


Note to Commission
Garver Feed Mill

Attached please find the wording of the proposed resolution accepting the proposal of Common Wealth Development and authorizing the City to negotiate a development agreement.

Attached, also, you will find a statement by a citizen regarding the design of the proposed development. Please note that the design is not finalized and much further design work would need to be undertaken, with the input of the Landmarks Commission.

I recommend that the motion to approve note that the Commission is not at this time reviewing or approving the conceptual design and that this will be reviewed and a Certificate of Appropriateness issued at a later date.

I have not mailed copies of the proposal in this packet. If you did not save your packet from the last meeting, you can find the document in Legistar, # 09957.

K. H. Rankin 
4/30/08



City of Madison

Legislative File ID 09785

Type: **Resolution** Status: **Items Referred**

Enactment Date: Enactment No.:

Title: **Accepting the proposal of Common Wealth Development for the redevelopment of the Garver Feed Mill and directing City staff to negotiate a development agreement with Common Wealth Development.**

Controlling Body: **PLAN COMMISSION**

Introduced: **3/31/2008** Version: **1**

Final Action: Contact: **nprusaitis@cityofmadison.com**

Name: **Garver Selection Resolution CWD**

Extra Date 1:

Requester: **BOARD OF ESTIMATES**

Sponsors: **Marsha A. Rummel, Larry Palm**

Attachments: **Legislative File Text**

Legislative History (* Unpublished Data)

Date	Acting Body	Action Taken	Motion
3/31/2008	Community and Economic Development Unit	This Resolution was Referred for Introduction	
4/8/2008	<i>Unpublished Meeting Data Pending*</i>		
4/8/2008	BOARD OF ESTIMATES	This Resolution was Refer to the BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS	
4/8/2008	BOARD OF ESTIMATES	This Resolution was Refer to the LANDMARKS COMMISSION	
4/8/2008	BOARD OF ESTIMATES	This Resolution was Refer to the PLAN COMMISSION	

Approvals

Approver	Date	Approval Status
Daniel Bohrod	4/2/2008	Approved

powered by Daystar Computer Systems, Inc.



City of Madison

Legislative File Number 09785 (version 1)

Title

Accepting the proposal of Common Wealth Development for the redevelopment of the Garver Feed Mill and directing City staff to negotiate a development agreement with Common Wealth Development.

Body

PREAMBLE

From 1906 through 1997, the Garver Feed Mill was a working industrial building and a significant feature on the east side of Madison. The building was designated as eligible for listing on the National Register in 1992 and designated a local landmark in 1994.

In 1997 after a two-year fundraising campaign, the Olbrich Botanical Society (the "OBS") acquired the Garver Feed Mill (the "Building") and approximately five acres of land surrounding it (collectively the "Property") for \$700,000. The City Parks Division acquired the surrounding 17.8 acres north of the Property to Fair Oaks Avenue. The OBS transferred ownership of the Property to the City with a deed restriction that the Property be used in perpetuity as parkland devoted primarily to botanical gardens. DNR Stewardship Funds were used for the both the City and the OBS purchases, so DNR permission is required for any sale, transfer or conversion to non-park uses. In 2000, the Park Commission adopted an updated Master Plan for the Olbrich Botanical Gardens (the "OBG"). The Master Plan proposed to preserve the Property as part of expanded park and botanical garden facilities north of the railroad and bike path. The Master Plan allocated space for future parking, but proposed several measures to minimize the amount of parking needed and to maximize the amount of open space.

In 2001, a fire destroyed all but approximately 60,000 square feet of the Building. In 2004, the OBS commissioned a Historic Structure Report and adaptive reuse study. In accepting this Report from the OBS in 2005, the Park Commission recommended that the Property be declared surplus for the purpose of seeking a public/private partnership for adaptive reuse. The Park Commission recommended that the reuse include some storage and maintenance for the OBG; that it include some broadly defined public space for uses that are compatible with the mission of the OBG; and that the reuse should minimize the amount of parking and maximize the amount of open space on surrounding parkland.

The Garver Building Reuse Committee (the "Committee") was established under the guidelines of the City's surplus property procedures, and its members were appointed by the Mayor and approved by the Council on September 6, 2006 (Resolution No. 06-00767, ID No. 04224). The Committee was charged with establishing criteria for reuse of the Property, with soliciting proposals and with selecting a proposal. To develop the Request for Proposals (the "RFP"), as outlined in city surplus property procedures, Committee held an open process that consisted of 3 public information meetings and over 20 regularly scheduled meetings that were open to the

public. The Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Neighborhood Association also held a workshop that many of the Committee members attended to gain additional input from neighborhood residents. After this meeting, the Committee drafted an RFP and recommended that the Common Council authorize its issuance. The Common Council approved the issuance of the RFP on June 5, 2007 (Resolution No. 07-00595, ID No. 06115).

In accordance with the RFP, proposals were received until September 14, 2007. Three proposals were received, and the Committee determined the proposals of Barnsdale Land Co. LLC ("Barnsdale") and Common Wealth Development, Inc. ("Common Wealth") to have been responsive to the RFP. The third proposal was determined not to be responsive to the RFP criteria and rejected. Common Wealth proposed creating an arts incubator in the building that would include affordable studio space for artists, a gallery, atrium, cafe, gift shop, performance space, museum, workshop room, roof garden, and space for the OBG. Barnsdale proposed creating a center for sustainability dedicated to bringing together in one location not-for-profit and private sector interests to further the practices of restorative and sustainable economy and ecology. The Committee reviewed the proposals, interviewed the developers who submitted the proposals, and heard public testimony. After reviewing the two accepted proposals and all associated information, the Committee determined that Common Wealth Development best met the criteria that was in the RFP and that its proposal was in the best interests of the City of Madison.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Common Council determines that it is in the best interests of the City to sell or lease the Property to Common Wealth Development for its adaptive rehabilitation and reuse by creating an Arts Incubator at the Garver Feed Mill property.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that staff from the City Parks Division, the City Attorney's Office, and the Office of Real Estate Services are authorized and directed to enter into negotiations on behalf of the City of Madison to prepare a development agreement between the City of Madison and Common Wealth Development, the terms of which will be subject to Council approval by separate resolution.

Fiscal Note

The Resolution authorizes the City to negotiate a development agreement, but does not commit to expenditures at this time. Terms of the development agreement will require Council approval under a future, separate Resolution.

4/23/2008 12:09 PM

Rankin, Katherine

From: CDebevec [cdebevec@mindspring.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 23, 2008 11:15 AM
To: Rankin, Katherine
Subject: Garver comments

Ms. Rankin,

I just heard about the meeting of the Landmarks Commission tonight where there will be discussion of the Garver feed mill proposal. Not sure if I can make it - are you the appropriate person to direct comments to? If not, could you forward to the right person(s)?

Below is something I posted to a neighborhood forum - I've been greatly concerned about the esthetics of the restoration & appropriateness to site - that it be done exceptionally well.

Where exactly in the approval process are esthetic considerations addressed anyway? Is that the domain of this commission?

Thank you
Cathy Debevec
1885 e. main street
Madison, WI

I do sincerely hope they'll go back to the drawing board & incorporate some of Barnsdale's design and renovation philosophy which seemed much more in tune with this being a HISTORIC building in a retreat-like NATURE setting. Commonwealth seems to be imposing a more urban (suburban?) mindset - their proposal shows a view of an awful concretized exterior with planters and an interior that looks like O'Hare airport. The plan shows a vast paved area in front of the building in addition to the parking lot. Lots of squared lines - your basic urban grid rather than the curved lines of the tree lined parkway & walk ways shown in Barnsdale's plan.

I also think they need to pay much more attention to the historic restoration aspect recognizing the difference between a true historic restoration (which retains the "vibe", feel, & architectural detailing of the original structure) VS. remodeling (also known as "re-muddling"). Between all the tear-downs & insensitive remodelings & landlord neglect, this city has not been kind to its historic sites - we do not want to lose another one!

I know Commonwealth can be responsive to input, but it is disheartening that their preliminary plans seem so far off the mark in terms of a sensitive restoration. For example, their drawing shows one of those goofy added-on top floors that bear no relation design-wise to the rest of the structure. Ugh! Enough of those! Some writer once aptly described this architectural fad as looking like a trailer park sitting on top of a building. It does not fool anyone into thinking the building is smaller than a three story building - it just looks like a three story building with a lot of clutter and visual chaos on the top!

Another illustration shows a new section with w/ squarish-horizontal Prairie-style windows. I'm not sure what I'd call the original

4/23/2008 12:09 PM

structure - neoclassical industrial?? - but it sure ain't Prairie!
An authentic prairie style building is a thing of beauty, but to take design features out of context and faddishly tack them on to everything and anything, is visual chaos - i.e. ugly. Whatever changes or additions are made to this building need to be congruent with the original materials and proportions. What is merely faddish and not authentic invariably looks dated in 20-30 yrs.

One of *my* needs as an artist-writer is an environment with some "soul" & some sense of history, visual harmony/ cohesiveness, & architectural sophistication. This city does not need another clumsily designed "Frankenstein" building surrounded by lots & lots of concrete.

Guess what I'm trying to say here is that this project needs and deserves some truly top notch expert restoration design work.