City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 19, 2014		
TITLE:	Policy Discussion on a Proposed Park Shelter Prototype to be Utilized in Various	REFERRED:		
	City of Madison Parks. (36186)	REREFERRED:		
		REPORTED BACK:		
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary		ADOPTED:	POF:	
DATED: November 19, 2014		ID NUMBER:		

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O'Kroley, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins, Tom DeChant, Lauren Cnare and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 19, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of a proposed park shelter prototype to be utilized in various City of Madison Parks. Appearing on behalf of the project were Melissa Destree, Jeanine Zwart, Kay Rutledge and Jason Ekstrom, representing City Engineering and City Parks. The Secretary noted that this discussion will provide the framework for him to continue to approve public projects with feedback from the Commission as to what they think is reasonable flexibility. Work on this concept development will accommodate toilet facilities and covered picnic areas for all the small parks. Larger parks will always be a separate project, these are intended for just the small parks. The team will work with the neighborhoods so they can have some input. The cement board comes in 3-4 different colors, a polished CMU, natural stone and a high clear story band of frosted windows. These shelters will not be heated, and minimal LED lighting will be used.

Comments and questions were as follows:

- Can you define small?
 - We had 3 different parks that needed their restroom facilities replaced in the near term, which is how we came up with the idea of one building to be flexible and adaptable in each of these situations, creating a template for these smaller facilities. Typically a small park would be 5 acres or less, and the neighborhood parks are usually larger. Nothing that would be a major shelter like at Tenney or Wingra.
- You said you would replace tagged panels in the lower area. But this roof will be accessible too. Do you have to replace it or could you refinish it?
 - We're using a Sherman Williams anti-graffiti finish, which is a standard used by the Parks Department.
- I understand the need for Parks to establish standards and have similar features, I don't understand the motive for creating a prototype that isn't site-specific.

- For every location that is identified, the toilet core will be oriented on the site, the landscaping will be developed, the stormwater will be analyzed to integrate into the site, and an extension of the canopy then to accommodate that function. This is a template for budgeting purposes and to expedite accommodating the aging toilet facilities we have. This design is very adaptable to any of our small parks to provide both of these amenities.
- It's just like when I approve a series of storefronts for example on State Street. They're a type, but as different white boxes get built out in order to fit the needs of the tenant, whether it's retail or a restaurant, it's going to change. There's a need to provide dialogue between other agencies about the projects they do on a routine basis before the Commission as part of our charge. Part of my charge is you knowing that this is what's happening.
- Regarding the site-specific issue, I don't have any trouble with most of the parks in the City with this sort of design. In the Isthmus where you have existing design issues I think I might have a problem.
 I don't think you'll see this within a 6-mile radius of downtown, or greater.
- The prototype aspect is my concern too, to the extent that I can go to a park, or I can be shown a picture of the facility, and know what park it is in just by the look of the facility. Then I think it's acceptable. I think there needs to be some uniqueness even though it is a prototype.
- Specific designs are going to be largely influenced by the individual neighborhoods. The colors, contextually how it's laid out, you won't see exactly the same design. And materials can be flexible.
- I'm thinking of the City wells, where you have a type of architecture that is repeated but it fit various locations around the City.
- I really would encourage a flashing system that really pushes that water away so over time those fascias won't be green and moldy.
- These overlapping planes are nice but when you do get flashing in there that can be a real clunky detail. Just be careful in how that actually is detailed and constructed.
- Have you tested this with any neighbors at all? These are beautiful but I'm afraid they're going to come back and say we want a pitched roof, we want brackets. How much input are we going to tolerate from neighbors?
 - \circ Al will use his judgment.
 - And if there are difficulties with a specific park, then this Commission will see it.
- I think you're going to be fine because people want shelters. It's like making an ice cream sundae, with all the choices they will have to make. This is also a nice branding effort for the City. You could also adapt it with perhaps mosaics that neighbors could do.
- Be careful to maintain the different between design and decoration. And I like the idea of a plaque that identifies where you are, but it has to be more than a plaque.
- Some of those amenities, I'm not sure they are necessary.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Cnare, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of the prototype, with the direction that the shelters would engage with the neighborhood, and that Al Martin, Secretary has the discretion to bring them to the Commission as needed. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Park Shelter Prototype

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Member Ratings								

General Comments:

• OK with prototype idea, modified to reflect neighborhood input and local considerations.