

Design Review Board

June 15, 2011

Present: Peter Schaudt, Art Hove, Susan Weiler, Pete Anderson, Dan Okoli

Staff: Gary Brown, Alan Fish, Dorothy Steele, Pat Richards

Project Review: Softball Practice Facility

A/E Firm: Potter Lawson – Eric Lawson

Dept. of Commerce: Dan Murray

Client Representative: John Chadima

Overview:

Chadima provided an overview of the program, noting that UW-Madison is the only Big 10 university that does not have a baseball team. Women's softball was added in 1998 and has been supported by the Goodman brothers. It is hoped that the Goodman Foundation will also support this project. This indoor practice facility will provide space for batting cages and infield practice. The architects have been charged with developing a concept that can be presented to the Goodman Foundation in August 2011. Athletics believes that with this addition the needs of the program will be met for the foreseeable future. This would become the permanent home for softball with the program vacating space currently used in the McClain facility.

Lawson provided an overview of the site which includes existing bleachers, press box, concession stand, storage buildings. The existing building is a white concrete cube with red accents.

- New building will be tucked behind and connected to the existing building and will match the height of the press box.
- The interior will include a full infield for infield and pitching practice, and movable batting cages. The floor of the practice field will be dirt with synthetic turf. Space for a team lounge, offices, an umpire room and limited storage are also included.
- A new entrance for athletes will be created between the new and existing building. This connector will be glazed and very transparent. The red piers from the existing facility will be repeated in the connector. The first floor will be usable space with mechanicals on the second floor.
- The exterior of the new building will be brick in a tone to blend with buildings in the neighborhood. There may be a concrete band to visually tie to the existing building. There is a desire to provide light into the interior but not direct sunlight.
- A freestanding vertical green wall may be included as a screen in front of the new facility.
- Spectators approach the existing facility from the east. A projecting wall with roof supported by red piers funnels spectators up the stairs to the bleachers. A sign for the Goodman Softball Complex is proposed to be added to the wall.
- A small amount of surface parking for coaches will be moved behind the new building off the new fire lane. The existing walk can be improved to create a main entry focal point as you enter the site from the east.

Design Review Board discussion:

- The basic concept is right. Location, massing and service are all handled well.
- The new facility is over-designed. It should be a handsome, simple practice facility that meets the needs of the program. A metal structure that would be less expensive would be fine. Money should instead be applied to improving the front of the house instead of the back. If it were possible to envelope the existing building that would be good.
- The wall that funnels spectators to the bleachers could be improved, possibly with a bench, signage for the Goodman complex and the motion W. Brick could be introduced at this wall to create a collegiate feel.
- The entry should be paved nicely and trees planted, including a hedge or greenwall at the bleachers, to soften the landscape.
- Pay attention to the approach and the experience. The intent should be to create a place rather than a building.
- The Campus Master Plan showed 3 outdoor tennis courts where this new building is located. Chadima explained that it would still be possible to add extra outdoor courts in the area if deemed necessary in the future. At this point, Athletics believes these additional courts will not be needed. They are really only necessary for outdoor Big Ten tournaments that only happen on a very infrequent basis.
- Stormwater management has to be included in this project. This would preclude any future tennis courts in the area. Including a green roof on the new practice facility should be considered to assist with stormwater management. Structural loading issues will need to be investigated.

Project Review: Music Performance

A/E Firms: Holzmann Moss – Doug Moss; Strang & Associates – Jeff Gaard

Landscape Architecture Firm: Ken Saiki Design – Ken Saiki, Pat Saiki

FP&M Project Manager: Julie Grove

Client Representative: John Stevens

The architects provided an overview of the project. This is the second appearance before the Design Review Board. This is near the end of programming pre-design, with the program statement due in one month. The official fund-raising campaign will then be launched. The architects provided a reminder of the important principles informing the design, including strengthening teaching, recording and town-gown relationships. The landscape architect provided an overview of the site, parking, circulation patterns and noted the importance of the East Campus Mall and that this facility will provide a critical transition from city to campus.

- Setbacks from University Ave are currently planned for 32 feet, Lake Street at 22 feet which is then reduced to 12 feet as you move north along the street. The lobby will be 25 feet in depth with a potential for greater visual setback (if the lobby is primarily glazed). The size of the lobby is much less generous than would be typical of a public performance space. It is shallow but provides access to three key rooms: concert hall, recital hall and rehearsal space).
- The rehearsal space has been relocated to the southwest corner of the building. The ideal placement would have this space between the concert and recital halls, but this location will allow it to also serve as an informal performance space and a pre-function space off the lobby at times. The rehearsal space may be designed with glazing to show the activity and energy in the building, if it can be done without inhibiting the programmatic function of the space. The rehearsal space must be at the same level as the stages of the concert and recital halls to provide easy access for musicians and instruments.
- The design includes ‘bonus space’ that is included in Phase II of the design but that may be included in Phase I if funding allows. This would include practice rooms, classrooms and rehearsal rooms. This could also include a rehearsal room specifically for the recital hall.
- The reverberation chambers start 12 feet above the floor and are large open chambers needed for acoustics.
- Stevens emphasized the need to meet the programmatic needs including separating the public from the student spaces. Public access will be limited to the front of the building. Performers should not need to move thru the lobby with instruments to access the halls. Creating an environment conducive to teaching is critical. Opening up the rehearsal space to public view may inhibit or distract musicians and conductors. He also noted that the Humanities Building will remain in use until Phase II is complete.

Design Review Board discussion

- The Chazen needs breathing space at the juncture with Music Performance (southeast corner of Chazen, southwest corner of Music Performance). There are windows in this corner of Chazen that need to be respected. Discussion centered

- on relocating the rehearsal space, but all options create programmatic problems and an impact on what would become the “bonus space” of phase I. Architects noted that the concert hall also needs to be symmetrical for acoustics, sight lines, etc.
- Consider rotating the center volume of the concert hall. This triangulation could relieve the corner particularly if the rehearsal space could be pushed back. The rehearsal space could evolve into a figural shape.
 - The city grid has to be maintained on the exterior but the rehearsal room could be smaller scale and figural within that space. This should take cues from Chazen and create a nice bookend to the Arts Plaza.
 - The southeast corner of the building and site needs to be very civic in nature. The design needs to be crisp and pure. The relationship between the exterior and interior is critical at this corner.
 - The lobby is actually low on the list of academic program priorities. The building needs to be casual and informal rather than a miniature Overture Center. The character of the lobby can be more like rehearsal space even though it could be used for informal performances.
 - The importance of tying together the campus Arts community – from SOHE, the Union Theatre, Chazen, Music and the Arts Loft was emphasized. An internal ‘street’ thru Music Performance could help articulate this connection.
 - Programming of the ‘bonus space’ will inform how far back the Phase I spaces can be pushed. Service, including a dock, will be on the north side of the building. Separation of the dock from the student entry will be important.

Design Review Board summary:

- This review was an excellent example of how the DRB process should work with the architects, landscape architects, clients and board members engaged in a good give and take. If this is indicative of design, this will be a fabulous building.
- Simplifying the design should always be a goal.
- The lobby should perhaps be more informal to respond to the needs of the program, be welcoming to students, etc. There needs to be an appropriate relationship between the rehearsal space and the lobby that provides the sense that this is a teaching environment. The public should be brought in to the teaching/student space.
- The rehearsal space needs to work for the Music program. The space may be shaped or figural but the program is key.
- The Chazen needs to be respected and given space, particularly in relation to the southwest corner of Music Performance.
- Explore creating an internal public gathering space, perhaps with skylights.
- The southeast corner needs strong relationships between the interior and exterior. This needs to be an important civic space.

Project Review: Lakeshore Residence Hall – Phase II

A/E Firm: Eppstein Uhen – Brad Nygaard, Paul Raisleger, Jonathan Parker, Molly Dunlap

Landscape Architecture Firm: Ken Saiki Design – Ken Saiki, Jon Wanta

FP&M Project Manager: Stu LaRose

DSF Project Manager: Rex Loker

Client Representative: Paul Evans

Overview:

The building has increased in size with 20 beds added over the single story mass on the north end of the building. This has increased the count to 174 beds and eliminated the one story apartment appendage. A greenhouse has been added to the roof on the south, as have 72 solar panels for hot water, this will support the mission of the hall which is to 'learn to live sustainably'. Gold LEED rating is the goal.

- The building has been shifted to the east as far as possible. Bike parking has been concentrated on the east. Moped parking is included. A second fire lane has been added to gain access from Elm Drive to the west. This provides fire department coverage to Cole Hall and Holt Commons which would be lost with this new building.
- The southern pedestrian walk connects to Lakeshore Residence Hall – Phase I to the west. The entire promenade will be part of the project. Paving patterns will tie the two designs together.
- The entry sequence to Holt has been reworked, with the entrance pushed east to create more courtyard space.
- More vegetation has been included to screen the upper northeast corner. This also screens the apartment from pedestrian traffic.
- A rain garden with a natural woodland feel has been included. A more natural spacing of trees helps create this sense of nature. This will help with stormwater management as well as being aesthetically pleasing.
- The gate to Allen Centennial Garden has been aligned with the east fire lane/promenade. This area will be cleaned up and more storage space added.
- The exterior of the building will be a combination of brick, manufactured stone (rock and smooth face) and a base of dolomitic stone.

Design Review Board discussion

- The fourth floor has double windows whereas floors below have a single window per room. Questioned why double windows aren't included throughout.
- The narrow column of beige brick on the façade isn't needed.
- Recesses at windows accentuate the height of the building which isn't needed since the building is already quite tall.
- The greenhouse is a good addition.
- On the south side of the building the walk looks nervous. Saiki indicated that is due to grading issues and the attempt to design around important existing trees.
- Consider using dwarf flowering trees and shrubs on the south side of the building instead of grass. The focus should be on spring and autumn plantings, a combination of flowering or nut trees/shrubs.

- The area next to the rain garden should be horticulturally rich. The rain garden could be extended toward Holt and bridged by the walk. Seating around the raingarden would be a nice amenity.
- Consider the verticality of the building and the role of color and texture. The ends, at the building entrances, need to be lightened up.
- Explore whether there is a way to make a positive out of the retaining wall needed to manage the grade change at Holt. Required exits from Holt and the residence hall limit the options.
- The north end seems to be paving heavy. Study whether it is possible to remove proposed sidewalks, add more vegetation and have people walk on the drives as they currently do in this area.
- FPM should look at paving patterns across campus to determine what to include where. The same pattern if not the same material from East Campus Mall could be used.
- The land could be molded better to meet learning needs which should be integrated with the landscape. A hierarchy of planting designs needs to be established.

Project Review: Memorial Union

A/E Firms: Uihlein-Wilson – Del Wilson, Nat Stein; Moody Nolan – Rex Hagerling, Bob Larrimer

Landscape Architecture Firm: JJR – Bill Patek, Kyle Trulen

FP&M Project Manager: Angela Pakes Ahlman

DSF Project Manager: Sam Calvin

Client Representative: Mark Guthier, Hank Walter, Wendy von Below; Colin Plunkett

The architect and landscape architect provided an overview of the project which is the first in a two phase project. The architect will be meeting with the WI Historical Society to discuss their concerns with impact on the historic structure.

- The Historical Society has instructed the architects not to overshadow the grand central stair on the south façade. A new entrance is planned for the southwest corner to equal the existing entrance on the southeast.
- Options for the theatre wing's north addition for pre-function space were reviewed. Features include an expanded terrace and a 'sunset deck' that could include an exterior stair down to the terrace.
- The Historical Society wants the line of the south façade of the connector (west theater wing and the central core) maintained. This will mean either the infill section is removed and rebuilt (extending up a story) or the front wall will be maintained with new construction behind.
- The Hooper addition on the north will be primarily glass and stone.
- A new loading dock area will be provided for the theatre on North Park Street. The current ticket office addition will be removed and the existing canopy restored. A new canopy will be created over the proposed new loading dock door.
- New elevator shafts and major exhausts will require new roof projections on both the west and main wings. Phase II may require additional exhausts on the roofs to the east.
- The outdoor brat stand will need to be reconstructed and integrated into the building. By code it can no longer be an open air stand.
- Water infiltration has caused damage to the building. The stone façade and mortar joints need attention.
- A glassed addition on the north side of the connector (at the Terrace) will enclose a stair from the second floor. This will improve access on the second floor and provide elevator access to the Terrace from the stair plinth above.

Design Review Board discussion:

- The Hoopers addition has a flat, commercial storefront feel. Pushing the glass back to create a shadow line, adding in stone piers or creating a cadence with lighting would improve the appearance. Folding glass walls could be included. Including more stone to articulate the clubhouse and other functions should be considered. Stone at the base could become a seat wall; a canopy overhead may be an improvement as well.
- The west face of the theatre pre-function space is shown as stone. The Board agreed this is a good solution.

- The WI Historical Society wants the pre-function space articulated as clearly separate visually from the theatre. Treating this as a pavilion seems appropriate. It will be important to maintain the sense of the theatre face, but the amount that the pavilion is cut in needs to be carefully balanced to avoid dead space.
- The southwest corner of the site now has two set of stairs divided by a planter. This design evolved to deal with the grade change and to create a gathering space at the corner. The Board suggested that the corner be established with a large planter that takes up the grade. The majority of pedestrian traffic comes from HC White and the sidewalk coming down Observatory Drive from Bascom Hill. It may be possible to keep the stair to the north and eliminate the second stair to the south. This corner needs to be more monumental.
- On the north side, the northeast corner of the Hooper addition is important, it should come to the ground rather than ending in a planter. This corner also needs to be studied and strengthened.

Design Review Board summary –

- This is a complex project. The design is going in the right direction. The architects need to look at both bold moves and details.
- The east façade of Hoopers seems too chopped up. The wall should be raised and straightened with landscape material added at the side.
- The lake façade of Hoopers needs more clarity and rhythm.
- The southwest corner (at Langdon and N. Park Street) needs to be strengthened with a planter or landscape at the corner.
- The Board looks at general to more specific details. In the future, options of all the different details should be presented.
- The mechanical engineer needs to be two steps ahead of the architectural design.
- Given the complexity of the project and the limited time for review, the DRB members should email Dan Okoli with any additional comments or details they would like to share with the project team.

Project Review: Chemistry Addition

A/E Firms: Ballinger – Bill Gustafson, Craig Spangler, Marc Ferrer;
Aro Eberle – Mike Eberle, Matt Aro, Doug Pahl

FP&M Project Manager: Pete Heaslett

Client Representative: Fleming Crim, Robert McMahon

This project will provide new instructional lab space (increasing the existing 70,000 asf to 125,000 asf) and renovate obsolete lab and instructional space. The concept of creating public space is a driving force in the thinking about this project.

- The site is bordered by University Avenue, N. Charter, N. Mills and W. Johnson streets with service coming from N. Charter St. The grade drops across the site from northeast to southwest.
- Two of the current lecture halls are obsolete and will be demolished. Three floors in the existing Daniels Building will be renovated.
- A new public area is introduced to the north with the lobby pulled back away from the street. An open environment will be included on the first floor facing University Ave. There will be entrances and exits on to University Ave and on N. Mills Street.
- Two top mechanical floors will also be pulled back from the streets.
- Transparency into labs and visual connections into classrooms will open up the environment.
- A café and lecture hall is being proposed on the first floor on the west side of the building.

Design Review Board discussion:

- The first floor plan is very good. Study whether an atrium running up the height of the building would be possible, perhaps with vertical gardens on the cross sections.
- Circulation should drive the flow of space.
- This project is going in the right direction but needs to include something unique. Is there a Wow statement that can be made and still meet the program? This building needs to be an exciting place to teach and learn.

Project Review: West Campus Parking

A/E Firm: Flad & Associates – Jeff Zutz, Laura Serebin

FP&M Project Manager: Matt Collins

Client Representative: Patrick Kass, Rob Kennedy

Patrick Kass provided an overview of the reasons for this study:

Transportation Services has been reviewing the parking supply on campus. Both the construction of the School of Nursing and a stormwater management project in the north portion of Lot 60 will result in a loss of stalls. This study is to understand what could reasonably be constructed at the hospital parking structure to replace capacity.

The demand for parking is increasing to meet employee and hospital needs. In addition, the stalls for persons with disabilities do not meet current code.

Laura Serebin reviewed the site constraints including location of the utility tunnel, property lines, setbacks and grade changes. Options that wrap the existing structure to varying degrees were reviewed:

- Option A provides a 6 level wrap on three sides of the structure gaining 1000 spaces but impacting the function, intersection and pedestrian circulation. This option was determined to not be viable.
- Option B includes only a partial wrap on the north. Entry is at the lower level. This creates a greater sense of entry for the hospital ramp and potentially for the hospital. This is the best option in terms of meeting capacity in the future.
- Option C adds to the east and south.

Shadow studies for the various options were also shown.

Design Review Board discussion:

- Arrival at a hospital is similar to an airport and needs a long entry space. The entry sequence needs to be re-thought.
- There should be an amenity associated with this project, a roof garden or some visual amenity.
- Questioned whether some portion of the structure could be built underground. The steam tunnel to the north may limit this.
- Questioned whether one or two levels could be removed on the north
- Option B has the most potential for improving entry to the parking structure and to the hospital. The partial wrap of the north side creates an opportunity to strengthen the entry sequence. A connecting bridge from the parking structure to the Health Science Learning Center could provide space for signage to create a gateway.
- This project needs to deal with stormwater management.
- Money should be spent on the ground along Highland Ave. This could become an urban forestry project with a combination of fast and slow growing trees and native groundcovers. A forest of trees could become a landmark for visitors looking for the Hospital.