

Design Review Board

April 19, 2011

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

Staff: Gary Brown, Alan Fish, Pat Richards, Yemi Falomo

Project Review: Badger Performance Center

A/E Firms: VOA Associates – William Ketcham; SportsPlan Studio – Joel Leider;

Berners-Schober – Ian Griffiths

Landscape Architecture Firm: JJR – Bill Patek, Brian Peterson

FP&M Project Manager: Ann Hayes

Client Representative: John Chadima

The A/E firm presented their preliminary study of the project. They stated this is not at schematic design yet but will present schematic design drawings at the next meeting. The presentation included scope of project, site analysis, response to campus master plan, architectural and physical context, current strategic concepts, observations, and opportunities on landscape design. There are many modifications for this project, some in scope and some out of scope. Currently, the project consists of Engineering Way, a redevelopment of Lot 17 East, renovation of McClain Center, development of Badger Way (east and west), and modifications and additions to Camp Randall. The out of scope work includes a study of potential work inside the Fieldhouse to create a retail space and Hall of Fame as well as south end zone improvements within the stadium. An addition to Engineering Hall is no longer in the scope, but site work will still be done around the west and south sides of building. The site is located in a central part of campus and the A/E has identified circulation and green space, the historic park adjacent to the Shell, and a new open space adjacent to Engineering Hall as primary pedestrian and circulation spaces. The current context of the site includes newer buildings that are more contemporary with glass and older historical buildings made of brick and stone.

Principal components:

- Redefinition of the entrance to the McClain Center
- Daily useage versus game days use
- Renovation of the McClain Center and correction of roof ice and snow issues
- Replacement of the McClain Center roof
- Improving the pedestrian experience throughout the site
- Score board upgrades
- Service and loading connections adjacent to Engineering Hall
- Snow storage, loading docks, bicycle & moped/scooter parking

The new scheme renovates the Camp Randall Stadium's lower level and moves some of the program that would have been on the new site into that space. This leaves only 40,000 GSF of new space required. It would be designed to be a two-story space that would wrap the upper north end zone and complete Camp Randall on its north elevation. The space would house the academic component of the program with the design intent of the building is to create a new and celebratory entrance into Camp Randall from the north.

- Entrance to the stadium will still be on the ground floor
- Olympic Sports locker rooms will be on level two
- The score board would have to be moved to make space for the new building

The site designs observations and strategic opportunities include:

- Working with Engineering Hall (neighborhood context)
- Service/loading dock connections adjacent to Engineering Hall
- Create a high level of detail for plaza (something similar to East Campus Mall)
- The intention is to make the space west of Engineering Hall a gathering space on this side of campus.
- Nodes and zones will be the focal points
 - Zone 1 focuses on Camp Randall Memorial Park entry sequence
 - Zone 2 focuses on Badger Way, east
 - Zone 3 focuses on the north end of the Stadium and Badger Way, west
 - Node A is the Camp Randall Arch
 - Node B focuses on new entrance to McClain and tower to the football offices
 - Node C is the Breese Terrace entry sequence and need for a focal point

Different options are being looked at to move the retaining walls 10 or 20 ft north of the site to open up space for the north addition and provide ample room for pedestrians and the required fire lane. The path could be moved to create more outdoor space. The fire access lanes will be fully maintained and there are many utilities that run through this site that need to be managed.

Design Review Board Discussion:

- What is the use of the plaza space during the week? It would be used as a gathering space for engineering and athletic students.
- There has to be a natural sequence to moving through the space.
- Entrances should be created into the spaces.
- It would be helpful to see an analysis of the use and what is projected for programmatic use of the open space.
- By moving the vehicular access north it seems like you are solving the vehicular problem but creating a pedestrian one.
- Look at this as an opportunity to connect the stadium back to campus.
- Look at the north-south and the east-west pedestrian movements and use the stadium to tie these parts of campus together visually.
- There should be good day lighting from the north windows in the academic area for the students.
- The stadium has historic character to it; the addition must fit in with that character but also be something of its own time.
- When designing, explore a variety of different options in expressing the architecture of the north addition.
- Make a physical model of the project to better understand the relationship of this building to the buildings and spaces around it.
- This area of campus is under utilized; make a greater north-south statement. It has historical significance and a wonderful view.
- The symmetrical thinking needs to go.
- Don't compromise the historic entrance off Randall Avenue and through the Memorial Arch.

Design Review Board Summary:

- Members are more comfortable with new developments including the solution for adding on to the north end of the stadium.
- The project has improved since the first review.

- As the design progresses, tie all the different components together in one drawing. We would like to see this at the next meeting.
- With respect to the proposed addition, provide several alternatives/thoughts that the board can respond to.
- The addition should tie to the rest of campus as well as to Camp Randall; explore this in form and material.
- The building does not need to be restricted to symmetry.
- Critically look at the landscape.
- Find a sustainable solution for the melting ice and water off the roof of McClain.
- What is driving this project from a delivery standpoint? Helium delivery is a key driver. Is there a different way of addressing that? Look at different solutions.
- Look more in-depth into the proposal to move the retaining wall north and what impacts that has on the overall site utilization.
- The new addition should be of its time but it needs to relate to its context.
- Circulation is very important on this project.

Project Review: Lakeshore Residence Hall – Phase II

A/E Firm: Epstein Uhen Architects – Brad Nygaard, Paul Raislager, Jonathan Parker

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

DSF Representative: Larry Earll

Client Representative: Paul Evans

FP&M Project Manager: Stu LaRose

The presentation was focused on site orientation, context, site analysis, and showed section cuts of the proposed building. They explained how these factors informed their design decisions. The site to be developed for this project is currently UW Parking Lot 32 surrounded by residence halls that were built in the 1940's and 1960's. To the north of the site is Lake Mendota and to the south is Allen Centennial Gardens.

Principal components presented were:

- Food service will no longer be in Holt Commons; all food service will now be in the new Lakeshore Residence Hall and Dining Facility that is under construction to the west.
- Service goods come in at the back of Allen Centennial Gardens and must be maintained.
- Fire lanes on the north and east of the proposed building site need to be maintained.
- Aligning the building north-south and creating a promenade/lane for a connection to the lake.
- The promenade would have trees species found on the lake with bike racks and trees on both sides.
- The north-south lane can only be used as a fire lane and pedestrian surface. It is not meant to be public driving surface.
- The new building would have a courtyard to the south of Holt Commons. This courtyard will have the Ogg Hall courtyard aesthetic (rain garden).
- New building pulls materials and hues from existing surrounding historic buildings.
- Building materials will be mainly cultured stone and brick.
- Windows will be translucent with frosted glass for the restrooms.
- The west side of the building is five-stories with a courtyard.
- Glass will be in the stairwell for visual safety reasons.
- The main entry to the building is on the south east corner of the building.
- Pedestrian traffic will either go to Holt Commons or to food service in the new building to the west.

Design Review Board Discussion:

- The building looks too busy because it is over articulated.
- The site plan looks like a group of disjointed spaces.
- The big picture has been lost due to small constraints. There could be too many little constraints in the project.
- It might be important to step back and simplify.
- The bike racks look haphazard; they should all be in one place.
- The look out to the lake seems forced; it might be better to bring the woods to the building instead of trying to create a look out.
- There seems to be too much going on with materials on this project; keep it simple like the buildings around it.
- It is obvious things have been well thought out as individual parts. Now, just step back and look at the entire project.

- The courtyard reads as unusable; too much shade and too confined. Open up the courtyard and simplify the building walls.
- The grade issue between the upper and lower levels has still not been resolved.
- Maybe simplify the line at the top of the building.
- Simplify the window elements (windows are reading like polka dots).
- A green roof on the top of the building will help take care of a lot of stormwater run-off.
- It appears possible to slide the residence hall east to provide more space between the west wall and Cole Hall.
- The budget will not be increasing, so keep the money in check.

Design Review Board Summary:

- Simplify
- It is obvious you have worked hard to work out the details, now take a step back and look at the overall context and simplify.
- Work on getting more functional and useable open space inside the courtyard.
- Take a new look at the green roof option.
- Work on bringing the woods into the courtyard. Take another look at making it a woodland garden.

Project Review: Memorial Union

A/E Firm: Uihlein Wilson – Del Wilson

Landscape Architecture Firm: JJR – Bill Patek, Ed Freer, Kyle Trulen

Client Representative: Paul Davidsaver, Hank Walter

FP&M Project Manager: Julie Grove, Angela Pakes-Ahlman

The presentation was an update of how the design scheme has progressed since the last DRB meeting. It focused specifically on site planning and site design features that would better connect the building to the rest of campus as well as to surrounding buildings.

Principal components:

- The current design makes use of one lift and ADA accessible ramps in different areas to move through the site (namely from the lakefront, up to alumni park and then down to Langdon Street with accessible connections into the Memorial Union at the upper most level; all areas would be fully accessible)
- The truck service entrance off of Langdon Street is as far east as it can go. The walls disappear into the landscape and southern end will be fairly low. There will need to be a 42” guard rail to the north which could be screened with landscape plantings.
- Southwest entry into theater will be directly off the corner of Langdon Street and North Park Street. There will be terraced steps at the corner and a seat height wall with bike parking around the edges. Room for tables and chairs are included to make this more of a destination and major entry to the building.
- Coming up from Langdon Street there is a walk-way and two existing staircases that do not meet accessibility codes and there are some alignment issues. To solve this, design team proposes a series of landings to bring people up the sidewalk or into the Union building. These series of landings reduce the impact of a staircase.
- An outdoor classroom and Hoofers would be placed on the rooftop of the existing Lake Lab building. Users can also either go to the lakeshore or go onto the terrace via a new stair case down to the lake.
- On the east side of the theater wing, there are some updates to the current brat stand; the design calls for an enclosed facility that will be bring the outdoor facility up to code. There will be an opportunity for sitting around the stand.
- The existing stairs east of the theater wing will be pushed out to the east. This is due to the location of the new roof of the basement of the new Hooper facility.
- The new access lift will be incorporated into architecture inside the building.
- At the Memorial Union Terrace, the design honors the prime axis to the north and south and is also keep most of the existing oaks and historic retaining walls to maintain the character of that space.
- There will be a new retaining wall to reshape the area but keeping the geometry and the raising of the area 18 – 20 inches in height.
- There will be a queuing area for the brat stand and the stand is being pushed to the west inside the building.
- The proposed stage will also function as a dining area when not in use; the design scheme creates a larger stage than what currently exists.
- Steps on the lakeshore will follow the same existing profile.
- There will be another structure to house mechanical equipment near the stage.
- The Below Alumni Center will be reconfigured to allow for a new west entry and plaza for small social functions. It could be designed to host a large event or break down into three or four smaller social spaces.
- The existing concrete pier will be removed and the shoreline will be rebuilt to remove the open area just north of the Red Gym. There is a proposed transient

dockage pier as part of the WAA Alumni park development. The dockage is permanent with a removable seasonal dock to be added to the east.

Design Review Board Discussion:

- There is 5% grade change from Langdon Street to the park lawn. Soften the grade change with planters.
- The columns supporting the arbor will be 12 – 14 feet on the alumni park side. The columns will step down with an inner ring and an outer ring? (yes) Will there be handrails on the stairs? (yes)
- The arbor is a new concept to this space. The large oaks are a historic component. There needs to be some coordination between the two concepts.
- This is the first comprehensive site plan for the project.
- Simplify the area, instead of having two distinct areas of the park and arbor. Can the trees come up to form a bookend with the large trees on the Terrace?
- The lawn area in Alumni Park could also be used in conjunction with the arbor plaza for a band or gathering area. It's could be used homecoming events and weddings. Could have hundreds of chairs on the lawn for these events.
- The spacing of columns is very far apart. The overhangs have the wrong structural message. The columns are at different heights when walking down the hill.
- If you put the columns closer together that will also block the view.
- It becomes too dense with two sets of columns.
- There is a 10 foot grade change from Alumni Park down to the lake front.
- A strong recommendation is to make the east-west connectivity more effective; maybe to have two arbors in an oval shape.
- The big view is the lake. This should be studied in model. Frame it to open to the lake, not away from the lake.
- Not the best place for a trellis. Could it be used in different ways? (Sam Calvin likes the trellis the way it is and would like to see it heavier)
- Look at different ways to plant instead of using planters.
- The ramp is above grade, possibly find ways to gain additional height. Try to stay away from adding too many stairs. Can the Park Street corner be raised up instead of sinking down? Put the corner at the sidewalk height.
- At the front of the building the planters seem too heavy. Simplify the planters in front of the building and make one set of steps instead of three.
- The space by the lake could be simplified. Too many things are happening there. The scheme could benefit by some elimination. The arbor area is too chopped up. Make the arbor an outdoor sculpture. Take the green out from the stairs and make it a hard space.
- Maybe make the area one level with two or three different main areas instead of so many choppy areas.
- The space you are creating needs to be in the tradition of the Union Terrace and could be a benchmark location.
- Don't forget the east-west connectivity is as important as the north-south.

Design Review Board Summary:

- Simplify with understanding the complexity of the project.
- Figure out different ways to approach the arbor; one option may be to split it in two and orient the pieces north-south on either side of the park. Be sure the size, height and orientation are appropriate and look into making it a sculptural piece. Also, look at the technical constructability.
- Bring sections with you to the next meeting.

Project Review: School of Music

A/E Firm: Holzman Moss Bottino Architects – Doug Moss

A/E Firm: Strang Architects – Jeff Gaard

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

Client Representative: John Schaffer, John Stevens

FP&M Project Manager: Julie Grove

This project is in the programming pre-design phase. The A/E aims to complete this portion in June or early July at which time the project will go on hold while the campus seeks more funding. The principal components consist of an 800-seat concert hall and 300-seat recital hall. The programmatic aspects consist of a diverse user group. These groups are the School of Music (students, faculty and staff); outside music-oriented users, such as the Madison Symphony band; and community people coming to watch performances and events.

The areas of program still being developed are:

- Area #1 (lobby space) - The music areas will access from the lobby.
- Area #2 (a recital hall) - This is a more flexible space with a balcony in it and acoustical hall.
- Area #3 (a rehearsal room) - This area might be visually seen from outdoors.

The guiding principles for the design relate to teaching, recording and bringing together town and gown for music events put on by the School of Music. Other spaces in the building will include dressing rooms and spaces for stagehands and performers. Faculty offices, classrooms and practice rooms will remain in the Humanities Building until phase II of the overall project. The recording industry has changed a lot in the last five years so the design of this new school needs to reflect that. It would also be the east gateway to the campus when traveling westbound on University Avenue. The site has been studied at both neighborhood and regional scale. The projects planning is in various stages of completion now and the design team is looking at where people will be coming from to determine where doors should be placed. Based on the approved campus master plan, Phase II of the Music project will be on the site of the current Extension Building to the north. A loading and service dock location will be at the northwest corner which is near the loading dock for Chazen. Based on the approved block master plan, the city is going to require that a service court be maintained interior to the block and that a dedicated access out to Lake Street will need to be maintained when we start looking at Phase II.

Design Review Board Discussion:

- The project is putting a lot of program onto this site. Are the University Avenue and North Lake Street sidewalks wide enough to accommodate 800 people?
- There is the need to accommodate pedestrian and vehicular movements due to high volume of traffic.
- The southeast corner of this site needs to make an important statement as this is the front door of the campus. The image also needs to compete with University Square to the south.
- The Chazen plaza space links us back to the East Campus pedestrian/bicycle mall. There maybe a side entry off of North Lake Street depending on the location to the entrance to the building.
- Currently, there is no cross walk midblock across North Lake Street to the city's parking ramp. However, there is a drop-off area in front of Chazen.

- There is a need for a large area for bus loading students and instruments (the marching band).
- Mechanical spaces will be below grade and instrument storage and other items would be located on the first floor.
- The lobby will be a modest space where more program space can be obtained in the building. Spaces adjacent to the lobby are restrooms and coat storage.
- The lobby is currently designed about a third or fourth of the size of an ideal lobby space.
- Coming west along University Avenue is the smaller space of the rehearsal hall. This rehearsal space is at the end of the arts piazza. Rehearsals will happen at all times of the day and night. Passers-by will be able to look inside the building to see activities happening.
- There is a large amount of space between Chazen and the School of Music that seems unusable. There will be plenty of space for bikes and pedestrian at the north, south view so it might make sense to bring the two building together.
- The design team explored taking the whole mass and moving it to the north and west and creating a new service drive for Chazen and the new music building south of the Extension Building.
- The mission of the building now is not for the lobby but for the recording and academic aspect. Can you enlarge the lobby 20 years from now? Can the lobby also be used vertically?
- Can we put Phase 1 and Phase 2 on one site? If so, there will be nothing in front for hardscape and landscape. This could possibly be a Phase I.B and then a Phase II.
- Exterior requirements are no windows for the two halls. Will the brick and stone tie this building to the rest of the campus or will it be articulated in any way to add some visual interest?
- Make each major space be their own masses and have their own articulation. There is a potential for a change of material on each of these masses. Phase II or I.B can have windows.
- Pete Anderson likes the I.B phase idea. It takes pressure off the site. Can the massing change so the tallest building is not on the west end? He likes the rehearsal space on the street corner so people can view when passing by. He would like to see the lobby incorporate elements two and three as shown on scheme III.B.
- The DRB likes the open space in front for use by patrons before and after performances.
- The DRB is concerned about how much room there is on the whole east side of the complex. There needs to be enough room for good pedestrian flow along North Lake Street.
- The DRB would like to make the view arriving on campus via University Avenue be just as great on the north side as it is on the south side (U Square).
- How will you have a loading dock if you put a major entrance on the northwest side for students? There may be conflicts in this design.
- If you have a phase I.B, will phase II diminish in size?
- The service entrance will be at the northwest corner of the existing building, not just north of Phase I.
- Would be helpful to see more of the proposed site for what is being built in connection to this.

- The board is concerned about the part of the project on North Lake Street. (namely the mass of the wall)

Design Review Board Summary:

- Everyone likes the III.B scheme.
- Very clear thought process.
- Next time present this on a larger context, site and open space.
- Show how it is adding value to everything else around it.
- The placement of the lobby gives it the ability to expand it in the future and makes it visible from East Campus Mall and University Avenue.
- The rehearsal hall at the corner adds transparency to it from the east. Gives opportunity to give interest and compete with activities on the other side (U Square).
- The board likes how the spaces are broken into separate masses; breaking them into pieces helps to figure out a way to unify them.
- Concerned with Lake Street and the mass of the wall. Give Lake Street some interest and use the project to improve Lake Street. The City would like this.

Project Review: Charter Street Heating Plant Redesign

A/E Firm: JJR – Bill Patek, Cassie Goodwin

Construction Firm: Boldt Construction – Jeff Niesen

This project is already in the construction phase, but it was brought back to present design changes caused by program change and scope update with the removal of the biofuels portion of the project.

Changes to the project:

- The bio-mass component for the project has been discontinued.
- This has reduced the site plan significantly; however it is still a large project.
- Space where bio-mass boiler used to sit is being preserved for a future bio fuel boiler.
- The Dayton Street building has been expanded a bit and the interior functions changed. It previously housed two gas boilers and it now houses four gas boilers.
- The building has grown a bit on the south end with no changes being made to the north.
- New additions include an elevated cooling tower with a water treatment building under it off the east side of the existing building, adjustments to the parking lot, and the landscape design.

Changes to the building materials:

- Not much has changed with the building; the biggest change is the west fuel transfer tower have been removed and replaced with a stair tower.
- The A/E provided building materials for review along with new renderings of the building.
- Changes to the East elevation were shared.
- The materials consist of different color brick and glass louvers.

Changes to the Landscape:

- The location of the outside fuel oil storage tank is determined by the minimum distance needed between the tank and future building setbacks (fire code) and the space needed for delivery trucks to get through.
- The site east of Mills Street is now dominated by parking because of the absence of Bio-Mass, therefore the new landscape concept infuses more trees to the site as required by city code.
- The designer has kept the large landscape stones in the site plan to act as a safety barrier for the windows from the street on the first floor.
- Mounding of stone and some plantings have been incorporated to disguise a utility vault that was built into the site.
- There is a decorative fence planned to replace the chain link fence that currently surrounds the west parking lot on Charter Street.
- The design team has included natural vegetation plantings between the fence and the sidewalk.

Design Review Board Discussion:

- Fence does not seem to be shown in accurate height in rendering.
- Fence feels too residential; it needs to be industrial.
- Are there any lights? There needs to be some lights around the site.
- Explore different light fixtures for site.

- While it is important the buildings fit in with other campus buildings, in a case like this where the building is not your typical campus building, it is fine for the building to stand out.
- Let the building be what it is supposed to be (industrial).
- Look into painting structure behind the glass of the Dayton Street building; it would be more visually stimulating and it will help people see the structure behind.
- Explore other landscape design options for parking lot; work on making things more intentional.

Design Review Board Summary:

- Let the building be what it is, industrial. Therefore things like the fence and lights should reflect that and be at scale.
- Don't make the building too cute.
- Explore colors to make the building more fun.
- Explore options for the parking lot landscaping that make it visually better. (Send them to Dan and Gary to review)