and rear setbacks should be in rhythm with other residential units on the block.

8. This currently designated C district is located on the north side of University Avenue west of Princeton Avenue extended. Building heights of 3 stories fronting University Avenue, with 5 stories after a 30' stepback from University Avenue unless a future Campus Master Plan is approved with greater heights. New development(s) should relate to the First Congregational Church 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.

Map 17: Proposed Madison Comprehensive Plan Changes



Map 18: Proposed Maximum Building Heights



Map 19: Proposed Minimum Front and Rear Yard Setbacks



*5’ setback in commercial area: Wider sidewalk to better pedestrian environment.
No plantings or landscaping which would compete with pedestrian space.

VII. Specific Area Recommendations

Area 1: Highland Node

Historically, this area has been the principal commercial node for the University Avenue Corridor. Neighborhood-oriented commercial uses, such as grocery stores, restaurants, and drug stores, have been located primarily in the 2400-2600 blocks.

The construction of the Campus Drive bypass in 1968 removed fifteen businesses from the north side of the 2500-2600 blocks of University Avenue. Traffic volume was diverted from the neighborhood with the opening of the bypass, prompting other businesses to relocate or close. Many of the remaining neighborhood-serving businesses closed in 1984 when a strip mall on the northeast corner of Highland and University Avenues was replaced by the Best Western InnTowner hotel.

However, the 2400-2600 blocks of University Avenue still contain a number of neighborhood-oriented businesses. Several single-family homes, currently used as rental units and several apartment buildings are also located within the three-block area. A predominantly single-family residential area abuts the commercial corridor to the south.

The Blue Moon Bar and Grill, 2535 University Ave

Import Auto Clinic, 2583 University Ave

Map 10: Subarea Boundaries



Older commercial buildings in the Highland Node

Existing businesses are Miller's Liquor, Suzen Sez Women's Apparel, Best Western InnTowner Hotel, Sushi Box, San San's Day Spa, Lombardino's Restaurant, New Seoul Korean Restaurant, Blue Moon Bar & Grill, Jack's Barbershop, Import Auto Clinic, and several business offices.

Until late in 2011, no major construction had occurred along this part of the Corridor for decades. Recently a mixed-use project at 2550 University Avenue was completed with four first-floor commercial spaces and 134 residential units. Three of the commercial spaces face University Avenue and one faces Highland Avenue. Several neighborhood-oriented businesses closed or moved as part of this redevelopment. One of the four first-floor commercial spaces has been leased to a Barre3 fitness studio.

Currently, the property at the southeast corner of Farley and University Avenues is being redeveloped as a two-story medical building. The InnTowner has been acquired by UW Hospital and Clinics, which will continue to operate it as a hotel while also using it for hospital visitors.

Future Land Use, Character, and Scale (See Map 16)

- The Highland node should maintain its character as the primary commercial area for the Corridor. Efforts are needed to support existing neighborhood-oriented businesses, attract additional businesses to vacant space, and manage parking and traffic issues. Commercial uses must be compatible with existing residential uses and have minimal impact on the single-family and small-scale apartments directly to the south, in order to maintain the quality of life of the entire neighborhood.
- Redevelopment along the south side of 2400-2500 blocks should be commercial or mixed-use with first floor retail. First-floor residential is not desired.
- On the 2600 block (one-way traffic eastbound), residential-only buildings are most appropriate, except at the southeast corner of Farley and University Avenues, where a medical office building is being built.
- Pedestrian and bicycle amenities should be installed, focused on the 2400-2500 blocks and north on Highland Avenue.
- A gateway entrance feature and rain garden should be installed at the west entrance to the Corridor. Traffic calming at University and Grand Avenues should be explored.
- Construction of an eastbound on-ramp from Highland to Campus Drive should be evaluated, including adverse impacts to the commercial node. (See Walnut Node for alternative on-ramp location.)
- Proposed eastbound on ramps at Highland and Walnut should be adequately studied, including adverse impacts to the business nodes, as part of the evaluation if one or more ramps would alleviate traffic on University Avenue.
- The public parking lot on the north side has been redesigned and reconstructed to accommodate community functions. The green space to its west should be maintained as additional community space.
- Restricted two-hour parking has been provided on the 2300-2500 blocks of University Avenue. Options for additional short-term business parking should be explored. Leasing of commercial space has been impeded by the limited parking available.

Area 2: Walnut Node

The Walnut node is a secondary commercial node directly east of the Highland node where University Avenue intersects with Walnut and Allen Streets. Three transportation-related businesses (a gas station, car wash, and auto repair shop) are situated on the north side of the street. A small-scale commercial building with second-story apartments is located at 2133 University Avenue. Existing businesses include Bracey Dental Office, Octopus Car Wash, Don the Car Care Man, 7-Eleven convenience store and gas station.

Large newer apartment buildings form much of character of this area. Casa Blanca Apartments is a three-story residential development with 178 apartments, located on the northwest corner of University Avenue at Walnut Street. Directly across the street is Old University Place Apartments, a 119-unit building that fills the entire block face. Both buildings are close to the sidewalk, giving this segment of the street a canyon-like feel.

The Walnut node presents some difficult traffic patterns. Walnut Street does not cross University Avenue in a straight line, but forms a 300-foot jog. Heading north, Walnut Street is the major street leading to the west side of Campus. Heading south, Allen Street feeds into the Regent Neighborhood and beyond. Walnut and Allen Streets are both heavily used by cars, buses, bicyclists and pedestrians. The intersections are controlled: North Allen Street has a stop sign and Walnut Street a signalized light, respectively. Transportation conflicts include entrances for residential and commercial properties, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian crosswalks.

2300 block of University Avenue, north side (left) and south side (right, Old University Place). The neighborhood does not want this pattern of development repeated elsewhere along the Corridor.

Future Land Use, Character, and Scale (See Map 16)

- Existing businesses should be retained and efforts made to attract additional businesses to vacant commercial space prior to redevelopment.
- Any redevelopment on the north side should be mixed-use or purely residential. Big-box stores are not appropriate (already too much traffic, insufficient parking); smaller, neighborhood-oriented businesses are preferred.
- Developments should include pedestrian and bicycle amenities.
- Any redevelopment on the 2200 block of the south side should be small-scale residential.
- Mixed-use would be appropriate for any redevelopment on the southeast corner of Allen Street and University Avenue.
- Proposed ramps at Highland and Walnut to Campus Drive should be adequately studied, including impacts to the business nodes, as part of the evaluation if one or more ramps would alleviate traffic on University Avenue.

- Construction of an east-bound on-ramp from Highland to Campus Drive and Walnut Street to Campus Drive has been discussed in the past to allow traffic to leave the western part of the UW-Madison Campus without using University Avenue. This discussion may be revisited if north-side redevelopment is proposed.

- Going north on Walnut Street toward the UW-Madison Campus, there is an underpass below Campus Drive and the railroad tracks. This underpass is poorly lit and unpleasant for pedestrians and bicyclists. Suggestions for improvement of this area are addressed in the sections on transportation and streetscape improvements.

Area 3: Center Block (North Side)

The 2100 block on the north side of University Avenue (between Allen and Forest Streets) is occupied by high-density multifamily apartment buildings of various styles. Most are set back at least a few feet from the sidewalk with some landscaping in front. There is no commercial space in this area of the Corridor. All of the buildings are relatively new and appear to be in good condition.

Future Land Use, Character, and Scale (See Map 16)

- Property owners should continue to maintain their buildings and enhance the landscaping if possible.

- Any replacement buildings should follow the size guidelines in Table 1 and the design guidelines of this Plan.

2100 block of University Avenue

22 Paunack Place

Area 4: Paunack-Chamberlain-Birge Area (North Side)

This predominantly student rental area is quite different from the other multifamily housing areas along the north side of University Avenue. Smaller lot size, narrower streets, and a mature tree canopy are characteristic of this area.

This three-block enclave (from Forest Street to Princeton Avenue) has a mix of single-family, two- to six-unit, and multifamily structures. Most structures are two to three stories, with the exception of an eight-story building located at Birge Terrace and University Avenue. The housing stock offers rental choices in smaller-scale multifamily structures that were built in the late 1930s to early 1950s.

413 Chamberlain Avenue

Almost all of the housing units are rental, with college-age students being the primary tenants. Besides the market-rate housing, Babcock House offers a group living choice for agriculture students. On- and off-street parking for tenants is limited, resulting in front yards being used for parking.

Chamberlain Avenue and Paunack Place are north-south streets that extend one block north from University Avenue until the streets end at the public right-of-way at Campus Drive. A chain link fence parallels the back yard property line to prevent residents from taking a shortcut across Campus Drive to reach the western end of the UW Campus. A three-foot drop in elevation separates the Paunack-Chamberlain-Birge Terrace area from Campus Drive.

Future Land Use, Character, and Scale (See Map 16)

- This area should be preserved as a unique enclave of two-story residential buildings.
- Any new development should be limited to 3-story, small-scale apartment buildings, oriented toward the street with parking at the rear or side. (See below for 2000 block of University Avenue.)
- Front yard setbacks should be in rhythm with other residential units on the block.
- Exterior materials should be complementary to materials used in existing housing stock that was built in the 1930s-1950s. Modern materials can be used for any potential redevelopment of parcels in the 2000 block of University Avenue.
- Small park-like spaces should be created at the ends of Paunack, Chamberlain and Birge to enhance the residential nature of these streets as they abut Campus Drive.
- Property owners should be encouraged to develop shared green spaces and parking areas.
- A visually pleasing green space could be installed opposite the end of Forest Street to serve as a pocket park and soften the transition from the residential neighborhood to the Corridor.
- The chain link fence should be replaced and plantings improved along Campus Drive.
- Enforcement efforts should be undertaken to remove illegally installed front yard parking areas.

900 block of University Avenue

Area 5: South Side from Allen Street to Breese Terrace

This stretch of University Avenue has a consistent, intact character and rhythm, with attractive buildings and mature trees. It consists primarily of small-scale, multi-family apartment buildings and rental houses.

There are a few larger buildings in this area. The First Congregational Church, established in 1840, is the major landmark in the Corridor and the dominant feature at the east entrance. The Institute for Religion of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints is located at 1711 University Avenue. Brownlofts Apartments, 1815 University Avenue, is a new four-story, 64-unit apartment building completed in 2013. The building at 1909 University Avenue houses the Association for Women in Agriculture and provides housing for 26 women agriculture students.

University Heights Historic District

The south side of University Avenue between Allen Street and Breese Terrace is in the University Heights Historic District and is subject to the provisions of Madison General Ordinance 33.19(12). This ordinance recognizes the historic character of the district. Construction, reconstruction, exterior alterations and demolition are reviewed to protect existing structures and preserve the historic appearance of the district.

Plan recommendations for Area 5 are intended to be consistent with these requirements. The neighborhood wants to maintain the historic character of

2100 block of University Avenue

this area and expects the Landmarks Commission and other City agencies to act accordingly on any requests for conditional use or rezoning.

Future Land Use, Character, and Scale (See Map 16)

- In keeping with the historic nature of the area, the south side should be preserved as medium density, small-scale, multifamily residential buildings. The buildings in this area contribute to the character of the historic district, so any building in good condition should be maintained and reused rather than replaced.
- Any new development should occur on existing lots, oriented toward the street with parking placed in the rear, side or underground. The height of new buildings should not exceed three stories or forty feet.
- Front and rear setbacks should be in rhythm with other residential units on the block. No zero lot line development should be permitted.
- Any new development or remodeling should be compatible in scale, materials, and texture with the existing buildings.
- Property owners should be encouraged to upgrade existing landscaping.
- In the 1700 and 1800 blocks, no building may be higher than the roof ridge line of the First Congregational Church (953.5 feet above sea level). This height as an absolute maximum, even under conditional use approval, to maintain scale in proportion to the historic church and to preserve the sight line to the church from the west.

First Congregational Church (left) and Wisconsin Energy Institute (right)

Area 6: University Edge

This area is on the north side of University Avenue at the east end of the Corridor. In the 1930s, the Blackhawk Motor Company and the Pennsylvania Oil Company were located on the north side of the 1600 block. Many residents still remember the chicken houses, part of the UW Poultry Farm until the late 1950s, in the 1800 block where the UW Foundation Building is today. All of the land in area 6 is now owned by the UW or the UW Foundation. Current buildings include Phase 1 of the new Wisconsin Energy Institute (1552 University Avenue) and the Naval ROTC building immediately to its west (1610 University Avenue). The Enzyme Institute and an open area leading to the Alicia Ashman Bridge make up the 1700 block. The UW Foundation building and its parking lot, along with an older house currently used for university offices, cover the north side of the 1800 block.

The First Congregational Church, located on the south side of the 1600 block, is a red brick Georgian Revival building built in 1928, with an addition in 1967. It is a contributing building in the national/state University Heights Historic District and serves as a symbol and gateway entrance feature for the neighborhood. Preserving space around the church so that there is an unobstructed view of it and the entrance to the Corridor along University Avenue is impor-

tant for the neighborhood. Recently added UW buildings have been designed to relate to the church and preserve its sight line from the east. The Engineering Centers Building has a curved façade along University Avenue. The Wisconsin Energy Institute (WEI) matches the height of the church nave along University Avenue and then steps back to greater height along Campus Drive. Going forward, protection of this view should continue.

The UW proposes to replace the Naval ROTC building by phase 2 of the WEI when funding becomes available at some point in the future. The neighborhood and the Urban Design Commission had several concerns about phase 1. The UW made extensive revisions to the plans to respond to these issues, which is greatly appreciated. In particular, concern about the height and mass of phase 1 adjacent to the church and a single-family residential area was partly mitigated by a stepback from a lower height along University Avenue to a greater height along Campus Drive. The neighborhood wants to work with the UW for a successful phase 2 that meets both UW and neighborhood needs and maintains the tradition of varied and interesting architecture in University Heights.

Future Land Use, Character, and Scale (See Map 16)

- Sketches of phase 2 of the Wisconsin Energy Institute presented during the city approval process for phase 1 (rezoning as a PD) depict a continuation of the current roof line and facades. This would nearly double the size of the building and create long unbroken walls along both University Avenue and Campus Drive. This is not acceptable. Phase 2 should be set back farther from University Avenue than phase 1, and should include features to break up the mass of the building, such as greater surface articulation and variation in roof lines.

- To protect the view of the First Congregational Church, phase 2 of the WEI should not be visible projecting above phase 1 when approached from the east. This may require phase 2 to be lower in height from grade, since it will be farther up the slope from phase 1 and will be across from the lowest elevation from grade of the church.

- Any future buildings in the area between the completed WEI and the UW Foundation building should be limited to 3 stories/40 feet fronting the street with a stepback to 5 stories/65 feet along Campus Drive.
Front yard setback of appropriate distance is important. A visual transition from WEI to smaller-scale development and the Ashman Bridge approach to the west will help avoid visually overwhelming the church located on the south side (the roof ridgeline of which measures 35 feet from grade at the west end); and to prevent an extension of mass along University Avenue which would negatively impact the streetscape and pedestrian experience in that section of the Corridor. Ideally, the area between the Enzyme Institute and the UW Foundation, currently largely open space (parking lot and bridge approach), would be limited to small-scale development to preserve an area of relief from larger buildings.

- The open space in front of the Alicia Ashman Bridge should be preserved and enhanced to encourage pedestrian traffic. UW-Madison has said there is not enough demand from surrounding buildings and foot traffic to support food vendors. However, the demand may increase as conditions change, so the option to revisit this possibility should be kept open, since neighbors would welcome the amenity.

Campus Drive Considerations

- The view of a neighborhood as seen from a highway affects how a city regards a neighborhood, giving an impression to potential visitors and/or intruders. Therefore the standards for façade treatment, articulation and other design elements continue to be relevant to buildings as they face Campus Drive and should be followed there.

- The green space along Campus Drive should be maintained, and setbacks from Campus Drive required by Zoning to avoid a row of buildings close to the street. No billboards, permanent banners or signs exceeding the permitted limits in the zoning code should be allowed.

- Strategies should be considered to encourage better upkeep of the backs of properties along Campus Drive.

- Construct pedestrian/bicycle overpass across Campus Drive between Alicia Ashman bridge and Walnut Street.

Building Design – Residential

Building Design - Mixed-Use and Commercial

VIII. Economic Development

The University Avenue Corridor has a number of successful long-term businesses that are integral to the neighborhood. In order to keep the street vibrant and add opportunities to expand local commerce, the Regent Neighborhood Association has encouraged developers to include first-floor commercial space as part of residential developments. This strategy has not been as successful as hoped, in part due to the downturn in the economy. Going forward, the strategy for economic development will include a number of approaches.

In October 2010 the City conducted a survey of 14 Corridor business and commercial property owners. Ten of the owners thought that the overall appearance of the Corridor was only "fair", although they were not particularly supportive of aesthetic improvements. They were supportive of wayfinding signage. Ten of the businesses surveyed supported more parking, including restricted one- or two-hour on-street parking. (The results of this survey are summarized in Appendix 3.)

A small group of neighborhood residents also met with a group of developers and lenders to discuss the redevelopment potential of the Corridor. This group did not see the Corridor as being a "destination" or having much sense of identity. Some suggested that the historic aspect of the Corridor could be emphasized. (The results of these discussions are summarized in Appendix 4.)

Business recommendations

- The neighborhood should work to retain and attract neighborhood-oriented businesses such as small-scale retailers and restaurants. It should make a concerted effort to fill empty first-floor commercial space in the Goldleaf and Mullins developments with businesses that fill neighborhood needs.
- Neighborhood residents should be encouraged to patronize Corridor businesses.
- Access to the Corridor should be improved by providing bicycle parking and improved walking and biking routes.
- The ambience should be improved by use of outdoor spaces, upgraded façades, and public and private streetscape amenities, to make the neighborhood more pedestrian friendly and inviting to consumers.
- The City should promote grant and loan programs to businesses, such as for façade improvement.
- The neighborhood should work with local business owners to establish a business association and develop a branding strategy for University Avenue. The formation of a Business Improvement District should be explored.
- Proposed ramps at Highland and Walnut at Campus Drive should be adequately studied, including impacts to the business nodes, as part of the evaluation if one or more ramps would alleviate traffic on University Avenue.

IX. Transportation Improvements

Transportation needs in the Corridor should be met by promoting alternatives to automobiles, including foot, bus and bicycle. Given the high density of the neighborhood and the large number of people traveling by alternative means, it is important to make the area safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. Many of the transportation issues arise from competition between various modes of travel.

The volume of peak hour car traffic should be managed to improve residential ambience and access to neighborhood-oriented businesses. The neighborhood recognizes that commuter traffic will continue to use the Corridor. The goal is to reduce its impact as much as possible without increasing traffic on neighborhood streets.

The intersection of University Avenue and Campus Drive just east of the Corridor was rebuilt in the summer of 2010. Although this intersection is not in the study area, the improved design greatly improved pedestrian and bicycle safety and access to the Corridor. University Avenue between Grand Avenue and Breese Terrace was resurfaced and restriped in 2011. Bicycle lanes were added, pedestrian crossings were more clearly marked, and a pedestrian-activated flashing light was installed at the Ashman Bridge. Although these were substantial improvements, the street needs to be monitored and additional safety options studied. UW-Madison also works to moderate commuter traffic through its Transportation Demand Management program.

Changes on the UW-Madison Campus and elsewhere will continue to affect ease of travel along the Corridor. Going forward, the transportation environment will need to be continuously monitored and new solutions found as needed (See Map 21).

Pedestrian and bicycle traffic

The Corridor should use streetscape and building designs that support a pedestrian- and bicycle- friendly environment, with pedestrian and bicycle amenities.

- There should be safe crossings, bridge and street lighting, and wayfinding signs to facilitate movement within the Corridor and to make safe, attractive connections across Campus Drive to the UW Campus and hospitals.
- There should be a consistent system of bicycle lanes and signage throughout the Corridor. The City should clarify whether bicyclists should be encouraged to use University Avenue or Kendall Avenue as the primary path as part of a citywide wayfinding plan.
- On-site bicycle storage should exceed the requirements in the zoning. This is already the standard for UW-Madison construction.
- Installation of a “B-cycle” station should be explored.

> “The reason so many people in Europe bike is it’s the easiest way to get around. You can’t make a lot of progress based on altruism.”
>
> *--Dave Cieslewicz*

At Highland and University Avenues:

- Pedestrian style lights (i.e. "old-fashioned" style street lights) should be used on the 2200-2500 blocks of University Avenue and on Highland Avenue north of University Avenue.
- Ease of movement for bicycles and pedestrians on Highland Avenue should be improved by marking bicycle lanes and crossings.

At Walnut Street and University Avenue:

- The Walnut Street bridge underpass needs a pedestrian-friendly path and lighting under the bridge. Bicycle lanes on Walnut Street should be marked.
- Signage and lane markings at Walnut Street and University Avenue should be redesigned to decrease bicycle/pedestrian/auto conflicts and increase safety.

At Alicia Ashman Bridge:

- Attention should be drawn to the Alicia Ashman Bridge as a safe place to cross University Avenue.
- Explore installation of a pedestrian hybrid beacon such as exists currently at the intersection of Blair and Mifflin Streets.

Automobile traffic

- Explore options for traffic calming at University & Grand Avenues with Traffic Engineering. Solicit neighborhood input on various options.
- UW-Madison has completed a West Campus traffic study. UW-Madison, the City of Madison, and the Village of Shorewood Hills are currently conducting a traffic study of the adjoining area (bounded by Regent-Randall-University-Midvale). The Regent Neighborhood will carefully review the results of these studies and give input on solutions because of the potential spillover into the Corridor. This input may be offered through the Joint West Campus Area Committee and other available avenues.
- The feasibility of an eastbound on-ramp to Campus Drive at Highland Avenue and/or Walnut Street should be revisited to address neighborhood concerns about the high volume of commuter traffic, although significant land acquisition would be required. The ramp would provide UW-Madison commuters with an alternative to using University Avenue. Impacts to the business nodes should be evaluated.
- Wayfinding for the University Avenue Corridor should be considered as part of a citywide wayfinding plan.
- Lane markings, crosswalks and signage installed during 2011 reconstruction of University Avenue in the Corridor should be re-evaluated and modified as needed.

Parking

- On-site parking should exceed the requirements in the zoning. Residents of multi-unit buildings should not be able to receive on-street parking permits.
- Parking meters should be evaluated for installation in the City parking lot on the north side of 2500 block.
- Shared parking between businesses with day and evening schedules should be explored. This would help address retail and business parking needs without interfering with residential uses.

Bus service

- Bus shelters should be installed at all bus stops where space permits.
- Madison Metro should be approached to extend Campus bus service to the Corridor, e.g. a West Campus circulator.

Map 20: Transportation Recommendations



X. Sustainability Initiatives

The Corridor should be a model for sustainable development and living practices. Sustainable attributes should be included in new private and public projects and added through retrofits to existing buildings where possible. The use of sustainable practices will affect the level of neighborhood support for new developments and major renovations. Specific recommendations will be included in the development protocol packet provided to potential developers.

The neighborhood should reach out to property owners and identify those willing to enroll in sustainability programs. It should also explore the possibility of a partnership with the UW-Madison Office of Sustainability. UW-Madison already works to incorporate sustainability principles into its building practices and should continue to do so.

Examples of sustainable practices to be promoted

- Environmentally friendly building design, building materials, and building practices.
- Installation of energy efficient windows, insulation, and appliances to retrofit existing buildings where appropriate.
- Use of alternative energy sources.
- On-site storm water management strategies to alleviate flooding and filter pollutants and nutrient runoff before they enter nearby lakes.
- Promotion of alternatives to the personal automobile through bicycle amenities, pedestrian-friendly features, and easy and comfortable access to mass transit.
- Education of residents and visitors through use of design elements and landscaping that are informative as well as artistic.

Stormwater retrofit, Seattle, Washington

XI. Public Art and Streetscape Improvements

During two design workshops in summer 2010, artists and neighbors worked with Madison Arts Commission to generate ideas to improve the aesthetics and design of the street. Recommendations arising out of the design workshops were to make the Corridor a destination rather than just a route to get to other places, and to connect the length of the Corridor by creating a brand or unifying theme that could be expressed in artistic applications at various locations. (More information on the design workshops is found in Appendix 6. Locations for the streetscape recommendations are shown on Map 22).

Blink temporary public art: In November 2011, local artists worked with a University Avenue property owner to project paintings and images on the wall of an apartment building. The installation called "The Space Between," was supported by the City through the Madison Arts Commission.

Street-level improvements

- The quality of residents' and visitors' experience can be enhanced through street-level improvements and attractive landscaping. Getting more people out on the streets helps create a sense of place, supports economic development, and increases safety.
- The supply of energy-efficient, soft pedestrian-level street lighting should be increased to improve aesthetics and safety for walkers.
- Wayfinding signs should be installed to direct visitors to area schools, hospitals, bridges and bicycle paths, restaurants and shops. Wayfinding for the University Avenue Corridor should be considered as part of a citywide wayfinding plan.
- The number of large street trees should be protected and increased. Trees removed for various reasons should be replaced with a variety of canopy trees.
- Property owners should be encouraged to maintain and enhance landscaping, especially at the base of buildings. Terrace landscaping should be encouraged in commercial areas.
- The installation of permanent artwork and temporary art exhibits should be encouraged. The RNA should consider using its funds for public art.
- Bury utilities whenever possible.

Zero lot line buildings

- The façades of zero lot line buildings should be enhanced through options such as murals, light projections, sculptural elements, vegetation on the walls, awnings, sidewalk planters, increased use of street trees, and terrace landscaping.

Western gateway to the Corridor: the corner of University and Grand Avenues, looking east.

The gateway could be enhanced by installation of a traffic calming measure and a rain garden.

Neighborhood gateways

- The gateways to the neighborhood should be beautified and made distinctive to create a sense of arrival and connect the Corridor to surrounding areas.

Western gateway

- The western entrance to the Corridor needs a unique gateway or iconic symbol to provide a sense of arrival to a distinct Madison location. A "Welcome to the Regent Neighborhood" sign should be installed.
- Traffic calming techniques should be used to slow incoming traffic at Grand Avenue.
- Wayfinding signs should inform travelers of desirable destinations along the Corridor.
- A visual and auditory barrier along Campus Drive could be installed to separate it from the Corridor, such as vegetation, fencing, a wall, or sculptures.
- The green space next to the parking lot on the north side of the 2500 block of University Avenue should be maintained. Seating could be added so it can serve as an adjunct to the parking lot for community events or as a resting place for walkers and bicyclists. A rain garden should be planted opposite the end of Grand Avenue.
- Additional trees and shrubs on the Campus Drive median strip should be added to reduce noise and soften the view to the north from the 2600 block of University Avenue.

Highland Avenue and Walnut Street bridges and underpasses

- These two underpasses are interfaces between the Corridor and major destinations to the north. They should be used as landmarks to define the end of one area and the beginning of another.
- These underpasses should be made more aesthetically pleasing with murals and/or artistic lighting. The horizontal spans of the bridges should be softened using color contrast and/or artwork. Small landscaping elements should be added.
- Safety for pedestrians and bicyclists should be increased by widening sidewalks, marking bicycle lanes and adding pedestrian-level lighting. Wayfinding signs are needed. Wayfinding for the University Avenue Corridor should be considered as part of a citywide wayfinding plan.
- These recommendations can be accomplished without altering the structure of the bridges.

Alicia Ashman Bridge

- This is one of the few safe opportunities for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross Campus Drive, and a major connection between the Regent Neighborhood and the UW-Madison Campus to the north, so it should be more visible.
- Attention to the bridge should be increased through artistic applications and wayfinding signage.
- The open space between the bridge and University Avenue should be enhanced (e.g. with landscaping, seating, a drinking fountain, public art) to create a gathering space and sense of place. The possibility of installing a Wi-Fi node should be explored. The ability to sustain food carts near the bridge on a seasonal or rotational basis should be considered.

Eastern Gateway

- The neighborhood sign should be repositioned so westbound travelers can see it. The RNA should work with the City to clarify who is responsible for maintaining landscaping on the islands and should install and maintain it if necessary.
- New signage should be installed on westbound University Avenue east of the Corridor to direct drivers to UW Hospital and Clinics and the Wisconsin Energy Institute.

Alicia Ashman Bridge

Map 21: Public Art and Streetscape Recommendations



XII. Design Guidelines

These design guidelines are intended to provide clear expectations and guidelines for new development and alterations to existing buildings. They apply to residential, mixed-use, commercial and institutional structures. The scope of new development may range from simple remodeling (such as a storefront) to the construction of new buildings. While the guidelines are not requirements, some of them are required in the zoning code for mixed-use and commercial districts and in the Landmarks Ordinance. Some of the guidelines go beyond the zoning code. The guidelines are to be used to review conditional use and rezoning requests submitted to the City.

The intent of the guidelines is to foster the type of walkable, urban environment that will contribute to the sustainability of the neighborhood. The key issue is the interface between the building/site and the public realm; the guidelines describe ways to coordinate them. Use of the guidelines is also intended to enhance the appearance of the Corridor over time.

According to City ordinance, for developments that involve a conditional use or rezoning, the developer must contact the alder and the neighborhood association in writing no less than thirty days prior to submittal to the City. Developers are advised to contact the president of the Regent Neighborhood Association for a development protocol packet and set up a time to meet with the RNA Board. Contact information may be obtained from the City's Neighborhood Planner.

A. BUILDINGS

1. Character

Context/Compatibility

Infill/redevelopment should relate to and complement the design of buildings adjacent to the site. The architectural merits of adjacent structures should influence choices. Not all buildings should be built to the maximum height and density, but should allow for varying elevations and scale.

Rear setbacks and façade design should be chosen to respect the impact on neighboring rear yards, especially when adjacent to single-family homes or small-scale multifamily buildings.

Façades

All building façades should employ quality materials and design features. No blank, unadorned walls should be permitted to face public streets, sidewalks, or residential areas. The new zoning code requires this for new mixed-use and commercial districts.

Rear- and side-facing façades, even if not visible from a public space, should also be well-designed, preferably with doors or windows rather than blank walls, to avoid creating unsafe dead spaces.

Compatible redevelopment — Williamson Street, Madison

Blank walls lack visual interest and are not pedestrian-friendly. North Paterson Street, Madison.

2. Composition

Vertical Composition

The architectural composition of building elevations should express base, middle, and top articulation, created by variations in detailing, color, and materials.

Façade Articulation/ Diversity

To break up the overall massing, buildings of more than 40 feet in width should be divided into smaller increments through articulation of the façade (i.e. architectural breaks, window bays, etc.). The new zoning code requires this for new mixed-use and commercial districts.

Facade articulation or diversity can include changes in material with small recesses, larger recesses, courtyards, division into storefronts with separate entrances, and variation in roof lines.

Vertical Expression

Building mass, rhythm, and proportion should express verticality to balance horizontal expression and avoid a tunnel effect along the street enclosure.

Clearly defined zones. King Street, Madison


Broom Street, Madison


University Avenue, Madison

Pedestrian Scale

The base of the building should include elements that relate to the human scale, such as doors and windows, projections, columns, awnings and canopies, ornamentation, etc.

The height-to-setback ratio should be considered. Heights can feel less confining for pedestrians if setbacks are used.

Rhythm

Building façades should utilize recurring building elements, proportions, solid and void patterns, and compositional attributes to create visually attractive rhythms. The façade rhythm illustrated in the photo is established with "A" at both ends and "C" in the middle, with the relief coming from the space "B" provides with the recess for balconies.

Horizontal Expression

Building façades should be designed at the local (pedestrian-scale) level to complement and continue horizontal expression lines found on adjacent buildings with architectural merit.


Atwood Avenue, Madison

Doty Street, Madison


University Avenue, Madison

3. Form

Building Length and Massing

The height, section, and design of street façades are the primary determinants of a street's character. In addition, the length of such façades may also be a significant issue, especially in neighborhoods with historically smaller lots and building footprints. When the character of neighborhoods is defined by the repetition of smaller lots, it is often referred to as having a smaller-scale, more intricate grain or texture. In this case, the best way to protect the grain of this neighborhood is to limit the length of new buildings. The street frontage of new buildings should be 120 feet or less.

City Row site plan, East Johnson Street

Alignment and Setback

Building design and placement on the site should enable neighboring buildings and properties to have or retain solar access.

The front yard setbacks of new buildings should relate to the setbacks of adjacent structures and adhere to the guidelines established in Table 1. Mixed-use and commercial buildings should be placed closer to the sidewalk but should be set back at least five feet.

Setback along University Avenue

Height

The maximum building height abutting Highland Avenue, University Avenue and Walnut Street should be 3 stories/40 feet. North of University Avenue, building height can be increased to 4 stories/52 feet or 5 stories/55 feet with conditional use approval, with a stepback of 15 feet from the front building façade above the third story. However, in Area 4 (Paunack-Birge), the maximum building height should be 2 stories/35 feet.

Building Stepbacks

For buildings taller than three stories or forty feet, a stepback should be provided after the third floor, with additional stories stepping back a minimum of 15 feet from the front of the building façade. The stepback will help protect the street wall or enclosure created by perceiving a three-story building along the street.

Williamson Street, Madison.

Building Entrances

The new zoning code requires a functional building entrance to be oriented to an abutting public street. The major public entry should be a prominent visual feature of a building. Multiple street-facing pedestrian entries should be used on buildings with over 80 feet of frontage. The major public entry and any entries located near handicapped parking places should be accessible.

East Wilson Street, Madison.

Balconies

Along street-facing façades, balconies should be recessed or semi-recessed.

Rooftop Equipment Screening

All mechanical rooftop equipment should be screened from view from adjacent streets, with the exception of equipment that is designed to be visually appealing. The new zoning code requires this for all new mixed-use and commercial buildings.

West Doty Street, Madison.

Bassett Street, Madison.

West Washington Avenue, Madison.

West Doty Street, Madison.

4. Details

Materials

The use of durable, high-quality materials such as stone, brick, wood, and metal panels is encouraged, particularly at the base of a building. When different materials of exterior cladding meet, a distinct variation in surface depth must be present to avoid flat façades and add to the aesthetic character.

Color

Color choices should complement the building's materials and style of construction and harmonize with adjacent buildings. Bright colors should be used only as accents.

Lighting

Exterior and façade lighting should be well-integrated as a design element to enhance a building façade's features, offer security, and invite awareness of businesses after dark. Use of LED lighting is encouraged. Lighting must be in keeping with the City's Dark Sky Ordinance.

B. SITE

1. Off-street parking and service areas

Location

Parking should not be placed between the building and any street-facing property line. Instead, off-street parking areas should be located at the rear or side of the site or integrated within a building (preferably below-grade). The new zoning code for mixed-use and commercial sites thoroughly addresses this issue. Parking located at the side of a building should occupy no more than 25% of the frontage along the primary abutting street.

Parking Lot Configuration

Shared parking is encouraged, and whenever possible, adjoining parking areas should be aligned to provide internal circulation. Per City Ordinance, all service and parking areas must be appropriately lighted and visually screened by walls, fences, or landscape materials. LED lighting is encouraged.

In paved parking areas, permeable paving, vegetated swales and/or infiltration islands should be used for storm water management. Tree planting is encouraged for shade, habitat protection, and reduction of the urban heat island effect.

Recessed garage entrance on side street. Princeton Avenue, Madison.

Parking lot bioswale, Hilldale Mall, Madison.

Vehicular Entry

Street-facing garage doors should be designed with attractive, panelized, high-quality materials that harmonize with the rest of the building façade and are recessed at least 15 feet.

Parking ratios

The number of parking stalls provided should be appropriate for the type of development (see new zoning code). Residential units should generally have a minimum of one stall per unit, with some flexibility if adequate guest parking
is provided.

Access

Service and off-street parking areas should be accessed from secondary streets where possible to minimize curb cuts and reduce pedestrian conflicts on University Avenue. Driveways that cross pedestrian areas should be minimized in width.

2. Landscaping

Plantings and Vegetation

Landscaping should be designed to create a foundation for the building and provide a pleasing relationship with adjoining properties and the public sidewalk.

Plant material should be chosen to meet site conditions. Native plants that don't require an irrigation system and /or vegetation and landscaping that serve multiple purposes (e.g. shade and equipment screening) are preferred.

Where buildings are not present along the block face, attractive landscaping should be used to maintain street-edge continuity along the public sidewalk. Landscaping requirements are covered at length in the new zoning code.

Existing street trees should be protected and plans made for replacement of trees killed by emerald ash borer. Planting of yard trees should be encouraged.



University Avenue, Madison.

North Hamilton & East Dayton Streets, Madison.

3. Miscellaneous

Site Furnishings and Outdoor Spaces

Site furnishings (benches, lighting, bicycle racks, planters, artwork, space for trash and recycling receptacles, etc.) should be designed to complement the character of the building, be visually attractive, and encourage a variety of outdoor activities. LED lighting is encouraged.

Buildings and plantings should be designed so that they create attractive, safe, multi-use outdoor spaces. Where possible, abutting properties should develop shared common space.

Outdoor spaces should be designed to meet site-specific conditions and can include green roofs, plazas, outdoor flower or community gardens, etc. Seating areas should be provided. At the ground floor of mixed-use developments with cafés or restaurants, outdoor cafés are encouraged.

Rain gardens do not have to be large. Edgewood College, Madison

Storm Water Management

To collect runoff and filter pollutants on individual lots, the use of the following options is encouraged: rain gardens, bio-retention basins, permeable pavements, green roof systems, and other systems to collect and evapotranspire rainwater. The City has installed new storm sewers to address longstanding flooding problems along the Corridor.



Equipment/Service Area Screening

Outdoor storage, service, trash or loading areas should be screened by a decorative fence, wall, or screen of plant material. The new zoning code requires this in mixed-use and commercial districts.

Noise Limits

There should be no increase in noise from outdoor mechanical equipment, as demonstrated by measurements taken before and after construction. Mechanical noise is a frequent issue of concern for the neighborhood.

Sustainable Design

Villa Park Police Station, Villa Park, Illinois

Sustainable projects encompass many components, including use of recycled materials; site design with storm water management and natural landscaping; and site amenities to support biking and walking. New developments and renovations are encouraged to implement green building and landscape certifications such as LEED, Living Building Challenge, Passive House, Sustainable Sites Guidelines, and Energy Star ratings.

Site design should address the long-term sustainability of the site's hydrology, soils, vegetation, use of materials, and contributions to human health and well being. For properties changing use, a Phase I environmental assessment consistent with the Environmental Protection Agency's "All Appropriate Inquiries" standard (a historical records search and site visit) should be conducted. A Phase II assessment involving tests performed at the site may be warranted given the historic land uses of many properties in or near the Corridor.

C. SPECIFIC LAND USES

1. Commercial/mixed-use

Transparency

Commercial building façades should provide a high percentage of windows at the ground floor to allow clear views in and out. Dark or tinted glass is discouraged. The new zoning code states that for ground floor commercial and mixed uses, windows and doors or other openings shall comprise at least 60% of the length and at least 40% of the area of the primary street façade.

North Pinckney Street, Madison.

Storefronts

New or altered storefronts should display a visual richness of detail to add interest to the base of the building and the street.

Monroe Street, Madison.

Entrances

The edges of buildings along the street should have well-defined and appropriately placed entrances. Awnings and canopies should enhance the expression of the building entrance and provide pedestrian shelter. See City codes for awning and canopy height requirements.

State Street, Madison.

Signage

Exterior signs are regulated by the City's sign code. New buildings should plan and integrate signs into the design considering the appropriateness of location, size, color, lighting, and design quality. Preferred sign types include building mounted signs, window signs, projecting signs, and awning signs.

2. Residential

Entrance Transitions

Ground-floor residential uses should be separated from the sidewalk by landscaping, steps, porches, grade changes, or low ornamental fences. Multiple entrances are encouraged for safety and aesthetic reasons.

Open Space

The total lot area devoted to usable open space may include at-grade or rooftop terraces, courtyards, gardens, plazas, and balconies. For balconies to count as open space they must be 4½ feet deep. The determination of the amount of open space required is in the zoning code. On smaller scale residential developments, front porches are encouraged.

Williamson Street, Madison.

Wilson Street, Madison.

Shared space behind City Row, East Johnson Street, Madison

D. Guidelines Applicable During Construction

Existing ordinances address some aspects of the noise, fumes, vibration, street constriction and parking problems attendant on construction projects. Because the neighborhood is so compact, any construction will have an immediate impact on surrounding residences. Developers should be cognizant of this impact and be prepared to mitigate it wherever possible. Additional information will be included in the developer packet.

Construction of Brownlofts Apartments, University Avenue, 2013.

XIII. Implementation

Table 2. Plan Recommendations and Implementation Strategy			
Recommendation	**Time frame**	**Lead Agency**	**Implementation**
LAND USE, BUILDING & SITE SPECIFICATIONS			
Amend the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan to reflect proposed changes depicted on Maps 16 and 17.	Short-term	Planning Division	Submit request to District Alderperson for submission to Common Council.
Use the Corridor Plan to review zoning, conditional use and demolition requests.	Ongoing	Planning Division, with RNA and business community	Provide the Corridor Plan to builders, developers, and real estate agents at the time of contact.
Explore the level of support for establishing an Urban Design District for University Avenue from Breese Terrace to Farley Avenue (or extending UDD #6, already located to the west).	Long-term	RNA, with Planning Division and Office of Business Resources	Convene a meeting with district alderperson, property owners and city staff to discuss process to establish a district. Work with Planning Division to allocate staff resources to develop urban design ordinance.

Recommendation	Time frame	Lead Agency	Implementation
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT			
Improve communication with the business community, monitor the economic climate, and implement economic development recommendations.	Short-term	RNA	Establish an RNA standing committee on Economic Development. Invite business and property owners as well as neighborhood residents with appropriate skills to participate.
Establish a formal business association for improved communications, joint marketing, and installation of private-public facade and streetscape improvements.	Short-term	RNA, with business community	Identify business leaders in the Corridor to talk with peers and take the lead in forming a business association.
Promote city-county-state business grant and loan programs, such as the Façade Improvement Grant Program, to area business and property owners	Ongoing	Economic Development Division	Target individual business with eligible projects. Façade Improvement Grant Program is available for eligible projects on University Ave. between Chestnut and Farley Avenues.
Assess the level of support for establishing a Business Improvement District (BID) to help defray the cost of marketing, improvements, and wayfinding signage on the Corridor.	Long-term	RNA, with business association	Identify business leaders in the Corridor to work with the business community on assessing the costs and benefits of a BID District. The Office of Business Resources can provide information to businesses. Submit BID Plan for Common Council approval.
Develop a branding strategy for the Corridor. Consider changing the street name for the 1600-2600 blocks of University Avenue.	Short-term	RNA, with business community, property owners, and institutional leaders	Provide information on branding to stakeholders. Convene a meeting to discuss ideas and implementation strategy.
Encourage neighborhood residents to patronize Corridor businesses.	Short-term	RNA, with business community	Work with local businesses to promote themselves to residents. Promote neighborhood retail and services in neighborhood communications, such as the RNA Newsletter and web site.
Encourage property owners to install streetscape amenities, such as benches, bicycle racks, and pedestrian lighting.	Short-term	RNA, with property owners and Economic Development Division	Work with local businesses and property owners to request city approval for installations on public right of way.
Make a concerted effort to help property owners lease vacant first-floor commercial space to neighborhood-oriented businesses.	Short-term	RNA, Office of Business Resources	Work with property owners to identify ways that neighborhood can support recruiting and marketing efforts.
Install additional parking at the west end of the Corridor (Area 1) to support business parking demands.	Short-term	Traffic Engineering	Work with Traffic Engineer to determine locations for on-street parking.
Explore use of food carts at Ashman Bridge and WEI to fill “food void” on eastern end of the Corridor.	Long-term	Economic Development Division	Work with City of Madison Vending Coordinator to determine feasibility of permitting food carts on private or public properties.

Recommendation	Time frame	Lead Agency	Implementation
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS			
AUTOMOBILE TRAFFIC			
Wayfinding for the University Avenue Corridor should be considered as part of a citywide wayfinding plan.	Long-term	Traffic Engineering	Work with RNA and the business community to identify locations (e.g. UW-Madison, The Veterans and UW Hospitals, Wisconsin Energy Institute) and type of signage and to evaluate feasibility.
Install a traffic calming measure at the intersection of Grand and University Avenues to reduce vehicular speed.	Long-term	Traffic Engineering	Work with District Alderperson, RNA and abutting property owners to measure level of support, select appropriate traffic calming measure, and apply for placement.
Parking meters should be evaluated for installation in the City parking lot on the north side of the 2500 block.		Traffic Engineering	Work with Traffic Engineering to determine the feasibility of installing parking meters in public lot.
Assess the feasibility of an east bound ramp from Highland to Campus Drive or at Walnut Street to Campus Drive.	Long-term	Traffic Engineering	At the time of major redevelopment, assess the feasibility of constructing a ramp(s).
Evaluate lane markings, crosswalks and signage installed during 2011 reconstruction of University Ave. in the Corridor and modify if needed.	Short-Term	Traffic Engineering	Work with District Alderperson, RNA, and the business community to assess the 2011 changes and make improvements if needed.
ALTERNATIVE TRANSIT MODES			
Increase safety for pedestrians and bicyclists using the Highland Ave. and Walnut St. underpasses by widening sidewalks, marking bike lanes and adding pedestrian lighting.		Engineering, UW-Madison	Work with Engineering to identify and install these features.
Install street-level lighting on existing power poles and add amenities such as benches, bicycle racks, trash cans, and bus shelters where appropriate and space permits.	Long-term	Traffic Engineering, with Metro Transit	RNA will identify locations for streetscape amenities. Traffic Engineering will determine appropriateness, total cost, and funding source.
Improve the aesthetics and ease of pedestrian and bicycle movement on Highland Avenue leading toward UW Hospital & Clinics. Improve pedestrian crossing at on-ramp, complete sidewalk gaps, improve streetscape amenities, landscaping, and lighting.	Long-term	Traffic Engineering, with institutions and property owners along Highland Avenue	Future transportation studies or major building projects should include additional features for pedestrian accessibility and safety.
Install pedestrian style lights on the 2200-2500 blocks of University Avenue and north on Highland Avenue.	Long-term	Traffic Engineering, with Office of Business Resources and property owners	Electric conduit was installed as part of University Avenue reconstruction project. Property owners will be assessed cost of pedestrian-style lighting when they wish to install it.

Recommendation	Time frame	Lead Agency	Implementation
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS (continued)			
Redesign signage and lane markings at the intersection of Walnut Street & University Avenue to decrease bike/pedestrian/auto conflicts.	Short	Traffic Engineering	Work with Traffic Engineering to assess intersection and plan improvements.
Draw attention to the Ashman Bridge as a safe place to cross University Avenue Install wayfinding signage.		RNA, UW-Madison	Work with UW-Madison to identify location, design, and funding sources for signage.
Explore installation of a pedestrian hybrid beacon such as exists currently at the intersection of Blair and Mifflin Streets.		Traffic Engineering	Request that Traffic Engineering assess the cross walk and determine whether other solutions, such as flashing red lights, would improve safety.
Wayfinding for the University Avenue Corridor should be considered as part of a citywide wayfinding plan.		Traffic Engineering	Work with Traffic Engineering to identify bicycle improvements. Clarify connections to official bike routes and bike paths.
Explore adding a B-cycle station in the Corridor.		Parks Division	Request that Parks Division identify possible locations for B-Cycle station and enter into agreement with property owners.
Work with UW-Madison to get campus bus service on the Corridor, e.g. a west campus circulator.		UW-Madison with Madison Metro	Request that UW-Madison work with Madison Metro to determine the operational cost and that UW-Madison secure budget to establish a circulator route.

Recommendation	Time frame	Lead Agency	Implementation
SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVES			
Determine the level of support among business and property owners for promoting sustainability along the Corridor. Identify property owners willing to enroll in programs such as Focus on Energy and Energy Star Portfolio Manager.	Long-term	RNA, Sustainability Committee	Work with Focus on Energy and MG&E to conduct peer-to-peer or informational meetings for Corridor property owners. Identify and solicit grant funding for interested property owners.
Explore a potential partnership with the UW-Madison Office of Sustainability to educate students and involve them in sustainability practices.	Long-term	RNA, Sustainability Committee	Work with UW-Madison Office of Sustainability to identify opportunities to have college classes or students involved in sustainability projects.
Promote on-site storm water management strategies to alleviate flooding and filter pollutants and nutrient runoff before they enter nearby lakes.	Long-term	RNA, Sustainability Committee	Work with property owners to encourage on-site stormwater management practices.
Install a rain garden on the north side of the 2500 block of University Ave.	Long-term	Engineering, RNA	Work with City Engineering to prepare design and cost estimates. Solicit private and public funding.

Recommendation	Time frame	Lead Agency	Implementation
PUBLIC ART & STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS			
Install entry features at the eastern and western gateways to the Corridor to provide a sense of arrival to a distinct Madison location. **Western gateway** Install a welcome sign. Build a visual and auditory barrier along Campus Drive to separate it from the Corridor, e.g. vegetation, fencing, a wall, and sculptures. Plant additional trees and shrubs in Campus Drive median strip to reduce noise and soften view to the north from 2600 block of University Avenue. **Eastern Gateway** Reposition neighborhood sign so it is more noticeable. Clarify who is responsible for maintaining landscaping on islands. Enhance landscaping to call attention to neighborhood entrance.	Short-term	RNA, with City Arts Commission, Parks Division, Forestry	Develop a design and solicit private and public funding for features. Apply to Dane County Cultural Affairs Commission, Madison Arts Commission, and Neighborhood Planning Grant Program.
Maintain the green space next to the parking lot on the north side of the 2500 block of University Avenue. Add seating so it can serve as an adjunct to the parking lot for community events or as a resting place for walkers and bicyclists.	Long-term	RNA, Engineering	At the time the City of Madison has property ownership, redesign the green space to serve as a gathering space for the community.
Bury underground electric lines on the 2400-2500 blocks of University Avenue at the time of street reconstruction.	Long-term	Property owners	At the time of major street reconstruction, determine property owners' level of support. Property owners are assessed 100 % of cost.
Apply artistic, decorative treatment on the Highland Avenue and Walnut Street bridges to define the transition between the Corridor and major destinations to the north.	Long-term	RNA, with Madison Arts Commission and Traffic Engineering	Develop a design and solicit private and public funding for artistic features. Apply to Dane County Cultural Affairs Commission, Madison Arts Commission, and UW-Madison.
Install a visually pleasing green space opposite the end of Forest Street to serve as a pocket park and soften the transition from the residential neighborhood to the Corridor.	Long-term	RNA, property owner	Work with property owner to develop plan.

Recommendation	Time frame	Lead Agency	Implementation
PUBLIC ART & STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS (continued)			
Improve appearance of the 10-15 foot right-of-way between rear property lines and the south side of Campus Drive.	Long-term	Engineering	Replace chain link fence, remove invasive species, and plant native tree and shrub species on the south side of Campus Drive.
Preserve and enhance the open space in front of the Alicia Ashman pedestrian bridge; consider an art installation.	Long-term	RNA, with UW-Madison	Develop a design and solicit private and public funding for functional and artistic features.
Protect and increase the number of large street trees. Plant new canopy trees for consistent coverage. When trees are removed for various reasons, replace with canopy trees, using a variety of species. Treat existing larger caliber ash to improve resistance to Emerald Ash Borer where feasible.	Long-term	Parks Division, Forestry	Evaluate sites for new street trees and identify ash trees to be treated.
Encourage property owners to maintain, enhance and upgrade landscaping.	Ongoing	RNA	Reestablish RNA Greenspace Committee to lead this effort.
Enhance the façades of zero lot line buildings.		Property owners	RNA will encourage property owners to explore treatments to enhance buildings facades.

Appendix 1: Public and Professional Participation

Past Corridor Planning Initiative

In 2007 a 25-member work group comprised of residents and business representatives set out to prepare design guidelines for the University Avenue Corridor. Working with a consultant, they held a design charrette in May 2007 and prepared a preliminary plan. At a neighborhood meeting in November 2007, many concerns were expressed about the draft plan, and the RNA Board decided that additional neighborhood-based discussion was necessary to ensure that the vision, values, and design for the Corridor were supported by the Regent neighborhood and the business community.

Present Planning Effort

In late 2009, the RNA Board renewed the planning process. A subcommittee of the Board was created to work with the City Planning Division to complete the Plan. Public input was gathered through a series of open houses, an art and design charrette, and interviews with business owners.

2010	
May	Kickoff presentation at Regent Neighborhood Association annual membership meeting.
June-July	Local artists, designers, and residents developed solutions for specific design challenges at an Art & Design Charrette.
July	Residents identified neighborhood issues at an Informational Booth at the Regent Neighborhood 4th of July Festival.
Sept	Open House #1 sought input on what to preserve and/or change along the Corridor.
Sept-Oct	City staff conducted one-on-one business interviews with local owners and tenants to identify the strengths and challenges of doing business along the Corridor.
Oct	Street improvements, City business programs, and parking and wayfinding strategies were discussed at a Business Stakeholder Meeting.
Sept-Dec	University Avenue Street Resurfacing Meetings provided input on bicycle, pedestrian, and parking issues to City Engineering.
Dec	Reaction to a vision statement, goals and objectives, and preliminary strategies was the focus of Open House #2.
2011	
Feb	Specific recommendations on land use, public art, urban design, and transportation were unveiled at Open House #3.
2012	
March	Development scenarios and sustainability initiatives were discussed with local professionals.
Nov	Comments on the final recommendations were obtained at a neighborhood meeting and by email.
2013	
July	Draft Plan presented at neighborhood meeting for final review.

Appendix 2: Public Input and Response

Contents of Appendix 2:

Present Planning Effort

A. City-sponsored events to gather input

Comments from events sponsored by the City of Madison Planning Division for neighborhood input on problems and solutions for the Corridor:

B. Final Draft Recommendations: Comments and Responses

Comments Received

Notes from Nov. 14, 2012 neighborhood meeting

Letter from Gary Brown for UW-Madison

Letter from George Hall

Letter from Patricia O'Callaghan

Responses to comments from the 11/14/12 neighborhood meeting

After draft recommendations were prepared and presented to the RNA Board a neighborhood meeting was held on November 14, 2012 to discuss the recommendations. Some of the comments collected at that meeting and later are presented below, along with responses. Many comments were general and would not translate into specific language, or suggested things that were already in the Plan, so a response is not given for every comment. There were a number of comments about inconsistencies in the Draft Plan; these are addressed section by section throughout the Plan, as reflected in some of the responses. Some comments are summarized for brevity.

Comment: I am a long-time renter and this constituency is rather left out.

Response: Renter participation in the process was consistently less than what was hoped for, but renters' concerns are reflected across the document.

Comment on building heights: Important to consider not just height, but height-to-stepback ratio (height can be more agreeable if stepbacks are utilized).

Response: Added this statement to Design Guidelines under "Pedestrian Scale": "The height-to-back ratio should be considered, since heights can feel less confining for pedestrians if setbacks are used."

- Comments on the Corridor as a "destination":
- Definitely in support of area as a "destination"
- Are there good ideas to be gained from the Dungeon-Monroe Plan and the success of Monroe Street?
- Like the "destination" aspects of the Plan
- Like the potential for commercial development throughout the Corridor
- Like the encouragement of a business district
- Filling empty commercial space would attract new business
- University Avenue should be studied relative to Monroe Street
- Question of if height restrictions will impact the mix of businesses
- Like leaving open for commercial in multiple locations
- Like destination

Response: Comments indicate that neighbors like the concept of the Corridor as a "destination" like Monroe Street or Williamson Street For a variety of reasons; we don't think this is feasible in the near term. The Board is committed to working on economic development as described in Principle 4 and section VIII.

Comments on transportation issues:

- In support of getting large vehicles/trucks out of the thoroughfare
- Wish to maintain modest speeds on University Avenue
- How can pedestrians and bicycles be incorporated into the area while still maintaining reasonable vehicle traffic?
- Continued concern about traffic; if modifications are made to traffic flow/patterns/speed on University Avenue, the cars may move onto side streets in the neighborhood
- Like the focus on transportation improvements
- Want consistent bicycle lanes along Corridor
- Parking should be market driven
- Consider rail service to Downtown
- Realization that there are businesses along the Corridor requiring deliveries, and also that the university and hospitals require truck access as well.
- Like transportation emphasis
- Really cut down on traffic

Response: We are very aware of traffic as an issue for the neighborhood, but recognize that commuter traffic will continue to use the Corridor. We share the concern about pushing traffic off the Corridor into the neighborhood.

Responses to comments from Gary Brown (on behalf of UW-Madison)

Comment: The University remains concerned about the process this latest draft document has taken in being drafted by a small group of individuals from the RNA without any public input over the 21 months it has been developed.

Response: The 21-month period referred to is between the Feb. 13, 2011 open house and the Nov. 14, 2012 neighborhood meeting. Preparation of the Draft Plan took longer than anticipated, partly due to changes in the volunteer personnel involved and partly due to process issues which arose. A draft was available in May 2012. In view of the negative neighborhood reaction to the Oct. 2007 draft plan, the RNA wanted to proceed deliberately and fully discuss the recommendations, which was done in the early fall of 2012 at open meetings. See the section on "Planning Process" for more details.

Part 1 (Vision and Guiding Principles)

Re Principle 2 (Balance the residential nature of the neighborhood with University and hospital uses.)

Comment: The RNA and neighborhood will continue to have full participation in the university's planning processes through the Joint West Campus Area Committee, as it does today. This should be stated clearly here in the plan so it is understood by all who read the Corridor plan. Any rezoning process would also have full participation through the public review process at the Plan Commission and City Council. The university will make any such plans available to the neighborhood association and residents as necessary.

Response: Joint West does not currently function in the manner described, even if that was the original intent. It serves primarily as a useful forum for the exchange of information between UW-Madison and west side neighborhoods. Specific issues are most commonly worked out directly between the Regent Neighborhood and UW-Madison through the district 5 alder. Regardless of the format, we want to continue our good working relationship with the UW.

Comment: ...we always consider scale and relationships of adjacent buildings when we plan any new facilities on Campus. It should be noted, however, that university buildings - especially research and laboratory facilities - are not residential buildings and they are inherently different uses that required larger footprints, taller floor-to-floor heights and generate different traffic patterns.

Response: UW-Madison should consider citing research and laboratory facilities elsewhere on Campus, rather than adjacent to a single-family residential neighborhood.

Re: Principle 5 (Promote walking, biking, etc.)

Comment: As you know, the university has an award winning, nationally known and respected Transportation Demand Management plan that emphasizes and promotes alternative modes..... we are currently working with the City and the Village of Shorewood Hills on a shared-cost traffic impact analysis of the West Campus and Regent neighborhood. The results of that study should be referenced in this Corridor plan.

Response: We salute what UW-Madison has done with respect to traffic management and encourage them to continue these efforts. Reference to the TDM plan and the traffic impact analysis will be included in the section on transportation.

Re: Principle 6 (Promote sustainable development and practices)

Comment: All new and proposed university buildings typically meet at minimum a LEED Silver certification based on State of Wisconsin sustainability guidelines. In several cases, university buildings go well above and beyond a Silver rating and meet Gold or Platinum certification levels. For example, the Phase I Wisconsin Energy Institute is currently tracking toward a Gold LEED certification. I would expect Phase II to do the same.

Response: We appreciate these initiatives and will point to UW-Madison as a model in our discussion of sustainable practices.

Part 2 (Land Use, Building and Site Specifications)

Comment: We agreed with the "C-1, Campus Institutional zoning district" along with the existing PUD for phase I of the Wisconsin Energy Institute. However, we are strongly opposed to the maximum height restrictions of 3 stories/40 feet along the street with a stepback to 4 stories/52 feet along Campus Drive. The draft also allows for 5 stories/55 feet if under a conditional use approval. The draft further states "nothing higher than First Congo roof peak". These statements all contradict the approved 2005 Campus Master Plan which calls for a 5-story building or 75 feet in height (using a 15 foot floor-to-floor height).

Response: The Campus Master Plan has not been approved by the City. We stand by our height guidelines.

Comment: The peak of the First Congregational Church is approximately 80 feet in height. That would suggest an 80-foot building would be appropriate, yet the draft document states a maximum of 55 feet or the "peak of the church". What is the maximum height then, 55 feet or 80 feet?

Response: Yes, this needs to be clarified. Note added to Table1: "The First Congregational Church height of 35 feet is intended to be an absolute maximum, even under conditional use approval or rezoning (PD). This is the height of the ridge line of the roof at the west end of the building (not the top of the steeple, not the eave line)." [**Note**: The height of the church and the height limits for area 6 were revised in the final plan. See below, responses to comments by Gary Brown at the July 24, 2013 neighborhood meeting.]

Comment: Further, this document just talks about "stories" and maximum height of the building without reference to penthouses, elevator overrides, mechanical systems, etc. Are these included in the height maximum or are they allowed to be higher, which is typically the case in most development scenarios. The Corridor plan should address these issues.

Response: Use height as defined in the Madison zoning code and allow exceptions as listed in section 28.134(2): Height Limit Exceptions. The following structures are permitted to exceed the maximum height regulations within any district where the use is allowed: church spires, belfries, cupolas and domes, water towers, flagpoles, chimneys, communication towers and elevator penthouses.

Comment: As an option, we would be willing to consider restricting future development heights to the western end of this area, east of the UW Foundation building, where smaller scaled facilities would be more appropriate.

Response: We would welcome this discussion.

Comment: We agree with the proposed 15-foot front yard setbacks along University Avenue. The rear yard setback, suggested as 20% of the lot depth or minimum of 25 feet is acceptable but may need to be revised based on plans for the proposed phase 2 addition to the Wisconsin Energy Institute. The lot depth in this location is 190 feet which would result in either a 38-foot or 25-foor minimum setback along Campus Drive. Currently, that setback is less than these minimums due to the curvature of the street right-of-way. Clarification is needed here.

Response: We are glad to hear that UW-Madison agrees with 15-foot setbacks along University Avenue, and hope this will apply to the proposed second phase of the WEI. We acknowledge the challenges posed by the irregularly shaped parcel and would consider supporting a reduced rear setback if an adequate front setback is provided. Discussion is needed.

Comment on Specific Area Recommendations, Area 6: We agreed with the proposal to preserve and enhance the open space in front of the Ashman Bridge. However, we do not agree with the proposal to explore the use of food carts in this area. We had proposed a cafe in the first floor of the Wisconsin Energy Institute and food vendors told us that a business plan could not be supported for such a venture. There simply is not enough pedestrian traffic and people in the area to make it work economically. We have preserved the option of adding a cafe/coffee shop in the first floor of the Wisconsin Energy Institute, but only if it works economically. This would further suggest that food vendors at the Ashman Bridge open space would also not be financially feasible.

Response: Thank you for this information. We see no reason not to keep this option open and revisit the feasibility at a later date, since neighborhood residents would welcome the amenities.

Part 5 (Transportation Initiatives)

Comment: Second paragraph: should read "UW-Madison completed a prior West Campus traffic study. UW-Madison, the City of Madison, and the Village

of Shorewood Hills are currently conducting a traffic study of the adjoining area..."

Response: Thank you for clarifying; corrections made.

Comment: Changes [to Campus bus service] would need to be recommended through Madison Metro, who approves all changes to bus routes and scheduling. This is not a university decision. The document should read "Work with Madison Metro...," not UW-Madison.

Response: Thank you for clarifying; correction made.

Responses to comments from George Hall

Comment: Planning study area should be larger to include secondarily affected areas, as it was in the PDI plan.

Response: The focus of this Plan is on Corridor itself, not on the adjacent residential areas, which are expected to remain relatively stable. Public input was sought on several occasions to gather concerns and suggestions from neighbors of the Corridor.

Comment: Please review the University Heights Historic District boundaries and requirements. ..anything occurring within will be guided by Landmarks and state and federal requirements.

Response: A map showing the National Historic District boundaries (which are the same as the State Historic District boundaries) and the Madison Historic District boundaries will be included in the Plan. The only part of the Corridor in the National/State Historic District is the First Congregational Church. Inclusion in a National/State Historic District allows tax credits but doesn't protect properties or impose any restrictions. The City of Madison's University Heights Historic District includes the south side of University Avenue from Allen Street to Breese Terrace. This historic district is governed by section 33.19(12) of the Madison City Ordinances. Text has been added to the Area 5 recommendations reflecting this.

Comment: The Corridor is actually more complex than this document (particularly Map 20), the comp plan, and the zoning ordinance suggest. Each (node) is in a micro-situs environment that the plan fails to distinguish.

Response: The division of the Corridor into six areas which are discussed separately recognizes this complexity at a level of detail sufficient for the purposes of this Plan.

Comments on Part 1 (Vision and Guiding Principles)

Re: Principle 1 (maintaining existing character):

Comment: The Street is already undergoing transition and this section implies freezing land use succession. Several problems - parcels are already assembled under a handful of owners (see city data).

Response: Parcel ownership is actually quite diverse, except in areas that have already been developed (e.g. Mullins development, Goldleaf buildings) and in two other places: the 2000 block of the north side (Carpenter) and the 2500 block of the south side (Lindholm).

Comment: A number of parcels are vacant or have structures/uses that are sub-optimal.

Response: True. Principle 1 now includes this statement: "Where structures or uses are suboptimal, new development is welcome."

Comment: And, rather than saying "The neighborhood wants the Corridor to continue to look and function as a residential neighborhood," how about something like - "The neighborhood would like to maintain the residential character on those block faces where it currently exists and strengthen the neighborhood services and retail character on those blocks where it currently predominates."

Response: The last sentence has been incorporated into Principle 1.

Re: Principle 2 (Balance the residential nature of the neighborhood with university and hospital uses):

Comment: You may not remember this but I was one of the founders of the

Joint West (UW) Campus Committee and served on it for many years. It was designed to do exactly what you say in the paragraph. [...] Over the past few years (since I left the committee) it is apparent that the 'hood has chosen not to use it for the purpose for which it was created...

Response: Joint West does not currently function in the manner described, even if that was the original intent. It serves primarily as a useful forum for the exchange of information between UW-Madison and west side neighborhoods. Specific issues are most commonly worked out directly between the neighborhood and UW-Madison through the alder. Regardless of the format, we want to continue our good working relationship with the UW.

Comment: The VA and FPL are federal entities and essentially beyond our reach (They were invited to Joint West, and periodically participated, but candidly getting at them through our congressional representative was usually the best route).

Response: Inserted at the end of Principle 2: "It would be helpful if the federal entities (VA, FPL) would participate in the planning process."

Re: Principle 5 (Promote walking, biking, etc.):

Comment: The recent reconstruction of University as a transit corridor and the inclusion of traffic calming measures should be acknowledged. .... Are you aware of the TDM measures UW has in place?

Response: Actions already taken by the City and UW-Madison are now acknowledged in the sections on transportation.

Comment: The normative concept of "destination" is in opposition to some of the "plan's" preceding statements.

Response: Comments indicate that neighbors like the concept of the Corridor as a "destination" like Monroe Street or Williamson Street. For a variety of reasons, the RNA Board does not think that vision is realistic in the 10-year time frame of this Plan, given the constraints on economic development discussed elsewhere in this Plan, so the concept of "destination" has been removed.

Part 2 (Land Use Recommendations):

Like the committee, I'm troubled with the land use categories and lines drawn on Map 10, but I also disagree with and do not necessarily support the lines you've drawn on Map 17. There are several areas where CMU is appropriate as well as HDR.

Response: The full text of the Plan will include more detailed justifications for these recommendations on land use. HDR is not appropriate anywhere along the Corridor; it is not compatible with our vision of a livable, walkable, pedestrian-friendly environment.

Part 3 (Specific Area Recommendations)

Comment: Disagree with statements prohibiting lot assemblage.

Response: The issue of lot assemblage was discussed extensively by the Corridor subcommittee and the entire Board. Ultimately the Board voted to remove all references to lot assemblage from the Plan, because the acquisition and development of multiple lots is outside the neighborhood's control. However, the Plan continues to support the concept that buildings be smaller, green space increased, and density be controlled to preserve the existing character of the neighborhood.

Comment: (Re Campus Drive) Is the issue enhancing aesthetics? More than a simple setback may be needed, including façade treatment.

Response: The issue is aesthetics and the general impression of the neighborhood as seen from Campus Drive. This statement was added to the section on Campus Drive: "Massing and design as seen from a highway affect the quality of life in a neighborhood by giving an impression to potential visitors and/or intruders. Therefore, the standards for façade treatment, articulation, etc. continue to be relevant along the Campus Drive side of Corridor buildings and should be followed there."

Part 4 (Economic Development):

Part of the difficulty finding first floor retail for Mullins and Fedler, et al. is due to where HVAC exhaust would go, effect on tenants, parking anomalies

(Fedler), viability of a business given current retail climate for class "a" space in combination with rents, expected sales per sq ft of floor area, etc . We asked for these as a condition of approval, we got them, and they remain empty. Maybe we should rethink the strategy….

Response: Agreed; the strategy should be revisited, but there should also be an effort to overcome the obstacles to finding retail tenants.

Part 5 (Transportation Improvements):

Reduction of traffic volume is not consistent with Campus, UW Hospital and Clinics, VA and FPL gateway, which isn't going away any time soon. Consider how this is consistent with desiring retail, wanting a "destination" environment, etc.

Response: The conflicts between commuter traffic that isn't going away, traffic needed for retail, and the desire to reduce traffic volume were discussed extensively during development of the Plan. This general statement of transportation policy has been added: "The neighborhood recognizes that commuter traffic will continue to use the Corridor. The goal is to reduce its impact as much as possible without increasing traffic on neighborhood streets."

Comment on Part 7 (Streetscape Improvements): [Re Highland Avenue and Walnut Street Bridges and Underpasses] Can recommendations be accomplished without altering the bridge structures - if so, say so.

Response: Added this statement: "The recommended enhancements would not require altering the bridge structures."

Part 8 (Design Guidelines)

Comment: Recommend incorporating relevant PDI graphics as they help to explain the concepts found in the latter pages of the document (Part 8).

Response: PDI graphics will be reviewed for possible inclusion.

Comment: How will the neighborhood/board consistently implement this requirement - are you planning on training the board, providing developers, property owners, etc., with guidelines for how to proceed? Is this something the city is advocating in concert with other neighborhoods that have adopted similar language? Will recommendations from the neighborhood be advisory or determinative?….. What happens if the board decides that something should not be built to the maximum density/height allowed? Is there an appeal from the neighborhood determination?

Response: Neighborhood plans are always advisory. The RNA Board can pass a resolution supporting or opposing a conditional use, but it is the Plan Commission or Common Council that makes the decision.

Comment: Why prohibit gabled roofs? "Flat roofs are preferred for larger buildings"? What informs this suggestion? And what might it result in? A large box? What will residents end up looking at during leaf-off? Flat roofs are boring.

Response: Agreed! This section has been removed.

Comment: [Re "Vehicular Entry"] There are no alleys for the buildings along the Corridor, so why "entries along the street should be discouraged?"

Response: Statement has been removed.

Responses to comments from Patricia O'Callaghan

Comment on land use: There is green space NOW along Campus Drive and the along the backs of several buildings at Birge Terrace. There is always a pair of cardinals living in the area. I see lots of squirrels and birds in the trees along Campus Drive. … The zoning plan doesn't specify building setbacks for Campus Drive, only for the south side which faces the University Heights area. This current green space will be lost under new construction.

Response: We have specified a 20-foot rear yard setback in the Paunack-Birge area. There are four parcels that abut Campus Drive with their side: two on Paunack Place and two on Chamberlain Avenue. The widths vary from 85 feet to 40 feet, and the required side yard setbacks vary from 10 feet to 4 feet. A 20 foot setback from Campus Drive won't work with these four parcels, because when the opposite side setback is added on three of the parcels in question the space left to build on is very small. As long as they meet the height and massing requirements for this area, developments on these parcels should have an exception from the 20-foot setback.

Comment on transportation issues: The Corridor needs highway signs near the

Univ. Ave. /Campus Drive/Breese Terrace intersection indicating the route to UW Hospital - and along University Avenue. I am often stopped on the sidewalk by people in cars asking for directions to the UW Hospital. They usually seem to be coming from the east and get confused once they are on University Avenue. I noted that there are blue signs coming from the west pointing to the UW Hospital parking.

Response: Inserted recommendation for eastern gateway: Install signage on westbound University Avenue for clarity in directing drivers to UW Hospital and Clinics and WEI.

Miscellaneous comments: There is also noise from the large UW Foundation building - the building's HVAC compressors are on the back/side of the building adjacent to the Birge Terrace circle. .... In addition, if you have guests, parking is frequently an issue - especially since the space behind the small UW building next to the UW Foundation was blocked off. This used to be available at night and on weekends.

Response: The RNA could raise these issues at the Joint West Campus Area Committee.

C. Final draft text: comments and responses

COMMENTS RECEIVED

Letter from Gary Brown for UW-Madison dated 7/24/13

> This letter contained a number of corrections which were incorporated into the plan and several substantive comments which are responded to below in the 7/24/13 meeting notes, since Gary Brown was present at that meeting.

Letter from Michael Lawton for Goldleaf Development LLC dated 8/26/13

> This letter was received a month after the final comment period and neighborhood meeting on the plan. The issues raised had already been considered in detail as the plan was being developed.

notes from 7/24/13 neighborhood meeting and responses

Regent Neighborhood Association Meeting

Best Western InnTowner Hotel

July 24, 2013, 7:00 – 8:30 pm

LD Oakley welcomed the group. She introduced the RNA board members in attendance: Mary Czynszak-Lyne, Marcia Vandercook, Karen Christianson, Betsy Greene, Eric Steege, Dan O'Callaghan, and Mary Sarnowski, as well as Alder Shiva Bidar-Sielaff. 22 people attended in addition to the board members.

Ms. Oakley said that tonight's meeting will not include a detailed review of the plan; the assumption is that all have read it. Ms. Bidar-Sielaff will talk about the city process for reviewing the plan. After that, each person who wishes to speak will have 5 minutes. Comment cards are available for more detailed comments, or comments may be emailed to Ms. Bidar-Sielaff or RNA president Jon Miskowski by July 31. Tonight the board members present will try to answer short questions. If an answer is complicated or needs to be researched, the board will have to respond later, possibly via the listserv.

The RNA board will review the plan in light of the comments tonight. Some things may already be addressed in the plan, some issues may need to be clarified or changed. All comments will become part of an appendix to the plan. This is the last review before the document is sent to the city for technical review and printing.

Ms. Bidar-Sielaff introduced Jule Stroick, neighborhood planner for the city planning department, who will be working with the plan once it's submitted to the city. After the RNA board takes these comments into account, the plan will be finalized and sent to the alder. Ms. Bidar-Sielaff will ask the city planning department to write a resolution to introduce to the city. It will then be assigned to twelve committees, including public works, board of estimates, economic development, long-range transportation planning, pedestrian/bicycle/motor vehicle, sustainability, transit and parking, urban design, and joint west. The plan commission makes the final recommendation that will be submitted to the common council.

Each committee has staff who will offer information and comments from the perspective of the committee. The committee may recommend changes to the plan. There will be an opportunity for public input at each of these committees, so if there is something that a person really wants to see changed, or kept in the plan, there will be other opportunities to testify or submit written com-

ments. Alder Bidar-Sielaff emphasized that citizens should speak up throughout the process if they feel strongly about something.

The city will give the plan a number that will follow it through the city process. On the city website, people can sign up to follow the plan (or any piece of legislation) and receive regular emails letting them know when hearings are scheduled or action is taken. (See http://www.cityofmadison.com/cityhall/legislativeinformation/). There will also be a calendar created for the plan process. Ms. Stroick estimated that it will probably take about six months from the time the plan is submitted to complete the committee process.

The question was asked, after the plan is approved, what is it? Is it law, guidelines, good ideas? Ms. Bidar-Sielaff said that in the new zoning code neighborhood plans have a stronger presence than previously. The plan's recommendations are not mandates; they're more like guidelines, a strong statement of what should happen. There is a good chance that the plan commission will follow them when reviewing proposed development. If there is a recommendation for the city to do something, such as installation of public infrastructure, the plan gives the alder a way to request the funding. The city capital budget is planned many years in advance, so the neighborhood can't expect to see changes right away. However, a plan provides a basis for the alder to take advantage of other things happening in that area. As an example, when the Mullins property was redeveloped it created the opportunity to have the city change the streetlights in the 2500 block.

The meeting was opened for public comment.

Kathy Fullin expressed concern that the street lighting be compliant with the dark skies ordinance. This plan calls for commercial properties to be compliant but doesn't say anything about residential development or city streetlights. The streetlights in front of the Mullins building don't appear to be compliant. She also questioned whether traffic calming is needed at the corner of Grand and University. If it takes the form of a traffic island with plants, she doubts that a volunteer can be found to take care of it at that location.

Mark Sukowaty owns small buildings on University Avenue. Over the last 10 years many high-density buildings have been built. 90% of the people who use the buses live in those buildings, so why aren't the bus stops located in front of them instead of in front of small buildings like his? When the bus stop was moved in front of his building he did not receive any notice, and he would have voiced an opinion. Bus stops are a detriment to a building because of the pollution and noise from the stopping and starting, cigarette butts, litter and people sitting on the steps. He would ask the city to put the bus stops in front of the high-density buildings.

Robbie Webber, former alder, responded to the earlier comment by Ms. Fullin. Her view is that that there is substantial traffic at University and Grand. She said she would be willing to water the plants on a traffic island there.

Ms. Webber said that the plan in quite a few places encourages more parking for residential units than the zoning code requires. At the same time the plan says that neighbors don't want any more traffic. Studies have shown that guaranteed off-street parking for residents increases the number of car trips the residents take because they know they won't lose their parking spaces if they leave. Requiring a developer to provide off-street parking also makes rental units less affordable and diverse by forcing people to pay for parking they may not use. The plan should not set any requirements for off-street parking and should let developers decide how much is needed for the profile of tenant the developer is trying to appeal to. If residents have bought houses without enough parking to take care of their own cars, that's their problem.

Response: The proposition that new residential construction exceed the zoning requirements for parking appears in section VI, Land Use Guidelines and in section IX, Transportation Improvements. Under section XII, Design Guidelines, part B, the plan says: "The number of parking stalls provided should be appropriate for the type of development (see new zoning code). Residential units should generally have a minimum of one stall per unit, with some flexibility if adequate guest parking is provided."

Neighbors recognize the need for residential parking associated with new buildings on the Corridor but are concerned about increased demand for parking south of University Avenue. Therefore, the above language about parking for new residential developments has been retained.

John Lindholm asked whether the plan sufficiently addresses economic development. He is concerned with the number of commercial spaces that have been built recently and remain vacant, such as in the old Ivy Inn and the

Mullins Building. Does the plan talk about how to address first-floor retail by finding tenants and promoting businesses? Does the city get involved? Ms. Oakley said that in the early stages of the plan, the city sent someone to talk with business owners along the Corridor for their feedback. The plan discusses economic development in several sections, under business development and the area recommendations. The board will look at this section and see if it is clear enough. Alder Bidar-Sielaff said the city is always concerned about empty commercial spaces. She personally calls the businesses frequently to see how rental efforts are going, and they report that potential tenants are discouraged by the lack of parking. This is an ongoing issue for the Corridor.

Response: The concern about empty commercial space is a valid one. The plan attempts to address it through automobile parking, economic development, support for existing businesses, and support for a business association for the Corridor.

Jean Parks questioned the language in the plan stating that Area 3, the center block, is not likely to be redeveloped in the next ten years. She questioned how anyone could know that if they didn't own the property. There is a vacant lot in that block that seems likely to be redeveloped. Ms. Greene said that particular block is in the Paunack-Birge area, but the board will revisit the language that says no change is expected.

Response: That language ("so no redevelopment is expected in the next ten years") has been removed.

Jeff Schimpf asked if rental prices for the vacant retail spaces are appropriate. He had heard that the prices were above market, and he wondered if the developers were holding out in order to be able to convert the space to residential units. Ms. Bidar-Sielaff said that it is possible for the developer of a PUD to ask for a conversion of the space. The City doesn't control what property owners charge, so all she can to is talking with them frequently about renting the spaces. She also talks with business owners in other parts of town to see if they're interested in opening up another location. Neighborhood residents can do the same thing. Ms Oakley said that the plan makes it clear that the neighborhood wants to see the spaces filled and businesses succeed there.

Mr. Schimpf seconded Ms. Webber's recommendation not to suggest any more parking than the city requires. He noted that Lombardino's does well without much parking, but Ms. Bidar-Sielaff said they tell her that their customers complain. Ms. Greene said that parking is always a conundrum – neighbors don't want more people driving through or parking on the streets but they want the neighborhood businesses, and the businesses need the parking and the traffic. Even if that's just the business's perception, it means there has to be some parking to entice businesses to locate there.

Jean Parks commented that it takes a long time to get to Old University Avenue from western Madison and Middleton. People can wait 45 minutes for the right bus. There is an odd relationship between Old University and Campus Drive. Ms. Bidar-Sielaff said the city is sensitive to that issue and it is an ongoing conversation. Ms. Oakley said that the plan addresses the ease of coming and going from the neighborhood, but the board will look at the transit recommendations to make sure they're clear.

Colin Koffel, who lives near the new Brown Lofts, asked about the role of the neighborhood plan in dealing with construction. Should the plan have guidelines that address noise, traffic, idling trucks, parking, loading and unloading? Ms. Bidar-Sielaff said that some of those things are covered by city ordinances. For hours of construction and idling trucks, residents can just call her and she will deal with it. It's also possible to add language in the plan the expectations of neighborhood during construction. Staging, parking, and loading could be addressed, or there could be a more general statement that in addition to existing ordinances, developers should be cognizant of the impact on the neighborhood. Ms. Oakley agreed this could be included.

Response: The following language was added at the end of section XII, Design Guidelines:

D. GUIDELINES APPLICABLE DURING CONSTRUCTION

Existing ordinances address some aspects of the noise, fumes, vibration, street

constriction and parking problems attendant on construction projects. Because the neighborhood is so compact, any construction will have an immediate impact on surrounding residences. Developers should be cognizant of this impact and be prepared to mitigate it wherever possible. Additional information will be included in the developer packet."

Dan O'Callaghan said that the plan will be most useful if it's kept at a high level, to set the tone and vision for the future, rather than try to provide a blueprint for every square inch for next 10 years. There is currently a lot of minutia in the plan. It's good to reflect general principles, such as the neighborhood desire for new growth and redevelopment that does not come at the expense of current residents. Rather than specify a particular type of traffic island at a particular intersection, the plan should address traffic calming as a goal, and require that it be done in a thoughtful way that doesn't create problems. He noted that the process for this plan started in 2006, so the neighborhood has been talking about a ten-year plan for eight years. He recommended that the plan focus on big picture ideas like "improve pedestrian safety and movement", rather than get down to the pavement markings. Ms. Oakley said the details are there to articulate the vision and give it meaning, so people understand what we're trying to do. But the board can review the plan to make sure the vision still comes through.

Eric Steege said in light of that, how do we clarify the vision of the neighborhood with respect to parking? Does the neighborhood want more parking or not? Ms. Fullin and Ms. Weber agreed that residential parking and commercial parking are two very different things and do not call for the same solutions. There are many variations and many tradeoffs that can be made. Ms. Oakley said the vision of the plan is to maintain a livable, walkable neighborhood. She observed that with increasing density, it can get harder just to cross the street. The board will look at what the plan says about residential parking requirements and make sure it makes sense and doesn't cause unintended consequences.

Karen Christianson commented that requiring underground parking can make a residential project unaffordable for developers. Some projects may not require parking at all. Ms. Fullin said that in the Village of Shorewood, the village requires underground parking and developers provide it.

Gary Brown, UW director of campus planning said that he recently submitted written comments to Ms. Bidar-Sielaff and to the RNA president. His oral comments relate to Area 6, the east end of the corridor where several university properties are located. He asked about the height of "the continuously shrinking church" and where the height numbers are coming from. He believed that there was an earlier agreement that the height of First Congregational Church is 80 feet at the ridgeline of the nave, as measured at the front of the building. It was his understanding that when the Wisconsin Energy Institute was built, the neighborhood's concern was for protecting the viewshed of the church and not detracting from its presence. That's why the east end of the building was used. The UW needs to know what height is expected; it's unrealistic to think the university properties will only hold two-story buildings. Additionally, the other heights in the plan are inconsistent in terms of the how the number of stories translates to the height in feet.

LD Oakley said that the RNA will look at the stories/feet again and will make sure they are consistent throughout the plan. Betsy Greene agreed that there should be a solid number for the height of the church, although the real issue is about protecting the view of the church and making sure there is not a 12-story building behind it. Ms. Bidar-Sielaff suggested that the number to use for height could be found in the Wisconsin Energy documents.

Response: Due to the slopes at the east end of the Corridor, both west-to-east and south-to-north, it is difficult to compare the heights of buildings measured from grade level. The architectural drawings for WEI phase 1 (as submitted to the Urban Design Commission for its 8/18/10 meeting) were reviewed and found to show the elevations above sea level for the WEI and the church. The roof ridge line of the church is shown as 953.5 feet; the top of the four story facade of the WEI along University Avenue is 951.5 feet. The benchmark for the height of the church will be 953.5 feet.

We have rewritten the recommendations for area 6 to focus on preserving the view of the church at the eastern gateway to the Corridor and transitioning from WEI to the rest of the Corridor. For phase 2 of the WEI, we recommend no increase in height as viewed from the east, which may mean slightly less height from grade because phase 2 will be at a slightly higher elevation. For the rest of area 6, we recommend a maximum height along University Avenue of three stories or 40 feet, stepping back to a maximum of five stories or 55 feet under conditional use.

As for translating the number of stories into the number of feet, we have used the city's conventions from the new zoning code: two stories/35 feet, three stories/40 feet, four stories/52 feet, five stories/55 feet. The most important limit for the neighborhood is the number of feet; if stories are larger than usual, there may be fewer stories for a given height in feet.

Mr. O'Callaghan reiterated that the plan should articulate broad principles such as preserving the viewshed, rather than bogging down in details. A neighborhood plan is not a law; it just needs to set a vision. Ms. Oakley said that the plan still should be clear and consistent. The document has been written by many volunteers, so copy-editing is still needed for consistency. Ms. Weber said that while she agreed somewhat with Mr. O'Callaghan, vision is in the eye of the beholder and developers still want detail. Ms. Greene agreed that the detail is there to illustrate how the vision applies.

Mr. Brown asked about the design guidelines in section 12 of the plan, which refer to residential and commercial properties. Since the university is neither, should he assume they do not apply to UW buildings? Ms. Bidar-Sielaff thanked him for pointing out the omission and said that UW would be included.

Ms. Webber talked about the "auto-oriented" businesses at the Walnut node. She is not certain that the three businesses there are the best use of that parcel, even though she likes them personally. Mr. Brown noted that an east-bound on-ramp for Campus Drive has been discussed as an alternative use for that area. Ms. Webber suggested that the plan clarify if it is seeking to retain specific businesses or just support businesses generally. Finally, she thought that the north side of University could take a lot more height next to Campus Drive, although she knows not everyone would agree.

Mr. Koffel said that overall he was excited about redevelopment in the neighborhood and the possibility of higher-quality buildings in some areas that need them. He thought the design guidelines would help promote that.

Patrick Corcoran noted that the plan is much more restrictive with rear setbacks than the zoning code requires. The code says that the rear setback should be 20 feet, while the plan says it should be 20 feet or 20% of the lot, whichever is greater. He cautioned that if the plan shrinks the footprint of the buildings too much there may be no redevelopment at all, since a smaller building would not be profitable. Some lots on the corridor have environmental cleanup costs that have to be factored in. There are a number of buildings in poor condition that should be replaced, but developers won't bother with this neighborhood if the plan is too restrictive. Or they may come in with a planned development and go around the plan requirements altogether. Ms. Oakley said that the plan would be re-examined to make sure it didn't create an unintended cumulative effect.

Response: The south side of the Corridor backs up to a residential street of single-family homes and small apartment buildings. Adequate rear setbacks are important for new construction to keep any increased density on University Avenue from crowding neighbors to the rear and making those properties less desirable.

Mr. Corcoran agreed with Ms. Webber that the plan should not ask for more residential parking spaces than the city does. He developed a building with no parking that is full all the time. Developers know what they need, so it's best not to be too restrictive in that respect.

Alexis Garrett commented in writing, suggesting that the plan promote shared parking between businesses with day and evening schedules. This would address retail and business parking needs without interfering with residential uses.

Response: This idea is worth exploring, perhaps by the Corridor business association suggested in section VIII, Economic Development. This language has been added to section IX, Transportation Improvements:

"Shared parking between businesses with day and evening schedules should be explored. This would help address retail and business parking needs without interfering with residential uses."

No one else wished to speak. Ms. Oakley thanked everyone for their comments. The RNA board will go over the plan in light of the comments and tighten it up. It will be posted on the RNA website when it's ready to be submitted to the city. People are welcome to submit written comments until the end of July.

Meeting summary submitted by Marcia Vandercook, RNA secretary.

Appendix 3: Survey of Business Owners, October 2010

General

1. Please check the statement below which best describes your interest in Old University Avenue.

I own/represent a mixed-use property **(4)**
I own/represent a residential property
I own/represent a commercial property **(1)**
I own/operate a business **(6)**
I am a resident of the neighborhood **(1)**
Other: Enzyme Institute **(2)**

2. If you are a business owner/tenant, what percentage of your business comes from the following customer base?

	<20%	20%	40%	50%	60%	80%	100%
Neighbors	1	1		2			
Near West Side	1	3					
Madison		3			1	1	
Outside of Madison	2	4					
Online Sales							
Other		1				1	

3. How important is it to create a defined, compact commercial node in the area of University Avenue and Highland?

Unimportant **(2)**
Somewhat Unimportant
Neutral **(4)**
Somewhat Important **(2)**
Important **(4)**

4. The Regent Neighborhood values your retail/service operation in the neighborhood. Looking five years ahead, is it likely that you will:

Continue to operate your business as is **(4)**
Expand your business in neighborhood **(4)**
Expand your business at another location **(2)**
Sell your business
Close your business
Other

University Avenue Appearance

1. What is your impression of the overall existing appearance?

Excellent
Good **(2)**
Fair **(10)**
Poor

2. Which of the following aesthetic improvements would you financially support in the corridor?

	Don't Support	Neutral	Somewhat Support	Support
Banners	2			
Benches	2			
Building Facade Upgrades		4		
Decorative Signage		2		
Flower Pots	2			
Landscaping	2			
Pedestrian Lights		2		
Public Art	2		2	
Trash Receptacles		2		
Other				

3. Which of the following do you think would help in the long-term economic vitality of the corridor?

	Don't Need	Neutral	Somewhat-Needed	Needed
District Branding/ Identity		4	4	
Retail/Business Joint Marketing		4	4	
Wayfinding Signage	2		6	
More Parking	2			10
Free Wi-Fi		2	1	1
Special Events	2	2	4	

Street Usage

1. Which is more important to you on the south side of the 2400 Block of University Avenue where Sushi Box, Suzen Sez, and Miller's Liquor are located?

Two traffic lanes (as is today) **(2)**
On-street parking with no time restrictions
1-hour restrictive parking **(2)**
2-hour restrictive parking **(4)**
Bicycle lane only

2. Which is more important to you on the north and south side of the 2500 Block of University Avenue where Lombardino's, Unearth, New Seoul Korean, Jack's Barber, Lulu's, Blue Moon, and Import Auto Clinic are located?

On-street parking with no time restrictions as is today
1-hour restrictive parking **(2)**
2-hour restrictive parking **(8)**

3. What do you feel are the two most important improvements that would make Old University Avenue more attractive to shop, live and work?

More parking for commercial
Can't survive on neighborhood business alone (only)
More street lights
Parking, City lights
Meter parking on Highland Avenue. Now, UW Hospital employees park all day on Highland Avenue.
More parking for commercial.
Can't survive on neighborhood business only.

Appendix 4: Notes from Meeting with Developers and Lenders

Meeting arranged by the City regarding development issues, March 27, 2012
Present:

Tom Landgraf, Realtor and UW Real Estate Instructor
Paul Lenhart, Krupp Construction
John Martens, Architect and East Side Developer
Mike Weber, Wisconsin Community Bank
Heather Stouder, Jule Stroick, Planning Division
Matt Mikolajewski, Peggy Yessa, Economic Development Division
Natalie Erdman, Community Development Authority
Elizabeth Greene, John Schlaefer, Regent Neighborhood Association Board

University Avenue is cut off:

- Campus Drive is both a barrier and diverts traffic
- UW, hospitals are self contained; people drive there, don't walk down to University Avenue
- Not a lot of action in Corridor, University Avenue is not a destination, not much identity for neighborhood; makes the street neighborhood oriented

Determine what kind of street neighborhood wants University Avenue to be: commercial or residential

- Start by identifying character of different parts and sides of the street to determine what will fit
- Don't forget to mine the historical content on the street
- Feasibility study is valuable in showing neighbors what is realistic; may save developer time and money, also
- Promote "Old" University Avenue brand

Commercial

- Need neighborhood destination places: small businesses neighborhood will support
- Use success of existing businesses and Façade Improvement Grants to attract new businesses
- Address the street in appropriate manner
- Need City cooperation on zoning to fit unique conditions of different areas of the Corridor
- Requires lot assemblage
- Will develop slowly
- Lack of parking on street is problem for commercial; need much more
- Water table causes underground parking to be more expensive

Residential

- Residential in center city is big now; can't get financing for suburban development
- Requires lot assemblage
- Height needed is determined by cost of land acquisition

Appendix 5: Notes from Sustainability Meeting

Meeting arranged by the City regarding sustainability initiatives, March 29, 2012
Present:

Jeanne Hoffman, Manager, Facilities and Sustainability, City Engineering Division
Jule Stroick, Planner, City Planning Division
Carly Myers, Intern, City Planning Division
Mark Faultersack, Madison Gas and Electric (MG&E) Multifamily Services Manager
John Stolzenberg, Hoyt Park Area Joint Neighborhood Plan committee
Darsi Foss, Elizabeth Greene, Christ Petit, John Schlaefer, Regent Neighborhood Association Board

New buildings

- Timing is key. Most energy decisions made when building built new. Later, owners only act if getting killed on energy costs; otherwise, don't want to put in any money.
- Re what we ask of developers: More dollars spent on architecture, less on energy efficiency. Would spend money on energy efficiency rather than LEED certification process.
- Expedited City approval of developments with LEED? No. Schlaefer: could at least expedite RNA process.

Retrofitting older buildings

- We don't know the degree of retrofitting in older buildings. There is little that the City can do to require sustainable practices and retrofitting, so engaging property owners is the best way; get them to partner with MG&E.
- There are property owners who have made significant improvements; could use them in a peer-to-peer approach. Peer-to-peer more effective than the City telling property owners what to do.
- Multifamily residential is hardest sector to motivate; costs just passed on to renters. Student rent dollars are spent for location, not energy efficiency.
- Sources of multifamily energy use:

  Heating - highest
  Domestic hot water - close second
  Lighting - 10-20%
  Cooling is in there somewhere
- Top thing to work on is heating; air barrier most important.

Existing Programs

- "Empower Champions" program. City and MG&E got EPA grant (MG&E matched EPA dollars). Support for businesses to do energy/water audit, implement measures to become more sustainable. Found many businesses just don't have time for sustainability. Corridor businesses could apply to this program as a group.
- EPA "Best Building" competition - track and mitigate energy use using Portfolio Manager.
- MG&E "Green Power" program.
- MG&E has energy audits on web site; could be available to all in about a year. Calculates energy use per square foot.
- Climate Showcase program: just done by Concourse Hotel. Would be good for InnTowner if it gets renovated. Good marketing item for hotels and convention center.
- UW has WeConserve program. Extend off Campus to where students live?

Appendix 6: **Design Ideas**

The following pages illustrate the challenges discussed and ideas generated at the Summer 2010 Art and Design Charrette.

Corridor Unifying Themes

Opportunity: Connect the length of the corridor by creating a brand that represents the unique values, desires and history of University Avenue.

Create a sense of place by visually unifying the corridor and enhancing feelings of arrival to a distinct and unique area of Madison. A series of themed artistic applications and natural enhancements (landscaping) would entice pedestrians to continue their journey to and down University Avenue.

Ideas generated as possible unifying themes:

- Promote the Corridor as a walking educational classroom of green sustainable learning. Provide signage about energy consumption patterns and ways to reduce waste. At bus stops, state the benefits of taking public transportation through a visual display of CO2 reduction, on bike racks the benefits of biking, on storm drains a map of where runoff settles, benefits of eating locally etc.
- The Corridor could be decorated with a "Mile of Tiles" along building facades and sidewalk fixtures that present artistic graphics or inform the traveler of unique facts about the area. Each block could represent a decade with informative tiles, kiosks, or signs relating to an assigned decade.
- Use parabolic shape of the Alicia Ashman bridge as a defining symbol for the corridor, attached to zero lot line buildings and bus stops, use the symbol as part of "Mile of Tiles," shape for bike racks and the armrests of benches.
- Install neighborhood signs at the 2600 block entrance to the Corridor and both bridge entrances to the Corridor utilizing the parabolic shape of the bridge.

Specific "concepts" that have been discussed by the neighborhood to implement these unifying themes include:

Storm water grate, Whistler, BC
Photo courtesy

Concept 1: Educational and artistic storm water grates

Decorative storm grates and sewer covers can educate the public about the importance of proper storm water management as well as act as a unique visual amenity for the corridor. Replacing existing storm water grates with ones similar to those below would provide a unifying effect throughout the corridor.

Sewer covers along Nicolette Mall, Minneapolis, MN.

Images: www.sewerhistory.org/grfx/components/mhcvr_us5.htm

Concept 2: Themed artistic applications along the Corridor

A series of artistic and/or informational tiles or art applications would unify the entirety of the Corridor. Designs, ideals, information or any number of a series of themes would give the pedestrian a reason to continue down the Corridor. The Corridor could be a "Mile of Tiles" in which a series of themed tiles appear along the Avenue. Each block could represent a different decade of time and the respective artistic applications could reflect notable events. Neighborhood symbols such as the Alicia Ashman bridge could be used to unify the Corridor with various artistic applications that resemble its shape appearing on bus stops, building facades, bike racks, benches, etc.

Left Image: www.newseasonsmarket.com/our-stores/seven-corners

Artistic brick applications by Richard Ellis

Concept 3: Environmental education applications

A series of educational and motivational signage along Corridor describing ways to act in an eco-friendly-manner would set the Corridor apart from other areas of Madison as well as draw people along the length of the Avenue. Signs could appear on bus stops, kiosks, light post banners or freestanding posts along the Corridor. Signs could be educational with respect to identifying LEED-certified buildings, benefits of non-auto based transportation, rain gardens, sustainable landscaping and exterior lighting. Signs could detail ways to live sustainably or explain neighborhood efforts to reduce its carbon footprint.

Current Household Emissions in Standard Two-Car Household



Potential Reduction from Replacing Use of One Car with Public Transportation



-4800 lbs CO_2 emissions

Corridor Improvements and Streetscapes

Opportunity: Enhance the quality of neighbors', residents' and guests' experiences in the corridor through pedestrian improvements and aesthetic landscaping.

Ideas generated: Wayfindng signs would draw people to the area from nearby employment centers such as the hospital complex and UW's west campus, as well as direct visitors to desirable locales. Adequate, diverse, and substantial street trees would provide shade cover as well as enhance the pedestrian experience. Crosswalk improvements would increase levels of safety and security for area users. Terrace landscaping would act as a buffer between pedestrians and auto-mobile travelers and act as a visual amenity for the area. Increased street lighting would improve safety in the corridor as well as promote walking as a viable travel mode along the University Avenue Corridor.

Concept 2: Improved street lighting

Increase the supply of energy-efficient, soft pedestrian-level street lighting along the University Avenue Corridor to improve safety and enhance the pedestrian experience. This would be a goal for new private development and remodeling as well as City improvements.

Energy efficient LED lamp post.

Image: optics.org/cws/article/industry/31783/1/



Light post in Bricktown area of Oklahoma City.

Image: flickr.com/photos/valeria-melissia/131149577

Light post, State St. Madison.

Image courtesy of: Archie Nicolet, Madison Planning Department

Concept 1: Wayfinding signs

Wayfinding signs along the corridor would direct visitors to destinations in the area such as UW hospital, UW campus, Madison West High School, Alicia Ashman bridge, bike paths and/or various restaurants and shops along University Avenue.

Directional Wayfinding sign
Image from: www.artscan.ie/

Wayfinding sign, Columbus, Ohio.
Image from: www.transassociates.com/newsletter.php

Image from: www.gilroydispatch.com/news/265780-council-reaches-compromise-on-wayfinding-signs

Concept 3: Street Trees

Promote the diversity, protection and increase the number of large street trees along the Corridor. Require that trees removed for various reasons be replaced with a diverse combination of tree species, with a preference for traditional, large shade trees, to protect the integrity of the Corridor's urban forest street trees. This would be a goal for City, University and private landowners.

Image above from: www.geograph.org.uk/photo/21755

Image left: massengale.typepad.com/photos/main_street_southampton/index.html



Image above from: www.cityofsound.com/photos/bostoncambridge_urban_for/mount_vernon_street_trees.html

Concept 4: Terrace landscaping

Terrace landscaping would improve the visual appearance of the Corridor. The sustainability guidelines promote the use of native plants for landscaping, and the use of rain gardents and bioswales. Edible and ornamental plantings, such as those currently in front of Lombardino's enhance the pedestrian experience and can act as a shield from unsightly parking lots and trash receptacles. Recessed landscape islands can naturally filter and infiltrate stormwater run off from roofs and sidewalks.

Image: www.werf.org/livablecommunities/studies_port_or.htm

Image from: www.land8lounge.com/group/greenstreets

Terrace landscape in front of Lombardino's Restaurant

Image: www.zieglerdesignassociates.com/gallery3.jsp?section=28&id=50

Concept 5: Pedestrian Safety

Pedestrian safety with respect to vehicle traffic was a recurring theme among neighborhood residents. Making crosswalks more visible through signage, raised pedestrian crossings, and color/texture differentiation would improve the visibility of crosswalks for motorists and increase the safety of pedestrians. Particular concern was expressed regarding the intersection of Highland Avenue and University Avenue as well as the Walnut Street and Highland underpasses.

Crosswalk sign, Pearl District.

Image: www.cityofseattle.net/transportation/pedestrian_masterplan/pedestrian_toolbox/tools_enc_signs.htm

Zero Lot-line Buildings

Opportunity: Zero lot line buildings can create the effect of a monotonous enclosure that is unpleasant for the pedestrian. Enhancing the façade of such buildings is one way to negate this effect. Through the use of the Corridor plan's design guidelines, artistic applications, streetscape enhancements and vegetation the building façade can come alive and have a more pleasant interaction with the sidewalk.

Ideas generated: Enhance building façades with the addition of murals or light projections. Affixing lightweight artistic applications along the building façade would enliven the interaction between building and sidewalk. Sculptural designs, such as decorative iron work, would break the monotony of such building facades. Ivy planters, vegetative growth or a living wall will enhance such building façades. For example, adding awnings, sidewalk planters, shrubs, increased use of street trees and/or terrace landscaping along such buildings. Open up the court yard area to public. In some developments, an existing courtyard wall could be created using landscaping, rather than human-made materials. Eliminate the potential for future zero lot line building through zoning mechanisms.



Examples of zero lot-line building

Concept 1: Murals and light projections

Murals and/or light projections on the facades of zero lot-line buildings would enhance the visual appeal of the corridor. Zero lot line buildings along the corridor could take on a theme of murals that provides a unique experience for the neighborhood.

Image from: mediacity.mit.edu. Mural by: Skagen Brakhage

Image from: www.createourworld.net/tag/graphitti/

Image from: www.createourworld.net/tag/graphitti/

Concept 2: Textured/artistic building facades

Attaching light weight artistic applications to the facades of zero lot line buildings would enhance the visual appeal of the corridor. Such art applications would add texture to the building faces as well as break up the mo-notony of significant building facades.

Above: 14th St. Corridor in Washington D.C.

Curated by: Welmoed Laanstra

carolinamayorga.alkem.org/series/dac_9_2.html

Metal fish

Image from: www.haitimetalart.com/catalog/item/6199939/6004276.htm

Example of a textured building facade

Concept 3: Living Building Facades

Enhancing the building façade with hanging ivy or creating a living wall can add life to the building face, and can add a pleasant aspect to the pedestrian experience.

Above: Hanging Ivy

Image: www.superstock.com/stock-photos-images/1570r-116668

Right: Green Building

Image: planetoddity.com/green-shop-made-from-natural-material/

Concept 4: Awnings/streetscape improvements

The addition of awnings, street planters, light fixtures and outdoor seating areas creates a more three-dimensional interaction between the building façade and the sidewalk, as detailed in the Corridor's design adn sustainability guidelines.

Enhanced streetscape of zero lot line buildings.

Image: dumbonyc.com/2007/08/07/pearl-st-press-conference/

Image from: www.dbarchitect.com/project_detail/83/Hotel%20Healdsburg.html

"Greening The Corridor"

Opportunity: By creating a "sustainable Corridor" through the use of environmentally friendly building materials, alternative energy sources, innovative storm water management strategies and multi-modal neighborhood design, University Avenue can become a leader in local sustainable development and living practices.

Ideas generated: Utilize rain gardens and bioswales to capture pollutants and nutrient runoff before they enter nearby lakes. Capture and reuse rain water in creative and innovative ways. Utilize energy efficient building practices and explore alternative sources of energy to allow the Corridor to develop a name as a leader in sustainability. Streets and streescapes should contain multi-modal design elements. The Corridor's proximity to the nearby UW campus and Energy Institute provides the opportunity to become a walking educational classroom through informative and artistic design elements and landscaping. New construction and retrofits should be done to a structure's interior and exterior through the use of environmentally friendly and energy efficient materials and appliances.

Concept 1: Alternative energy/ building practices

Through the use of environmentally friendly building design and materials the corridor can become a leader in the field of sustainability and act as a prototype for other neighborhoods throughout the city. Retrofitting existing buildings with energy efficient windows, insulation, and appliances will decrease the environmental impact of the corridor. Encouraging new permitted use and planned development (i.e., non-permitted use) buildings to incorporate as many features of the Corridor's Design and Sustainability Guidelines as economically feasible.

Solar panel example



Pervious concrete application in North Carolina.

LEED logo

Before (top left) and after (right) image of a bioswale site in Sarasota, Florida

Concept 2: Rain gardens and bioswales

Using rain gardens and bioswales as methods of storm water management will act as filtering mechanisms for hazardous pollutants and runoff as well as enhance the visual landscape of the corridor. Such attributes would also help to alleviate area flooding during rain events. See the Design and Sustainability Guidelines for more examples and details.

Bioswale, Puget Sound

Concept 3: Capturing and reusing rainwater

Innovative design of rain drainage systems and rain water detention devices can draw attention to the importance of responsible storm water management as well as act as a visual amenity to building facades and streetscapes and help University Avenue enhance it's reputation as a leader in green technology implementation

Rain drainage system, Seattle, WA

Rain drainage system Dresden, Germany

Rain barrel, Portland, OR

Concept 4: Promote alternatives to the personal automobile

Promoting the Corridor as a multi-modal transportation area can allow users and visitors the opportunity to experience University Avenue in a more personal way while at the same time creating a name for the Corridor as an eco-friendly area. With the addition of bicycle amenities, pedestrian-friendly environments, and easy and comfortable access to mass transit University Avenue can become a multi-modal transportation corridor.

Pedestrian seating area

Western Gateway to Corridor

Location: 2600 block University Avenue

Opportunity: The 2600 block of University Avenue acts as the western most entrance to the corridor. The neighborhood hopes to create a unique "gateway" or iconic symbol that would provide a sense of arrival to a distinct Madison location in this area.

Ideas generated: Create a small "pocket park" or urban oasis on the north side of the 2600 block, between University Avenue and Campus Drive. Erect a green, living wall or an artistic fabricated wall of recycled materials along Campus Drive to create a visual and auditory barrier between users and passing traffic. Placement of landscaping, artwork and benches to invite neighbors and visitors to linger. Potentially include some type of orchard for urban gardening could be implemented. Utilize the space as a location for food carts, farmers market and public gatherings. Create an archway at the Grand Avenue intersection to inform travelers that they have arrived at a destination. Erect a "Welcome to the Regent Neigbhorhood" sign in front of the utility box to inform travelers of arrival, as well as increase the visual appeal of the site. Use traffic calming techniques to slow incoming traffic. Provide wayfinding signs that inform travelers of desirable destinations along the corridor.



Current views of western entrance to University Avenue

Concept 1: Build Visual and Auditory Barrier Along Campus Drive

Creating a visual and auditory barrier between the green space and highly traveled Campus Drive can provide safety for users of the location as well as add an identifying symbol for the corridor, marking its place as a unique destination. The barrier itself could become a unique symbol through the use of recycled materials or living green walls. The neighborhood could partner with the UW campus and US Forest Products lab on designing an installation.



Metal tree artwork at the gateway to the Bristol and Bath Railway Path, UK.

Designed by Cod Steaks Image from: www.flickr.com/photos/antphotos

Passage" at Jesup Blair Park - Georgia Ave-nue, Silver Spring, MD. Designed by Linda DePalma

Concept 2: Urban oasis / pedestrian park

Utilize the site as a small urban oasis or pedestrian park. Seating areas and visually appealing landscape applications would create a destination and/or resting place along the corridor. The area can also be used for small gatherings such as a farmers market or neighborhood concert. Food carts could also call this space home attracting employees from nearby institutions such as the UW and VA hospitals.

Urban park in Ithaca NY

Image: www.sustainablesites.org/cases/enlarge.php?id=18&image=2

Food cart in Library Mall, Madison

Image: badgerherald.com/news/2007/11/01/street_vendors_seet_.php

Concept 3: Erect a visual/auditory barrier along Campus Drive and corridor entrance

Creating a visual and auditory barrier between the green space and highly traveled Campus Drive would provide safety for users of the location as well as add an identifying symbol for the corridor, marking its place as a unique destination. The barrier itself can become a unique symbol through the use of recycled materials or living green walls.

Open air library in Germany, winner of Best Public Spaces 2010, wall made from recycled materials

www.bustler.net/index.php/article/european_prize_for_urban_public_space_-_winners_2010/

Right: Living or green wall

Image: www.jsroofing.com/JsRoof-ing_Living-Walls.html

Highland and Walnut Street Bridges and Underpasses

Location: Campus Drive & Highland Avenue, Campus Drive & Walnut Street

Opportunity: The underpasses at these locations act as the interface between the University Avenue Corridor and major destinations such as the UW and VA hospitals and the west end of the UW campus. These underpasses provide for an opportunity to declare such a relationship, to act as a landmark that defines the end of one area and the beginning of another.

Ideas generated: Make the underpasses more aesthetically pleasing through the application of small murals and/or artistic lighting along underpass faces. Artistic wayfinding signs could be added for pedestrians and bicyclists. Increase safety for pedestrians and bicyclists by widening sidewalks, clearly marking bike lanes on roadway, as well as the addition of pedestrian level lighting. In partnership with the UW, MATC and West High School art programs, a design charette for each bridge could be held, and the winning design implemented through grants and donations. Soften the horizontal span of the bridges through the use of color contrast. Add a back panel to already existing signs to "set-off" their appearance. Add small landscaping elements, extending from underpass support beams.

Current view of bridge underpasses

Concept 1: Enahance horizontal bridge face

The addition of a second color to the horizontal bridge face or the application of metal artwork will provide for a more pleasing aesthetic experience. The bridges will become more iconic and take on character that it currently lacks. Color schemes could coordinate with themes of particular interest to the areas such as red when entering UW campus or green when entering the University Avenue Corridor. Metal ironwork could further develop desirable artistic themes along the Corridor. Add small landscaping elements, such as ivy, to bridge façade. Include neighborhood signage to the north sides of the bridges, "welcoming" travelers to to the Regent Neighborhood. Enhance the look of the Walnut St. railroad bridge by ensuring that it is painted and it be maintained.

Examples of two toned bridges



Image: www.creativedesignresolutions.com/projects/highway/bridges/benning-road-(proposal)/36.html?headerbar=0

Greely, Colorado. Image: http://lorisandassociates.com/services/vehicular-bridges/11th-avenue-bridge

Example of metal artistic application

Image: www.cambridgema.gov/gallery/?AlbumID=111&level=album

Concept 2: Enhance the underpass walls

The underpasses can become an iconic symbol for the area through the use of artistic murals. Such applications can become a defining characteristic of the Corridor and embed its place as a distinct location within the greater Madison area.

blog.chicagoweekly.net/2010/04/16/chicagoist-highlights-local-murals/

Mural in Chicago

Image: //chicagoist.com/2009/08/26/foster_avenue_underpass_opening_fol.php?gal-lery0Pic=14#gallery

Concept 3: Underpass lighting

The addition of artistic lighting applications or simple, energy-efficient pedestrian-level lighting along the bridge underpasses would allow the underpasses to make a statement as well as enhance the safety for pedestrian and bicyclists.

(Below) Underpass Lighting. Brooklyn, NY.

Image: www.architizer.com/en_us/projects/view/this-way-brooklyn-bridge-underpass/512/

(Above) Simple application of pedestrian lights

Image: www.pedbikeimages.org/pubdetail.cfm?picid=1195

San Antonio

Image: //blackand-fawngallery.com

Alicia Ashman Pedestrian Bridge

Location: 1700 block University Avenue

Opportunity: The Alicia Ashman bridge is one of few safe opportunities for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross Campus Drive to access the UW campus. An opportunity exists to draw attention to the bridge through artistic applications as well as utilize a small green space node at the entrance to maximize the potential of this amenity.

Ideas generated: The bridge is a major pedestrian/bicycle connection between the neighborhood and UW facilities to the north, as well as to those classrooms near the Energy Institute and engineering buildings.. Making this connection visual through the use of colors and symbols would allow the relationship between the Corridor and the UW to be explicit. Vertical sculptures could be added at the Alicia Ashman Bridge opening that represent this connection. Such amenities could attract attention to the area, as well as the destinations that lie on either side of the bridge. Creating an open sweeping plaza that extends to both sides of the bridge would provide a destination for area residents, UW and hospital workers and visitors alike. The addition of Wi-Fi at the open space node could further create a desirable destination. Wayfinding signage that clearly describes destinations on both sides of the bridge would enhance the relationship between the Corridor and destinations to the north. Food carts, either on a seasonal or temporary basis, could further enhance this area as a place to linger or even as a destination.

Current views of Alicia Ashman Bridge



Concept 1: Draw attention to the bridge through artistic applications

Attract attention to the bridge by using artistic applications such as vertical sculptures and multi-colored crosswalks. Such applications would make the bridge more visible to pedestrians and bicyclists as well as increasing awareness of passing motorists, thus increasing safety at this location.

Potential ideas for sculpture shape, using symbolism to connect to destinations on other side. Sketches courtesy of: Ingrid Slammer



Concept 2: Maximize potential of green space node

Turn an underutilized open space into a more inviting, active space to maximize the potential as well as draw additional attention to the site. Provide wi-fi, water attributes, benches, food carts, and artistic amenities to create a welcoming and desirable destination along the Corridor.

Below: Current view of open space looking south from Alicia Ashman Bridge

Pedestrian plaza, Jersey Shore

Image: www.streetsblog.org/2006/08/23/pedestrian-safety-competition-at-the-jersey-shore/

Park in Savannah, Georgia

Image: www.city-data.com/picfilesv/picv15544.php

Concept 3: User amenities

Simple user amenities such as drinking fountains, seating areas, and wayfinding signs would greatly increase the functionality of this green space node.

Image: //pi-casaweb.google.com/lh/photo/dh8eRrW0ClU-Cix2BJMkhSg

(Below) Image: commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Oak_park_bench.jpg

(Right) Image: www.eveandersson.com/photo-display/large/usa/or/portland-tower-district-water-fountain.html

Plan Recommendation and Implementation Strategy

Recommendation	Range	Lead Agency	Implementation
Land Use and Zoning			
Amend the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan to reflect proposed changes depicted on Map 14.	Short-term	Planning Division	-Submit request to Plan Commission from District Alderperson and RNA.
Amend Draft Zoning Map to reflect proposed changes depicted on Map 15.	Short-term	Planning Division	-Submit request to Plan Commission from District Alderperson and RNA.
Use the UAC Plan to review new development proposals or major alternations. The UAC Plan identifies land uses, building placement, and site guidelines.	Ongoing	Planning Division, in conjunction with RNA and the business community	-Provide UAC Plan to builders, developers, and real estate agents at the time of contact.
Explore the level of support to establish an urban design district for University Avenue from Breese Terrace to Farley Avenue.	Long-Term	RNA, in conjunction with Planning Division and Office of Business Resources	-RNA, in conjunction with district alderperson, will coordinate a meeting with property owners. Invite city staff to discuss process to establish a district. Work with Planning Division to allocate staff resources to develop urban design ordinance.
Transportation			
Install wayfinding signage at Grand, Highland and Walnut to assist motorists and bicyclists in locating specific destinations including UW-Madison, Veterans and UW Hospitals.	Long-Term	Traffic Engineering	-Working with RNA and the business community, identify locations and type of signage. Capital Budget Request. Estimated Cost: $
Install restrictive 1-2 hour parking lanes on the 2400-2500 blocks of University Avenue.	Short-Term	Traffic Engineering	-Mark parking lanes at the time 2550 University Avenue construction is completed. Capital Budget Request. Estimated Cost: $
Redesign former WiDOT parking lot to accommodate additional restrictive 1-2 hour parking for commercial users. Incorporate multiuse space for community events, such as farmers market, in parking lot design.	Short-Term	Traffic Engineering, in conjunction with Engineering	-Work with City Engineering and the RNA to prepare parking lot design. Capital Budget Request. Estimated Cost: $
Install pedestrian style lights on the 2200-2500 blocks of University and on Highland Avenue leading toward University of Wisconsin Hospital & Clinics. [Walnut St. lights needed?]	Long-Term	Traffic Engineering, in conjunction with Office of Business Resources	-Traffic Engineering will work with RNA or newly formed business association at the time property owners want to install lighting. Electric conduit was installed as part of University Ave. reconstruction project. Property owners will be assessed cost of pedestrian lighting at time of installation.

Work with Village of Shorewood Hills, University of Wisconsin Hospital & Clinics, the Veterans Hospital and the US Forest Products Lab to improve the aesthetic and ease of pedestrian and bicycle movement on Highland leading toward UW Hospital & Clinics. Improve pedestrian crossing at on-ramp, complete sidewalk gaps, improve streetscape amenities and landscaping.	Long-Term	Traffic Engineering, in conjunction with RNA private property owners	-Future transportation studies or major building projects should include additional details on pedestrian accessibility and safety.
Install street lighting on existing power poles and add pedestrian amenities such as benches, bicycle racks, trash cans, and bus shelters along University Ave. where appropriate.	Long-Term	Traffic Engineering, in conjunction with Metro Transit	-RNA will identify locations for streetscape amenities. Determine if locations are appropriate, total cost, and funding source for features. Capital Budget Request. Estimated Cost: $___ light per pole, $ ___ per bench, $300-$675 per bicycle rack, $___per trash can, and $8,000-$10,000 per bus shelter.
Plant new street trees for consistent coverage and treat existing larger caliber ash to improve resistance to Emerald Ash Borer where feasible.	Long-Term	Parks Division, Forestry	Evaluate sites for new street trees. Cost Estimate: $ ___ per street tree.
Mark bicycle lanes between University Ave. and Gifford Pinchot Drive. Place wayfinding signs at Southwest Bicycle Path.	Short-Term	Traffic Engineering	-Request Traffic Engineering, in conjunction with UW-Madison, to mark bicycle lanes and install wayfinding sign.
Assess the feasibility of an east bound ramp to Campus Drive	Long-Term	Traffic Engineering	-At the time of major redevelopment, assess the feasibility of constructing a on and off ramp. Capital Budget Request. Cost Estimate: $
Install a traffic calming measure at the intersection of Grand and University to slow down vehicular speed.	Long-Term	Traffic Engineering	-Work with District Alderperson, RNA and abutting property-owners [no hyphen!] to measure level of support, select appropriate traffic calming measure, and apply for placement. Cost Estimate: Varies depending on traffic calming measure. Capital Budget Request. Cost Estimate: $
Bury underground electric lines on the 2400-2500 blocks of University Avenue at the time of street reconstruction.	Long-Term	Property-Owners [no hyphen]	-At the time of major street reconstruction, determine the level of support of abutting property owners to bury power lines. Property-owners are assessed ___ % of cost.
Replace chain link fence, remove invasive species, and plant native tree and shrub species on south side of Campus Drive.	Long-Term	Engineering	-Improve appearance of the 10-15 foot right-of-way which exists between the rear property lines and Campus Drive. Capital Budget request. Cost Estimate: $ ___per linear foot.

Economic			
Establish a formal business association for improved communications, joint marketing, and area private-public improvements.	Short-Term	RNA, in conjunction with business community	-Identify business leaders in the University Avenue Corridor to talk with peers.
Promote city-county-state business grant and loan programs, such as the Façade Improvement Loan, to area business and property owners.	Ongoing	Office of Business Resources	-Target individual business in target area with eligible projects. Façade Improvement Program is available for eligible projects on University Avenue between Chestnut and Farley.
Assess the level of support to establish a Business Improvement District to help defray the cost of marketing, improvements, and way finding of the University Avenue Corridor.	Long-Term	RNA, in conjunction with business community	-Identify business leaders in the University Avenue Corridor to work with the business community on assessing the costs and benefits of a BID District. The Office of Business Resources could assist in providing information to local businesses.
Develop a branding strategy for University Avenue. Part of the branding could include change of street name from University to Old University Avenue.	Short-Term	RNA, in conjunction with business community, multifamily property-owners, and institutional leaders	
Promote neighborhood retail and services in neighborhood communications, such as the RNA Newsletter and web site, to encourage residents to use local services.	Short-Term	RNA	-Work with local businesses to promote neighborhood businesses to residents.
Encourage property owners to install streetscape amenities, such as benches, bicycle racks, and pedestrian lighting.	Short-Term	RNA	-Work with local businesses and property-owners to install pedestrian-friendly amenities on site. .
Environment			
Determine the level of support among businesses and multifamily property-owners for promoting sustainability along the Corridor.	Short-Term	RNA, Sustainability Subcommittee	-Work with City of Madison, Focus on Energy, and MGE to identify and solicit grant funding for University Avenue.
Identify property owners willing to enroll in MPower Champion Program, Focus on Energy, MGE Portfolio Manager and other programs.	Short-Term	RNA, Sustainability Subcommittee	-Work with Work with City of Madison, Focus on Energy, and MGE to conduct peer-to-peer or informational meetings for UAC property-owners.
Outreach to UW-Madison Office of Sustainability to explore a potential partnership to educate, inform and involve students on sustainability practices.	Short-Term	RNA, Sustainability Subcommittee	
Install a rain garden on the north side of the 2600 block of University Avenue.	Short-Term	Engineering, in conjunction with RNA	-Work with City Engineering to prepare design and cost estimates. Solicit private and public funding. Capital Budget Request. Cost Estimate: $

Identity and Public Art Features			
Establish entry features at important portals into the district at the east (Breese Terrace) and west (Grand Avenue) gateways.	Short-Term	RNA, in conjunction with City Arts Commission	-Develop design and solicit private and public funding for features. Apply to Dane County Cultural Affairs Commission, Madison Arts Commission, and Neighborhood Planning Grant Program.
Design and install art installation at entrance way leading to Alicia Ashman pedestrian bridge.	Long-Term	RNA, in conjunction with UW-Madison	-Develop design and solicit private and public funding for artistic features.
Apply artistic, decorative treatment on the Highland and Walnut Street bridges.	Long-Term	RNA, in conjunction with Madison Arts and Traffic Engineering	-Develop design and solicit private and public funding for artistic features. Apply to Dane County Cultural Affairs Commission, Madison Arts Commission, and UW-Madison.

Pedestrian and Streetscape Recommendations



Bicycle Improvements

1 - Bicycle Lanes on Walnut
2 - Bicycle Crossing Improvement
3 - Bicycle Wayfinding

Pedestrian Improvements

1 - Crosswalk Improvement at Alicia Ashman Bridge
2 - Lighting at Walnut Bridge
3 - Pedestrian Access and Path
4 - Bus Shelter

Roadway Improvements

1 - Traffic Calming/ Diversion
2 - Wayfinding
3 - East Bound Ramp at Walnut
4 - Bury Powerlines

Parking Improvements

1 - Public Parking Lot

Enhancement Recommendations



Gateway

1 - Artistic Feature at Alicia Ashman Bridge
2 - Artistic Feature at Grand Avenue
3 - Pedestrian Lights, Benches and Bicycle Racks

Landscape Improvements

Artwork

1 - Affix Artwork to Highland Bridge Horizontal Front
2 - Interior Wall Artwork at Walnut Street Bridge
3 - Affix Artwork/Plantings to Long Spans of Building Walls

Greenspace & Landscaping

1 - Rain Garden
2 - Urban Greenspace Pockets
3 - Street End Improvements
4 - Improved Fencing and Plantings

Adopting Resolution

The University Avenue Corridor Plan is adopted as a supplement of the Madison Comprehensive Plan. The University Avenue Corridor Plan was introduced on January 7, 2014 to the Common Council for adoption. During the adoption process, nine City boards and commissions reviewed the plan recommendations for approval. Attached to this neighborhood plan is the Common Council resolution that designates the lead City agencies and departments to implement the plan recommendations (see Common Council Resolution). Inclusion of neighborhood improvement projects in the capital or operating budgets, work plans, or other sources of funding from state or federal governments are possible ways to implement plan recommendations.

The Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development (Planning Division) will submit status reports to the Common Council on plan recommendation implementation. It will be important for the neighborhood to campaign strategically for plan implementation. It is crucial that neighborhood associations develop a strategy for plan implementation. Governmental officials, City departments, and non-profit organizations must be approached for funding during their annual budget cycles.