

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: August 18, 2010
TITLE: 1552 University Avenue – PUD(GDP-SIP) for Wisconsin Energy Institute, New Laboratory Building. 5 th Ald. Dist. (16837)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: August 18, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner and Melissa Huggins.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 18, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP) for both phases of the project, and an SIP for the first phase of the project located at 1552 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Eric Lawson and Patrick Gleason, representing the State of Wisconsin; Gary Brown, representing UW-Madison; Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, representing the 5th Aldermanic District; and John Schlaefer, representing the Regent Neighborhood Association; Staff reminded the Commission to be very specific about their recommendations and conditions relative to the overall PUD-GDP for both Phase I and II and the PUD-SIP for Phase I. Lawson provided revised plans showing the relationship to the nave of the church across the street by dropping the fifth floor office block, creating a significant setback and lowering the leading edge. A different pattern of exterior has been introduced with yellow brick that matches the rest of University Avenue, with zinc metal panels on the interior, to simplify and provide symmetry. He noted that by changing the fifth floor the entire building has been reprogrammed, because of an uneven number of offices to match with laboratories. Updated plans show fifty-five (55) parking stalls on the east side of the building, doubled from the last time. Bike and moped parking is being provided on the west and back sides of the building. Saiki reviewed the landscape plans, including detention and demonstration areas. A café and patio space is available along University Avenue, along with a full garden space set back from University Avenue. The lighting design includes two poles, along with lighting underneath entryway overhangs. Minimal lighting will be provided on the access drive between this building and the ROTC building. Some lighting is being provided behind the high buy screen wall for maintenance. Offices from the fifth floor have been moved down through the building and reduced the element of exposure on the south side of the building allowing for the stepback above the fourth floor along the University Avenue elevation. A sound study has been completed, reading noise from six different locations around the building and in the neighborhood, as far away as Summit. It is believed all the systems for the building will be within the sound criteria of the existing noise generated levels. Three areas of the building have been refined based on Commissioner’s comments from the last meeting. The east story façade has been simplified with brick on the left and right sides of the building and zinc bars in the center, highlighted by the light well in the middle; a sort of bookend design. The brick face is turned closer to the old University Avenue/neighborhood side. The window pattern has been simplified by removing the middle row of windows, leaving a single window at each of the stair landings. Since packets were issued, the zigzag of the conference

room on the end has been changed by adding one more bay of the vertical accent piece/office fenestration. All spandrel glass has been left in the center to highlight the main entries. A wind tunnel study is being performed on the stacks. Different colored paving and possibly accent stripes will be used at the main entry to the building. Larger brick band reveals will be used to break up the mass of the tower over the main lab façade. The louver of the main mechanical intake of the lab air handling units will have a darker paint to match accent stripes, with accent stripes repeating down the tower. Public testimony was as follows:

- John Schlaefter of the Regent Neighborhood Association spoke, noting that they are very appreciative of how the UW has worked to address the neighborhood concerns. However, they still have serious concerns about Phase II massing and how it will affect the church and the street. The Regent Neighborhood Association does support Phase I.
- Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff spoke, thanking the University for their hard work. She spoke to the neighborhood's two remaining concerns: the GDP approval for Phase II, which she requested be tabled at this time and that the Commission just concentrate on the GDP approval for Phase I. She noted discomfort with the massing and scaling of Phase II. She also spoke to the height of the stacks and their hopes that their heights will be dictated by a Commission decision.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The trees along Campus Drive could be larger to go with the mass and help pull that scale down.
- The east façade still looks kind of “sandwichy” to me. I have no problem with the massing of the building.
- It looks a lot better; seems like a much more attractive and coherent building.
- Appreciate that you brought down the height.
- The Campus Drive renderings look really cool.
- I really like the height. I know the neighborhood and Madison struggles with height and I appreciate the changes that you made.
- How will the glass atrium feature be highlighted at night?
 - There will be enough ambient light in the building to highlight this feature without light spillage occurring. You'll be able to see straight through it.
- The small windows on the stairwell are reminiscent of an older type of architecture. It's a juxtaposition of great open glass and tiny “Soviet” style windows.
- The height change is the nod you needed and it gives you more freedom elsewhere.
- The masonry on the office piece is a nicer, more subtle read.
- On the east elevation, the two elements abut rather than interlock. Study that joint a little more.
- The brick that wraps around makes it look like infill.
- There are enough good variation between heights and materials and detailing that it doesn't look like a sandwich.
- I share concerns for the windows in the stair tower, the scale is too small. It may be the symmetrical approach of the windows.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the PUD-GDP for Phase I and Phase II. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided that design issues associated with massing, scaling, height articulation, setback/stepbacks, siting and footprint are subject to further consideration with future PUD-SIP for Phase II.

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the PUD-SIP for Phase I. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Utilize taller trees along Campus Drive and look at better interweaving of the spaces with landscaping materials off the east elevation.
- The intersection of the two towers on the east elevation are further studied and resolved with the integration of screening at the top of the building.
- Need to resolve abruptness on how the north tower connects to the stair tower on the east elevation.
- The scale of windows in the stair tower on the east elevation is too small, maybe the symmetrical approach in windows. The proportion of glazing should be studied.
- Add something more than lights in the door on the lower east elevation next to the coffee shop.
- Extend the first floor glazing system for Education and Outreach room to the bottom of the second story element on the north tower of the east elevation.
- Study the entrance elevation on old University Avenue, it appears small; visually make adjoining windows and mullions the same trim as the aluminum door so the entrance is clear with integration between spandrel panels and masonry panels continued to be developed above.
- Resolve issue with the height and screening of stacks, their integration architecturally along with the louver atop the building.
- All architectural modifications shall return for approval.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 6, 6.5, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1552 University Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating	
Member Ratings	6	7.5	6	-	-	-	7	7	
	7	8	8	7	6	6	8	7	
	6	5	5	-	-	6	6	6	
	8	8	-	-	-	-	9	8	
	6	6	6	7	8	8	7	6.5	

General Comments:

- More coherent architecture with change of material along Old University makes buildings more attractive. Interesting variation of layers, fenestration lowering office portion along Old University successfully addressed neighborhood concerns. Building steps down and respects church much better than earlier iterations. Plan Commission should separate Phase 2 of GDP because bulk and massing will need more study and dialogue with neighborhood.
- Appreciate work to lower office block; excited to see it built.
- Study bringing subtle offset horizontal read above Old University entry. Excellent effort addressing context.
- Resolution of Old University highly successful.

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: July 21, 2010
TITLE: 1552 University Avenue – PUD(GDP-SIP) for Wisconsin Energy Institute New Laboratory Building. 5 th Ald. Dist. (16837)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: July 21, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Jay Ferm and Henry Lufler.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 21, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for the Wisconsin Energy Institute located at 1552 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Brown, Alan Fish, Pete Heaslett and Abbie Moilien, all representing UW-Madison; Jim Moravec, representing the Wisconsin Department of State Facilities; Eric Lawson, representing the State of Wisconsin; Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, representing the 5th District; Patrick Gleason and John Schlaefer. Registered in opposition were JoAnne F. Kloppenburg, representing the Regent Neighborhood Association; and Ronnie Hess. Moilien presented revised details including:

- The building has been moved 10-feet to the east.
- 43 bike stalls are shown throughout the site versus the 16 previously.
- Moped parking has been increased.
- Planting areas have been extended to accentuate the main entry plaza to the building and provide more privacy for the café seating area.
- Granite pavers would be used to mark the main entry.
- The east entry will have a permeable granite paver patio.
- Bio-fuel demonstration areas will use prairie grasses.

Moravec detailed changes for the south elevation, including making the top appear different from the floors below it, addressing the major comments about the façade needing more dimension and having a greater sense of entry from Breese Terrace.

Public testimony was as follows:

- JoAnne Kloppenburg, representing the Regent Neighborhood Association felt that there could have been more of a dialog with the neighborhood. This building is a flagship for the University but it is also a gateway to the Regent Neighborhood. They continue to have concerns that the mass of the building is too big for the rest of the neighborhood. There is also continued concern with the height of the building as it relates to the intent of the neighborhood. There is also concern about the noise.

- Ronnie Hess also expressed concerns with mass and scale and the lack of communication with the neighborhood. She has real concern with the “smokestacks” coming from the building, that even though they will not be emitting smoke it is completely out of character with the neighborhood.

Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff spoke to the importance of this gateway corner in our city and this neighborhood. In her opinion this building still does not transition between the end of the campus to the beginning of the Regent Neighborhood. She stated the noise and industrial appearance of this building do not reflect the feel of the neighborhood.

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- What is the big idea here, architecturally? Moravec and Heaslett noted:
 - The design reflects saving energy, first and foremost.
 - A space and place that inspires collaborative thinking and brings people together.
- How does your design respond to the neighboring buildings?
 - Heaslett: The building form recedes away from neighboring buildings.
- Appreciate your attempt to simplify the building, much improved.
- The color palette works well in framing the church.
- Don't have a problem with the building competing with the church.
- The pulling of the building form into the landscape strengthens your concept.
- Agree with the concept of having a taller building mass here; creates a better edge to neighborhood than Campus Drive.
- The height relationship is not respected on this side of the street (Old University).
- Halo not a strong enough gesture to relate to church, what can be done to top floor of atrium or light well in combination?
- Architecture doesn't portray vision of Wisconsin Energy Institute, section across from church needs tuning.
- Like building and mission with mass OK; need more work to reduce impression of façade with neighborhood.
- The south elevation doesn't read as a light well with two bays, it reads as four with light well as a bar. Make light well higher or its roof to read better as part of the south elevation.
- The face on old University is too vertical, it doesn't have a strong enough relationship to the church.
- Some of the proportions are starting to lead its way to a dialog with the church.
- The landscape is coming along pretty well.
- There is going to be concern about the second building with shading on Campus Drive.
- Provide more views coming from west and north, as well as details of the north elevation.
- Provide full plan details and elevations in the application packet.
- Think about noise masking for the neighborhood. In response Fish noted:
 - We are doing an ambient noise study from several different areas in the neighborhood.
 - In order for us to survive over the next 20 years we have to build as infill in neighborhoods.
 - We don't have a lot of lots and we do treasure our greenspace. We are trying to build courtyards and greenspaces around these.
 - This particular location was picked because there was no other spot that worked for the science that's going to happen there.
- I like this building and I really believe in the mission of it.
- I think the mass is OK. I find that the urban infill is a compelling argument. That's the compromise we have to make as a city.

- Agree that the extra height effectively creates a neighborhood wall. Stacks are OK, they speak to the purpose of the building.
- The light well idea doesn't come through on the south side. One idea would be to bring that light well higher so it communicates to the south side.
- The screening around the stacks adds a lot of height look at something different such as use of different color as the spire for the church is a different color.
- Small windows at stair on south elevation are not appealing and uncomfortable.
- Regarding the metal banding across walk; perpendicular application is not necessary.
- Make prairie bed different; it will require membrane.
- Consider moving more function above high bay addition, as well as on the light well elevation to relieve functions at Old University to provide a setback.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0-1) with Lufler abstaining. The motion provided for the following:

- Resolve issue with the mass at the office component at University Avenue with setback to relate to the church, specifically the 5th floor with adjustments to the other features of the building.
- Look at maintaining noise reduction.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 5, 6, 6, 6, 6, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1552 University Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	6	6	-	-	5	6	6
	8	6	8	8	8	7	6	7
	6	3	6	-	-	6	5	5
	7	6	7	7	-	6	9	7
	6	-	-	-	-	-	7	6
	6	5	6	-	-	-	6	6
	8	7	8	-	-	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Has come a long way. Mass on University Avenue too tall; materials/colors coming along.
- Better, but still lacks a sense of scale, a bit too massive and blank feeling personality. Four floors on south office bar.
- Mass is OK. Energy = movement. This building is 4 slabs with picture windows. Simplify back to 2 slabs and light well!
- Dilemma – too much building for site in historic neighborhood and church.
- Nice use of tight space but south module (office) needs modification to relate more strongly to church.
- Study horizontal lines of Enzyme and introduce on Phase 1 for Phase 2 to continue dialog. Differentiation from historic neighborhood strong approach, further compatibility with historic proportions and scale.

AGENDA #4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: June 16, 2010
TITLE: 1552 University Avenue – PUD(GDP-SIP) for Wisconsin Energy Institute New Laboratory Building, 5 th Ald. Dist. (16837)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: June 16, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, Ron Luskin, R. Richard Wagner, Mark Smith and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by O’Kroley, Agenda Item No. 4 was taken out of order prior to Agenda Item No. 1 at the request of Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0).

At its meeting of June 16, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1552 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Brown, Peter Heaslett, Jim Moravec and Alan Fish, all representing the UW-Madison; Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, representing District 5; Brad Ricker, representing the Vilas Neighborhood Association; Patrick Gleason, representing Hor Architects; Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; John Rakocy, Darsi Foss and LD Oakley. Fish presented revised plans as well as changing site conditions. This is a two-phased project with planning currently for the first phase. The substantial “nose” to the building on the south side has been brought back to open the courtyard and bring in more greenspace. He indicated that a misreading of the height of the church nave (First Congregational) has caused this current plan for the Energy Institute to be off by about one floor, causing significant consternation. He indicated the need for brainstorming to align with the new Old University Corridor Plan relevant to building height. This site was selected for a specific reason, as the UW does not have very many empty lots. This area involves all the hard sciences on Henry Mall and will have potential connections to the Institutes for Discovery and Computer Science. They have received a \$125 Million grant to be one of the only places in the country to invent a process to take plant material from trees or agricultural products and turn it into fuel. He indicated taking out floors of office or laboratory space to deal with the building height issue won’t give them the critical mass necessary to make this grant effective. Moravec spoke to the reconfiguration of the building based on the Commission’s previous concerns and comments. Now each floor has a lab “core” with offices that wrap around them. This has led to a gathering space that connects the office block to the north and the office block to the south. There are currently two entrances to the building; the main entrance addresses University Avenue and the intersection of Campus Drive and University Avenue. There is a large bioretention area out front for all of the stormwater/roof run-off. The plantings along University Avenue will provide screening of the ROTC building. Bike parking will be located to the south below an overhang, with additional bike parking being considered at the east end. The building is now a two-part façade which relates better to Breese Terrace. Both stairwells are across the center core. Brick will be used to define the major masses with all the offices defined as a glass system with an integrated complexity. The glazing on the spandrel is similar to

what is neighboring at the Engineering Center building to stay familial to the palette currently on campus. Material samples were shown. Sixteen bike parking stalls are shown, as well as moped parking on the east.

Darsi Foss with the Regent Neighborhood Association spoke to the neighborhood's relationship to the University as a neighbor and their general approval of the University's project. She mentioned the neighborhood's concern with the height of the building not being in line with the nave of the church. She mentioned the Congregational Church as an icon to welcome people into their neighborhood. The neighborhood feels this is too much mass next to the church. Brad Ricker, president of the Vilas Neighborhood Association spoke about the University being a great neighbor, but that they respectfully disagree with this project. They are concerned with the precedent of allowing a building of this height in this location. There is concern about whether this will still be considered a livable, walkable neighborhood, or will it become an urban neighborhood. He mentioned the need for the University to be flexible to changing programs and funding in the future. Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff spoke about how the University has held a number of meetings and engaged the neighborhood. The neighborhood sees the greenspace at the corner as a very positive element to this project. However, the height is out of proportion with the neighborhood. She mentioned that this is a very important area: the entrance to the neighborhood, the entrance to the west side of Madison from the central region, and 60,000 cars go past that corner every day. She noted her concern with the building's massing and how it will essentially build a wall along old University Avenue. She noted the lack of a striking design in the building; breaking up the mass could be very important. Rummel asked if the neighborhood has any concerns about modern materials mixing with older materials, like the church.

Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- The building is doing a little too much clashing and not enough meshing.
- Appreciate the mix of materials and interest in layering the building and expressing each of the zones.
- The building doesn't communicate a cohesive body. Looks a little bit too distracting, particularly on a site that is a gateway to the University and the west side. Needs greater clarity.
- The nose of the building loses something, looks cut off.
- Move Phase I northerly greenspace at Campus Drive to south along Old University Avenue to provide more greenspace.
- Flip conference space in the internal core to outer wall where there is office to open up to Old University Avenue.
- Concern with maintenance of "no mow" grasses.
- Details of the building might look different when you're on the ground.
- The planting plan seems stiff, too regimented, form doesn't interplay with the building.
- Concern with how mowing will be done between trees.
- The view from Breese Terrace – there are opportunities for that.
- Adding the fast growing trees seems a bit disconcerting. Doesn't seem so cohesive. The front angle seems really intense.
- I think this is an important building. Appreciate you not just throwing up an industrial building.
- It's not quite coming together yet.
- View to Breese Terrace/Campus Drive west needs a lot more attention; missing an opportunity to create a terminus.
- Ninety-eight percent of Madisonians will see the building from University Avenue. I challenge you to make this a beautiful and compelling façade.
- Need something to show the beginning and the end of the building, like the church.

- This is a building about collaboration; the demand for pedestrians and bicyclists coming to and from here is maybe higher than it first seemed, given that it's not a classroom building, need to accommodate better.
- Would like to see more street level renderings, especially from Old University. Need a sense of mass from the street level.
- Phase I is self-contained and stands on its own. But when you add Phase II the mass really comes up, especially along Old University. We need to understand the impact of that; need to see more on Phase II.
- Use vertical elements in the landscape plan to relate better to Breese Terrace.
- No prominence of building components when viewed as terminus with University Avenue toward Campus Drive and Old University Avenue.
- Office mass creeps too close to Old University Avenue and church; shift floors to align with mass of church with more stories to the north.
- Move more building mass into open space court.
- The high screen transparency of east façade should be moved down façade.
- Like new modern approach but need to see more context with surrounding development.
- The mirroring of masses is definitely the comfortable move.
- The mass is creeping too close to its neighbor.
- This is an incredibly smart building.
- Don't think a rain garden is the appropriate way to deal with stormwater on this site in this location, unless it's more of a built trenched-type system. Don't see a natural element being successful on this site (in terms of visual, not functional).
- The material palette is great.
- It's fantastic that you're talking to all of your neighbors.
- This design is still trying to find its sweet spot; it hasn't fully resolved itself. Seems a little bit disjointed.
- I like the way the different forms relate to the church.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion for referral provided for address of the above stated concerns and the following:

- Look at massing elements.
- Show us more bike parking.
- Investigate ways of terminating the view coming from the south on Breese Terrace.
- Be more specific about the landscaping plan.
- Address the retention area and see if that is the most appropriate placement.
- Study bringing the north side of the building further to the east; this might allow you to play around with the mass.
- Study possible design/visual tricks to help it feel lower than it really is, since you can't eliminate that floor.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 4, 5, 6, 6, 6.5, 7, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1552 University Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating	
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	
	5	4	6	-	-	6	5	4	
	5	5	5	-	-	5	5	5	
	5	5	5	-	-	5	6	6	
	7	6	-	7	-	6	8	7	
	5	5	4.5	-	-	6	8	7	
	6.5	6	7	7	-	8	7	6.5	
	5	6	5	5	-	6	7	7	

General Comments:

- Still needs a lot of work – context folks! Smooth design, not so choppy and aggressive.
- Mass/height is fine. Breese terminal view needs dramatic improvement.
- The height and massing dilemma – step back height from Old University, address Breese Terrace views, create space from church. Don't use larger brick at base.
- Comments per presentation.
- Further integrate with urban context. Continue to express building program through form. Excellent project.

Firchow, Kevin

From: Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2010 6:28 AM
To: Murphy, Brad; Martin, Al; Firchow, Kevin; BROWN, Gary; FISH, Alan; HEASLETT, Peter; Fruhling, William
Subject: RE: Wisconsin Energy Phase II images

Dear Brad,

The RNA and I would like to limit any land approval to Phase 1 only: approval of GDP and SIP for Phase 1, leaving Phase 2 completely out of this approval process, meaning no GDP approval for Phase 2. We understand that we could do a GDP approval for Phase 2 with conditions that indicate that there is no commitment to even footage, mass or scale but, instead of a GDP with conditions, our strong preference is no GDP approval at all for Phase 2. Al Fish told me at UDC yesterday that UW would be fine with no GDP for Phase 2. We need your assistance in drafting the appropriate language indicating that Phase 2 is not at all part of this current approval process (= no GDP for Phase 2 at this time) so that it is clearly stated in the report and hopefully vote of the Plan Commission. Could you draft such language and email it to us?

Thank you so much,

Shiva Bidar-Sielaff
District 5 Alder
(608) 220-6986

From: Murphy, Brad
Sent: Tuesday, August 17, 2010 5:35 PM
To: 'Eric Lawson'; Martin, Al; Firchow, Kevin; BROWN, Gary; FISH, Alan; HEASLETT, Peter; Fruhling, William
Cc: Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva
Subject: RE: Wisconsin Energy Phase II images

Eric, Thanks for sharing these.

Gary, Alan, There seems to be some confusion about Phase 2. I heard from Ald. Bidar Sielaff that you guys are saying that Planning Staff are requiring phase 2 to be included in the plans and approved at this time. That is not the case. You have requested GDP level approval for Phase 2. So including these renderings certainly provides a better indication of how phase 2 might relate to phase 1 and the over- all visual impacts. We appreciate receiving the images.

Given our review of the images we are likely going to recommend that if the GDP for phase 2 is approved that there be conditions placed on the approval that does not commit to or approve the scale, mass, square footage or design at this time. The other option would be to approve the GDP and SIP for just phase 1 which would also be a possibility and ok with us.

Again, Planning staff are not requiring that Phase 2 be approved at this time.

I apologize for contributing to this misunderstanding.

Brad Murphy
Planning Division Director
Dept. of Planning & Community & Economic Development
P.O. Box 2985
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd
Madison, WI 53701
608 266 4635



Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development
 Planning/Neighborhood Preservation & Inspection/Economic & Community Development
 Mark A. Olinger, Director

Bradley J. Murphy
 Planning Division
 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
 P.O. Box 2985
 Madison, WI 53701-2985
 (608) 266-4635

REVIEW REQUEST FOR:

- PRELIMINARY PLAT
- FINAL PLAT
- LOT DIVISION/CSM
- CONDITIONAL USE
- DEMOLITION
- REZONING
- INCLUSIONARY ZONING
- OTHER

1552 University Avenue
 RZ : OR to PUD-GDP-SIP
 Demolish Former UW Health Services to Construct Phase 1 of Wisconsin Energy Institute
 UW Board of Regents/Gary Brown - University of Wisconsin

PLANNING DIVISION CONTACT: Tim Parks

RETURN COMMENTS BY: 29 July 2010

PLEASE ALSO EMAIL OR FAX ANY COMMENTS TO THE APPLICANT:

Applicant E-mail: gbrown@fpm.wisc.edu Fax: 265-3139
 Date Submitted: 09 June 2010 Plan Commission: 09 August 2010
 Date Circulated: 14 June 2010 Common Council: 07 September 2010

CIRCULATED TO:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ZONING | <input type="checkbox"/> DISABILITY RIGHTS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ALD. <u>Siola</u> DIST. <u>5</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FIRE DEPARTMENT | <input type="checkbox"/> POLICE DEPT. - CHANDLER | <input type="checkbox"/> MADISON GAS & ELECTRIC |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PARKS DIVISION | <input type="checkbox"/> CITY ASSESSOR -M. RICHARDS | <input type="checkbox"/> ALLIANT ENERGY |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TRAFFIC ENG. | <input type="checkbox"/> MADISON METRO - SOBOTA | <input type="checkbox"/> A T & T |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CITY ENG. - DAILEY | <input type="checkbox"/> MMSD BOARD, C/O SUPT. | <input type="checkbox"/> T D S |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CITY ENG. - MAPPING & ENV. | <input type="checkbox"/> PUBLIC HEALTH - SCHLENKER | <input type="checkbox"/> MT. VERNON TELE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> WATER UTILITY | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CDBG - CONSTANS | <input type="checkbox"/> NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> REAL ESTATE - EKOLA | | |

Review the above as per time schedule set in Chapter 16.23(5)(b)2; 16.23(5)(3)3; or Chapter 28, City of Madison Ordinance; OR your agency's comments cannot be considered prior to action.

One copy for your files; one copy for file of appropriate telephone company; PLEASE RETURN one copy with joint comments.

The above is located in your district. A copy is on file in the Planning Division Office for review. If you have any questions or comments, contact our office at 266-4635.

The above is located within or near the limits of your neighborhood organization. A copy is on file in the Planning Division Office for review. If you have any questions or comments, contact our office at 266-4635.

RETURN COMMENTS TO: PLANNING DIVISION, DEPT. OF PLANNING & COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, ROOM LL100 MMB, 215 MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BLVD.

NO COMMENTS / YOUR COMMENTS:

I have some significant concerns regarding this development as it relates to height, mass, design and overall compatibility with surrounding area. I will be present at UPC & Plan Commission to share my concerns.

JOINT WEST CAMPUS AREA COMMITTEE

REPORT of ACTION

June 9, 2010

Agenda Item / Project Name:	WISCONSIN ENERGY INSTITUTE
Street Address:	1552 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
Project Contact(s)/Phone #'s:	UW - Alan Fish, 262-3488, Pete Heaslett, 263-3012 Potter Lawson Architects - Jim Moravec, 274-2741
Date of JWCAC meeting(s):	June 9, 2010
JWCAC Members in Attendance:	Allen Arntsen, Dawn Crim, Nan Fey, Alan Fish, Karl Frantz, Sherwood Malamud, Micheal Nenmetz, Brad Ricker, Laura Rose, Chris Schmidt, Laura Shere, Caitlin Seifert, Mark VanderWoude, Liz Vowles, Robbie Webber.
Committee staff present:	Gary Brown

Brief Project Description & Background:

The Wisconsin Energy Institute is a new, phase one 107,000 GSF building to be built at the intersection of University Avenue/Campus Drive and Breese Terrace (1552 University Avenue) on the current site of the prior University Health Services building. The total building will be built in two phases for an approximate total 207,000 GSF building with the second phase based on future funding availability. No schedule has been established for phase II. The existing building and surface parking lot will be removed with this project. When phase II is eventually built, the existing Naval ROTC building will also be removed.

The committee heard a presentation by Alan Fish (UW), Pete Heaslett (UW) and Jim Moravec (Potter Lawson Architects). The proposed building is 5 stories tall (approximately 16 feet floor-to-floor for a total of approximately 82 feet tall above grade at the main entrance) on the south side along University Avenue and 115 feet tall on the north side along Campus Drive. The additional height of the building (approximately 33 feet) is mainly for an enclosed mechanical penthouse to reduce overall noise impacts of the building. The height of the building steps back from University Avenue with the lower side toward the neighborhood and the taller side along Campus Drive.

The UW's 2005 Campus Master Plan calls for a 5-story, 195,000 GSF building at this site. The draft Old University Avenue Corridor Plan suggested the building height for this site to be approximately the same height as the roof ridgeline over the nave of the First Congregational Church, across the street, at the corner of Breese Terrace. The current plans call for the south office block of the building to be approximately one story (~14 feet) taller than the roof ridgeline, the north lab block would be an additional 3 stories taller (total of about 47 feet).

Action or Recommendation by JWCAC:

Motion by Robbie Webber, seconded by Laura Rose to convey the following concerns about the project to the necessary City of Madison zoning review bodies:

- Overall height of the building (especially the south office block compared to the height of the church across University Avenue)
- Building materials (especially the large glass curtain wall on south façade of office block)
- Overall mass of the building (especially when phase II of the building is fully built-out)
- Noise (the new building should produce no additional new noise levels in the neighborhood over existing ambient noise)

The motion passed via voice vote with Nan Fey and Chris Schmidt abstaining.

July 18, 2010

Dear Members, Madison Urban Design Commission:

I am writing this letter on behalf of the Regent Neighborhood Association (RNA), as the Association's designee to the Joint West Campus Area Committee. This letter conveys the official position of the RNA with respect to the Wisconsin Energy Institute project proposed for the site on the UW Madison campus at the intersection of Campus Drive, University Avenue, and Breese Terrace. The RNA took this action at its meeting on June 23, 2010.

The RNA submits the following comments with respect to the proposed project:

- The overall height of the building is too high. This is especially a concern with the south office block as compared to the height of the First Congregational Church directly across the street from the office block. That section of the building exceeds the height of the church nave's peak. This is contrary to the originally contemplated building design that was represented to the neighborhood.
- The building materials, especially the proposed use of the glass curtain block on the south façade of the office block, are not attractive.
- The overall mass of the building, especially when Phase II of the WEI is completed, is too large for the scale of the Regent Neighborhood, which is comprised primarily of single family homes and small apartment buildings.
- The project, when completed, should not add any noise to the neighborhood, above the noise levels existing prior to commencement of the project. Significant concerns already exist among residents with respect to noise emanating from UW west campus buildings. Noise measurements should be taken prior to and after construction to ensure that pre-construction noise levels have not been exceeded.
- The UW Madison should show the same sensitivity in the design and construction of this building as was demonstrated in the construction of other buildings in the west campus area.

In summary, the RNA has significant concerns with the design and size of the proposed WEI building, and requests that the Urban Design Commission seriously consider these comments as it reviews the project at the July 21, 2010 meeting.

Sincerely,

The Regent Neighborhood Association
By: Laura Rose
Joint West Campus Area Committee Designee