

JOINT WEST CAMPUS AREA COMMITTEE

REPORT of ACTION

February 26, 2014

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Agenda Item / Project Name: | University Avenue Corridor Plan |
| Street Address: | ---- |
| Project Contact(s)/Phone #'s: | Gary Brown, 608-263-3023 |
| Date of JWCAC meeting(s): | February 26, 2014 |
| JWCAC Members in Attendance: | |
| Committee staff present: | Gary Brown |

Brief Project Description: The Regent Neighborhood Association has prepared a draft University Avenue Corridor Plan to provide guidance for future development within the corridor from Breese Terrace to Farley Avenue. The plan recommendations include proposed land use guidelines, design guidelines, transportation improvements, sustainability initiatives, public art and streetscape improvements.

Action or Recommendation by JWCAC: *(from draft meeting minutes)*

Motion by Duane Steinhauer to recommend approval of the University Avenue Corridor Plan to the City of Madison Plan Commission. Second by Kelley Ignatoski.

Discussion: Robbie Webber noted her concerns for property owners in the corridor who didn't have a significant part in the development of the latest draft plan and that their needs likely are not be reflected in the final plan. The neighborhoods are asking the Common Council to adopt these types of neighborhood plans. The Council needs to approve a plan that is appropriate for the overall city and not just for the specific neighborhood. If the Council approves a plan knowing that the plan will be ignored in the future, this seems to undermine the overall process of approving neighborhood plans. Examples of this have occurred in the recent past. Sherwood Malamud noted an example of this with the Dudgeon-Monroe neighborhood association discussions on the Knickerbocker development. The Plan Commission seemed to ignore the neighborhood concerns, but the neighborhood plan was actually followed in the final plans.

Eric Sundquist noted that city's comprehensive plan recommendations will actually become legally binding if the plan recommends changes to the city comprehensive plan, which this plan is suggesting. Most of the other recommendations are looser, and less binding, but depend on interpretations and recommendations made by the city planning staff to the Plan Commission and Common Council under a specific project's zoning review process.

Duane Steinhauer suggested that a lot of the neighborhood plans are many times directed by city staff and typically don't come as a ground swell from the neighborhood. RNA residents said in fact this was not the case for University Avenue Corridor Plan. The current draft plan has been supported by the RNA Board and the neighborhood.

Robbie Webber made a motion to amend the draft plan to include a second pedestrian overpass over Campus Drive as shown in the university's 2005 Campus Master Plan. The motion was seconded by Eric Sundquist.

Discussion: Rob Kennedy noted that the second pedestrian bridge is still in the campus' long range transportation plan as is the east bound vehicular access to Campus Drive. Gary Brown reminded everyone that these recommendations were studied in detail after the 2005 Campus Master Plan was published and were deemed not to be feasible due to private land ownership restrictions and lack of available right-of-way.

Sherwood suggested that perhaps the language should suggest that "if the land becomes available and if feasible, the second pedestrian overpass and an eastbound ramp at Walnut or Highland". This friendly amendment failed due to a second.

The chair called the question on the amendment that a second pedestrian overpass over Campus Drive be included in the plan; Vote: Yes, 6 – No, 6. Motion failed.

Webber made a second motion to amend adding the following language: That an eastbound on-ramp to Campus Drive be included at Walnut Street "or at Highland Avenue". Motion seconded by Dan O'Callaghan.

Discussion: Webber noted that the city's PBMVC suggested that Highland be a secondary option for an east bound entrance to Campus Drive as opposed to from Walnut Street. Both options need to be reviewed to determine if either one is better or more feasible.

The chair called the question on the subsequent amendment to add Highland Avenue as a secondary option for an eastbound on-ramp to Campus Drive. Vote: Yes - 6; No - 6. Motion failed.

Gary Brown made a motion to amend the draft plan to strike the language in Table 1: Land Use, Building & Site Recommendations (page 45 of the draft plan) for Area 6 – University Edge, related to building heights and setbacks, and to instead use the Campus-Institutional district height standards which is the recommended zoning for this area in the draft plan. Second by Eric Sundquist.

Discussion: – Eric Sundquist reminded the committee that the University will still need to rezone these parcels with any future development and receive full review by Joint West, UDC, the Plan Commission and the Common Council for any development in this area based on the current zoning of this area from TR-U1 to C-I. The committee discussed the fact that there was some confusion in the draft plan where this section in Table 1 was more restrictive than what is shown in text form on pages 57 and 58, with specific respect to the second phase of the Wisconsin Energy Institute.

The chair called the question on the above amendment. Vote: Yes – 12 , No - 0 . Motion carried unanimously.

Eric Sundquist noted that this draft neighborhood plan has been referred to the various city committees to get these types of very detailed recommendations discussed and amendments made as the document makes its way to the Plan Commission and Common Council for final action.

Main motion, to recommend approval of the plan to the Plan Commission, as amended above. Vote: Yes - 8; No – 0; Abstained – 2 (Sundquist and Webber). Motion carried.
