

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** 3/11/19

TITLE: 917 E Mifflin St - Exterior Alteration to a  
Designated Madison Landmark  
(Breese Stevens Field); 2nd Ald.  
Dist.

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 3/14/19

**ID NUMBER:** 54762

---

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Richard Arnesen, Katie Kaliszewski, David McLean, and Marsha Rummel. Excused was Anna Andrzejewski.

### **SUMMARY:**

*Mike Sturm, registering in support and wishing to speak*

*Vern Stenman, registering in support and available to answer questions*

*Conor Caloia, registering in support and available to answer questions*

Levitan opened the public hearing.

Levitan noted that the District 2 Alder is present.

Bailey described the revised plans for the new suite structures that were submitted by the applicant today. She pointed out that the new proposal includes metal roofing rather than vinyl, and a color scheme that will match the existing press box, with a red roof and tan walls. The dark brown framing structure mimics the colors in the existing grandstand roof. She noted that the new structures may also be permanent rather than temporary, as was previously submitted.

She discussed the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and encouraged the Commission to consider whether the revised plans meet Standard 9. Levitan asked if she thinks the updated plans address Standard 9. Bailey said that she had recommended denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the original plans, but would recommend approval with the current iteration because the modifications make the new structures compatible with the historic property.

Rummel asked if Standard 9 would apply differently if they were temporary rather than permanent structures. Bailey said that they are simply considered structures, so they are reviewed the same whether temporary or permanent.

Rummel asked Sturm if it was always part of their plan to build these structures at Breese Stevens Field. Sturm said that there has been an evolution of the facility with a significant new reuse in professional soccer, and it has been a learning experience to understand the improvements necessary to have a successful soccer franchise. He mentioned that previous Landmarks Commission approvals included canopies in the space alongside the press box, so this is similar to previous plans; however, they have recognized the importance of creating a higher scale experience.

Rummel asked if they anticipate the project returning to the Landmarks Commission again. Sturm said that they are reaching the full buildout identified in the facility report, where they investigated maintenance and programming to see what improvements would be necessary to make this a viable venue for a variety of performances and events. He pointed out that this is a modification of something that was previously approved and another level of the buildout.

Levitan asked if the revenue from the proposed improvements is something Parks took into account when negotiating the terms for uses at the facility. Sturm said that the revenue from professional soccer being held there was taken into account, though the specifics of the amenities were likely not considered. Levitan asked if the additional revenue from these amenities would prompt Parks to reopen negotiations for the contract, and Sturm said not to his understanding. Stenman said that Big Top is funding 100% of the cost of the buildout, which will become property of the City.

Levitan asked if the structures will be temporary. Stenman said that they had anticipated them being temporary, but now that they have changed the materials, they could be left up year-round. He said that they are waiting for feedback from other agencies before they make a decision, but pointed out that even with the design changes, the structures could be removed quickly.

Arnesen asked if it matters whether they are temporary or permanent as the Commission makes its decision. Bailey said that they will read as structures either way, and they are not permanently altering the historic resource. Stenman said that he understands concerns about how this will affect the facility, and emphasized that even with a metal roof, the structures can be removed in a day.

Levitan asked if the structures will be used for other events like concerts. Stenman said they most likely will. Levitan asked if Parks had a preference on whether they are permanent or temporary structures. Sturm said that Building Inspection favors them going through the full review process for permanent installation, so they anticipate them being permanent; however, they are still waiting on feedback from other agencies.

Rummel noted that the suites are climate controlled, and asked where the machinery is located. Stenman said that they are interior units with a small tube going out the side of the structure. Rummel asked if the structures are now a shorter height in the revised plans. Stenman said that they can potentially bring the front elevation down two feet and turn down the roof overhang to mimic the shape of the grandstand roof. He said that if the Commission thinks those are positive changes, they would be willing to alter the design. Levitan said that he thinks the Commission would be in favor of those changes.

Stenman explained that they had concerns about the vinyl roof in their original design collecting water, but with a metal roof they can get the pitch required for snow load and still bring the height down by two feet so that the highest point is at 13' rather than 15'. Kaliszewski said that her biggest concern is the structure's height over the historic wall, so a shorter height would be better. Stenman said that they had previously looked at the structures as temporary, but staff input has helped them look at it in a different way, and the revised design is an improvement on the original.

Arnesen asked if they are installing glass garage doors on the suites, and Stenman said that there are removable glass doors. Arnesen asked if the doors need that additional height, and Stenman said they do not. McLean asked what was driving the overall height, and Stenman said that they need framing clearance above the door.

Alder Zellers said that she is very pleased with the changes made to the design, and thanked Bailey for working with the applicants to make these changes. Zellers said that this is a much better proposal with the different materials, lower height, and turned down roof, and that she is supportive of the proposed work.

Levitan referenced the public comment received from Patrick DePula that was shared with the Commission, and said that he received the same message via his personal social media account.

Levitan closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Rummel, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of structures outlined in the revised plans with design changes including a metal roof, a height that is 13' or shorter, and a turned down roof overhang on the front of the structures.

McLean pointed out that these are large structures, and an entire bank of them along E Washington Ave will dwarf the historic wall and have an impact on the character of the historic resource. He said that he understands the support for the project from those in the neighborhood, and thinks the new materials being more on tone with the wall will help. He said that these improvements will also help to fund the longevity of the historic resource. Levitan asked which Secretary of the Interior Standard McLean thought was not met, and McLean said Standard 9, which discusses scale and massing. McLean suggested that the applicant work with their engineer to see if the height can be lowered even more. Kaliszewski spoke to the cumulative effects on the historic resource from each time new projects come before the Commission and what that means for the property moving forward. She said that she likes the shorter height and new colors in the new design. She pointed out that everything proposed can be removed fairly easily, but asked how much will continually be added to the property and when it will become permanently changed.

Levitan asked if anyone had opinions on temporary versus permanent structures. McLean said that in terms of the historic context, it doesn't matter whether the structures are there all year or only part of the year. Arnesen agreed, and said they probably have more potential to damage the historic wall if they are taking the structures down and putting them back up more often.

Levitan suggested that they add a condition to the approval that there be no advertising on top of the structures. Bailey said that the line of sight they are judging from is visibility from E Washington Ave, so that could be included in the condition. She also mentioned that any permanent signage would require a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Landmarks Commission. Stenman said that their intent is to paint the metal roof a solid red color. There was consensus that this condition be included in the motion.

### **ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Rummel, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of structures outlined in the revised plans with design changes including a metal roof, a height that is 13' or shorter, a turned down roof overhang on the front of the structures, and the condition that no signage be visible from E Washington Ave. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**