

# Design Review Board Minutes

December 17, 2013

## Project Review: Music Performance, Memorial Union Phase II / Alumni Park / WAA, & Tandem Press

### Present:

#### Board Members:

Peter Schaudt	Design Review Board
Pete Anderson	Design Review Board
Dan Okoli	FP&M CPD/ Design Review Board

#### Campus Affiliates:

Gary Brown	FP&M CP&LA
Megan McBride	FP&M CPD
Yemi Falomo	FP&M CPD
Bill Elvey	FP&M

#### Music Performance:

Susan Cook	School of Music
Pete Heaslett	FP&M CPD
Russ Van Gilder	DFD
Larry Barton	Strang
Mark Bastian	Strang
Rick Gilbertsen	Strang
Doug Moss	Holzman Moss Bottino
Malcolm Holzman	Holzman Moss Bottino
Ken Saiki	Ken Saiki Design

#### Memorial Union:

Hank Walter	Wisconsin Union
Mark Blakeslee	Wisconsin Alumni Association
Julie Grove	FP&M CPD
Lisa Pearson	DFD
Del Wilson	Uihlein-Wilson
Bill Patek	SmithGroup JJR

#### Tandem Press:

Paula Panczenko	Tandem Press
Ann Hayes	FP&M CPD
Russ Van Gilder	DFD
Dan Beyer	Continuum Architects
Ursula Twombly	Continuum Architects
Lucille Strawn	Continuum Architects

---

**Music Performance****Project Background:**

This project is an important part of the University's East Campus development plan; it calls for the creation of a contemporary and technologically advanced arts and humanities district that is consolidated along East Campus Mall, the University's pedestrian and bicycle corridor. The proposed site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of North Lake Street and University Avenue. Since the project was put on hold in 2011, the scope has been revised to include the recital hall and rehearsal space and it defers the proposed concert hall to a future project.

---

**Music Performance****Presentation:**

1. The program has generally stayed the same as it was a couple of years ago when project came to the Design Review Board for programming. The uses and functions are the same however the big difference is that the project will now be developed in a phased approach with the large concert hall as a future project.
2. There was quite a bit of work that went into the initial program; there were workshops, tours, and listening sessions. There were a variety of layouts and site options. The team also came up with a few guiding principles (see slide 6 of the presentation).
3. At the end of programming, the project included a 63,000 gross square foot facility with two primary performance spaces; a large concert hall and a recital hall. The discussion today will center on how the project will build phase one, which includes the recital hall and a rehearsal space, and then build phase two, which includes the future concert hall.

**Phasing**

4. A few years ago, the intention was to build phase one which included all three of the primary spaces (concert hall, recital hall, and rehearsal space) and a phase 1b which would build academic spaces to support the facility. However, there no longer will be a phase 1b. That work will be included in a final third phase of development with the remaining academic functions from the Humanities building.
5. After talking with the School of Music, it was decided that it would make most sense to build the most utilized spaces first, which includes the recital hall and a rehearsal space. Additionally, the project would need to build a portion of public spaces for the recital hall as well as a few support spaces.
6. The design team will now move forward with the available funding and build the most used elements; the recital hall on the south east and the rehearsal hall on the south west leaving the area in the middle open for the concert hall during phase two.

7. The design team is looking to wrap up programming in January and use 2014 as the design phase. Construction would occur at the end of 2014 and through 2015. The project would then close out in 2016.

#### **Site/Landscape**

8. The bold red lines on the drawing show the aerial apparatus routes for fire protection.
9. The design team originally designed fire access through and around the site using East Campus Mall to make sure the building was compliant with city codes.
10. The blue arrow defines the service route for the Music Performance building as well as other buildings around the area who will share the route from Lake Street.

#### **Building Mass**

11. The massing of the building was extensively discussed.
12. There was a desire to set the concert hall back into the site in order to break up the large mass and scale of the building.

#### **Lobby/Entrance**

13. The site was originally designed to have a public entrance along the south and have a student and a service entry along the north.
14. The south side of the building was designed as a streetscape plaza.

#### **South East Corner**

15. The south eastern corner of the site has always been designed as a gateway to the University with an open public space plaza.

#### **South West Corner**

16. The design team looked at creating some transparency to the building to express the activity inside the building.
17. The recital hall, which is placed on the south east corner of the building helps define the School of Music's presence at the gateway to the University. In the same respect, the rehearsal space was intended to define the school's presence from the south west perspective.
18. The team looked at creating a feature element on the corner of the Music Performance Center to bracket the Chazen Museum.

---

### **Music Performance**

#### **Design Review Board Comments:**

##### **Phasing**

1. There had been many discussions as to how to leave the area for the building between phase one and two.
2. The DRB is concerned about the complications with inserting the concert hall into a space that is bound on three sides.
3. The design team has not looked into the details related to designing phase one to allow for phase two to be built around it. Regardless of the shape of the building there will still be complications with construction phasing to consider.
4. The DRB believes people will get used to the open green space between phases and they caution the design team to treat the north façade in such a way that can manage expectations. The DRB suggested that the design team may want to

minimize the glazing that is placed along the north façade in phase one to mitigate expectations of long term views and open space possibilities.

### **Site/Landscape**

5. One of the responsibilities of the DRB is to see that new projects enhance and contribute to campus and the buildings that have come before. The DRB is concerned that the current Music Performance plan is not enhancing the Chazen museum and its site.
6. The music building's symmetry, which seems to have become even more symmetrical over time, is calling more attention to itself as a standalone building. This is an issue that the DRB has discussed in the past.
7. This building improves Lake Street but hides the Chazen Museum for those coming from the east.
8. There needs to be some balance in how this building positions itself compared to other buildings.
9. The DRB sees this building as a piece of a whole, like a Lincoln Center. They would like the building to softly connect to its surroundings.

### **Building Mass**

10. The design team did discuss moving the acoustical chamber on the sides of the concert hall above the hall so that they could compress the footprint. This option was rejected because of acoustical issues, a desire to have a less massive structure close to University Avenue, and to keep the mass relative in scale to that of the Chazen Museum.
11. The design team stated that the users preferred to have all of the spaces on the same level so that large instruments didn't have to be moved around between floor levels.
12. It was suggested that this building should be taller and more compact so that the building could open up or pull back into the site on the west side, which borders the Chazen Museum.
13. The DRB would prefer to have a taller building if that meant the south west corner could better relate to its surrounding context.

### **Lobby/Entrance**

14. The main entrance to the building seems to be tucked behind the mass of some of the buildings elements. The DRB would like to see the entrance/lobby relate more to the landscape plaza in front of the Chazen. The rehearsal space juts into the lobby and blocks the Chazen plaza.
15. The DRB discussed looking at the building rotated 90 degrees with the entrance on Lake Street. They suggested that the lobby should have a presence on University Ave but that it could appear only as a corner piece.
16. The design team did also look at rotating the building but those concepts were not preferred.
17. In the first phase, before the concert hall is built, the design team doesn't plan to build all of the lobby space. They are looking into ways in which they can phase the lobby so that it will work for the amount of program in phase one and then they can build onto it in phase two with the concert hall.

### **South West Corner**

18. The DRB would like to see the music building take up more of the south east corner which would allow the building to open up along the west corner near the Chazen plaza.
19. The DRB thinks it's also problematic that the south west corner of the building sits so close to the curb but it was a deliberate decision in the Campus Master Plan to make the Chazen's forecourt closed off on the east and west end. The desire was to make the forecourt feel enclosed like a room to reflect the feel of the urban campus.
20. In the past there were discussions about having the south west corner lighter and transparent.
21. The south west façade is too long in the southern direction. It would be nice if it could be a reentrance corner and be shorter so that it doesn't get so close to University Avenue.
22. The intention of the design team was to have a lobby space that one could understand from University Avenue from both the pedestrian and the vehicle perspective.
23. The DRB stated that there is a need to enter from three directions. There is the pedestrian plaza and lobby along University Avenue, there is the Gateway entrance in the south east corner of the site, and there is the south west corner off the Chazen plaza and the East Campus Mall which is also important.
24. Currently the design team has represented the rehearsal space as a cube with some glazing. This is unresolved and somewhat problematic because the users believe this space does not need glazing. The design team hopes that this space can be transparent or at least translucent so that the activity inside is somewhat visible from the exterior but this has not yet been resolved.
25. The DRB could picture adding doors to the rehearsal space which would allow the Chazen's forecourt to become a swing space for rehearsals and gatherings.
26. The design team pointed out there is also a space that runs between the performance center and the eastern edge of the Chazen which has also not been resolved.
27. The design team is trying to activate the Chazen's forecourt by allowing some transparency between outsiders and the performers. The challenge will be whether or not the performers, professors, or students want that level of transparency or if they will constantly draw the shades. The design team is looking into an option where they place mirrors in the ceiling so that outsiders can see the performers and directors but the performers and directors would not be distracted. This is a discussion that the design team will have to have with the school.
28. The DRB thinks there needs to be some balance of urbanity, transparency, and functionality. They think this is a great project to enliven University Avenue and they believe the design team is headed in the right direction. They stated that music is such a beautiful art form that it would be nice to see it externalized.
29. The DRB doesn't understand the importance of the Lake Street entrance but they are happy to hear that the design team is still working on these challenges.

---

## **Music Performance Summary:**

1. The project is headed in the right direction but there are issues to work out.
2. Transparency is important but there needs to be a balance between transparency and function.
3. This project has a civic responsibility and the DRB is excited to see it develop further.
4. There is some discomfort with the south east corner of the building that should be revisited in further designs. One option would be for the main entrance to move to the south west corner. Currently there seems to be a rationale to have an entry at three points but this should be developed further. The people moving along East Campus Mall will use the south west entrance and those parking in the ramp will use the south east entrance.
5. The design team plans to come back in February and at that time the DRB would like to see a diagram of the public parking and the larger urban context and its influence.
6. The ways in which the volumes of the building are treated will be essential to the buildings relationship to the surrounding buildings.
7. The plans need to further tie the music performance center to the Chazen Museum.

---

## **Memorial Union/Alumni Park/Wisconsin Alumni Center Renovation Project Background:**

The second phase of the Memorial Union project will restore the building's exterior and interior. Plans for the interior include modest renovations and infrastructure improvements. This project will also improve the functional relationship between the dining area in the northeast corner of the building and the terrace. A new service elevator will be installed along with an underground loading dock.

The Alumni Park project will provide for a new campus civic space between the Memorial Union and the Red Gym on existing parking lot #1. Functions include alumni recognition spaces, landscape plantings, seating and gathering areas, and iconic university images to portray the importance of university faculty, staff, and alumni accomplishments.

In coordination with the Memorial Union and Alumni Park projects, the Wisconsin Alumni Center will be building a new entrance along Alumni Park- One Alumni Plaza. The entrance will bring visitors and alumni into an existing space that is being redesigned to serve as a welcome center. The welcome center will include meeting space and a lounge.

The Memorial Union Phase II and Alumni Park projects will be discussed with a focus on materials and site developments, as both are currently in the design development

phase. The Wisconsin Alumni Center Renovation will be presented in relationship to the other two projects; however, the focus will be on the recently concluded design study which was completed in October.

---

## **Memorial Union/Alumni Park/Wisconsin Alumni Center Renovation Presentation:**

1. The design is the same as what was presented at the last DRB meeting; the only changes are updates to materials.

### **Vegetation**

2. The design team has broken the site down into major components, the first of which are the lawns. Typically, the lawn will be blue grass turf mix. They will be mowed and a place where people can sit and where tents can be temporarily installed. There are three major areas; a lawn at the end of Progress Point, the Picnic Knoll, and the large green space in the middle of Alumni Park. (Slide 13)
3. The rest of Alumni Park is made up of ground cover, shrubs, and vegetation beds which make up most of the site. (slide 14)
4. Some of the beds are used to negotiate grade change; some of the beds are used to augment the exhibits; and some of the beds are used to visually soften bike parking.
5. There were many discussions about how much plantings should be on the Terrace and the design team believes they have come to a good balance of hardscape and greenery.
6. There will be a grove of Oaks and a Honeylocust on the historic Terrace that will remain along with the historic Hawthorn in front of the Red Gym and some street trees. (slide 15)
7. There are many trees that will need to be removed including a large Linden Tree on the historic Terrace.
8. The design team will be adding trees along the Seam (the sidewalk east of the Memorial Union and adjacent to Alumni Park) and they will add some trees to the Terrace in a historic fashion with Oaks and a few Maples which will provide shade quicker. (slide 16)
9. The arborist who has been advising the design team said some of the trees had 75 years of life left in them so, the design team will use that time to build up the canopy on the east side of the Terrace with new oaks.
10. The design team is trying to keep the East Campus Mall corridor open but tuck some plants in behind the Red Gym and along the Alumni Center.
11. The design team has added a few medium scale trees along Alumni Way. (slide 17)

### **Materials**

12. There are a few areas where the design team is proposing standard grey concrete. One area is adjacent to Hoofers. They will continue the grey concrete along the Terrace front as well as continue the scoring pattern that currently exists in front of Hoofers. There will also be grey concrete inside of the right-of-way which

- will match what is happening in that area in phase I. The team is also looking to place grey concrete along the western edge of the Red Gym. (slide19)
13. The colored concrete with the sandblast finish is a material that the team has used in phase I. This is the material for the bulk of the site. It will be placed in the Terrace, along the path in front of the lake, along the seam, and at the south east entrance to the Memorial Union. (slide 20)
  14. The design team is proposing an accent colored concrete paver to contrast with the grey concrete, mainly along the ripples, around the Alumni Center and in a few locations at the south east entry to the Memorial Union. (slide 21)
  15. The WHS has told the design team they would like the limestone paving at the historic terrace to be the same if not similar to what exists today. They are also proposing this stone along Alumni Way and in the outdoor classroom. (slide 22)
  16. There are a couple places where the design team is proposing wood. There would be wood on the stage floor, the benches along the lake, and on the benches at the south east entry to the Memorial Union. (slide 23)
  17. The WHS has asked that the team replace some of the planters around the historic Terrace in kind so the design team is proposing stone on the historic steps and around the two planters. This will be a stone wall with a stone cap and a mortared joint. (slide 24)
  18. The majority of the walls in the Terrace will be a poured concrete wall with a stone cap. The design team is still considering different options but they believe the wall will be sandblasted with a limestone cap. The heights of most of the walls are seat height or less. There is no wall that is greater than 30 inches from one section in the Terrace to the next. (slide 25)
  19. The majority of the stairs in phase I are precast and the design team would like to match that look in phase II on the Terrace and in Alumni Park. (slide 26)
  20. The south east walls will be similar to those in phase I and made out of a precast concrete. The wall around the mechanical room will be slightly higher than any of the walls in phase I. (slide 27)
  21. There are a few locations where the design team is proposing monolithic limestone benches and seats. These stones will be placed around the classroom, in parts of Alumni Park and in some areas at the south east entry. (slide 28)
  22. The design team has tried to keep the layout as simple as possible. In the bulk of the park there are three materials.

### **Lighting**

23. The design team is proposing four different light fixtures.
24. They are proposing historic fixtures at the south east entry to match those in phase I.
25. They are proposing 25 foot mast lights with a beacon light at the top along Alumni Way; some of these have signage hung on them.
26. The team is also proposing café lights on the historic Terrace. The team has found a photo of these lights in a picture taken in the 1960's. For the rest of the site the team is looking at a non-bird-friendly, spider web free pedestrian light. They have also designed some step lights to be placed in the seat walls, similar to those in phase I. (slide 30-32)

## **WAA**

1. Through the creation of Alumni Park, the Wisconsin Alumni Center realized they need a front door on the west side of their building, facing the Park.
2. In order to create this west entrance, the design team has adjusted the perimeter form of the current one story 1980's addition to the Alumni Center.
3. The desire was to make the building feel like it is part of Alumni Park rather than an entrance that is tacked onto the original building.
4. The rooftop deck of the Alumni Center is around the same level as Progress Point and the stage level of the Memorial Union Terrace. The design team was interested in how they could connect all these elements visually.
5. The design team looked at how the interior layout could connect the two entrances of the Wisconsin Alumni Center, the one on North Lake Street and the new entrance off Alumni Park.
6. The new space was designed to be a welcoming gathering space for Alumni and the general public.
7. There is a two foot grade difference between the finished floor of the Alumni Center and the path along the lakeshore. The design team has negotiated the grade change internally with steps and a ramp.
8. The design team has also increased the exterior glazing on the existing building to open up views to the lake and create more transparency into the building.
9. The design intent is to keep the field stone look which exists on the current building.
10. The plan also includes a roof top terrace that will have views to the lake and to the Memorial Union Terrace.
11. The design team has come up with two options which connect the plaza along the lake and the Alumni Park classroom to the rooftop terrace.
12. The two options have been submitted in the predesign study without a decision, but the design team is interested in the DRB's thoughts on the two options.
13. In both options there is an ADA ramp that will allow access to both the rooftop deck and the lower plaza.
14. Currently both options are cost neutral, so the decision should center around which option is best for the site and the Wisconsin Alumni Association.

---

## **Memorial Union/Alumni Park/Wisconsin Alumni Center Renovation**

### **Design Review Board Comments:**

#### **Vegetation**

1. The DRB believes there is too much happening at the south east entry to the Memorial Union. They would like to see some of the trees removed from the plaza space so there is a greater sense of arrival
2. The DRB believes the planting areas are too small and it will be difficult to maintain the planting beds. They would like to see the three southern planting areas in the center of the plaza area removed.
3. The design team added the planters in the plaza because they were looking to define an area for tabling that would be out of the way of the main traffic flow.

4. The Wisconsin Union believes that there are many people that enjoy the greenery and the natural aspects of the site. They would hate to see the vegetation which is closer to the building and stairs go away.
5. The design team believes there will be enough respite, closer to the building between the two planters bordering the wood stairs, so they could remove the three planters closest to Langdon Street.
6. The DRB would like to see a few longer life trees along the loading dock entry. The proposed poplars typically have a very short life span.
7. The Design Review Board also believes that the center grove of trees in Alumni Park, at the end of Alumni Way (west of Progress Point) should be removed. They want to see a bold postcard view; these trees seem to be impeding that view.
8. The design team was attempting to frame the view on Progress Point but they will look into other options possibly using shrubs instead of trees.
9. It was stated that a few edits would quiet the design a bit and create a better overall plan.

### **Materials**

10. The DRB thinks the Alumni Park signage in the Welcome Plaza looks too commercial. They would like to see a more traditional sign application. They would like to see the large steps continue west around to the smaller steps and have all the steps be made of the monolithic stone. In essence the stairs in this area would be one arc.
11. The DRB believes that the pavement should also be one material from the bike parking through to the Alumni Welcome Plaza. Different things can happen in this space but the paving materials should remain the same. The material could be the upgraded concrete, although if that was the case the two southern entries of the Memorial Union would not be the same material.
12. The WAA would like to see the Welcome Plaza remain as its own identity.
13. The DRB would also like to extend the raised area in Langdon Street (the table top pedestrian crossing) to the east, but they are not sure that is possible based on city requirements.
14. Under the current plan the materials and the planters tend to emphasize the Seam rather than Alumni Way.
15. The DRB would like to see the path along the lake be one of the two materials not both.
16. The change in the material along the lake was determined by a cost savings.
17. The Wisconsin Union stated that the area along the lake north of the Terrace is used in a different way than the Terrace so it would make sense that there would be a material change at that location.
18. The WAA could imagine blocking the path along the lake and using it for functions, due to this reasoning they would like to see a higher quality material in this area.
19. It was stated that the path between the Alumni Park and the Alumni Center building, along the classroom, should become the concrete pavers not the sandblasted concrete.

20. The DRB believes there is a lot going on in the plans and they think the design could benefit if it became more simple, consistent, and unified.
21. It was decided that the paving along the shoreline should be all one material and that being the sandblasted colored concrete.
22. The DRB likes the concrete pavers moving through the colored concrete along the seam.
23. The design team believes that a lot of the areas on the site will appear to the untrained eye as the same material. The sandblast concrete and the grey concrete will be very similar.
24. The DRB believes the cantilever at the end of Alumni Way is too massive. The design team may want to consider making the cantilever thinner or not a cantilever at all. If it's not a real cantilever it could simply be a sloped wall.

### **Lighting**

25. The DRB likes the mast heads along Alumni Way.
26. The DRB does not like the LED strip lighting along the ripples. They do not believe Alumni Park is the correct setting for these lights.

### **Terrace**

27. The DRB thinks the Terrace looks great.

### **WAA**

28. The DRB has a clear preference for stair option A and they would like to see the stair material relate to the building and not necessarily to the Alumni Park.  
(Please see attached)
29. The DRB would also like to see the stairs become heated if the budget permitted.  
(This will likely not be approved by the DOA or the campus based on energy conservation concerns.)
30. The design team stated the raised entry was designed to drive daylight and to accommodate the grade change between the exterior and the interior floor. The DRB thinks that if the vestibule ceiling was not raised the rooftop deck would have even better views to the lake and Terrace.
31. The DRB thinks the rectangular planter at the top of the steps along the rooftop deck is awkward and should be removed.
32. The DRB would like the design team to consider thickening the pylon/sign. They also would like to see the horizontal band terminate before it reached the pylon. The pylon is the element that needs to be done right so the team might want to look at the element a bit more and maybe even make a physical model of the element.
33. The DRB is pleased with the direction this project has taken and they feel the space will be warm. They believe the interior spaces have a feel of a club and will be a nice destination for Alumni.

---

## **Tandem Press**

### **Project Background:**

This project will bring Tandem Press, a self-supporting printmaking studio from its current location off campus, to a permanent home on campus in new and renovated

space in a former UW warehouse. Space will be designed for printmaking and etching, gallery space suitable for receptions and public viewing, and space for sale and storage of the art collection. This will be the second review and will focus on Schematic Design options.

---

## **Tandem Press Presentation:**

1. Tandem Press is a public and private organization. They are part of the School of Education but they have visiting artists and they sell their work.

### **Site/Landscape**

2. The proposed site is within the Arts Lofts campus and a half block away from the Kohl's Center. The site resides between North Frances Street on the west and West Mifflin Street on the east.
3. The existing building is a one story brick building and part of a metal warehouse building.
4. Two and three story public apartment buildings border the site as well as a Madison School district building to the north
5. The design team is trying to design for two different entities; they want to help Tandem Press increase their presence on campus, and they want to design for the public in order to draw artists to their organization and sell their work.
6. The design team has gone through numerous iterations and massing studies.
7. During the schematic design process the design team learned of a new private building development that may be built directly north of Tandem Press's proposed site.
8. Originally, the design for Tandem Press was planned with the entire program on one floor but after news of the potential development to the north, the design team began developing two story concepts.
9. The design team has looked at creating an entrance that connects the building to campus. They also have looked at creating exterior space that provides daylight to the building's interior spaces as well as functional outdoor space.
10. The design team has arrived at a scheme which places the addition parallel to the pedestrian walkway that will run between Tandem Press and the new development. The walkway will act as a connection between the public developments along West Mifflin Street and the campus buildings to the northwest.
11. The site is a challenging site for a loading dock which requires turnaround space. Due to the constraints of the site it was determined that access off North Frances Street would be the best option for the loading dock.
12. The main entrance to Tandem Press has been placed off of West Mifflin Street.
13. The design team has also carved away some space for visitor parking along West Mifflin Street for Tandem Press's clients. Currently the team has located four parking stalls in this area.
14. The gallery is cantilevered over the building which creates a covered pedestrian path with the loading dock at the northwest end of the building. The design team

- is still looking at the relationship of the loading dock to the building and they are aware that they need to be mindful of some details that arise from having the loading dock below a cantilevered gallery.
15. The loading dock will essentially be two double doors and not have a raised dock to minimize the look of the service entry.
  16. Currently the gallery is around 12 feet above the finished floor so clearance for under the cantilever will be around 12 feet 2 inches.
  17. Unfortunately the gallery can't be raised to accommodate more loading dock clearance. The current warehouse structure is driving the ceiling height; if the ceiling were to be raised the main structural beam would intersect the new structure in such a way that would cut off adequate head room and make the space non-compliant with code.
  18. The design team has been discussing bollards and other options to protect the gallery from trucks that will use the loading dock.
  19. The finished floor is around three feet above exterior grade so the project requires an accessible ramp.
  20. The design team has placed a ramp along the pedestrian path coming from the west with the stairs to the entrance along the east façade. The design team believes it makes sense to have a ramp coming from campus; they are looking into whether they want to place a second ramp on the east end as well. There are some complications with a second ramp due to the three feet of grade change and the length the ramp needed to make the ramp accessible.
  21. The design team did look at creating a ramp with a switchback but that doesn't seem to be the right option. Ken Saiki, the project landscape architect, has just begun to look at these issues but he believes there is a good solution.
  22. The design team is still looking at the exterior forecourt and they are working with Ken Saiki to design the area.
  23. Canopy options over the entrance are still being designed. The design team is looking at how the canopy might relate to the interior ceiling and up through to the gallery ceiling.
  24. The proposed development to the north is still undefined, however, it has the potential of being as close as 18-20 feet from Tandem Press's site.
  25. The design team is looking at keeping the façade along West Mifflin Street a simple brick building.

### **Floor Plans**

26. The floor plan is comprised of three pieces. There is an administrative wing with the director's office, curatorial staff space, lobby space, and storage. The second piece is studio space where the equipment is located and the prints are made. The third piece of the program is gallery space where Tandem Press will display some of their artwork.
27. The gallery was determined to be the best space to occupy the second story.
28. The design team wanted to make the gallery accessible and still a part of the facility. In order to connect the space to the rest of the building, the design team has created a large staircase to bring people up to the second floor and activate the gallery.

29. The western edge of the gallery is all glass which visually connects the site back to campus. The view currently looks out onto the lawn in front of the Kohl Center. A future Art building, to the northwest, may eventually block this view.
30. The design team placed a conference room between the gallery and the studio with a window that looks down into the studio.
31. There is a balcony off the gallery that overlooks the studio as well. The design team thought it was very important to continue to make the connection back to where the prints are made.
32. The visiting artist's office is placed on the second floor including a balcony space which overlooks the studio as well.
33. An important issue in the studio has always been the ability to bring daylight into the space. The design team has placed clerestory windows along the east wall to bring daylight into the studio and they have placed some large windows on the first floor, north end, which will bring direct light into the space.
34. There is a partially exposed basement in the current brick building, however, the design team does not plan to do much with the space. There is some existing mechanical equipment that will be upgraded, some walls will be demolished, and a new elevator will be installed.
35. The elevator will be a service elevator.
36. Tandem Press will use this basement space for storage and mechanical equipment.

#### **Building Materials/Building Skin**

37. The design team became intrigued by the metal engraving process one of the artists was working on while they were visiting the studio. The process intrigued the team so much that they are looking into ways to articulate something similar on the skin of the building. The design team thinks they want to use a light metal skin that would bring brightness to the tight corridor along the north.
38. The design team has also looked at a flat metal panel option and an option where they could express the structural truss qualities of the cantilever on the skin of the building.
39. The team is still looking at how to articulate the skin and how much glazing it should have.

---

#### **Tandem Press**

#### **Design Review Board Comments:**

1. The DRB really enjoys this scheme.

#### **Site/Landscape**

2. The DRB questioned if there would be enough room for a ramp next to the stair on the east side of the building. They suggest the front entrance could be moved around to the north and come off of the forecourt.
3. It was suggested that something could be added to the front entrance/courtyard that would grab people's attention and pull them into the building.
4. An option was discussed where the retaining wall would be removed and steps added to open up the area along the pedestrian corridor.

5. The design team thinks the replacement of the retaining wall for stairs could be an appropriate gesture for the area but it depends on how Tandem would like to use the forecourt and how public they want the space to be.
6. It was suggested that the stairs on the east could be pulled back into the forecourt and the door could be moved so that the entry could become a bit softer and the sidewalk could open up a bit. The design team thinks this could be a good option but they would want to look at ways to clearly define the entrance so that it didn't become hidden from view.

### **Floor Plans**

7. It was stated that it would be nice to find some way in which the plan could incorporate daylight into the visiting artist's studio/office.
8. The DRB questioned why the fire exit stair is positioned where it is.
9. It was suggested that the fire exit stair could move to where the corridor is currently located and the visiting artist studio could move to where the stair is currently shown in the plans, then windows could be added to the same façade as the windows at the end of the gallery for the visiting artist studio.
10. The design team stated that the stair does not currently exist and that it could move.
11. The design team would like to eliminate the exit door on the wall of the gallery.
12. Ideally the design team would have the exit to the stairs come through the balcony so that they could limit the number of doors in the gallery. The problem with this option is that there is a beam running down the middle for the existing building in the studio space that would not provide enough head height for a corridor to the stairs.

### **Building Materials/Building Skin**

13. The DRB questioned whether the column on the exterior is structurally necessary. They would like to see the column become something like a fat lally column that could be set back under the cantilever so that the long cantilever structure became more defined.
14. The DRB suggested that the metal: the northern façade, the column, and the retaining wall could be imagined in the same plane and as one piece of material with some cutouts. The canopy at the entrance might also become part of the one plane of metal. The gallery stair skin and the lobby skin could be another material.
15. The DRB stated that the thrust of the cantilever seemed to be horizontal in nature and they question whether the metal should be oriented in a horizontal fashion rather than a vertical fashion.
16. The design team does like the idea of keeping the bend at the gallery stair in the same material as the cantilever but they can see how changing the orientation of the metal panels could enhance the organic nature of the gallery mass. They are still looking at material options.
17. It was stated that depending on what happens with the proposed building development to the north, the skin on Tandem Press might not be very visible and its articulation might not make much impact.
18. The DRB does think the metal column takes away from what they believe is a very nice concept.

19. The DRB suggested that if the retaining wall was not metal but brick, it would enhance the metal gallery mass.
20. It was suggested that the design team may look at involving Tandem Press to develop a material for the skin.
21. The DRB suggested that the building could be a canvas which could accept art so that the collaboration would not hold up the building process.
22. The raised structure, on the roof, above the lobby may want to be another material in order to further strengthen the metal structure. The design team stated that the raised area has not yet been resolved; at one point there were plans to add some clerestory windows to this area but they have since been removed to reduce structural cost.
23. Tandem Press thinks the design is wonderful but they still believe there are some details to work out such as parking, the proposed transit station development that may be built to the north, and how much they want to open up the north façade of their building given that the building may be placed in close proximity to the newly proposed building to the north.

---

**Tandem Press  
Summary:**

1. The design is moving in the right direction but there are some detail issues to work out.
2. The DRB would like to see more development on the skin, how the structure meets the ground, the ramp, and access to the building.
3. The design team should consider long term integration of art so that the skin could say something about the building or Tandem Press.
4. Universal access is always a big issue for campus; the university does not want to make anyone feel like a second class citizen.

---

**Addendum:**

January 24<sup>th</sup> 2014

**Reference Comment:**

Music Performance

Design Review Board Comments:

29. The DRB doesn't understand the importance of the Lake Street entrance but they are happy to hear that the design team is still working on these challenges.

**Further Explanation Provided by Pete Anderson on January 19<sup>th</sup> 2014 as follows:**

“It seems to me that the art plaza in front of the Chazen Museum is the more important space along University Avenue. Stretching the effective width of Lake St. with a setback to emphasize a Lake St. entrance to the Music Building whittles away at the importance of the Chazen plaza. If one were to eliminate the Lake St entrance and focus on improving the University Ave frontage by putting the entrance there, I think the issue of how to treat the facade facing the Chazen plaza would become much easier to resolve.”