

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 12/11/17

TITLE: 917 E Mifflin - Exterior Alteration (new construction) to a designated landmark site (Breese Stevens Field); 2nd Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 1/4/18

ID NUMBER: 49742

---

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; David WJ McLean, Marsha A. Rummel, Lon Hill, and Katie Kaliszewski. Excused were Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair; and Richard Arnesen.

### **SUMMARY:**

*Mike Sturm, registering in support and available to answer questions.*

*Peter Rott, registering in support and available to answer questions.*

*Robert Klebba, registering in opposition and wishing to speak.*

Levitan called the Commission's attention to the email from Mike Ivey.

Levitan asked about the rationale for the concession stand's placement. Sturm gave a brief summary of the proposal and explained that the placement of the stand was proposed with future improvements and event accommodation in mind.

Per Rott, the historic portion of the field (the grand stand) was originally used for baseball. Baseball is not played there any longer, though the stadium is used for other sports. When they were planning the renovation, they considered ways of incorporating that historic space. Placing the concession stand there would also be an opportunity to revitalize that end of the field while maintaining the historic aspects of it and the exterior.

Levitan asked if it would make more sense from a financial and logistical perspective to have the concession stand where they are proposing it vs. on the East Washington side. Per Rott, the location was selected for a variety of reasons.

Levitan asked if the lower level bleachers would have an obstructed view of the field. Per the Applicant, those seats are rarely (if ever) used because they are located away from the field of play or the stage. The only time those seats are used is if there's a rainstorm.

Levitan asked if pop-up food carts would still be used in the event that the concession stand is approved. Sturm responded that it would depend on the user and the event. The advantage to installing the concession stand is that there will be a commercial kitchen available for use. Levitan also asked if there are currently field-level accessible bathrooms at Breese Stevens. Per the Applicant, there are not.

Rummel asked whether they knew which elements of the grandstand were original. Rott cited a Historic Structures Report that indicates exactly what is original and what is not. Rummel wondered why they wouldn't remove it entirely if it wasn't used and was not significant. Rott responded that they prefer to activate it, rather than remove it, with this addition. Rummel asked whether the concession addition will resemble the Duck Pond

at Warner Park. The Applicant indicated that it's a similar concept, although it would be on a property with a completely different program and function.

Rummel asked about the State Historical Society's position regarding the grand stand. Rott referenced the original nomination. There are two zones of significance: outside the wall and inside the wall. The zones are treated differently with regard to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The outside is treated with "preservation 101" and a strict adherence to the standards. The inside is not treated as a museum. There have been changes and adjustments over time.

Rummel asked why the Applicant chose the proposed materials. Rott responded that it was partially for the economy of it, but also for the appropriateness of the building. Some of the materials were chosen to match the recently added press box, and the materials used for the restrooms were chosen to match the landmark's historic brick.

McLean asked about the placement of the handicap accessible ramp. The Applicant directed his attention to the appropriate drawing. McLean also asked about the elevation, and whether 10' was as low as was possible. The Applicant indicated that it was as low as it was possible to be. McLean asked about the rooftop being additional seating and asked what the difference from the bleachers to the rooftop would be. Per the Applicant, it's about a half level. They spent time to make sure there's a workable, accessible plane to be developed.

McLean asked about the activation of the old bleachers being put to new use and whether anything of the interior was being preserved at all. The Applicant responded that they want to make it an active location in the community, and these interior renovations are the best way to facilitate that.

Levitan confirmed that the Applicants were comfortable with Staff conditions. The Applicants confirmed that they are.

Kaliszewski confirmed the shape of the roof. There was further general conversation about the roof, what will appear on it, and how it will be arranged.

Klebba referenced a conversation with Vern Stenman during which they discussed Breese Stevens. Klebba was under the impression that this concession stand was on the other end of the field. He feels its current proposed placement will impact spectators seated behind the stand and feels that the current operator could utilize other options than what is being presented. He also mentioned that the current contract with the City of Madison allows for 70 events. He feels that few of these events require a concession stand.

Hill asked what other ideas Klebba had. Klebba suggested lowering it, putting it under the stands, or on the other side of the field.

Levitan asked the Applicant why they were not considering placing them under the stands or elsewhere. Sturm responded that it was due to cost, visibility, and the placement of the accessible restrooms. They would like to make it a facility that will be attractive to operators and would facilitate worthwhile events.

There was general discussion about the sports and events that currently utilize Breese Stevens.

Rummel commented that she's struggling with reviewing this proposal that's part of a larger evolution without having any evidence of future plans. Sturm replied that it's essentially a removable structure that will hopefully revitalize the space and make Breese Stevens a more marketable location.

Kaliszewski referenced the negative public response. McLean agreed, and indicated that he did not find the proposal something he could wholeheartedly support. Hill also concurred with having some reservations.

Levitan asked about the timeline for future plans. Sturm responded that more funding might be available after 2020, and determinations would be made at that time.

**ACTION:**

A motion was made by Hill and seconded by Kaliszewski to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the stipulation that Staff recommendations be observed. The motion passed on a voice vote. Hill and Kaliszewski voted in favor. Mclean and Rummel voted in opposition. Levitan voted in favor, breaking the tie.