

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION   | <b>PRESENTED:</b> June 3, 2009                                  |
| TITLE: 400 State Street – Lisa Link Peace Park Improvements in the C4 District. 4 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (14907) | <b>REFERRED:</b><br><b>REREFERRED:</b><br><b>REPORTED BACK:</b> |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary  | <b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>                                     |
| DATED: June 3, 2009  | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>   |

---

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm and Todd Barnett.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 3, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for improvements to the Lisa Link Peace Park located at 400 State Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mike Sturm, representing Ken Saiki Design; Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; Carter Arndt, representing MSA Professional Services; and Mary Carbine, representing Madison Central BID;. Appearing in opposition was Dolores Grengg. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the Urban Design Commission, at its meeting of February 18, 2004 recommended approval of Resolution, I.D. 25282 adopting the Lisa Link Peace Conception Master Plan and authorizing the Parks Division to retain architectural services to move beyond the conceptual plan to construction drawings. The proposed improvements provide for construction of facilities within the park that include an amphitheater, a center fountain and stage, including Visitor's Center. Sturm provided details of the modified development proposal for the park facility emphasizing site and landscape amenities with Arndt providing a detailed review of the various building elevations for the Visitor's Center. The elevations provided for consideration of two options. Option 1, the preferred option, a one-story version with Option 2 expressing the same mass and volume as a two-story structure. Option 2 is intended to address provisions within the C4 Central Commercial District that require buildings to be a minimum of not less than two-stories abutting the property's State Street frontage. Staff noted the visitor's center not being two stories was an issue more relevant to the Plan Commission's review of the project and that the Urban Design Commission should look at design elements and comment if the two-story version has issues. Following the presentation, Bruce Woods, Chair referenced an email from Commissioner Dawn Weber (excused) relevant to project as follows:

- Request that the applicant show adjacent façades on State Street especially the building to the east.
- The building concept appears to be an exterior simple form with a sculpture inserted within. Please ask applicants to study the exterior simple form; follow and complete a more historic lot line due to the urban character of the site and to maintain the street edge of State Street.
- The interior sculpture could be set further to the north to allow one to walk between the exterior wall and the sculpture in an exterior arcade. This exterior arcade could continue to the northeast elevation to act as a backdrop to the stage and provide performers an entrance to the stage. This eliminates the

utilitarian doors at the stage façade. This could also allow the landscape of the park to enter the building through the arcade.

- Study a void in the roof between the exterior simple form and the sculpture.
- Lighting of the sculptural form should be studied.
- A more urban material for the exterior simple form should be studied, the sculptural form should have more flexibility in material selection.

This is a very unique urban park project. The connection between the built form (both historic and new) and the natural landscape is a design challenge and great opportunity to create a special space.

Continued discussion by the Commission noted the following:

- Surprise with the use of stone on the building's façade; not found on State Street, brick more traditional with State Street buildings.
- Weber's comments are right on.
- In time will be a need for more interior space, for example conference room, building maybe needs to be a two-story structure.
- In concept prefer slope of single-story option don't like the two-story volume in terms of appearance, including brackets.
- Agree with the stone issue, building is less inviting, a masonry volume with punch openings doesn't feel inviting.
- Problem with view of State Street and park for visitors in the visitor's center not being provided.
- Problem with dedicating a room on a major face of the building which will likely be under utilized by police, a mistake.
- Space needs to open up to the outside.
- No shade for ambassador's area due to southern exposure.
- Make a green building as far as budget will allow.
- Entry to building not welcoming, doesn't relate well to State Street.
- In comparing the earlier version, the project with the current proposal; there is a loss of formality of entry at State Street.
- Design as proposed provides for competition between the stage and the fountain with the State Street frontage.
- The game tables would be appropriate on Gilman by at least one.
- The building pinches the gateway to the park from State Street.
- Question why the concept of peace is not incorporated into the design of the "Peace "Park."
- Check out the pavement pattern and how it relates to the location of trees.
- Look at amount of solar gain from the slanted roof.
- The performance stage appears to be limited to one direction of orientation, which reflects a lessening of flexibility from the previous design.
- Check out tree alignment in relationship with stage.
- Round form of the architecture at State Street brings people back to State Street.

Doris Grengg, speaking in opposition noted opposition to the hardscape improvements within the park, and distress with permanent presence of police in park. She reminded the Commission that the park was named "Lisa Link Peace Park," which honors peace. She further questioned why police patrols were not sufficient in the area without a police presence in the park, as well with distress with the extent of built environment in the park that is now and as proposed. She emphasized that no police presence in the park would be more

welcoming. In response the Commission noted its charge with reviewing design, not land use. Other comments from the Commission noted the following:

- Permanence of locating police in the park not a UDC issue, more of a Plan Commission issue.
- The fountain and stage conflict. In Wisconsin climate limits use and effect of a fountain, rather see a sculpture element, want to see more of adjoining context and views from both adjoining streets (State and Gilman).
- Bring gaming tables around to corner to be viewable from State. Deal with bike parking in a different manner that allows for a more efficient use of the area abutting State Street where current bike parking is proposed.
- The arcade gallery concept as suggested by Weber would go a long way.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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, 5, 6, 6 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 400 State Street**

|                       | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> | 5         | 5            | 5              | -                              | -     | 5                                   | 5             | 5              |
|                       | 6         | 5            | 6              | 6                              | -     | 5                                   | 7             | 6              |
|                       | 5         | 5            | -              | 6                              | -     | 6                                   | 6             | 6              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 6              |
|                       | 5         | 4            | 5              | -                              | -     | 5                                   | 5             | 5              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- Interesting project. Consider conflict between stage and fountain. Is the fountain needed? Provide perspective from Gilman and State Street (both).
- Water drainage off roof. Fountain and stage are in competition. Stage seems oriented to north, not north and south. Plan less engaged with State Street than previous.
- Building interior plan ignores street when the interior should engage the street. State Street face should be more of a gateway into park rather than a semi-random meander. There are many elements of sustainability in this park: water, green, sun. The building should respond to this with passive solar cooling design. Consider rain fountains.
- Previous site plan seems to work better. Stage/fountain are competing for space. Formal (entry) to casual lawn juxtaposition works well on original plan...missing an update.
- Lose the fountain.
- Still needs work to make it more inviting.