

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: February 21, 2018
TITLE: 917 East Mifflin Street - Breese Stevens Field Concessions Building Addition in UDD No. 8. 2 nd Ald. Dist. (49883)	REFERRED:
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	ADOPTED:
	POF:
DATED: February 21, 2018	ID NUMBER: 49883

Members present: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Rafeeq Asad and Lois Braun-Oddo.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 21, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a concessions building addition to Breese Stevens Field located at 917 East Mifflin Street in UDD No. 8. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mike Sturm and Peter Rott, representing the City of Madison Parks Division. Appearing in support and available to answer questions was Vern Stenman. This was referred at the last Commission meeting to allow for input at a neighborhood meeting. The architect reviewed the drawings, noting what has changed since the last meeting. O’Kroley moved for referral because of placement in the stands; she could not support an addition in the heart of a historic building that separates spectators from the event. Harrington seconded the referral motion. The applicant then reviewed the process for selection of the proposed addition location and the reason for choosing the grandstand. There was discussion at the last meeting regarding a master plan for the facility. The applicant met with Ald. Rummel, with one option being the ability to have occupancy on the roof of the concession stand that would extend into the current seating area, but that is not part of this budget. The team did work with Ald. Rummel regarding concerns of process, and the Parks Division needing to move forward with the current budget.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What is status of future uses?
 - We are pursuing a renegotiation of the lease and a professional soccer team to be the lead tenant. To meet minimum standards, we must seat up to 5,000 capacity. Currently we can only seat 2,700. Looking at future activation of all spaces.
 - The location is not perfect, but it works best for all disparities of potential uses.
- Without seeing the masterplan, it is difficult to approve these.
- With proposed fans and vents – where is the future seating on the roof?
- Will there be seating on East Washington?

- The current plan is to bring in 1,000 portable seats from Brearly and place them behind the soccer goal. There is also seating under the angled grandstand, plus the area behind the addition in the grandstand.
- Is there a sequencing plan? If we did refer, would these improvements be something you can show?
 - The report is public, but has not yet been acted on by the Board of Commissioners.
- I don't think we should refer if looking for a master plan. There are some basic design issues, I don't have an issue but that's not the motion on the table.
- (Ald. Zellers) The highest priority is to have a facility that is usable today for the needs of today. I have been convinced that this is the best location to accomplish what is needed. I'm not thrilled with the design or location, but it doesn't harm the historic structure. I have come to support this project – knowing that it does disrupt the visuals inside. It does something needed for the kinds of events taking place there.
- Are you structuring it for seating?
 - Yes, it will be structured for seating
- Explain the mechanical ductwork.
 - Located at the corners where stairs come in. Only two penetrations in roof and they are very small. We have worked exhaustively to figure those locations.
- If this is the only way to make this, I will support it. There aren't other options available. Not harming landmark.
- Do you see a way this can fit, be a stronger element? The form of the building doesn't seem to work.
- Looks like they are using compatible materials and the building is as low as they can make it and keep it accessible. The renderings and images presented are not great. This is the dead end of the field.
- What about the space behind it? Per section, putting this right in front of bleachers. How long until something is developed?
 - The area will remain available for people attending events. Two side pieces – masonry masses correspond with historic exiting areas. Restrooms in those areas wouldn't block any views. We also need to deal with setback from the field. The shape was defined by a use study. Fashioned based on exiting from stairs. This is dead space that needs to be used.
- The service portion is the main distraction, it doesn't fit, it seems odd and disjointed.
 - There is a minimum depth for the kitchen and service combined with access to lower levels. Plays off of existing geometry. We have compressed it as far as we can. SHPO has seen the master plan and have been a partner in planning.
- Do you have 3.2 sheet – mechanical plan? Could be seating – occupied roof terrace. Ask that a roof plan be designed that shows how the roof will integrate with the grandstand.
 - Illustrates the relative elevations (not in packet).
- Your design intent is creating a tunnel behind the addition that is not addressed. Mechanicals are not reflected in the section.
 - Two penetrations are concealed by parapets.

The motion to refer failed on a vote of (2-4) with O'Kroley and Asad voting yes; Braun-Oddo, Harrington, DeChant and Goodhart voting no; and Wagner non-voting.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Goodhart, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion passed on a vote of (3-2-1) with DeChant, Goodhart and Braun-Oddo voting yes; O'Kroley and Harrington voting no; Wagner non-voting; and Asad abstaining.