

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** May 24, 2017

TITLE: 1860 Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Drive –  
University of Wisconsin-Madison Campus  
Institutional (CI) District Master Plan.  
(46950)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Chris Wells, Acting Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: May 24, 2017

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, Lois Braun-Oddo, Amanda Hall, Tom DeChant and Michael Rosenblum.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 24, 2017, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the University of Wisconsin-Madison Campus Institutional (CI) District Master Plan. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Brown, Aaron Williams and Bill Patek, all representing UW-Madison.

The Commission was tasked with three things: building design review (standards and guidelines); categories of membership (of the ‘new’ Campus Design Review Board); and review procedures (coordination, format, and process).

Gary Brown of UW-Madison Campus Planning wanted the Commission to focus on Chapters 6 (*Design Review Process*) and 7 (*Campus Design Guidelines and Standards*).

**Building Design Review (Campus Standards & Guidelines)**

Brown reviewed the Campus Design Neighborhoods section outlined in the plan, noting the entire campus is divided into ‘design neighborhoods.’ For each neighborhood, the Master Plan (MP) contains information on the massing and scale, building heights, build-to lines, build-to dimensions, landscape principles, material and styles and various design considerations.

Brown noted the differences in building height in the Master Plan versus the City of Madison’s current planning documents. He reviewed the existing Campus Institutional (CI) District as well as which parcels, currently zoned Planned Development (PD) District are proposed to be rezoned to CI zoning, and briefly explained the process.

Campus Planning has a SketchUp model where they can examine individual buildings and how the proposed Master Plan is similar/different from City of Madison neighborhood plans. The landscaping plan will create “corridors of landscaping.”

The Master Plan is not prescriptive of the landscaping or buildings, but part of an overall context. They have identified “hero” buildings, which should stand out, versus “good soldiers,” which are more supportive and in the background.

### Categories of Membership (of the ‘New’ Campus Design Review Board)

Brown outlined the current 11-membership architectural review committee, now being called the "Campus Design Review Board," which will have one Urban Design Commission representative. There will be 7 voting members and 4 non-voting members to work on a consensus basis.

Ald. Verveer requested that the Alder (specific to the area of the project discussed/voted on) be added as a non-voting member. The Master Plan has classified this as an ‘Ad Hoc City of Madison Alder’ (non-voting). Ald. Bidar-Sielaff questioned the (voting) neighborhood liaison not being representative of the affected neighborhood. This was resolved by adding a non-voting position from the affected neighborhood board (‘Ad Hoc Campus Planning Committee Liaison’).

### Review Procedures (coordination, format, and process)

The review procedures were discussed as follows:

- Will review projects at approximately 10%, 35%, and 90% of the way through completion.
- Would have a public comment period during each project review to hear comments from neighbors, campus users and the general public.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Will the board meet on a regular basis or as needed?
  - We’ll have a regularly scheduled time (3rd Thursday of the month), but will cancel it if no need.
- Who is the “client?”
  - It depends on if there is state taxpayer, in which case the state will be the client. If it is gift-funded, then campus Planning will be the client. But overall, the User Group (i.e. the tenants of the building, usually the Dean of the school located in the building) will be the client.
- Is it appropriate for the UDC representative to bring it back to the UDC members without the review of the staff? (UDC members added: Would they be doing it in the public setting of the committee?).
  - The UW would want to be present to give a full presentation.
- Had reservation about doing this. Need to be careful about creating a walking quorum.
- I have concerns with certain (Brutalist) buildings.
  - We are currently discussing this and working out an agreement with the local historical society. Concerned about buildings that are almost 50 years old. Have defined steps when taking down buildings.
- More concerned about adjacent historic buildings...wanted a process about determining how these design issues will be handled.
  - If something is a landmark it will still need to go through the City’s process. We’ll make sure this process is outlined in the Master Plan document.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by O’Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).